

## Probing the Factors that Hinder the Success of Blended Learning in English Language Learning

<sup>1,\*</sup>Prof. Ala'a Ismael Challob (Ph.D.), <sup>2</sup>Noor Khalid Shehab, <sup>3</sup>Heba Sobhi Ali  
Dept. of English, College of Education for Humanities, University of Anbar, Ramadi, Iraq  
<sup>1,\*</sup> [dr.alaaismael@uoanbar.edu.iq](mailto:dr.alaaismael@uoanbar.edu.iq)

**KEYWORDS:** Factors, Success, Blended Learning, English Language Learning.



<https://doi.org/10.51345/v37i1.1309.g639>

### ABSTRACT:

Blended learning, as a current trend in teaching in general and in teaching English as a foreign language in particular, plays a crucial role in helping students learn English language. However, EFL students at the university level encountered so many technical and pedagogical challenges when learning English language by using blended learning. Accordingly, the current study investigates the main factors that hinder the success of blending learning in English language learning. More specifically, the study attempts to investigate the sequence of the effectiveness of these main factors in hindering the success of blending learning in English language learning, and to identify the sequence of the effectiveness of these sub factors within each main factor in hindering the success of blending learning in English language learning. The researchers used a quantitative descriptive research design whereby a closed ended questionnaire including twenty items that are distributed among four domains where used to collect data for the current study. A sample consisting of EFL students at their 4th year study was randomly selected from the English Department, College of Education for Humanities, University of Anbar in the academic year 2023-2024. Quantitative data analysis was implemented by using SPSS to analyze the collected data. Findings revealed that there are many factors that hinder the success of blended learning in learning English language. These factors are students' factors, psychological factors, teachers' factors and institutional factors, respectively.

### REFERENCES:

- Alammery, A., Sheard, J., & Carbone, A. (2014). Blended learning in higher education: Three different design approaches. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 30(4).
- Anthony, B., Kamaludin, A., Romli, A., et al. (2019). Blended learning adoption and implementation in higher education: A theoretical and systematic review. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 25(3).
- Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (2012). *The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs*. New York: John Wiley & Sons..
- Broadbent, J. (2017). Comparing online and blended learner's self-regulated learning strategies and academic performance. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 33.
- Collis, B., & Moonen, J. (2001). Flexible learning in a digital world. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 17(3), 217-230.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. 4th Ed. Los Angeles: Sage publications, Inc.
- Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 49(1), 5-22.
- Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2).
- Graham, C. R. (2006). Blended learning systems. *The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs*, 1, 3-21.
- Graham, C. R. (2019). Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In *The handbook of blended learning* (pp. 3-21). Pfeiffer.
- Graham, C. R., Woodfield, W., & Harrison, J. B. (2019). A framework for institutional adoption and implementation of blended learning in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 18.

- Hockly, N. (2018). Blended learning. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 97-101.
- Kahu, E. R., & Nelson, K. (2018). Student engagement in the educational interface: Understanding the mechanisms of student success. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(1).
- Liu, J. (2020). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 71-86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00687.x>
- Marsh, D. (2012). *Blended Learning Creating Learning Opportunities for Language Learners*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 4.
- Moskal, P., Dziuban, C., & Hartman, J. (2013). *Blended learning: A dangerous idea? The Internet and Higher Education*, 18.
- Neumeier, P. (2020). A closer look at blended learning—Parameters for designing a blended learning environment for language teaching and learning. *ReCALL*, 17(2), 163-178.
- Porter, W. W., Graham, C. R., Spring, K. A., & Welch, K. R. (2019). Blended learning in higher education: Institutional adoption and implementation. *Computers & Education*, 93.
- Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 144.
- Sharma, P., & Barrett, B. (2021). *Blended learning: Using technology in and beyond the language classroom*. Macmillan.
- Smythe, M. (2011). *Blended learning: A transformative process?*, Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology, Retrieved May 28rd, 2015 from: <https://akoatearoa.ac.nz/.../smythe-blended-learning>
- Stein, J. & Graham, C. (2019). *Essentials for blended learning: A standards-based guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Stracke, E. (2019). A road to understanding: A qualitative study into why learners drop out of a blended language learning (BLL) environment. *Language Learning & Technology*, 23(1), 52-75.
- Tomlinson, B., & Whittaker, C. (2021). *Blended learning in English language teaching: Course design and implementation*. British Council.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

