
A Comparative Study of Hybrid versus Traditional Instruction in Foreign Languages

Jorge Cubillos, University of Delaware

Abstract

This investigation compares the outcomes of two language course formats: hybrid (three hours per week in the classroom and two hours online) and face-to-face (5 hours per week of classroom instruction). A total of 189 students enrolled in an introductory college Spanish course participated in this study (127 in the six hybrid sections and 62 in the three face-to-face groups) for a period of one semester. All sections followed the same syllabus and were assessed using the same instruments. Student performance in required course tasks such as compositions, grammar tests, and oral examinations was tracked for the entire academic term, and all participants were surveyed at the end of the course to determine their impressions of the course. Research results indicate that there were no significant differences in the performance of students in any of the ability measures under consideration, but that the hybrid format was largely favored by these college learners due to its autonomy and flexibility. Language course design considerations are discussed, as well as the implications of these findings for syllabus and materials designers.

Introduction

In recent years, cuts in state budgets for higher education in the United States have compelled many colleges and universities to seek ways of reducing costs, especially of labor and resource-intensive programs, such as the foreign language graduation requirement. As a result of this 'do more with less' charge, class sizes have increased, new hires have been frozen, and in many cases, language departments have had to eliminate courses in order to reduce their operational costs. It is no surprise that some schools are turning to technology — specifically, online instruction — in order to preserve their language offerings (Arnone, 2002). Indeed, current technological advances make it financially and pedagogically viable to transition away from the traditional classroom towards a virtual one (Hokanson, 2000; Kinney & Robertson, 2003; Tunison & Noonan, 2001).

Although this move away from traditional forms of delivery of instruction is now possible (and in fact, quite attractive from an administrative point of view), there is

Jorge H. Cubillos (Ph.D., Penn State University) is Associate Professor of Spanish and Foreign Language Pedagogy at the University of Delaware. He teaches courses in Applied Linguistics, and supervises the 100-level sequence in Spanish. His main areas of research are educational technology and study abroad, and he has published several textbooks and educational materials for beginning- and intermediate-level Spanish.

limited information about the pedagogical impact of such a change (Salaberry, 2000). In the case of foreign languages, the body of research available has focused on the applications of technology-assisted instruction to different aspects of language learning such as vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension. Unfortunately, the information available on the comparative pedagogical advantage of this online learning environment versus the traditional face-to-face model is very limited (Young, 2002).

While a complete switch from face-to-face to online instruction is being considered by some institutions, others are contemplating a compromise position: hybrid instruction, which is a combination of traditional face-to-face with online teaching (Carroll, 2003; Hopper, 2003; Oblender, 2002; Patterson, 2004). This option is being used in other disciplines such as history, economics, textile science, nursing, and computer science with encouraging results (Brown & Liedholm, 2002; Combs, 2004; Krawiec, Salter & Kay, 2005, Riffell & Sibley, 2005; Salamonson & Lantz, 2005), but once again, there is little published information on the benefits or shortcomings of this instructional format for foreign languages.

“As a result of this ‘do more with less’ charge, class sizes have increased, new hires have been frozen, and in many cases, language departments have had to eliminate courses in order to reduce their operational costs.”

Research questions

In view of the limited published data on the viability of hybrid course formats in foreign languages, this study sought to explore the following questions:

1. Are there any differences in achievement between students enrolled in hybrid and traditional foreign language courses?
2. How do students perceive the hybrid language learning experience? (What motivates them to choose a hybrid course? Is there a specific learner profile for hybrid courses? Do hybrid language courses live up to learners' expectations? Do students in hybrid courses face any special challenges? Finally, do students perceive that their achievement is enhanced or impaired by the hybrid environment?).

