Asian Social Studies and
Applied Research (ASSAR)
Published by ASAR Council

Volume 2 Issue 4
November, 2021
ISSN (E): 2709-9229

A Comparative Analysis of Teachers' Roles in Online and F2F Learning in a Blended Classroom

Dr. AZHAR PERVAIZ
Department of English, University of Sargodha.
Email: azhar.pervaiz@uos.edu.pk

KAYNAT KHUDADAD
MPhil Scholar, Department of English, University of Sargodha.

RABIEAH TAHIR
MPhil Scholar, Department of English, University of Sargodha.

Abstract

The present study draws a comparison between the role of a teacher through online learning and face to face (F2F) learning in a blended classroom. In recent years, blended form of learning has become a notorious way of giving guidance at all educational levels and across multifarious fields of study. Researchers conclude that there is an archetypical change in various fields of mixed learning, from didactics to roles of teacher to student roles. Thus, the current study uses questionnaire to study how 100 university going students viewed the role of their teachers in a blended English course in both online and F2F learning. The role of a teacher in both types of classes are considerably addressed in this paper by dividing it into an effective role, cognitive role, and managerial role. Statistical, and quantitative figures reveal two notable results: first, all the three sub-roles of F2F teachers had substantially higher average of learning than those in online learning. In F2F learning, the cognitive role had the highest average, while the managerial role had the highest average in online learning. This paper also compares the parameters of proficiency through the questionnaire between the two distinct modes of learning. Finally, the study will help the other researchers to explore how teachers can act in a better way in both types of learning methods and what are other parameters, need to be discussed further and construct grounds for students' roles in online and F2F learning in a blended classroom.

Key Words: *Blended Classroom, F2F, Online learning, Teacher Roles, Cognitive And Affective Role*.

Introduction

We are living in a world that is continuously and consistently changing (Sethy, 2008). The rapid revolution in technology has not only taken the world into vogue but according to Wang (2010), it has also revolutionized teaching and learning methods, specifically distance education. Over the two decades down in line, evidence of the efficacy of blended techniques in language learning continues to mount (Bañados, 2006; Scida & Saury, 2006; Murday, Ushida & Chenoweth, 2008) which result in its gradual acceptance by more and more institutions. Blended learning is not a novel process, in recent years, there has been noticeable evidence of a speedy development in online academic courses as provided by higher education institutions (Toven-Lindsey, Rhoads, & Lozano, 2015). Now, the students are significantly more prone to an online learning habitat than they were in the past (Tichavsky, Hunt, Driscoll, & Jicha, 2015), as

32% of all registered students in the year 2011 had taken only a single online course (Allen & Seaman, 2014). To describe its success in the Pakistani context, the process accelerated during the last two years owing to Covid-impelled lockdown that seized functions all over the world including Pakistan. To keep academics in line, there occurred an increase in shift from F2F to the online mode of learning. Earlier on, the traditional method of teaching was the major and official conduit for institutional learning. F2F offline modus operandi is a conventional classroom practice that permits learning by gathering lecturers and students simultaneously (Ramakrisnan et al. 2012; Kaur 2013). F2F learning includes lectures, presentation activities, individual and group deliberation, student progress assessment, and laboratory activities (Koohang 2008; Sun and Qiu 2017). In the F2F technique of tutoring, the disquisition makes use of various educating materials to stimulate the students to ensure the successful delivery of learning by using supporting material such as papers, whiteboard, handouts, and flash drives to promulgate creative presentation (Ramakrisnan et al. 2012).

Online modus operandi entails web-mediated programmes that are mostly engaged in universities to carry out lectures, distributing assignment briefs, delivering lessons, grading students, class tutorials, uploading course notes, assessment of students' their conduct, and giving response for augmentation (Arbaugh et al. 2008). Online process allows dispensation of accessible material and resources in the form of e-books, interactive study videos, Youtube, and course information to students taking e-course. Students to give feedback to teachers thus bestow to enhancing the effectiveness of learning and teaching (Sun & Qiu, 2017). New technologies are employed to offer newfangled learning grounds that help to supply appropriate and effortless surroundings for the implementation of online courses together with price frugality (Farinella, Hobbs, & Weeks, 2000; Garbett, 2011; Kim & Bonk, 2006; Pape, 2010), this makes these online programs more striking to executives and students in universities.