## 1. Introduction

Blended learning is a method of teaching that combines conventional face-to-face teaching with digital technology. It has become quite popular in English Language Learning (ELL) because it may make learning more flexible, engaging, and personalized to each student (Graham, 2019). Blended learning integrates the advantages of face-to-face contact and digital resources, providing learners with many possibilities to enhance language performance, fluency, and confidence at their own pace (Sharma & Barrett, 2021). Despite its rising popularity, this approach has a number of problems that prevent its proper deployment in ELL settings.

The importance of blended learning to support independent learning, accommodate various learning styles, and offer instant feedback through digital technologies makes it significant in language instruction (Hockly, 2018). Research indicated that by combining interactive activities, multimedia materials, and cooperative online platforms, blended learning environments enhance motivation and language retention (Neumeier, 2020). However, despite the well-established advantages of blended learning, a number of barriers keep blended learning from realizing its full potential in English as a foreign language learning contexts.

Despite the success of blended learning as a teaching and learning paradigm, students might encounter challenges that hinder their learning of English language due to many reasons. The fact that some teachers and students struggle to adjust to blended learning approaches is a serious problem. The blended learning process is frequently interrupted by problematic issues including inadequate technology infrastructure, insufficient digital literacy, opposition to pedagogical change, and poorly designed courses (Tomlinson & Whittaker, 2021). For example, some students may not have access to dependable internet or digital devices in educational settings with limited resources, which can lead to differences in learning outcomes (Dhawan, 2020). Furthermore, some teachers find it

difficult to switch from traditional to blended learning approaches, which results in irregular application (Stracke, 2019). This matter is obviously reflected by EFL students who study English language at their 4th year, in the English department, College of Education for Humanities, University of Anbar. Hence, the current study attempts to investigate the main factors that hinder the success of blending learning in English language learning, examining the ways in which institutional, pedagogical, and technical impediments impact language acquisition. Specifically, the present study aims at:

1. Investigating the main factors that hinder the success of blending learning in English language learning.
2. Investigating the sequence of the effectiveness of these main factors in hindering the success of blending learning in English language learning.
3. Identifying the sequence of the effectiveness of these sub factors within each main factor in hindering the success of blending learning in English language learning.

By looking at these issues, the study aims to provide pedagogical insights on the possible fixes that can improve the use of blended learning tactics in English language learning. In the end, even though blended learning has revolutionary potential for English language instruction, resolving these issues is essential to its successful implementation.

## 2. Theoretical Background

### 2.1 The Meaning of Blended Learning

According to Vygotsky (1978, p. 51), language is considered a cultural device, and consequently, it is an essential instrument for converting individual experiences into cultural awareness and comprehension. Besides, human culture and experiences are transmitted from one generation to the next through the use of language. This is true in the context of instruction and teacher preparation. Critical thinking skills in their subject areas, such as curiosity, flexibility, persistence, responsibility, originality, and dedication to excellence, may be enhanced by teachers through project work. A growing number of empirical studies indicated that "scaffolding" among learners has a positive impact on second language learning (Liu, 2020, p.648).

Collis and Moonen (2001, p.29) argue that "blending learning is more than the delivery of technologies, it is certainly not a plug and play proposition. Instead, it is a shift in our profession. It is also time and effort to be successful at blending learning". Blended learning is one of the current learning trends in English language which is advocated based on language-centered learning approaches that emphasize the role of learners themselves in their learning in self- learning opportunities (Mohammed, 2022, p. 26). According to Smythe (2011, p.62), blended learning is a practical approach that incorporates a wide range of practical and efficient teaching and learning methods. It enhances the use of many techniques to improve learners and encourage exposure and engagement at all language levels, as well as the use of digital technologies to aid the teaching and learning process.

### 2.2. A Theoretical Perspective of Blended Learning.

The concept of blended learning has been around for a while, but it wasn't until the early 2000s that its terminology was firmly established. Graham (2006) defined "blended learning systems" as learning systems that "combine face-to-face instruction with computer mediated instruction". Tomlinson & Whittaker (2021) enhance that the aim of the two delivery methods is to complement each other. Presently, the use of the term "blended learning" includes uniting

Internet and digital media with recognized classroom forms that need the physical compresence of teacher and students.

