Covid-19 Era Alternative Strategies: Exploring Blended Learning Methods in Malay Language

Nurul Haniza Samsudin[1], Nur Azimah Mohd Bukhari[1], Akhmad Mansur[1], Mohamad Zaidih Sapi@Hussein[1]
Jabatan Bahasa Melayu, Akademi Pengajian Melayu,
Universiti Malaya, 50603, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
*Corresponding Author, email: haniza_85@um.edu.my

Abstract

There are no ending signs when it comes to the spreading of COVID-19 worldwide. The cases were increasing and have caused the students of Higher Education to have their studies to be carried out either in hybrid or blended learning. The COVID-19 during the pandemic had affected many sectors and industries and mainly the education industry. The education sector had faced many impacts. As for the higher education sector, the institution had led to factors such as academic stress, anxiety, loss of concentration, and frustration. Today, COVID-19 is still spreading worldwide and, in our country, as well. Malaysia declared it a pandemic in the early stages, but as time passed, Malaysia declared it an endemic. Blended learning would be among the options to pull through during the COVID-19 era, and it is also an alternative strategy to continue teaching and learning. Blended learning includes face-to-face and online teaching. This benefits the learners with dual instruction and learning strategies and this study shares and discusses the design of a blended learning course in teaching and learning language using the Blended Learning Model by Bath & Brouke (2010). The model contains five phases; planning, designing, implementing, reviewing, and improving. This model applies to the subject of Teaching the Malay Language. These courses were registered as required subjects with a total of 24 third-year students. During the planning phase, questionnaires were used to implement the quantitative methods. In the meantime, qualitative methods are used to analyse the document during design, implementation, review, and improvement. This study revealed a need for blended learning to balance the benefits of face-to-face and online learning. A hybrid learning environment gives students the privilege of understanding and exploring real-world problems through an authentic learning experience and facilitates the online learning experience. This study concludes that COVID-19 has changed instructor teaching strategies to make language teaching more effective.
.

Keywords: Blended Learning, COVID-19, Teaching Malay Language.

Introduction

Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) has disrupted the education system in diverse ways since the outbreak in 2020. The pandemic affected students nationwide from various nationalities, levels of education, gender, and age. The situation resumes with lockdowns and interrupts the traditional education system. Scholarly societies handle this challenge and take action to ensure the educational system continues. Prior to these circumstances, the adaption of a new pedagogical approach and mode of delivering lessons accept as a new norm. Unfortunately, the quality of the delivered instruction is debatable due to the formal training obtained by the teacher before the pandemic started. The Ministry of Higher Education in Malaysia also assumed the same action to ease the spread of COVID-19 by pausing face-to-face teaching and proposing social distancing. Various e-learning platforms are

present to continue the teaching session for communicating with all learners from different places in the same academic environment.

Several studies discuss the positive impact of online learning on students' viewpoints. The student reacted that online learning is more stimulating and manageable than traditional classes (Yusnilita, 2020). Meanwhile, students and educators consent that online learning enhances the quality of instruction and provides two-way communication during online classes (Nambiar, 2020). Online learning also improves motivation, which positively influences learning performance; meanwhile, positive academic emotions enhance online learning performance (Zhu et al., 2022). In contrast, the negative impact of online learning has also been debated during the pandemic. The pivot into online classes has declined, especially for students and educators. For various reasons, students are unmotivated and have less knowledge of handling assignments alone (Bird et al., 2022). Cognitive load dealing with several courses, more infrequent knowledge educators designing online learning, uncomfortable online learning environments, and improvised adult learners (Sharma, 2020). From this point of view, educators and students encounter the same circumstances; improvised learning during the pandemic (Izumi et al., 2021). Students need to cater concentration to online lessons and tutorials, while educators struggle to work from home.

The process of delivering knowledge beyond the physical classroom connects learners from all over the world. Students and educators modified learning to the online environment during the pandemic. At the same time, face-to-face teaching is still significant to deliver knowledge that cannot instruct during online learning. Blended learning supports online and conventional teaching, whereas the method integrates the advantages of online and face-to-face education. Blended learning is the term that defines the integration of online and face-to-face learning methods with self-direct learning (Abdelrahman & Irby, 2016). Technology is also incorporated with face-to-face teaching and creating learning material unrestricted to all learning participants. Meanwhile, blended learning allows the lecturer to determine a mode of instruction. The lecturer can select the various methods of teaching the courses depending on the difficulty of the syllabus. The flexible part conducts in hybrid mode (online and face-to-face), while the complex part instructs face-to-face. Face-to-face learning between the instructor, peers, and the physical environment delivers a precise interpretation. In contrast, online learning makes learning more interactive and active so the learners can stand concentration for a long span.