The triumph of any upheaval in the field of academics, for example, the initiation of online tutoring and technologies (frequently termed as e-learning), most often, based on how well instructor engages with the nouveau schemes and execute them with their apprentices. For teachers are mostly viewed by the learners as an institution and courses are believed to be one of the vital constituents which can either construct or disintegrate the entire learning escapade (Freeman, 1997) and can serve as a crucial element in learner approval of e-learning' (McPherson & Nunes, 2004).

Blended learning has attracted the attention of various researchers (Osguthorpe & Graham, 2003; Precel, Eshet-Alkalai & Alberton, 2009; Jokinen & Mikkonen,2013; Francis & Shannon, 2013; Fadde & Vu, 2014; Hung & Chou, 2015; Anthony et al., 2019) all over the world and many institutions are already following it. The term 'blended learning' is used to demonstrate learning affairs or pursuits which are both physical and virtual in nature, as combining both, online and conventional forms of tutoring (classroom-based) (Donnelly, 2006). The primary goal of the blended mode of instruction was to bridle the weaknesses of refined online directives (Tayebinik & Puteh, 2013). Since, unalloyed e-learning and conventional learning, both possess infirmities and strengths as well, thus it is better to mix the durabilities of both modes of instruction to develop a new mechanism of distribution which is called blended learning (Azizan, 2010). Considering the application of blended instruction which has swiftly increased, for the instructor's regard that such varied delivery procedures can enhance students' contentment from the learning ordeal and also their learning consequences (Lim, & Morris, 2009).

Therefore, the present study appends to the existing research through two means. Firstly, it seeks to inspect the apprehensions of students regarding F2F and online learning. Secondly, its data is drawn and collected randomly from different students at the same university, irrespective of their number, discipline, program, or semester, but it has been ensured that the students who are selected, have necessarily

experienced the two modes of learning, this can help in generalizing the results in a better way. The results of data provide insights to educationalists to carry out useful decisions encompassing a shift from traditional to the hybrid method (blended learning) as part of the curriculum on all levels (primary, secondary, and tertiary) of education.

Literature Review

There are various studies (e.g. Van Schaik, Barker & Beckstrand, 2003; Chen and Zimitat, 2004; Francescucci and Rohani, 2019) which compared F2F and online methods and found no significant difference between their learning outcomes. As Van Schaik, Barker, and Beckstrand (2003) reported a switch from conventional education mode to online learning mode and demonstrated a research where they collated online learning (by using the WebCT as a learning management system, and additional electronic lectures) and formal class sessions. They found no prominent distinctions between the two media, neither in test results nor attenuation rates. In a similar study, Chen and Zimitat (2004) measured student's after-effects through test scores, this study also proved that there was no significant difference in learning outcomes of the two modes. As there are blooming tendencies in postsecondary education to highlight the efficacy of online and technology incorporated learning. Francescucci and Rohani (2019) conducted a study to investigate if student's performance and engagement outcomes are the same in instructor-led Virtual, Interactive, Real-Time, Instructor-Led (VIRI) online learning as in F2F course and found the similar extent of student production in the VIRI classroom as in the F2F environment. This further suggests the efficiency of the synchronous learning approach. But Cavanaugh and Jacquemin (2015) when utilized 6,000 student observations while conducting a score comparison of online and F2F courses. They got mixed results with students having high grades (previously) who excelled in online learning as compared to F2F, while students with lower GPAs had to struggle more in online learning than in F2F. This shows the necessity for more study to bring clarity in this field.

F2F gathered positive assertions in many studies (e.g. Atchley et.al., 2013; Jaggars and Xu, 2013; Xu and Jaggars, 2013). Further, Atchley et.al. (2013) used archival data of five years record system of a university, the study finding showed a greater proportion of students attained A, D, and F grades in online courses. On the other hand, another higher percentage of students earned B and C grades in F2F class sessions. While studying online courses' outcomes, Jaggars and Xu (2013) asserted that students in online community college courses manifested higher rate of failure and withdrawal than those in F2F class sessions. This research also indicates that subsequent conduction cracks of students may increase when are delivered online course instead of F2F. In another research on community and technical college students, Xu and Jaggars (2013) analyzed data of 40,000 students and reported a negative relationship of online courses with course persistence and course grades.