The theory of blended learning models includes instructor-delivered content, learning, webinars, conference calls, live or online sessions with teachers, and other media and events, for example, Facebook, e-mail, chat rooms, blogs, podcasting, Twitter, YouTube, Skype and web boards. Blended learning embodies an educational environment for much of the world where computers and the Internet are willingly obtainable. It syndicates self-study with valued face-to-face interaction with a teacher. The blended learning development may offer new vision in communication and learning and enlarges the limits of the traditional classroom. The concept Blended learning has no clear definition. Most educators and writers reflect it a blend of face-to face learning and online learning or rather a combination of a physical and a virtual learning environment (Liu, 2020).

Blended learning appears to be a developing tendency in higher education and has caught my interest as one method to growth and boost students in their learning process. Teachers have always engaged in different forms of blending and added new information and knowledge to what students already know through various learning activities and through a mixture of theory and practice. Teachers are usually most skilled in face-to-face teaching and learning and have a specific insight in how their students may enhance their learning. If teachers are equally trained in the digitally instructional teaching and learning they will be able to choose and combine the more traditional way of learning with digital learning and choose the best from each educational arena (Sharma & Barrett, 2021).

### ***2.3 Components of blended learning.***

Instruction can be delivered in face-to-face or online (synchronously or asynchronously). Whether live or recorded, be sure to (1) model skills and ask students to give them a try, and (2) chunk content to avoid overwhelming students with too much at once. After each chunk, build in time for students to process the material (Bonk and Graham, 2012).

#### ***1. Face-to-Face:***

Capitalize on face-to-face time by administering group checks for understanding using whiteboards, think-pair-shares, discussion, and debate to reveal shared understandings and misconceptions. Ending class with a traditional exit slip helps shape subsequent instruction to more accurately meet student needs. Make a connection between students and content. Students' answers about themselves, their families, and their communities launched an investigation of the same question regarding geographical change (Tomlinson and Whittaker, 2021).

Students can collaborate in traditional small groups or via individual devices using Google Docs or Slides. These forums also allow groups to present their work to the full class by sharing links or projecting products on the classroom screen. Use face-to-face time to provide explicit instruction based on student needs revealed by students' collaborative work (Bonk and Graham, 2012).

Introduce tasks in face-to-face or remote, synchronous settings so that students have opportunities to ask questions. If you plan to use digital tools like Piktochart, Canva, or Anchor, introduce those in class so that students can experiment and become comfortable while you are there to troubleshoot.

#### ***2. Online:***

Provide direct instruction via video and be sure to include opportunities to "pause and post" along the way for students to share joyful moments, questions, and examples. Try

novelty. Relevant video clips, memes, or comics are useful online launchpads. An English teacher began a study on the effect of a narrator's perspective by posting several optical illusions with varied interpretations and asking students to comment explaining what they saw.

Use digital platforms to monitor student understanding during online learning. Students learning about different triangles might draw examples on Go Formative or post pictures of examples on Padlet. These online learning checks reveal if re-teaching is needed, streamlining instructional time.

Engage students in meaningful online interactions with peers through discussion posts in your school's learning management system or on sites like Flipgrid. Invite interaction by asking classmates to comment on one another's posts. Students can also use Google Docs or Slides to maintain the flow of collaborative work between digital and face-to-face settings (Tomlinson and Whittaker, 2021).

Continuing work online is most successful when students have access to peers for collaboration (through Google Docs or chats) and have a place to post questions that surface during work. Take advantage of flexible online learning experiences by scheduling opportunities for students to interact with mentors (in the community or beyond) (Bonk and Graham, 2012).

#### ***2.4 The importance of blended learning in English language learning.***

Marsh (2012, p.5) stated that “essentials for Blended Learning provides a practical, streamlined approach for creating effective learning experiences by blending online activities and the best of face-to-face teaching. Effective blended learning requires rethinking of teaching practices and a redesign of course structure. Suitable for instructors in any content area”. Focusing on the quality of blended learning, Marsh (2012, p.14) pointed to some elements that make it useful. He explained that it promotes individualized learning styles, experience as language teachers can provide learners by many authentic tasks based on their potentials. It also encourages personalized learning support; where language learners can be given notes related to their particular exercises other than those that are presented for the whole class. He also argues that blended learning promote motivation for identity, autonomy and cooperative learning, promote student's exposure and engagement in learning systems, provides a relaxing learning environment for effective and fruitful learning, and encourages flexible learning and instruction.