Description of the study

Subjects

To investigate the effects of hybrid instruction in the teaching of foreign languages, nine sections of a third-semester Spanish course were selected (n=189). Six of these sections used the experimental hybrid format, and three used the regular face-to-face course structure. Three teachers participated in the experiment, each teaching two hybrid sections and one traditional face-to-face course. This 2:1 ratio was chosen to accommodate the teaching loads of the participating instructors, and to maximize the

data available on the performance of students under the less familiar hybrid conditions. Teachers volunteered for the assignment, and were involved in the design and implementation of the hybrid course template.

The investigator was in charge of course design, in cooperation with an instructional designer appointed by the university. Hybrid and face-to-face classes used the same textbook, covered the same material, and were assessed using the same instruments and rubrics.

“To investigate the effects of hybrid instruction in the teaching of foreign languages, nine sections of a third-semester Spanish course were selected...”

Due to scheduling considerations, students were allowed to self-select their classes. This selection was done on the basis of a brief notation in the course catalog indicating the times at which the hybrid groups would have traditional face-to-face meetings, and stating that the equivalent of two-hours of online work per week would also be required.

The Hybrid Course Format

The hybrid course consisted of 48 face-to-face and 27 online sessions. The online component of the course was designed to preview, practice, and/or reinforce the material presented during the face-to-face meetings. Each online session had four parts: (a) lesson goals (a list of skills to be mastered); (b) preparatory work (typically a reading assignment corresponding to the section in the students’ textbook); (c) optional practice activities (an average of three self-correcting fixed-response activities were provided to assist students in the mastery of the stated goals); and (d) required session assessment (a combination of fixed and constructed-response items designed to check students’ achievement). The online course management system *WebCT* was used to deliver the online lessons (including the required assessments), while the popular *Quia* educational website was used to manage all practice activities as it provided more engaging formats for the learners (graphic-based drills, games, etc.). Teachers were asked to review and manually grade the constructed response items in the required assessments on a weekly basis, while the computer assessed all fixed-response items. The average of all required online session assessments constituted 15% of the students’ final grade.

The Traditional Course

The traditional course format consisted of 75 face-to-face sessions. The course goals, textbook, and assessments were the same as the ones used in the hybrid course. Although the general orientation of both the traditional and the hybrid sections was communicative, about 40% of the class time in the traditional sections was devoted to pre-viewing, practicing, and reinforcing new material with the help of textbook ancillaries (the equivalent of the online sessions in the hybrid sections). In all other respects, both the traditional and hybrid sections encouraged the same type of meaningful oral interactions, and the processing and creation of the same forms of extended written discourse.

Data Collection

A pre-test of grammar and vocabulary was given to all the participants in order to assess prior training and language learning experience. In addition, student data pertaining to all course graded assessments (compositions, grammar, oral, and reading examinations) were obtained and statistically compared (Table 1). In order to determine student perceptions of the experimental treatment, a web-based survey (Appendix 1) was administered at the end of the course.

Table 1. Student Score Averages

| Class Type | Number of Students | Pre-Exam 40 pts max. | Oral Exam 100 pts max. | Composi- tions 100 pts max. | Reading Exam 100 pts max. | Final Exam 100 pts max. | Final Grade 100 pts max. |
|-------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Traditional | 62 | 34.12 | 88.13 | 90.35 | 78.76 | 82.85 | 87.51 |
| Hybrid | 127 | 34.98 | 88.82 | 89.61 | 88.46 | 83.01 | 87.19 |

Results

A simple observation of the average scores in Table 1 suggests that the performance of students in the traditional and the experimental groups was very similar. However, to provide a more robust analysis of the data, a univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for all the dependent variables in the study (oral exam, compositions, reading exam, final exam, and final grade). The ANOVA test was suitable for this investigation since all the statistical assumptions for its application were met (all cases were independent from each other, the dependent variable was ratio, the distribution of the variables was normal, and the variance in groups was homogeneous). The results of these analyses confirmed that scores in the graded assessments for this course were not associated with class type. The tests of between-subject effects for oral exam, compositions, reading exam, final exam and final grade did not reach significance when cross-tabulated with class type or instructor (alpha level was set at .05). Differences in student performance between the hybrid and the face-to-face classes only approached significance in the case of the reading examination ($p=.07$), slightly favoring the hybrid groups. However, for all the variables in the study, differences in performance could only be attributable to differences in prior language training and background ($p < 0.001$ for all variables).