Opposite results were found in other studies (Ladyshewsky, 2004; Stacey & Wiesenberg 2007; Hansen, 2008). Ladyshewsky (2004) compared learning of graduate business students in nine courses, all of them being taught in both modes of learning (online and face-to-face), he generalized the finding that overall students learning online did better as compared to those than those who are learning through F2F method. It is submitted that by using Lotus Learning Space as an online approach with lecture notes, self-assessment activities, resources, teacher-moderated discussions, both the quality of the online design and the teacher's experience of online teaching got improved over time. Nevertheless, at the individual level, no statistically significant difference of learning was noted between the two modes. According to the study by Stacey and Wiesenberg (2007), teachers expressed positive beliefs about online learning and held that the online approach helped students to be more self-directed (autonomous) and rendered teachers more facilitative and innovative. Hansen (2008) concluded that online course delivery was more

effective as compared to the traditional course delivery regarding developing skills in experiential studies where students are required to apply their knowledge to their real-world projects. Online mode has also improved collaborative learning as reported by studies (Stacey, 1999; Baskin, 2001).

"Blended learning" commonly entails an amalgamation of F2F learning and internet-based online learning mode (Whitelock & Jelfs, 2003, Oliver & Trigwell, 2005). According to Osguthorpe & Graham (2003), blended learning approaches aim to achieve harmony between online ingress to knowledge and F2F interaction. This can be the alloy of online and F2F activities with numerous goals such as pedagogical efficacy, access to knowledge, adroitness of course revision, and social interaction (p. 231).

Different studies (Johnson et al., 2010; Strickland et al., 2012; Jokinen & Mikkonen, 2013; Owston, Garrison & Cook, 2006; Anthony et al., 2019) have focused on blended learning approach. Anthony et al. (2019) affirmed that various factors are affecting the effectiveness of blended learning such as achievement, involvement, cognitive outcome, engagement, and retention. Their findings suggest that factors such as delivery, evaluation, performance, and motivation influence the effectiveness of academic staff. Johnson et al. (2010) suggested planning both online learning ventures and F2F sessions to make them pertinent and appealing for often a diversified group of students. In organizing a blended course, Strickland et al. (2012) consider it important to append a variation of activities in addition to reading information to meet the requirements of variety of learners. This study also proposes that the blended learning model encourages instructors to plan for versatile learning methods to individual student's needs. The same study infers that online learning posed challenges to teachers and reducing face to face teaching was a problem to them. Jokinen & Mikkonen (2013) contended that careful planning is a prerequisite to ensure the effectiveness of the blended approach in achieving learning outcomes for a variety of students. Owston, Garrison & Cook (2006) described the overall positive perceptions of students towards blended learning experience and used web resources, nonetheless, many of instructors and students in the same study believed that this technology use takes extra time and also leads to a lack of institutional recognition.

Coppola et al. (2002), studied multiple parts played by instructors in e-learning but focused on three roles as cognitive, affective, and managerial roles. Goodyear, Salmon, Spector, Steeples & Tickner (2001) stated that online instructors need to acquire numerous competencies related to the roles of content facilitator, designer, administrator, manager, technologist, assessor, and process facilitator. Donnelly (2013) studied the roles played by online teachers and identified three varying roles for (Problem Based Learning) PBL tutors; firstly, the perception of instructor's positivity that should be made available there all the time, second is the sense of the importance of teacher's authority and his presence and the third is, informative role to prevent equivocation or obscurity. While studying the role of an instructor in the blended learning approach, Huang (2019) indicated that students perceived that teachers had a considerable impression on students in F2F mode than in online mode. The cognitive role of a teacher is recognized to be more effective in F2F learning while a managerial role is more operative in online learning. A great many studies indicate the need to clarify the understanding of academic aspects in blended learning mode (Thorne, 2003; Bersin, 2004). According to Ireland et al. (2009), it is obvious that blended learning demands teachers' vigorous role to enhance learning and to Ocak (2010), it dictates fictitious teaching techniques along with constant mirroring of relevant teaching procedures. Jusoff and Khodabandelou (2009) disclosed that it is exigent for educators to magnify student learning without being all-time available, (Smyth et al., 2012) deemed it significant for teachers to comprehend their role as a facilitator in blended learning course, and it is imperative to them to generate an online environment to authorize students to cooperate and also to make them more autonomous.

Objectives of the Study

The basic objectives of this study are to figure out what are the expectations of a student from a teacher in either F2F or online learning. Secondly, to find out whether the role of a teacher is diminishing in online learning classrooms. Thirdly, to note if there lies a difference between the role of teacher in online and F2F learning. Lastly, to comprehend how a student judges a teacher through cognitive, managerial, and effective roles in the two distinctive learning methods.

Research Questions

The research study traces the following given questions through analyzing the collected data:

1) What is the expectation of a student from a teacher in F2F learning and online learning?
2) Whether or not the teacher's role is diminishing in online learning classrooms?
3) Whether or not there is a difference between teacher's role in online learning as compared to F2F learning?