Besides, blended learning can provide self-paced teaching and learning settings that are sensitive to individual characteristics and goals (Dhawan, 2020). By the use of blended learning, advanced language learners and college students can move rapidly through assignments that provide little difficulty, while others can take the time, they need to master basic skills and behaviors (Stein & Graham, 2019).

### **3. Methodology**

#### ***3.1 Research Design***

Research design is the overall plans, and procedures for research that decide the types of inquiry within the research approaches and consequently, provides direction for a research process (Creswell, 2014:295). To attain the objectives of the study, quantitative research design was used as it is the most suitable one for the current study. Supporting this idea, (Creswell, 2014:50) indicated that”

*“Certain types of social research problems call for specific approaches. For example, if the problem calls for (a) the identification of factors that influence an outcome, (b) the*

*utility of an intervention, or (c) understanding the best predictors of outcomes, then a quantitative approach is best”.*

Given the study's nature and objectives, the researchers employed a quantitative descriptive research approach, utilizing a questionnaire of four closed-ended items across various domains.

### **3.2 Participants and study context**

The current study is conducted in the first semester of the academic year (2023-2024) in the Department of English, College of Education for Humanities at the University of Anbar.

Iraqi fourth-year male and female EFL students, represented the study's population. Out of them, thirty students were chosen to participate in the present study as a sample. Random sampling technique was used and their absolute agreements served as the foundation for the selection process. The age range of the students was 21–23 years old.

### **3.3 Research Instrument**

A closed-ended questionnaire was designed and employed in order to achieve the objectives of the current investigation. The purpose of the questionnaire was to look at the key elements that might affect blended learning's effectiveness in an EFL learning environment.

There were two sections in the questionnaire, the first of which was intended to gather participant demographic data; whereas the second aimed to determine the barriers to blended learning success as seen by university-level EFL students. Consequently, there are four domains in this section of the questionnaire. These include aspects related to teachers' factors, students' factors, psychological factors, and institutional factors.

To guarantee the questionnaire's face validity, the initial draft was sent to specialists. These professionals attested to the legitimacy of the survey and offered a few helpful suggestions that improve its validity. When creating the final version of the questionnaire, their feedback was taken into careful consideration. The questionnaire was then administered to a pilot group of 15 students in order to assess its reliability, appropriateness, practicality, and clarity. The reliability rating, which represented 89%, was satisfactory, and all of these qualities were entirely guaranteed. The instrument is therefore prepared for final application.

### **3.4 Procedures of the Study**

The researchers conducted the following procedures in order to collect the data of the study, and attain the aims of the study:

1. Constructing the questionnaire questions and items after examining earlier pertinent research that addressed these types of questionnaires.
2. Ensuring validity and reliability of the questionnaire.
3. Identifying the population of the study and randomly selecting the sample of the study.
4. Conducting the questionnaire to the sample of the study and collecting the data.
6. Analyzing the collected data that help the researchers attain the aims of the study.

### **3.5 Data Analysis Procedures**

The researchers utilized the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the data they had gathered and accomplish the aims of the present investigation. As a result, means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages were computed for both the demographic and questionnaire-collected data.

## **4. Findings of the study**

#### 4.1. Findings related to the first aim of the study

The four elements, in varying degrees, contributed to the barriers to using blended learning, according to the examination of the data gathered by the questionnaire. Students' and psychological factors are having a strong negative influence as challenging elements to the success of blended learning, as table 1 below illustrates. These are followed by teachers and institutional factors that have a moderate impact on blended learning effectiveness.

No.	Dependent Variables	Means	Standard Deviation	Degree	Rank
2	Students' Factors	6.53	0.59	High	1
4	Psychological Factors	6.34	0.57	High	2
1	Teachers' Factors	6.21	0.64	Medium	3
3	Institutional Factors	6.15	0.55	Medium	4
Total		6.30	0.47	High	----

Table (1). Means and SD of the Four Domains of the Questionnaire.