This study discusses designing blended learning courses in teaching and learning language using Blended Learning Model by Bath & Brouke (2010) in the Teaching Malay Language course. Several studies discuss the blended learning model, but not concentrating on implementing the model in certain courses. Rao (2019) discusses the form or model of blended learning by Frieson (2012). This study focus synthesis of various blended learning model, i.e. The Rotation Model, The Flex Model, The Self-Blending Model, and The Enriched Virtual Model. Meanwhile, Mahmud (2020) discusses the blended learning model from Anderson & Gerison's; ICT-Based Blended Learning and the hybrid model adopted by Anderson Interaction Pattens and Edgar Dale. The study conducted by Juwita & Purwoko (2022) focuses in design and implementing the hybrid learning model in one of the schools in Bogor, Indonesia. This study focuses on designing infrastructure and equipment operational skills to give balanced interaction between teachers and students online and offline, but not implementing this model to language learning subjects.

Methods

This study adopted a case study with a mixed methods approach (Creswell & Clark, 2011) on how instructors design hybrid learning and students' hybrid learning need analysis. The study was designed with the Blended Learning Model by Bath & Brouke (2010) which implements five steps in the blended learning design process. The steps are planning, designing, implementing, reviewing, & improving. The five steps of this model are implemented in the subject of Teaching Malay Language courses. This study starts with the need analysis in planning steps. In the planning step, the qualitative method applied includes document analysis. The document of courses analyzed includes the form of (Semester 1, 2020/2021 sessions), i.e., alignment of learning outcomes to assessment, student learning time, course information for the current semester, and so on.

The data were interpreted using content analysis to determine the issues faced by learners during online learning. The same courses were taught via online learning the previous semester. Therefore, the difficulties faced by learners via online learning are evaluated to form a better education plan by this current semester. The output of need analysis is important to develop meaningful content, instruction method, assessment, and media used in blended learning. This output facilitates the other phases of the blended design process namely designing, implementing, reviewing, and improving. The second phase of the need analysis is to evaluate learners' satisfaction with the courses via online learning using a questionnaire by Google Forms. These courses were instructed fully online during the previous semester so this data used to be an indicator to form a better learning environment in hybrid courses, especially in the online parts. The survey executed by questionnaire includes two parts. The first part is demographically followed by the level of student satisfaction through courses taught via online learning. Four items stated in the questionnaire are convenience, lecturer interaction, online teaching, and assessment and exams. The level of student satisfaction is analyzed based on a 5-point Likert scale consisting of very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, not sure, satisfied, and very satisfied. Overall, there is 20 question that requires to be answered by respondents via this survey.

The data were analyzed using SPSS software to determine the reliability of Cronbach's Alpha, mean, and standard deviation. The results appear that Cronbach's alpha is 0.875, indicating that the scale in the sample has a high level of internal consistency. Alpha Cronbach values above 0.80 indicate the highest reliability and are accepted (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Cohen et al., 2000).

Table 1: Index Classification Reliability of Alpha Cronbach

Indicator	Value of Alpha Cronbach
Highest	>0.90
High	0.70-0.89
Average	0.30-0.69
Low	<0.30

The qualitative approach is the methodological approach to process design and implementation. During the design phases, the lecturer creates: (i) Course learning objectives. (ii) Teaching and learning activities and assessments related to the course learning objectives; (iii) Student study time related to lectures and tutorials (face-to-face and online) and assessment; (iv) Learning materials include resources related to blended learning, such as example books, article journals, and videos Reviewing and improving are the additional steps in the implementation of blended learning. A crucial step in determining the quality of blended learning is reviewing actions. This step used quantitative methods to compare the percentage of differences between the previous and current semesters' course learning outcomes analysis of students. As a result, the analysis of the course learning outcome achievement result meets the criteria for course learning outcome achievement. In order to differentiate students' course learning outcomes, lecturers compare the previous semester's improvement plan to the current semester's improvement plan. The results of the course learning outcome analysis will be planned during the current semester and incorporated into plans for course modifications for the following semester.

Result and Discussion

This section discusses the outcome and discussion of blended learning designs in five steps. The steps are planning, designing, implementing, reviewing, and improving.

1. Planning

The survey's need analysis, which is part of the planning step, looks at four aspects of learning: facilities, interaction with the lecturer, assessments, and exams. Table 2 shows the facilities in faculties provided by the university. According to the data, the claim that " It makes the students easily find information on the registered subject because of the convenience of websites like Spectrum" receives the greatest minimum score (mean 4.65). During the planning phase, instructors use the SPECTRUM platform to secure lecture notes, quizzes, and activities. As a result, the student can easily access and obtain the registered subject information. According to Chuanzhen (2020),

lecturers need to choose a suitable online platform and upload learning resources. Lecturers plan to use existing online course resources like SPECTRUM and record videos by themselves for both online and offline teaching methods. Table 2 shows mean of interaction with the lecturer.