From the point of view of general demographics, the hybrid and the face-to-face classes were fairly similar (Table 2). Both sets of classes had a similar proportion of males and females, and both had a nearly identical ethnic composition. However, there were some clear differences in age and academic standing of the participants (with a majority of freshmen enrolling in traditional classes, and sophomores, juniors, and seniors gravitating toward the hybrid sections), which suggests that the hybrid format was

“...scores in the graded assessments for this course were not associated with class type.”

more appealing to experienced college learners. Also, as indicated in Table 3, students in the hybrid sections appeared to have been more self-motivated and to prefer individual and self-paced learning tasks, while students in traditional sections seemed to opt for more structured class activities, personal interaction, and also, they seemed to be less confident about their computing skills. Although these personality distinctions were identified solely on the basis of self-perceptions and reports, they suggest that in addition to academic experience, personality type and learning style may be factors determining class type preference.

Table 2. Learner Demographics

| Gender | Class Type | Male | Female | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Hybrid | 39% | 61% | | | |
| | Traditional | 35% | 65% | | | |
| Age | Class Type | <18 yrs | 18-20 yr | > 20 yrs | | |
| | Hybrid | 0 | 84% | 16% | | |
| | Traditional | 2% | 88% | 10% | | |
| Ethnicity | Class Type | Caucasian | African-American | Hispanic | Other | |
| | Hybrid | 91% | 2% | 4% | 3% | |
| | Traditional | 92% | 3% | 3% | 2% | |
| Year | Class Type | Freshman | Sophomore | Junior | Senior | Other |
| | Hybrid | 2% | 54% | 22% | 20% | 2% |
| | Traditional | 61% | 20% | 6% | 11% | 2% |

Table 3. Exit Survey: Learner profiles (hybrid versus traditional sections)

| I am/do... | | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Self-motivated | Hybrid | 43.5% | 54.1% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 0 |
| | Traditional | 33.5% | 30.1% | 34.4% | 2% | 0% |
| Prefer a structured classroom | Hybrid | 13.8% | 46.0% | 28.7% | 10.4% | 1.1% |
| | Traditional | 18.5% | 53.8% | 23.7% | 4% | 0% |
| Prefer working alone | Hybrid | 28.7% | 37.8% | 27.7% | 3.5% | 2.3% |
| | Traditional | 12% | 25.5% | 32.9% | 16.4% | 13.2% |
| Have problems managing my time | Hybrid | 1.2% | 19.5% | 35.4% | 32.9% | 11.0% |
| | Traditional | 16.3% | 25.3% | 40.5% | 13.9% | 4% |
| Learn by reading | Hybrid | 11.6% | 53.5% | 16.3% | 11.6% | 7.0% |
| | Traditional | 14.3% | 35.7% | 28.6% | 17.8% | 3.6% |
| Learn by interacting with others | Hybrid | 5.8% | 35.3% | 33.3% | 24.4% | 1.2% |
| | Traditional | 19.3% | 40.1% | 28.5% | 12.1% | 0% |
| Comfortable using computers | Hybrid | 27.1% | 56.4% | 14.1% | 1.2% | 1.2% |
| | Traditional | 15.9% | 30.5% | 25.6% | 18.2% | 9.8% |

The exit survey

As previously indicated, at the end of the term students were invited to complete a voluntary online exit-survey. The return rate of this survey was significantly higher for the hybrid classes (83%) than for the face-to-face ones (47%). This difference alone suggests an uneven level of student engagement, which is also evident in the much higher quantity and quality of the written-responses to the open-ended items provided by students enrolled in the hybrid classes.