#### 4.2 Findings Related to the Second Aim of the Study

Table 1 shows the average and SDs of the students' questionnaire answers. Accordingly, the following are the primary determinants of the success of the use of blended learning in English language learning. The students' factors have the greatest mean (6.53), with SD of 0.59, suggesting that they are the primary cause of the blended learning's failure. The second ranking is psychological factors, which have an average mean of 6.34 and SD of 0.57. This means that these factors also play an important part in preventing the success of blended learning. Furthermore, the teachers' factors are ranked the third, with a mean of 6.21 and SD of 0.64 for medium degrees. Finally, institutional factors have an average mean of 6.15 and SD of 0.55. Institutional factors appear to have had less of an impact on the success of blended learning.

#### 4.3 Findings Related to the Third Aim of the Study

As noted in earlier sections, the domain related to the students' factors received the highest ranking among the three domains. Table 2 shows the MSs and SDs of student responses to each item in this category.

No.	Domains	Means	Standard Deviation	Practice Degree	Rank
5	Students do not have the required digital readiness to use the blended learning English language platforms.	6.89	0.67	High	1
3	Students cannot work independently and access online English language learning sources by themselves.	6.60	0.44	High	2
4	Students' are not able to continuously interact with their colleagues and with their teachers in an online and face to face modes.	6.54	0.38	High	3
1	Students do not have the required skills to allocate sufficient time to complete online and blended learning activities.	6.44	0.91	High	4
2	Students do not reflect active engagement and participation in the BL English learning activities.	6.23	0.56	Medium	5

Table (2). Means and standard deviation of the domain related the students' factors

As seen in Table 2 above, item No. 5 ranks the first with MS of 6.89 and SD of 0.67. Item No.3 is ranked the second, with MS of 6.60 and SD of 0.44. Item No. 4 is ranked the third,

with MS of 6.54 and SD of 0.38. Then, item No.1 received the fourth position, with MS of (6.44) and SD of (0.91). Lastly, Item No. 2 in this category ranked the fifth with MS of (6.23) and SD of (0.56).

Second, the domain pertaining to psychological factors had the second highest ranking among the three domains. Table 3 shows the mean scores and SDs of students' responses to each item in this category.

No.	Domains	Means	Standard Deviation	Practice Degree	Rank
3	The blended learning environment does not make me motivated to learn English.	6.89	0.63	High	1
5	Learning English in the BL mode does not make me comfortable in learning	6.33	0.47	High	2
4	Learning English in the BL mode does not make me aware about my learning needs.	6.29	0.79	High	3
2	I do not have the freedom to ask other students or my teacher what I did not understand.	6.21	0.65	Medium	4
1	I do not feel happy in working at my own speed autonomously at home.	6.01	0.45	Medium	5

**Table (3). Means and Standard Deviation of the Domain Related the Psychological Factors.**

As can be seen in Table 3 above, item No. 3 receives the highest ranking with MS of 6.89 and SD of 0.63. Item No. 5 receives the second position with MS of 6.33 and SD of 0.47. Item No. 4 receives the third position with MS of 6.29 and SD of 0.79. Then, with MS of 6.21 and SD of 0.65, item No.2 came in at number four. Ultimately, Item No. 1 in this category received the fifth position with SD of 0.45 and MS of 6.01.

Thirdly, out of the three domains, the one that was pertinent to teachers' factors came in third. The MSs and SD of students' answers for each item in this area are shown in Table 4 below.

No.	Domains	Means	Standard Deviation	Practice Degree	Rank
4	In a BL context, teachers are not able to create comprehensive and flexible language lessons to improve the students' learning process.	6.44	0.67	High	1
3	Teachers are incapable to direct, guide, and develop learning online content that help students' self-access of online learning materials.	6.38	0.51	High	2
1	Teachers are not competent to employ modern online technologies to enhance students' learning	6.24	0.81	High	3
2	The online and face to face learning activities created by teachers are to some extent misleading.	6.16	0.59	Medium	4
5	Teachers are not able to design and select suitable evaluation methods according to the students' abilities and technology skills.	5.85	0.63	Medium	5

**Table (4). Means and standard deviation of the domain related the teachers' factors.**

Item No. 4 receives the top rank with MS of 6.44 and SD of 0.67, as seen in Table 4 above. Item No. 3 receives the second rank with MS of 6.38 and SD of 0.51. Item No. 1 receives the third position with MS of 6.24 and SD of 0.81. Then, with MS of 6.16 and SD of 0.59, item No.2 came in at number four. Lastly, with MS of 5.85 and SD of 0.63, item No.5 in this area received the fifth place.