Table 2: Satisfaction of Facilities in Faculty

Satisfactions	Mean	SD
I am satisfied with the steps taken by the University of Malaya in identifying the use of various applications suitable for carrying out online learning and teaching processes.	4.52	.511
I found that it was beneficial and effective to use apps like Google Meet as a platform for online learning.	4.35	.487
I found that there are a lot of useful special features when using apps like Microsoft Teams.	4.43	.507
I agreed to the use Zoom app for my learning and teaching activities because it's very easy.	3.26	.541
Students can easily obtain information on the subject that is being registered with a convenience website such as Spectrum.	4.65	.487

Table 3 shows the satisfaction of interaction with the lecturer. The statement indicates that the lecturers have a good and friendly communication relationship which shows has the highest minimum interaction with the lecturer (mean 4.48). Regarding this argument, lecturers must prepare effective communication hybrid learning plans for two-way communication. A communication plan between students and lectures that combines online and face-to-face instruction for students, including face-to-face group discussions, online discussions, forums, quizzes, and many more. According to Mahdum (2015), lecturers play a significant role in the management of the learning process by employing the appropriate methods to successfully impart their knowledge to students. Lectures also provide direct feedback on method questions, either online or in person during the lecture. Interaction between students and lecturers is beneficial in enhancing subject content. With interactive teacher-student interactions, students participate more actively in discussions compared to using recitation scripts (question-answer-assessment) developed in non-interactive interactions. This is beneficial for students' content (lecture comprehension) and language development (Abdul Majeed, M. & Navaz, M., 2013).

Table 3: Satisfaction of Interaction with Lecturer.

Satisfactions	Mean	SD
Lecturers are capable of handling class discussions.	4.35	.573
Lecturer responds with accurate and satisfactory answers and provide feedback on student questions	4.35	.487
Lecturers maintain good and friendly communicative relations with all students.	4.48	.511
I am satisfied with the language used by the scientific lecturers.	4.30	.470
Lectures always ask questions to ensure students understand the topics being taught.	4.26	.449

The data from Table 4 shows that "Online assessment is more effective because I can easily refer to information" (mean 4.57). Online learning assessment methods provide a variety of interactive, collaborative learning formats that align with Bloom's taxonomy. During online learning, formative assessment is conducted with frequent feedback to identify student weaknesses. A different method of evaluation, such as essays, projects, and presentations use various online resources. The main challenge of online assessment is to measure knowledge without traditional assessment, but it is considered highly impractical to measure student knowledge because it cannot be done face-to-face. (Amer et al., 2022). This awareness-based design of blended learning implied that lectures should

create assessments based on significance, transparency, and fairness criteria. In blended learning, the assessment must be meaningful in the sense that students will benefit from it and find meaning in its completion. The test should be hands-on, relevant to real-world situations, and meet the criteria for lifelong learning. The second aspect is openness or specificity to the student or any third-party seeking information about the assessment criteria or instrument. Fairness for students is the final aspect. This gives students the same chance and excludes no one from the evaluation of the criteria.

Table 4: Satisfaction of Assessment

Satisfactions	Mean	SD
The teaching method used by lecturers is relevant.	4.43	.507
The lecturer's explanation of the subject being taught is clear and understandable.	4.35	.487
Lectures are responsible for ensuring that student reference materials are available.	4.35	.487
I gained a better understanding of the topics covered in the online classes.	4.43	.590
Online assessment is more effective because i can easily refer to information.	4.57	.728

According to the data in Table 5, the statement "The suggested examination methods are compatible with the pandemic situation" has a higher min (mean 4.35) than in other states. The exam method during full online learning is a take-home exam with an open-book format exam. Instructors will upload question exams between weeks 14 and 16 (after the syllabus is completed) based on a schedule agreed upon by instructors, allowing students to schedule a time to answer and submit exam papers. The lecturer will plan the final examination to be submitted in 24 hours rather than one week during the fully online learning period in the blended learning situation. Open-book assessments are meant to encourage students by allowing them to use any resource, online or offline. However, rather than simply memorizing facts or information, the questions are designed to require higher-order thinking skills and additional knowledge. Students need basic knowledge for better understanding and are required to complete an open-book assessment within the specified time (Yusoff, Yusoff, & Md Noh, 2017).

Table 5: Satisfaction of Examination

Satisfactions	Mean	SD
Students are not burdened by the time allotted by lecturers to complete assignments.	4.04	.562
The time allotted for online exam responses is very reasonable.	4.04	.562
The proposed research method is suitable to the pandemic situation	4.35	.573
Assessments weighting ease the students.	4.04	.367
The weighting of the scores set by the lecturer was met by the examination questions given.	4.09	.417

2. Designing

This section includes discussions about designing course and learning objectives, teaching and learning activities and assessment, activity types, teaching and learning activities with a time-material relationship, and learning hours with blended learning; (i) Course learning objectives; (ii) teaching and learning activities and assessments related to the course learning objectives; (iii) student study time related to lectures and tutorials (face-to-face and online) and assessment; (iv) Learning materials include resources related to blended learning, such as example books, article journals, and videos.

(i) Course Learning Objectives

In order to meet the requirement, lectures plan the course with the implementation of blended learning. The courses have three learning objectives: (i) Emphasize the fundamental principles of language education in terms of learning, teaching, and philosophy, (ii) Applying language theory in teaching Malay lessons, and (iii) Summarize the challenges associated with teaching Malay language.

