

woven into the F2F classes for then next week, which are then forwards into another blended cycle with the e-learning components (see figure 1 above). Moreover, lesson materials and activities are also developed through a cycle of categorization, evaluation, adaption, implementation, and reflection.

2.1 Class Example

The sample lessons for the mid-level classes were based on *World English: Level 1* (Cengage Learning) with a focus on future “be going to.” This lesson was in its third cycle for both instructors. The ENT’s class began with questions using vocabulary from the text to illicit future-tense responses. Next was a paired speaking practice adapted from the text that then moved into a mingling activity designed to drill the grammatical point through controlled production. The lesson for that day concluded with a collaborative writing/communication exercise in which students shared and discussed future plans. The activities were all designed to be collaborative and explorative in order to familiarize the students with the target and spark enough curiosity for the JNT-led component.

The JNT led class had a more in-depth focus on the grammar in context. The main task of the lesson tested their understanding of verb tense and critical thinking skills as they worked to complete a reading from the same unit by filling in appropriate verbs (on cards) in the correct verb tense. This is accompanied by a listening activity to complete the reading and check accuracy. In this way, the activity targets 4 areas: listening, reading, vocabulary, grammar, and dictionary use. Because the activity is quite challenging, students worked in pairs to lessen the anxiety, boost confidence, and enhance collaboration.

3 Outcomes

Overall, cyclical blending altered teacher’s roles by not only expanding them, but moving them towards mentoring and facilitation. This is largely due to the support of the e-component removing the need for much exposition. Furthermore, the materials and activities began to become more intensive and communicative, with upwards of 80% of activities for a given class being adapted to better fit this mold. In short, teacher roles expanded to be more active in material development and reflective on the value of each resource to the students. Also, as the majority of the teacher tailored materials require students to

be practicing and producing during F2F time, the teachers have gained more time to monitor student aptitude and attitudes and identify how to respond to students that struggle.

In general, students highly value the cyclical blended-learning curriculum. Overall, 77% (n=155) of the students surveyed in fall 2017 indicated that they became more interested in learning English since starting the course. In addition, roughly 84% (n=155) found the use of the scaffolded materials on Glexa to be helpful for their language acquisition. This may be due to the amount of opportunities the system afforded students to study. Over 30 weeks in 2017, students had between 178 to 226 SRL activities, depending on the class, on Glexa alone.

There were also tangible improvements to overall language skills as well. Students in both first and second years increased their CASEC scores at the end of the course.

These results imply that cyclical blending allows for multiple revisions of each resource and helps to tailor activities to student needs. Finally, it allows teachers to provide more intrinsic and communicative activities in the F2F classes.

References

- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 57-59.
- Nation, I. S. P. & John Macalister (2010). *Language Curriculum Design*. New York & London: Routledge. 60-64, 159-164.
- Oguri, Takamaru, et.al. (2017). Improving Students' Motivation Through Blended Learning: A Case Study in the English Programs for College of Engineering. *Journal of Chubu University Education* No. 17. 127-137.
- Schunk and Zimmerman (2012) *Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning*. New York: Routledge. 1-30.
- VanPattern, B.(2002) Processing Instruction: An Update. *Language Learning* 52:4. 755-803
- Walker, A., & White, G. (2013). *Technology Enhanced Language Learning: connecting theory and practice-Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers*. Oxford University Press. 1-11.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP16K02858.