These research questions can easily be ascribed to a larger area of study, as the paradigm of learning and teaching methods are evolving with the establishment of technological advancement in the education sector. It will help the teachers to improve their methods of teaching but will also enlighten the students on what to expect from both types of learning methods. The major argument or claim of this research paper is that role of a teacher is more effective in F2F learning as compared to online learning. Further, the managerial role of a teacher is more competent in online learning whereas the cognitive role of a teacher is more influential in F2F learning.

Methodology

Data for the present study were collected from 100 university students acting as respondents, having a thorough experience of both online and F2F learning, simultaneously. The apparatus used for the current research paper is a "questionnaire" containing 33 items to judge the teacher's role in both F2F and online learning. The questionnaire contains 11 questions related to a managerial role and the next 11 questions are related to the cognitive role and lastly the remaining 11 questions are related to the effective role of a teacher in both types of teaching/learning installed in a blended classroom. These 33 parameters are aligned through a trichotomous Likert scale. Frequencies and percentages of participants were manually calculated in the separate tables and were further analyzed in data analysis and findings. The current study has taken a mixed approach because of its qualitative and quantitative nature. We expect the students were more in favor of the F2F learning technique as compared to the online learning.

Data Analysis

Data were collected in quantitative form. We have set up four objectives and by keeping them in view; in a dichotomous table of a questionnaire, which is given in the index, question number one to 27 excluding question no 7, 8 and 13, 14 which cover the first two objectives. Question numbers 8,13,14 and 16 cover the third objective whereas questions number 7 and 28 cover the fourth objective. In trichotomous table number one, the first and the fourth questions cover the first two objectives while the fifth question covers the fourth objective. The average answers will further help us constitute the solid grounds that will aid in proving the above mentioned hypothesis. The results extracted from the questionnaire are given below in the form of tables.

Instruments and its Implications

The instrument used in this study comprises 33 questions that entail information about three different roles. Firstly, the 'managerial role' involves punctuality, efficiency in controlling, competence, management, comprehension of lecture, following of timetable, discipline, restriction of unethical activities, organization, use of monologue speech, and opportunity of contributing for students. Secondly, the 'cognitive role' involves lectures having a more lasting impact on the students' memory, active and flexible performance, issue of anxiety, use of video-play and slides play, non-verbal communication, creativity, problem-solving approach, questioning, teacher-student relationship, and level of experimentation. Lastly, 'affective role' involves the impact of teacher's personality, application of different learning techniques, the possibility of confusion, level of concentration, academic environment, information exchange, level of motivation, instruction, multimodality, active discussion, equal distribution of responsibility, and application of different teaching methodologies. The given table 6.1 to 6.3 below deal with the managerial, cognitive, and affective roles, respectively.

In table 1 average values of managerial role adapted by teachers in F2F and Online learning which were recorded by the University students are given. The average value of managerial role in F2F is 63.3% and 16% in online learning whereas the average value managerial role followed in both types of learning is 20.6%.

Managerial role (question 1 to 11)

Table 1: Contains qualitative data representing the managerial role of the teacher.

No. of Question	Option F2F	Option Online	Option F2F & Online	Total no. of participants	Total no of responses	% of F2F	% of Online	% of F2F & Online
1	25	8	63	100	96	26	8.3	65.6
2	79	4	14	100	97	81.4	4.1	14.4
3	73	5	20	100	98	74.5	5.1	20.4
4	84	5	9	100	98	85.7	5.1	9.2
5	48	7	43	100	98	49	7.1	43.9
6	78	3	17	100	98	79.6	3.1	17.3
7	12	87	2	100	98	12.2	85.7	2
8	81	6	11	100	98	82.7	6.1	11.2
9	80	10	8	100	98	81.6	10.2	8.2
10	39	34	24	100	97	40.2	35.1	24.7
11	82	6	10	100	98	83.7	6.1	10.2
Average:	61.9	15.9	20.09	100	97.63	63.3	16	20.6

In table 2 the average values of cognitive role adapted by teachers in F2F and Online learning which were recorded by the University students are given. The average value of cognitive role in F2F is 64.8% and 21.3% in online learning whereas the average value cognitive role followed in both ftypes of learning is 13.9%.

Cognition role (question 12 to 22)

Table 2: Contains qualitative data representing the cognitive role of the teacher.