(ii) Teaching And Learning Activities and Assessments Related to the Course Learning Objectives

The data in Tables 2 to 5 are qualitative data and the learning strategies implemented in the first semester sessions of 2020/2021 and the first semester sessions of 2021/2022 during the transition from online to blended learning assessment methods, and a comparison of student study time. The data show differences in learning strategies, assessment methods, and assessment weightings to accommodate blended learning strategies. Table 6 shows the difference between synchronous and asynchronous learning as it applies to the subjects taught in the Teaching Malay Language course. Blended Learning will be used intensively in Semester 1 session 2021/2022. Instead of passively listening to the lecturer during class, the student analyses and synthesizes the resources provided to the lecturer as material. Digital video is the most commonly used medium to facilitate interactivity in blended learning (Yasin, Hanafi, & Abd Aziz, 2020). Online learning strategies enabled students to self-regulate their learning and transform themselves into independent learners. In contrast, online learning makes students more trustworthy and attached only to lecturers (Al-Hawamle et al., 2022). Students assume their teachers are the source of information, and this dependency affects their self-regulation toward independent learning. Online learning offered students new learning opportunities through the combination of synchronous and asynchronous learning, but they also prefer synchronous learning with face-to-face meetings. Asynchronous learning allows students to learn at their own pace and at their own speed, whereas two-way instruction requires the student to be guided when learning new and abstract concepts (Triana, 2021). According to Lalima & Dangwai (2017), blended learning, on the other hand, is more successful at meeting the needs of students both offline (in person) and online, increasing collaborative, constructive, and computer-assisted learning.

Table 6: Comparison Learning Strategies in Semester 1 Session 2020/2021 and Semester 1 Session 2021/2022

Learning Strategies	Semester 1 Session 2020/2021	Semester 1 Session 2021/2022
Synchronous	Google Meet is being used to host a live lecturer.	Microsoft Teams: Lecturer having a face-to-face lecture in class and live-on lecturer. and Microsoft Teams: Face-to-face tutorials in class and live-on tutorials.

The data in Table 7 shows a continuation comparison of the 2020/2021 Semester 1 Session and the 2021/2022 Semester 1 Session. For the first semester session of 2020/2021, students are required to develop a Course Learning Outcomes 1 (CLO1) syllabus, emphasizing the basic teaching, learning, and philosophies of language instruction. Students should prepare this task on paper. In contrast, the 2021/2022 semester 1 session has changed the assessment method and requires students to complete their syllabus in soft copy format. Some parts of Malay Grammar require a lesson plan to be presented in a PowerPoint template or Canva. In this evaluation, the interactivity element carries over to the multimedia elements such as audio, video, graphics, text, etc. This assessment can connect students to practical teaching and further explain difficult concepts of teaching and practice in Malay language

teaching. From this perspective, course objectives, assessments, and teaching strategies are aligned so that students build positive expectations for learning and success. The course learning objective (CLO 2) is supported by assessment 2, which is the second category of continuous assessment. to incorporate language theory into Malay instruction. Students are required to record teaching simulations in the form of a video and upload them to their YouTube channels for the first semester of 2020/21, while teaching simulations will be implemented in a classroom setting for session 2021/22. According to Sabus & Macauley (2016), simulations are the experiential instructional method that lectures create in order to achieve the desired instructional outcome by imitating or replicating actual events, problems, procedures, or skills. The student was assigned the role of teacher while also completing a task in teaching Malay Language Grammar. Students can use recorded teaching simulation to simulate an online learning environment and teach using via Google Meet or Microsoft Teams platforms. In contrast, the 2021/2022 session requires students to conduct simulations in the classroom. Students act as teachers in simulation teaching and use blended learning in the task. They can flip the lesson to introduce the topic, games, and scenarios associated with teaching. Students can also use tools and technology to simulate better learning environments.

Table 7: Comparison of Method of Continuous Assessment

No	Method of assessment	Name of Assessment	Semester 1 Session 2020/2021	Semester 1 Session 2021/2022
1.	Continuous Assessment	Assessment 1	Preparing the teaching plan	Preparing E-teaching plan
		Assessment 2	Recorded teaching simulation	Classroom teaching simulation

(iii) Student learning time to relate with the lecturing and tutoring (face-to-face and online) and assessment

Table 8 shows the students learning time that contains two aspects, teaching and learning, and assessment. For teaching and learning activities and assessments, lectures should be aligned with teaching and learning activities and assessments against course learning objectives. The educational activity he conducted for 13 weeks, 3 hours a week, and various types of summative assessments were carried out. Lectures must be designed to accommodate the 120 notional hours of students' learning, which correspond to three credit hours per semester. The first aspect is the teaching and learning activities divided into four parts: live-on lectures, live-on tutorials, blended learning lectures, and blended learning tutorials. In addition, each activity is divided into four types of teaching and learning: face-to-face, non-face-to-face, student preparation time, and no student self-study time. To complete this course, the lecturers must design the calculation of learning time for each activity category. In comparison to the estimated amount of time allotted for this course each semester, calculating the learning and teaching time has a greater advantage for both students and lecturers. Microsoft Teams allows for three-time sessions for live lecturers and tutorial sessions, for instance. The difference between this session and live lectures, which took two hours, and tutorials, which took place in one hour. Students must complete 10 hours of blended learning lectures (2 hours per session), as well as 5 hours of blended learning tutorials (1 hour per session). The total number of face-to-face sessions in 13 weeks is 24. Furthermore, the non-face-to-face session includes 5 sessions of blended learning lectures and tutorials.