Responses to multiple choice items in the exit survey (Table 3) indicate that students enrolled in the hybrid sections made a deliberate choice for this type of learning environment (100% stated that they were familiar with the concept of hybrid courses, 55.3% that class type was either very or extremely important to them, and 90.5% reported making their class choice because of the flexibility of this learning format). A small fraction (21.8%) had prior experience with online college courses, and 100% had previously used WebCT. The vast majority of students in the hybrid sections (97.6%) did not have to learn any new computing skills for this class, and very few (9.6%) experienced technical difficulties while accessing or completing their online assignments. Technical

“Responses to multiple choice items in the exit survey (Table 3) indicate that students enrolled in the hybrid sections made a deliberate choice for this type of learning environment...”

assistance on the part of the faculty was either not necessary (91.7%) or adequate (4.2%). Most students lived on campus (64%) and the majority (93.1%) used a broadband connection.

Online tasks in the hybrid course were described by students as both accessible and useful. A large percentage of students in these sections rated their online assignments as essential (8%), extremely useful (10.2%), or very useful (19.3%), and most described their online assignments as easy (37.9%) or very easy (34.5%). On average, students in the hybrid course reported spending about the same amount of time per week in language learning tasks as their traditional classroom counterparts (6.1 hours versus 6.3 in the traditional sections), and most perceived the impact of their online work as most evident in the areas of writing and reading comprehension (60% and 66.3% respectively), and less so in the areas of speaking and listening skills (29.4% and 40% respectively).

Responses to the open-ended items in the survey indicate that the hybrid experience was very positive, and that it provided students with desirable course features such as convenience (included in 70% of the comments), flexibility (35%), and self-directed pace (25%). Several also commented on the benefits of a more structured course format required by the hybrid classes (14%), and on the variety of activities available to reinforce important concepts (12%).

“I felt that the hybrid-format class was the best way to keep myself interested in the class and...”

Finally, it is important to note that the level of student satisfaction with the course was higher among survey respondents in the hybrid sections (70.5% indicated that they recommend this type of course to other students, versus 63.8% in the traditional group). However, given the limited rate of return of the face-to-face classes, we cannot provide any definitive comparative data on this matter.

The following are some typical comments provided by the majority of satisfied students in the hybrid classes:

- “The online classes really improved the flexibility of my schedule and allowed me to take courses that I may not have been able to take otherwise. The online courses were a sufficient supplement for the material in the book and the material learned in class. I would highly recommend to someone to take the hybrid format.”
- “It was much easier schedule-wise. Going to Spanish five days a week in the past was so tedious. Also, it was a good structured learning activity I could do on my own. I loved it.”
- “I felt that the hybrid-format class was the best way to keep myself interested in the class and not have to worry about a certain time to do Spanish.”
- “It was a fun new way to learn.”

While the hybrid format was very popular, a few students pointed out some potential drawbacks (particularly in the areas of motivation, personality type, and language learning background):

- “I am personally highly self-motivated, but I know that’s not the case with everyone else in the hybrid course. It would be great if scatter-brained people could sign up for e-mail reminders to complete their online assignments. But then again, I guess it’s the student’s responsibility to complete all work without having to be told!”
- “I don’t think there was anything wrong with the course; I just don’t personally do as well in a language course when it’s not face-to-face everyday. However, I do believe if students really want to do well in a language the best way is to take it face-to-face everyday, otherwise you won’t learn to speak it as well.”
- “If someone was just starting to learn a language I would recommend the face to face because with the online lessons, you’re teaching yourself as you go along.”

“I just don’t personally do as well in a language course when it’s not face-to-face everyday”

Discussion

The hybrid format demonstrated that it is equally as effective as the traditional face-to-face method for the teaching of a third-semester Spanish course in all major language sub-skills. These results are consistent with previous research findings pertaining to online and hybrid instruction in other disciplines, and highlight the potential of online instruction as a valuable asset for language instruction at the college level.