No. of Question	Option F2F	Option Online	Option Both	Total no. of participants	Total no of responses	% of F2F	% of Online	% of Both
Q# 12	83	5	10	100	98	84.7%	5.1	10.2
Q# 13	67	8	21	100	96	69.8	8.3	21.9
Q# 14	22	67	8	100	97	22.7	69.1	8.2
Q# 15	13	66	18	100	97	13.4	68	18.6
Q# 16	83	9	6	100	98	84.7	9.2	6.1
Q# 17	81	9	8	100	98	82.7	9.2	8.2
Q# 18	72	10	15	100	97	74.2	10.3	15.5
Q# 19	64	9	24	100	97	66	9.3	24..7
Q# 20	55	20	20	100	95	57.9	21.1	21.1
Q# 21	72	17	8	100	97	74.2	17.5	8.2
Q# 22	80	7	10	100	97	82.5	7.2	10.3
Average:	62.9	20.63	13.45	100	105.8	64.8	21.3	13.9

In table 3 the average values of affective role adapted by teachers in F2F and Online learning recorded by the University students are given. The average value of affective role in F2F is 64.97% and 17 % in online learning whereas the average value affective role followed in both types of learning is 18%.

Affective role (question 23 to 33)

Table 3: Contains qualitative data representing the affective role of the teacher.

No. of Question	Option F2F	Option Online	Option Both	Total no. of participants	Total no of responses	% of F2F	% of Online	% of Both
Q# 23	78	8	11	100	97	80.4	8.2	11.3
Q# 24	65	15	17	100	97	67	15.5	17.5
Q# 25	25	61	11	100	97	25.8	62.9	11.3
Q# 26	60	20	17	100	97	61.9	20.6	17.5
Q# 27	80	4	13	100	97	82.5	4.1	13.4
Q# 28	66	9	22	100	97	68	9.3	22.7
Q# 29	80	6	11	100	97	82.5	6.2	11.3
Q# 30	51	22	22	100	95	53.7	23.2	23.2
Q# 31	70	9	18	100	97	72.2	9.3	18.6
Q# 32	57	13	27	100	97	58.8	13.4	27.8
Q# 33	60	14	23	100	97	61..9	14.4	23.7
Average:	62.9	16.4	17.45	100	96.8	64.97	17	18

Results and Interpretation

The instrument used in the current study deals with three types of roles performed by the teachers in two different types of learning methods. Online and F2F learning both have merits and demerits. The three selected roles i.e. managerial, cognitive, and affective role are equally prevalent in both types of learning. Further, it is a strong evidence to mark that teacher's roles are present and very much needed in F2F as

well as online learning. Moreover, the present data clearly shows that the teacher's roles do vary in F2F and online learning progressively killing the myth that teacher's roles are the same in every type of learning. For instance, this study clearly dictates that teacher's roles were more apparent and abundantly utilized in F2F learning and were somehow less pervasive in online learning. More importantly the students taking English courses are more inclined towards F2F learning as compared to online learning which are evident from the data.

In addition to this, students were more eager to learn through F2F learning insisting upon the idea that they were understanding the concepts more easily and in a personalized manner which is a luxury somehow absent in online learning. Due to lack of motivation in online learning the students complained that teachers took more time in explaining the topic under discussion and found it hard to clear the ambiguities of the students. This investment of extra time demands devotion from the teachers who need to be more motivated and always engaging students during the discussion. Although online learning gives more space to relaxation and homely environment, it definitely lacks motivation and requires the students to be self-motivated which is another hurdle in making online learning a preference for the students.

Now, focusing on the three selected roles of the teacher, it is evidently clear that cognitive role of a teacher holds the largest share because it is considered to be more vital for the students' performance in the classroom following any type of learning method. The present data collection shows that students were more satisfied with cognitive roles of teachers in F2F learning as compared to online learning. As 64.8% preferred cognitive roles of teachers in F2F while only 21.3% students favored online learning. Additionally, students claimed that teachers were highly engaged in F2F learning making the learning process easy whereas the same effortless engagement was absent in online learning. Into the bargain, students insisted that they were more comfortable in asking a question and becoming part of classroom discussion in F2F learning as the similar ease was lacking in online learning.

Also through affective role of teachers the study clearly indicates that in online learning even though the students and teachers were having complete access to technology, online books, web materials and open books in hands they were still unable to learn and comprehend things easily. Further, the students asserted that learning was easy and speedy in F2F learning as compared to online which clearly shows that learning is not the same and constant in every learning method they insistingly vary from one method to another. However it also specifies that teachers' role in any class is not a luxury, rather it is a need of a student which is far more beneficial for the students in comparison to the knowledge and material readily available online.