A blended learning tutorial takes two hours to complete, while a blended learning tutorial takes one hour. The total time spent on non-face-to-face lecturers and tutorials per semester is 15 hours, with 10 hours spent on a blended learning lecturer and 5 hours spent on a blended learning tutorial. The total hour of activities with face-to-face and non-face-to-face students is referred to as student preparation time. The total number of student learning times includes face-to-face, non-face-to-face, and student preparation time. According to data analysis, blended learning lectures have the most student learning time (40 hours). Blended learning lectures include both face-to-face and non-face-to-face components, with five sessions of two hours each. To accommodate the blended mode, the lecturer must plan live face-to-face sessions via Microsoft Teams as well as non-face-to-face

recorded lectures or videos, quizzes, and other activities. Continuous assessment receives a weighting of 40%, while summative assessment receives a weighting of 60%. In continuous assessment, the classroom teaching simulation has the highest number of student learning hours (16 hours). Students must prepare by taking a non-face-to-face classroom teaching simulation assessment and putting in 6 hours of study time. Simulation as a teaching strategy must be acceptable to both students and lecturers. Students must be given sufficient time for briefing and training to encourage reflection practice (Sharoff, 2015). Adequate student preparation time and non-face-to-face feedback ensure students are fully engaged in pre-simulation and reflection practice, reducing anxiety during the actual simulation. For the final exam, students are given 12 hours of preparation time to answer all questions. There is an open-book exam and students have to prepare their answers online during a real simulation. The lecturer gave students 24 hours from the time the questions were uploaded to the SPECTRUM portal to download the questions. They must also upload their answers to the SPECTRUM system within 24 hours. There are 2 out of 4 total questions, each mark containing 30%. The questions were created to match /correspond CLO 2 (Applying language theory in teaching Malay lessons to apply language theory in teaching Malay) and CLO 3 (Summarize the challenges associated with teaching Malay language).

	Activities	Face To Face	Non-Face-To Face	Student Preparation Time	No Of Student Learning Time
TEACHING & LEARNING	Lecture being on Live via Microsoft Teams	3 sessions x 2 hours = 6 hours		3 sessions x 2 hours = 6 hours	12 hours
	Live tutorials on Microsoft Teams	3 sessions x 1 hours = 3 hours		3 sessions x 1 hours = 3 hours	6 hours
	Lectures in blended learning: Face to face, Live Microsoft Teams, recorded lecturer or video, and quizzes	5 sessions x 2 hours =10 hours	5 sessions x 2 hours = 10 hours	10 sessions x 2 hours=20 hours	40 hours
	Tutorial for blended learning: Face-to-face and using live Microsoft Teams, a forum, and a discussion	5 sessions x 1 hours =5 hours	5 sessions x 1 hours=5 hours	10 sesions x 1 hours =10 hours	20 hours
	TOTAL	**24 hours**	**15 hours**	**39 hours**	**78 hours**
ASSESSMENT	**Weightage** **Continuous Assessment**				
	20% Preparing e-teaching plan		10 hours	4 hours	14 hours
	20% Classroom teaching simulation		10 hours	6 hours	16 hours
	TOTAL		**20 hours**	**10 hours**	**30 hours**
	Weightage **Summative Assessment**				
	60% Final examination			12 hours	12 hours
	TOTAL			**12 hours**	**12 hours**
	GRAND TOTAL	**24 hours**	**35 hours**	**62 hours**	**120 jam**
				TOTAL SLT	**120**
				CREDIT = **SLT/40**	**3**

(iv) Learning material includes resources involved in blended learning for example books, articles journals, videos, etc.

Lecturers must also provide learning materials, such as books, articles, journals, videos, and other resources used in blended learning. Table 9 shows a sample of weekly teaching activities, topics, and resources. Lectures plan the topics to be taught over the 13 weeks and provide resources for each topic. A book, a link to the selected video, journal articles on related subjects, lecture notes, and other resources are provided to students. These resources have been uploaded to the SPECTRUM portal, where students can access them. Additionally, lecturers have prepared all of these resources for the current semester's course information form. In addition, the lecturer has scheduled learning activities for 13 weeks of instruction, and lessons using the references.

Table 9: Sample of Teaching Activities in Week, Topic and References.