Lastly, out of the three domains, the one related to institutional considerations received the fourth place. The mean scores and SD of students' answers for each question in this area are shown in Table 5 below.

No.	Domains	Means	Standard Deviation	Practice Degree	Rank
4	The university does not establish an intelligent classroom system consisting of devices that support learning, including sound systems, projectors, and online meeting systems, etc.	6.66	0.45	High	1
3	The university does not keep truck with students and their teachers to solve the technological problems that they face in the BL courses.	6.23	0.65	Medium	2
5	The university does not establish a good technology platform as a key for an organization in creating an effective BL model.	6.21	0.87	Medium	3
2	The university does not provide training for students and professional development support for lecturers to use BL.	6.01	0.35	Medium	4
1	The university does not have the required infrastructure and supportive technologies that enhance the use of BL.	5.65	0.54	Low	5

**Table (5). Means and standard deviation of the domain related the institutional factors**

As can be seen in Table 5 above, item No. 4 receives the top ranking with MS of 6.66 and SD of 0.45. Item No. 3 receives the second position with MS of 6.23 and SD of 0.65. Item No. 5 receives the third position with MS of 6.21 and SD of 0.87. Then, with MS of 6.01 and SD of 0.35, item No.2 was ranked the fourth. Lastly, with MS of 5.65 and SD of 0.54, item No. 1 in this area came in at number five.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusion

### 5.1 Discussion

The current study attempted to investigate the most influential factors that negatively affect the success of the use of blended learning in English language learning at the university level at the university of Anbar - College of Education for Humanities. The findings indicated that these varying factors were having negative influence on the success of blended learning and at varying degrees. Specifically, students' factors and psychological factors are having the highest negative impact on the success of blended learning whereas teachers' factors and institutional factors are having moderate impact on the success of blended learning. These results support earlier studies while also offering a more thorough understanding of the main difficulties in blended learning settings.

As revealed in the current study, students' factors and psychological factors are the more challenging ones to the success of blended learning. This is in accordance with earlier studies that demonstrate how low motivation, poor self-control, and anxiety about online learning have a detrimental effect on students' performance and engagement (Broadbent, 2017; Rasheed et al., 2020). Furthermore, blended learning environments can provide challenges for students who have issues with time management or computer literacy (Anthony et al., 2019). Besides, Psychological obstructions, such as stress from adjusting to technology-mediated learning and emotions of loneliness intensify this situation further (Kahu & Nelson, 2018). In according to these results, and in order to lessen these challenges, blended learning models need to include robust student support networks, such as seminars for skill development, mental health services, and orientation programs.

Despite the medium-level influence of these variables, teachers continue to play a critical role in the success of blended learning. Issues including resistance to change, poor course

design, and insufficient training in digital pedagogy are consistent with other research (Graham et al., 2019; Porter et al., 2019). Effective blended education may be difficult for teachers to enable if they lack confidence in their ability to use learning management systems (LMS) or create interactive online content (Alammery et al., 2014). However, students' own levels of involvement have a greater impact than teachers' since they serve as facilitators rather than the only forces behind learning. Peer mentorship, professional development programs, and rewards for implementing blended learning techniques should be given top priority in order to solve this.

Institutional barriers, including a lack of money, unclear regulations, and inadequate technology infrastructure are also found to have a moderate impediment to the success of blended learning. This supports previous research that highlights the need for strong institutional commitment for blended learning (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Moskal et al., 2013). Both students and instructors encounter preventable challenges in the absence of dependable internet connectivity, current learning management system platforms, and administrative assistance. To improve blended learning sustainability, institutions must thus make investments in scalable digital resources, transparent implementation frameworks, and continuous technical assistance.