These findings also suggest that when a foreign language course is designed to capitalize on the strengths of online and traditional face-to-face learning configurations, teachers and students indeed get the best of both worlds: Students get the benefits of technology (focused presentation and practice, multi-sensory stimulation, extensive and immediate feedback, and self-directed pacing) without giving up on the benefits of face-to-face instruction (personal interaction, reinforcement, and follow-up). Teachers, on the other hand, are freed from having to spend a significant amount of class time on basic skill building activities (such as grammar and vocabulary drills), and are able to focus more of their time and attention on creative and interactive language learning tasks.

Today’s students are quite familiar with electronic media in their daily lives, and the hybrid course format takes advantage of this existing level of familiarity and technical expertise. A carefully-planned and well-supported online language course component can infuse any language course with such coveted features as self-pace and flexibility, which in turn facilitates independent and individualized learning. Students in hybrid language courses can indeed reach similar levels of linguistic achievement as their traditional face-to-face counterparts, but with substantially higher levels of satisfaction. This alone suggests that the hybrid format represents a significant course design improvement over traditional face-to-face delivery methods in foreign languages.

The development of suitable online materials is perhaps the most difficult and costly aspect of implementing a hybrid language course. However, more and more

textbook publishers are making electronic course management programs available along with their traditional printed media. As design and implementation costs decrease, language programs can transition to hybrid formats at lower costs, and with potentially greater technical quality and support.

Conclusions and recommendations for further research

The substitution of 40% of the traditional face-to-face time with self-directed online tasks in this study had no detrimental effects on the performance of language learners in any of the measured linguistic sub-skills (reading, listening, writing, and speaking). In fact, this course format was extremely well received by learners as it

“The substitution of 40% of the traditional face-to-face time with self-directed online tasks in this study had no detrimental effects on the performance of language learners in any of the measured linguistic sub-skills...”

enhanced the flexibility and convenience of their required language learning assignments. In spite of the positive feedback obtained from participants, we must take into account that for practical reasons, this study could not use random subject assignment. Future studies should seek to determine if similar learning outcomes can be obtained with intact classes.

It is important to note as well, that when the hybrid format was first developed at this university, it was tested with a randomly-selected, third-semester Spanish class. Students participating in the experiment were surveyed at the end of the course, and a relatively small percentage of the students (20%) expressed preference for the traditional method. The reasons provided could in most cases be traced to technical glitches in the original course design (non-working links, incorrectly-coded answer keys, inconsistent values assigned to the different online tasks, etc.) and to lack of familiarity with the approach on

the part of the instructor (inaccurate instructions pertaining to the online components of the course, limited ability to assist students with basic technical problems, lack of prompt feedback to learners, incorrect entries in the online grade book, etc.). Nevertheless, those comments suggest that the online environment may not work for all students (and teachers), and that the option of traditional face-to-face courses may still be necessary for some learners. As indicated by the exit survey results, there appears to be a connection between personality factors and class type selection. A much closer examination of the nature and significance of this relationship may be necessary, before we can establish the extent to which the hybrid course environment can be beneficial for a general school population.

In spite of this limitation, the results of the present study indicate that hybrid courses are practical and effective alternatives to traditional face-to-face instruction in foreign languages, particularly for independent and self-motivated learners who are familiar with basic computer skills. This experience also suggests that language pro-

grams seeking to implement hybrid courses into their curriculum need to pay special attention to teacher training and ancillary development issues (especially if original materials are going to be at the core of their online offerings). Finally, these results highlight the need to implement language curricula that take into account individual differences and diverse learning styles, perhaps by offering some traditional face-to-face sections alongside the hybrid ones, or by providing additional support to those individuals whose learning style may conflict with the self-paced and self-directed hybrid approach.