Week	Topic & Activities	References
1	Introduction to the concept of teaching, learning, and Malay language education.	Ellis, R.. (2012). *Language Teaching Research and Language Pedagogy*. United Kingdom : Wiley Blackwell and Sons. (Published Online: 3 FEB 2012 02:09AM EST) (Online ISBN: 9781118271643)
2	Basic concepts of educational philosophy	Bayyurt, Y. (2014). *Language teacher education for a global society*. New York: Routledge, 2012, xiv + 148 pp. World Englishes, 33, 292–294. doi: 10.1111/weng.12067

3. Implementing

The implementing phase includes the steps in the planning and designing phases. This step involved implementing online and face-to-face teaching and learning in 13 weeks of lectures. There are three sessions of live-on lecturing and three sessions of live-on-tutorials based on the students' learning time as shown in Table 10. Lecture sessions are 2 hours and tutorial sessions are 1 hour. In contrast, a blended learning implementation involves 5 sessions and 2 hours of face-to-face and non-face-to-face sessions per session. The same sessions are also used for lectures and tutorials in blended learning, but only in one-hour sessions. In face-to-face instruction, students are introduced to the idea of teaching and learning, as well as the Malay language teaching theory, approach, and method. Students discussed a variety of lecture-related topics and questions during the tutorial. In addition, online blended learning provided online and tutorial lectures, discussions, and practice teaching on selected topics as a medium to achieve course learning objectives.

Table 10: Implementation of Face-To-Face and Blended Learning

Week	Topic	Learning strategies
1-3	• Introduction to the concept of teaching, learning, and Malay language education. • Basic concepts of educational philosophy	• Live lecture (face-to-face) in Microsoft Teams. • Live tutorials on Microsoft Teams.
4-8	• Theories of language and teaching & principles of language teaching. • Approaches in Malay language teaching. • Malay language teaching methods.	• Blended Learning Lectures: Face-to-Face, Live Microsoft Teams, Recorded Lecture or Video, Quiz. • Blended Learning Tutorials: Face-to-Face, Live Microsoft Teams, Forums, and Discussions.

| 9-13 | • Teaching and learning strategies.
• Oral Teaching
• Issues in language teaching.
• Teaching Malay as a first and second language. | • Blended Learning Lectures: Face-to-Face, Live Microsoft Teams, Recorded Lecture or Video, Quiz.
• Blended Learning Tutorials: Face-to-Face, Live Microsoft Teams, Forums, and Discussions. |

The second part of the implementation is doing the evaluation. The criteria for assessing the preparation of an e-teaching plan and classroom teaching simulation are shown in Table 11. This assessment uses rubrics to create an electronic curriculum and six criteria that are carefully evaluated as students present the curriculum: preparation, idea building, introduction of learning content, and professional writing, educational process, evaluation criteria, assess completion. The second part of the evaluation is a classroom simulation. The assessment assesses his five criteria: learning objectives, interest and focus, teaching elements, preparation, and quality of teaching.

Table 11: The criteria for assessing the preparation of an e-teaching plan and classroom teaching simulation

Assessment	Continous Assessment	Weightage	Criteria
1	Preparing e-teaching plan	20%	• preparation (10%) • construction of idea (10%) • introduction of learning content (10%) • professional writing (10%) • teaching procedure (20%) • assessment criteria (20%) • reflection (20%)
2	Classroom teaching simulation	20%	• learning objective (20%) • interest and focus (20%) • instructional component (20%) • preparation (20%) • teaching quality (20%)

The student's e-teaching plan will be evaluated using seven criteria, with weightage provided in assessment 1. The preparation aspect allows students to create a complete teaching plan and describe the step-in teaching. Students must also elaborate on the material and technology that will be used in teaching with the app. Students take on the role of the teacher, presenting their learning in a meaningful way without the errors of technical writing. The course of the lesson should be clear and aligned with the learning objectives set out in the lesson plan. The criteria and types of assessment chosen to measure achievement of learning objectives. Finally, a reflection of the learning takes place as a flashback to all of the teaching procedures, lessons learned, and developmental insights to best benefit students.

The classroom simulation of teaching Exam 2 considered five learning criteria: Learning Objectives, Interests and Focuses, Teaching Elements, Preparation, and Teaching Quality. To attract interest and focus, learning objectives should be clearly stated in simple language. The educational component relies on teachers simultaneously for instruction, examples, and planning of the practical aspects. Preparation includes development activities and an assessment plan that allows students to assess their learning. Voice clarity must be reflected in the quality of teaching in the allotted time, and teachers must also have good interpersonal skills to deliver meaningful lessons. Table 12 shows the implementation of the course's summative assessment.

Table 12: Implementation of Summative Assessment

Part	Weightage	Dimension of Questions	Marking Criteria
A	30%	• Fun learning planning and implementation; or • Group learning with abilities of various types.	• Main point (1 marks) + Description (3 marks) and example (1 mark) =5 marks • For each section, the student must have at least three main points.
B	30%	• Development of multiple questions; or • Implementing teaching strategies to address the affective domain.	• Main point (1 marks) + Description (3 marks) and example (1 mark) =5 marks • For each section, the student must have at least three main points.