## 5.2 Conclusion

The current study emphasizes that teacher readiness and institutional support are still amongst the crucial factors for blended learning effectiveness, even if student-related and psychological variables are the biggest obstacles. Accordingly, optimizing blended learning results requires a comprehensive strategy that combines institutional investment, teacher training, and student assistance. To better address these obstacles, future studies should emphasize on examining certain solutions (such as artificial intelligence-driven tutoring for individualized learning or gamification for motivation).

The novelty of the current study is that it statistically and descriptively addresses the barriers that encounter the success of using blended learning at the university level in Iraq. The use of blended learning in English language learning and teaching is considered a new pedagogical trend in Iraq, and consequently, few studies have concentrated in studying the factors that affect its success. More precisely, the majority of the previous studies have emphasized on its effectiveness experimentally and the studies that investigate the factors that positively or negatively affect its success are still rare and to some extent ignored due to the difficulties that may encounter researchers in collecting data relevant to this critical issue.

Despite the valuable findings of the current study, certain restrictions are in need for consideration by future researchers. Due to the context of the current study, only simple descriptive statistics were implemented using quantitative research method. Therefore, future researchers can strengthen and deepen the results of the study by using qualitative research instruments along with quantitative ones to conclude in depth results. In addition, as this study did not consider academic level and gender as variables for the current study, future studies are recommended to address these variables to understand whether they have an influence on the concluded results of the current study.

Thus, the findings of this study have the potential to inform students, educational authorities, and policy makers, in certain practices that can mitigate English language learning when using blended learning. Students should be provided with orientation and training sessions that foster their digital literacy level and offer psychological assistance that release their stress and tension to online learning. For teachers, training sessions are needed to elevate teachers' proficiency in using blended learning pedagogy in language learning along with the use of innovative teaching techniques that increase the effectiveness of blended learning

impact on the English language learning process. Finally, educational institutions should make valuable investments in technology, establish clear policies for the use of blended learning and collect feedback for constant development and improvement in the infrastructure facilities that consequently lead to more empowerment in the impact of blended learning in English language learning at the university level.

## دراسة العوامل التي تعيق نجاح التعلم المدمج في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية

أ.د. علاء إسماعيل جلوب<sup>1\*</sup>، نور خالد شهاب<sup>2</sup>، هبة صبحي علي<sup>3</sup>

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة الأنبار، الرمادي، العراق

<sup>1\*</sup> [dr.alaaismael@uoanbar.edu.iq](mailto:dr.alaaismael@uoanbar.edu.iq)

الكلمات المفتاحية: العوامل، النجاح، التعلم المدمج، تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية.



<https://doi.org/10.51345/v37i1.1309.g639>

### الملخص:

يلعب التعلم المدمج، باعتباره اتجاهًا حديثًا في التدريس بشكل عام وفي تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية بشكل خاص، دوراً حاسماً في مساعدة الطلاب على تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية. ومع ذلك، واجه طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية على مستوى الجامعة العديد من التحديات التقنية والتربوية عند تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية باستخدام التعلم المدمج. وبناءً على ذلك، تبحث الدراسة الحالية في العوامل الرئيسية التي تعيق نجاح التعلم المدمج في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية. وبشكل أكثر تحديداً، تحاول الدراسة التحقيق في تسلسل فعالية هذه العوامل الرئيسية في إعاقة نجاح التعلم المدمج في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية، وتحديد تسلسل فعالية هذه العوامل الفرعية داخل كل عامل رئيسي في إعاقة نجاح التعلم المدمج في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية. استخدم الباحث تصميم بحث وصفي كمي حيث تم استخدام استبيان مغلق يتضمن عشرين فقرة موزعة على أربعة مجالات لجمع البيانات للدراسة الحالية. تم اختيار عينة تتكون من طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في دراستهم في السنة الرابعة بشكل عشوائي من قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة الأنبار في العام الدراسي 2023-2024. تم تحليل البيانات الكمية باستخدام برنامج SPSS وكشفت النتائج عن وجود العديد من العوامل التي تعيق نجاح التعلم المدمج في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية، وهي: عوامل الطلاب، والعوامل النفسية، وعوامل المعلمين، والعوامل المؤسسية.