Keeping in view the above tabular data, the possible results extracted are: F2F provides more open grounds for experimentation and further application of different teaching methodologies that are scarcely present in online learning. Students can openly interact and participate in F2F learning which is difficult for them to oblige in online learning. Students feel less anxious and more motivated in F2F learning whereas the use of video-play and slide play are comparatively easy in online learning. Organization and management are not durable in online learning and teachers are less punctual whereas according to students, teacher and student relationship is easily developed and nourished in F2F learning which is quite difficult to cater to in online learning. Overall, the average figures show that role of a teacher in F2F learning is highly preferred by students in Pakistani university as compared to online learning.

Conclusion

Concluding the above discussion, the present research clearly shows that the three sub-roles that are the part and parcel of teachers' roles in F2F learning are prominently higher as compared to online learning. Online learning is still a novel experience for the teachers as well as the students in Pakistan. Not only the student's academic growth but also the level of motivation provided by teachers is low and it plays a vital role in any form of education. The above results show that in English blended classroom courses, teachers in online learning had executed less discernable roles than they did in F2F learning. Moreover, in online learning, the average cognitive role was the highest value, followed by affective role, and managerial role. In contrast, the average affective role in F2F learning is the highest, followed by cognitive role whereas the average managerial role turns out to be the lowest in both types of learning. In other words, students in the English blended classroom course think that the affective and cognitive role of teachers was more delectable in F2F learning. In addition to other detailed results extracted by the comparison of 33 items of the two classroom learning methods, the current research reveals that more attention-worthy findings that are novel and eminent from the past research. These discoveries may have some classroom insinuations and inferences that help in enlightening future researchers in the field of blended classroom learning.

References

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2014). Grade Change: Tracking Online Education in the United States. Babson Survey Research Group.

Anthony, B., Kamaludin, A., Romli, A., Raffei, A. F. M., Abdullah, A., Ming, G. L., ... & Baba, S. (2019). Exploring the role of blended learning for teaching and learning effectiveness in institutions of higher learning: An empirical investigation. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24(6), 3433-3466.

Arbaugh, J. B. (2008). Does the community of inquiry framework predict outcomes in online MBA courses?. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning,* 9(2).

Atchley, W., Wingenbach, G., & Akers, C. (2013). Comparison of course completion and student performance through online and traditional courses. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 14(4), 104-116.

Azizan, F. Z. (2010). Blended learning in higher education institution in Malaysia. In Proceedings of regional conference on knowledge integration in ICT (Vol. 10, pp. 454-466).

Bañados, E. (2006). A blended-learning pedagogical model for teaching and learning EFL successfully through an online interactive multimedia environment. CALICO journal, 533-550.

Baskin, C. (2001). The Titanic, Volkswagens and collaborative group work: Remaking old favorites with new learning technologies. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 17(3).

Bersin, J. (2004). The blended learning book: Best practices, proven methodologies, and lessons learned. John Wiley & Sons.

Cavanaugh, J. K., & Jacquemin, S. J. (2015). A large sample comparison of grade based student learning outcomes in online vs. face-to-face courses. *Online Learning*, 19(2), n2.

Chen, N. S., & Zimitat, C. (2004). Differences in the quality of learning outcomes in a F2F blended versus wholly online course. In Beyond the comfort zone: Proceedings of the 21st ASCILITE Conference (pp. 175-179).

Coppola, N. W., Hiltz, S. R., & Rotter, N. G. (2002). Becoming a virtual professor: Pedagogical roles and asynchronous learning networks. *Journal of management information systems*, 18(4), 169-189.

Donnelly, R. (2006). Blended problem-based learning for teacher education: lessons learnt. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 31(2), 93-116.

Donnelly, R. (2013). The role of the PBL tutor within blended academic development. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 50(2), 133-143.

Fadde, P. J., & Vu, P. (2014). Blended online learning: Benefits, challenges, and misconceptions. *Online learning: Common misconceptions, benefits and challenges*, 33-48.

Farinella, J. A., Hobbs, B. K., & Weeks, H. S. (2000). Distance delivery: The faculty perspective.

Francescucci, A., & Rohani, L. (2019). Exclusively synchronous online (VIRI) learning: The impact on student performance and engagement outcomes. *Journal of marketing Education*, 41(1), 60-69.