The third part of implementation is a summative assessment. Data from Table 11 shows two parts of summative assessment which are 60% of weightage. Part A has 4 questions, students must answer 1 out of 2 questions, weighted at 30%. This question was created to support the learning objectives of the course and emphasize the basic teaching, learning, and philosophies of language teaching. Students can choose either to answer about planning and implementation of fun learning in teaching the Malay language or procedure teaching the Malay Language to the group of students with abilities and different types of abilities. In contrast, the lecturer creates part B questions to align with the third-course learning criteria. This question is designed to summarize issues for teaching Malay. The student has to answer 1 of 2 questions, the weight is 30%. Students can respond to either the process of developing multiple-choice questions or the implementation of teaching strategies that align with an affective domain. When marking the exam paper, the teacher also prepares the marks schema with marking criteria. To answer the questions, students must clarify the main point with elaboration and examples. To answer these questions, they must have at least three takeaways/answers. Table 13 is the result for overall student based on learning objectives.

4. Reviewing and Improving

The review stage is an important part of the blended learning phase to determine the quality of the course. The purpose of the review is to measure the success and improvement of actions taken in every course. After the reviewing step has been completed to enhance and revise the course, then it follows with the improving step. The revision input will be useful for the next session, of course. Table 13 is the final result for overall student based on learning outcome, type of assessment (continuous assessment and final examination), and mark and student's final mark.

Table 13: Final Result Based on Learning Outcome, Type of Assessment (Continuous Assessment and Final Examination) and Mark and Student's Final Mark

Learning Outcome (LO)	LO 1			LO 2			LO 3			
Assessment	CA	FE	Total	CA	FE	Total	CA	FE	Total	Grand Total
Marks	20	-	20	20	30	50	-	30	30	100
Students										
S1	17.2		17.2	16.8	20	36.8		17	17	71.0
S2	16.2		16.2	15.6	25	40.6		15	15	71.8
S3	15.2		15.2	15.4	23	38.4		21	21	74.6
S4	16.6		16.6	13.8	24	37.8		22	22	76.4
S5	15.0		15.0	15.0	23	38.0		17	17	70.0
S6	15.0		15.0	15.0	24	39.0		20	20	74.0
S7	14.0		14.0	14.4	25	39.4		22	22	75.4
S8	16.2		16.2	15.6	25	40.6		18	18	74.8
S9	16.6		16.6	16.6	25	41.6		22	22	80.2
S10	16.6		16.6	16.6	23	39.6		23	23	79.2
S11	15.2		15.2	15.4	23	38.4		22	22	75.5
S12	17.2		17.2	16.8	23	39.8		24	24	81
S13	15.2		15.2	15.4	26	41.4		15	15	71.6
S14	17.2		17.2	16.8	24	40.8		22	22	80
S15	16.6		16.6	13.8	22	35.8		23	23	61.6
S16	15.0		15.0	15.0	27	42.0		26	26	68
S17	17.2		17.2	16.8	27	43.8		26	26	70.2
S18	16.6		16.6	16.6	21	37.6		24	24	61.6
S19	15.2		15.2	15.4	23	38.4		23	23	61.2
S20	16.2		16.2	15.6	20	35.6		18	18	54.2
S21	14.0		14.0	14.4	23	37.4		20	20	57
S22	16.6		16.6	13.8	22	35.8		18	18	56.6
S23	15.2		15.2	15.4	22	37.4		20	20	57.2
S24	16.6		16.6	16.6	27	43.6		13	13	56.6

Table 13 is the final result based on learning outcome, type of assessment (continuous assessment and final examination), and mark and student's final mark. For the learning outcome (LO) 1, all students get 15 to 17.2 marks out of 20 effects for continuous assessment (CA). Students S1, S12, S14, and S17 get the highest 17.2 of 20 marks. There are no final exam examinations (FE) set up for LO 1 this LO. The results from LO 2 show three students get the highest marks which are 16.8 out of 20 for CA. Three students got 27 marks out of 30 marks (S16, S17, and S24) and indicated the highest marks for FE. The S17 student gets the highest marks for LO 2, 43.8 marks out of 50 marks, after combined CA dan FE. The S17 also gets highest mark for CA (16.8 marks) dan FE (27 marks). For LO3, two S16 and S17 students get the highest marks 26 out of 30 marks for FE. There is no CA set-up for LO 3. For overall marks, S12 students get highest total mark, 81 marks out of 100 marks,

when sum up marks for LO 1, LO 2, and LO 3. In contrast, S24 students get the lowest grand total marks, 56.6 marks out of 100 marks. The S24 students also got the lowest marks for LO3, 13 marks out of 30 marks, and affected the criteria for course learning outcome discussed in Table 14. The result for Table 14 describes the student's achievement in the course learning outcome.