Francis, R., & Shannon, S. J. (2013). Engaging with blended learning to improve students' learning outcomes. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 38(4), 359-369.

Goodyear, P., Salmon, G., Spector, J. M., Steeples, C., & Tickner, S. (2001). Competences for online teaching: A special report. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 49(1), 65-72.

Hansen, D. E. (2008). Knowledge transfer in online learning environments. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 30(2), 93-105.

Huang, Q. (2019). Comparing teacher's roles of F2f learning and online learning in a blended English course. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(3), 190-209.

Hung, M. L., & Chou, C. (2015). Students' perceptions of instructors' roles in blended and online learning environments: A comparative study. *Computers & Education*, 81, 315-325.

Ireland, J., Martindale, S., Johnson, N., Adams, D., & Eboh, W. (2009). Blended learning in education: effects on knowledge and attitude. *British Journal of Nursing*, 18(2), 124-130.

Jaggars, S., & Xu, D. (2013). Predicting online student outcomes from a measure of course quality.

Johnson, N., List-Ivankovic, J., Eboh, W. O., Ireland, J., Adams, D., Mowatt, E., & Martindale, S. (2010). Research and evidence based practice: Using a blended approach to teaching and learning in undergraduate nurse education. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 10(1), 43-47.

Jokinen, P., & Mikkonen, I. (2013). Teachers' experiences of teaching in a blended learning environment. *Nurse education in practice*, 13(6), 524-528.

Jusoff, K., & Khodabandelou, R. (2009). Preliminary study on the role of social presence in blended learning environment in higher education. *International Education Studies*, 2(4), 79-83.

Kaur, M. (2013). Blended learning-its challenges and future. Procedia-social and behavioral sciences, 93, 612-617.

Ladyshewsky, R. K. (2004). E-learning compared with face to face: Differences in the academic achievement of postgraduate business students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 20(3).

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Grammar and Its Teaching: Challenging the Myths. ERIC Digest.

Lim, D. H., & Morris, M. L. (2009). Learner and instructional factors influencing learning outcomes within a blended learning environment. *Educational Technology & Society*, 12(4), 282-293.

McPherson, M., & Nunes, M. B. (2004). Developing innovation in online learning: An action research framework. Psychology Press.

Murday, K., Ushida, E., & Ann Chenoweth, N. (2008). Learners' and teachers' perspectives on language online. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(2), 125-142.

Ocak, M. A., & Uluyol, Ç. (2010). Investigation of students' intrinsic motivation in project based learning. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 7(1), 1152-1169.

Oliver, M., & Trigwell, K. (2005). Can 'blended learning'be redeemed?. *E-learning and Digital Media*, 2(1), 17-26.

Osguthorpe, R. T., & Graham, C. R. (2003). Blended learning environments: Definitions and directions. *Quarterly review of distance education*, 4(3), 227-33.

Owston, R. D., Garrison, D. R., & Cook, K. (2006). Blended learning at Canadian universities: Issues and practices. The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs, 338-350.

Pape, L. (2010). Blended teaching and learning. *The Education Digest*, 76(2), 22.

Precel, K., Eshet-Alkalai, Y., & Alberton, Y. (2009). Pedagogical and design aspects of a blended learning course. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 10(2).

Ramakrisnan, P., Yahya, Y. B., Hasrol, M. N. H., & Aziz, A. A. (2012). Blended learning: a suitable framework for e-learning in higher education. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 67, 513- 526.

Scida, E. E., & Saury, R. E. (2006). Hybrid courses and their impact on student and classroom performance: A case study at the University of Virginia. CALICO journal, 517-531.

Sethy, S. S. (2008). Distance education in the age of globalization: An overwhelming desire towards blended learning. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 9(3), 29-44.

Soffer, T., & Nachmias, R. (2018). Effectiveness of learning in online academic courses compared with face-to-face courses in higher education. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 34(5), 534-543.

Stacey, E. (1999). Collaborative learning in an online environment. *Journal of Distance Education*, 14(2), 14-33.

Stacey, E., & Wiesenberg, F. (2007). A study of face-to-face and online teaching philosophies in Canada and Australia. *International Journal of E-Learning & Distance Education/Revue internationale du e-learning et la formation à distance*, 22(1), 19-40.

Strickland, K., Gray, C., & Hill, G. (2012). The use of podcasts to enhance research-teaching linkages in undergraduate nursing students. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 12(4), 210-214.

Sun, Z., & Qiu, X. (2017). Developing a blended learning model in an EFL class. *International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Life Long Learning*, 27(1-2), 4-21.