Table 14: The Student's Achievement in The Course Learning Outcome

Course Learning Outcome	Student's Achievement	Achievement of Course Learning Outcome
Emphasize the fundamental principles of language education in terms of learning, teaching, and philosophy.	100%	100% of student's achieve the criteria of learning outcome
Applying language theory in teaching Malay lessons.	100%	100% of student's achieve the criteria of learning outcome
Summarize the challenges associated with teaching Malay language.	97.4%	97.4% of student's achieve the criteria of learning outcome

Data from Table 14 is a review of course learning outcome analysis from continuous and summative assessments. The learning outcome criteria are students passing with 50% marks overall. The student's achievement is calculated using two types of assessments which are continuous and summative. The weight for continuous assessment is 40%, but the total assessment to fully fill the course learning outcomes is 60%. This data shows that students achieved the learning outcomes for all courses after combining their continuous and summative assessment with 100% of students meeting the learning outcomes criteria. In contrast, 97.4% of students achieved learning outcomes for courses summarizing problems in teaching Malay. For summative assessment, one of the students did not archive the learning criteria, and one of the students did not archive the learning criteria with a mark of more than 50% and 50% of all students in the total.

During the improvement phase, lecturers had to observe the need for courses from students or infrastructure to improve blended learning. Course structure needs to be improved to support course learning outcomes. The lecturer intends to enrich the course content and widely implement blended learning for the third-course learning outcome. Students are thus able to improve their understanding, skills, and attitudes toward the learning outcomes of the course. Students are thus able to improve their understanding, skills, and attitudes toward the learning outcomes of the course. For example, implement interactive and collaborative work to introduce topics into Malay language teaching. Combining face-to-face and online learning can enhance the teaching and learning process. In addition, lecturers must provide learning resources such as books, articles, journals, and websites. The topic was related to YouTube links and others. In regards to assessment, lecturers must develop a continuous assessment to support course learning simulation games or tasks, editing or developing hard documents (wiki, video, and sound tools), interviews (e.g., making podcasts), presentation or demonstration tasks (using web conferencing or online presentation tools), illustration (using online graphic, creative tools) all propose that the cognitive domain's applying skills are met (Sulisworo, 2018).

Acknowledgments

References

Abdul Majeed, M. & Navaz, M. (2013). A Study on Perception of Lecturer-Student Interaction In English Medium Science Lectures. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 7*(2), 117-136.

Abdelrahman, N. & Irby, B. (2016). Hybrid learning. *International Journal of Information Communication Technologies and Human Development, 8*(1), 1-25.

Amer, A., Sidhu, G., Bo, Z., & Srinivasan, S. (2022). A Short Review of Online Learning Assessment Strategies. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Teacher Education, 6*(2), 89-103. https://dx.doi.org/10.20961/ijpte.v6i2.66579

Al-Hawamleh, M. & Alazemi, A. & Al-jamal, D. & Shdaifat, S. & Zeynab, G. (2022). Online learning and self-regulation strategies: Learning guide's matter. *Education Research International*, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/4175854

Bird, K. A., Castleman, B. L., & Lohner, G. (2020). Negative Impacts from the Shift to Online Learning during the COVID-19 Crisis: Evidence from a Statewide Community College System. EdWorkingPaper No. 20-299. *Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University*.

Bogdan, R.C. & Miklen, S.K. 2003. Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Chuanzhen, S. (2020). Research on blended learning implementation. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1682*(1), 1-7. 1682. 012086. 10.1088/1742-6596/1682/1/012086.

Izumi, T., Sukhwani, V., Surjan, A. & Shaw, R. (2021). Managing and responding to pandemics in higher educational institutions: Initial learning from COVID-19. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, *12* (1), 51-66. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJDRBE-06-2020-0054

Lalima & Dangwal, K. L. (2017). Blended learning: An innovative approach. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5*(1), 129-136. 10.13189/ujer.2017.050116

Mahdum, M. (2015). Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge (TPACK) of English Teachers in Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 6*(5), 168–176. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5s1p168

Nambiar, D. (2020). The impact of online learning during COVID-19: Students and teachers' perspective. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 8* (2), 783-793.

Sabus, C., & Macauley, K. (2016). Simulation in physical therapy education and practice: Opportunities and evidence-based instruction to achieve meaningful learning outcomes. *Journal of Physical Therapy Education, 30*(1), 3-13.

Sharma, R. (2020). Online learning and its positive and negative impact in higher education during COVID-19. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR), 6*(9), 171-181. https://doi.org/10.36713/epra2013

Sharoff, L. (2015). Simulation: Pre-briefing Preparation, Clinical Judgment and Reflection. What is the Connection?. *Journal of Contemporary Medicine, 5*(2): 88-101.

Triana, Y. (2021). Synchronous or Asynchronous: Students' perceptions on online learning during the pandemic. 1. 54-59.

Yasin, N.F., Hanafi, M., Ong, A., & Aziz, N.N. (2019). Assessment of the Blended Learning Implementation in Higher Education: Students' Readiness Perspective. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology, 29* (6), 702-712.

Yusoff, S., Yusoff, R., & Md Noh, N. H. (2017). Blended Learning Approach for Less Proficient Students. *SAGE Open, 7*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017723051.

Yusnilita, N. (2020). The Impact of online learning: Student's views. *English Teaching Journal (ETERNAL), 11* (1), 57-61. http://journal.upgris.ac.id/index.php/eternal/index

Zhu, Y. et al. (2022). The impact of online and offline learning motivation on learning performance: The mediating role of positive academic emotion. *Education and Information Technologies 27*(7), 8921-8938.