Tayebinik, M., & Puteh, M. (2013). Blended Learning or E-learning?. arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.4085.

Thorne, K. (2003). Blended learning: how to integrate online & traditional learning. Kogan Page Publishers.

Tichavsky, L. P., Hunt, A. N., Driscoll, A., & Jicha, K. (2015). " It's Just Nice Having a Real Teacher": Student Perceptions of Online versus Face-to-Face Instruction. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 9(2), n2.

Toven-Lindsey, B., Rhoads, R. A., & Lozano, J. B. (2015). Virtually unlimited classrooms: Pedagogical practices in massive open online courses. *The internet and higher education*, 24, 1-12.

Van Schaik, P., Barker, P., & Beckstrand, S. (2003). A comparison of on-campus and online course delivery methods in Southern Nevada. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 40(1), 5-15.

Wang, S., & Zhan, H. (2010). Enhancing teaching and learning with digital storytelling. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education (IJICTE)*, 6(2), 76-87.

Whitelock, D., & Jelfs, A. (2003). Editorial: Journal of Educational Media special issue on blended learning. *Journal of Educational Media*, 28(2-3), 99-100.

Xu, D., & Jaggars, S. S. (2013). The impact of online learning on students' course outcomes: Evidence from a large community and technical college system. *Economics of Education Review*, 37, 46-57.

Smyth, S., Houghton, C., Cooney, A., & Casey, D. (2012). Students' experiences of blended learning across a range of postgraduate programmes. *Nurse education today*, 32(4), 464-468.

Asian Social Studies and Applied Research (ASSAR)
Published by ASAR Council

Volume 2 Issue 4
November, 2021
ISSN (E): 2709-9229

Appendix

Dear participant,

This is a questionnaire of a research study on the comparison of the role of a teacher in the F2F (face to face) learning and Online learning classrooms. We assure you that your data will not be disclosed in any situation. We can assure, your consent matters and nothing in this questionnaire is going to violate your privacy. If you cooperate with us, we would be very grateful to you.

Thank you in anticipation.
Dr. Azhar Pervaiz, Kaynat KhudaDad, Rabieah Tahir
Department of English, UOS

Name: Click or tap here to enter text.
Gender: Click or tap here to enter text.
Age: Click or tap here to enter text.
Class and semester: Click or tap here to enter text.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Tick in the right box you think is of the question.

Sr. No	Questions	F2F learning	Online learning	Both
1	A teacher remains punctual in which type of the classroom learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
2	The teacher controls the class more efficiently in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
3	The teacher performs competently and manages the better in which type of classroom learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
4	Students understand the lecture better in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
5	The teacher follows the timetable with complete preparation in which type of classroom learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
6	Concepts are thoroughly explained to the learners in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
7	In which type of learning, a teacher faces more difficulty in maintaining the discipline of the class?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐

8	Unethical activities of students are better checked in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
9	In which type of learning a teacher is more capable of organizing a lecture and conducts more activities?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
10	More monologue in teacher's speech is present in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
11	Students get more opportunity to interact in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
12	In which type of learning a lecture has a more lasting impact on your memory?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
13	Teachers are more active and react flexibly in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
14	Students face more anxiety issues in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
15	In which type of learning there is more opportunity of using slides and a video-play for lessons?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
16	The classroom environment is more experimental in which type of classroom?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
17	Non-verbal communication of a teacher is more impactful in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
18	The presence of a creative element and problem-solving approach is dominant in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
19	The efforts of a teacher to deliver a lecture are more prevalent in which type learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
20	Students ask more questions about which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
21	Which type of learning gives more instructions and a comfortable environment for learning in a classroom?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐

22	Which type of learning ensures a well-built teacher-student relationship and gives equal attention to every single student?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
23	The effects of a teacher's personality are more impactful in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
24	Different learning techniques are more easily applied to which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
25	The possibility of confusion in understanding lecture is excessively present in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
26	Which type of learning offers a high level of concentration?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
27	Which type of learning is more likely to offer an academic environment?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
28	More examples and information exchange between student and teacher occur in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
29	In which type of learning students are more motivated?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
30	Instructions are given formal and Multimodality is more likely to be used in which type of learning?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
31	Which type of learning offers more student and teacher active discussion?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
32	In which type of learning responsibilities are equally divided among student and teacher?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐
33	Which type of learning makes it possible to be used different kinds of teaching methodologies for better understanding?	F2F learning ☐	Online learning ☐	Both ☐