The pressure to do 'more with less' may be leading us toward technology-intensive models of instruction. However, this shift does not need to happen to the detriment of our well-established language proficiency goals and standards. As documented by this investigation, our language programs can achieve the same linguistic objectives through hybrid courses, with important additional benefits (namely, higher levels of student satisfaction, individualization of instruction, and rationalization of resources). However, there is yet a lot for us to learn about these new curricular options. These findings should initiate a dialog that will lead to further inquiries into the pedagogical potential of these hybrid learning environments, and to a more solid understanding of their strengths and limitations.

“...language programs seeking to implement hybrid courses into their curriculum need to pay special attention to teacher training and ancillary development issues...”

References

- Arnone, M. (2002). 3 Iowa Universities go online to preserve Eastern European language courses. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48, 45.
- Brown, B. W., & Liedholm, C. E. (2002). Can web courses replace the classroom in Principles of Microeconomics? *The American Economic Review*, 92(2), 444-448.
- Carroll, B. (2003). Going hybrid: Online course components increase flexibility of on-campus courses. *Online Classroom*, February, 4-7.
- Combs, L. (2004). Science education in the web era. *Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*, 23(2), 139-149.
- Hokanson, S. G. (2000). Distance education in foreign languages. *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature*, 54(2), 85-93.
- Hopper, K. (2003). Reasons to go hybrid. *Distance Education Report*, 7(24), 7.
- Kinney, D. P., & Robertson, D. F. (2003). Technology makes possible new models for delivering developmental Mathematics instruction. *Mathematics and Computer Education*, 37(3), 315-28.
- Krawiec, S., Salter, D., & Kay, E. J. (2005). A "hybrid" Bacteriology course: The professor's design and expectations; the students' performance and assessment. *Microbiology Education*, 6, 8-13.
- Oblender, T. E. (2002). A hybrid course model: One solution to the high online drop-out rate. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 29(6), 42-46.
- Patterson, J. (2004). For quality and cost-effectiveness build a hybrid program. *Distance Education Report*, 8(21), 1-2.

- Riffell, S., & Sibley, D. (2005). Using web-based instruction to improve large undergraduate biology courses: An evaluation of a hybrid course format. *Computers & Education*, 44, 217-35.
- Salaberry, M. R. (2000). Pedagogical design of computer mediated communication tasks: learning objectives and technological capabilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 28-37.
- Salamonson, Y., & Lantz, J. (2005). Factors influencing nursing students' preference for a hybrid format delivery in a pathophysiology course. *Nurse Education Today*, 25, 9-16.
- Tunison M., & Noonan, B (2001). On-line learning: Secondary students' first experience. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'Education*, 26(4), 495-511.
- Young, J. R. (2002). 'Hybrid' teaching seeks to end the divide between traditional and online instruction. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48(28), A33-A34.

Appendix I

Spanish 107: End-of-Semester Online Survey

Section A. Course Compatibility with Personal Needs

1. How important was each of the following reasons for choosing your Spanish 107 section?

RESPONSE CHOICES:

<Displayed as a pull-down list on web survey>

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Barely important
- Not at all important
- It was offered at the right time for my schedule...
- I wanted this particular instructor...
- My friends were signing up for this section...
- I wanted to take a hybrid-format class (**hybrid**: MWF = face-to-face, TR = online activities)
- I wanted to take a traditional-format class (**traditional**: MTWRF = face-to-face)
- Other important reason (specify) _____

2. When you were selecting the Spanish 107 section, what differences between the traditional-format and hybrid-format sections did you know about? (Choose all that apply.)

- I was not aware of any significant differences.
- I was aware that the hybrid-format had 3 face-to-face sessions/week and the traditional-format had 5 face-to-face sessions/week.
- I was aware of the hybrid format's use of online activities on Tuesday and Thursdays.

3. How useful has each item below been in helping you learn and understand the overall course content?

RESPONSE CHOICES:

<Displayed as a pull-down list on web survey>

- Essential
- Extremely useful
- Very useful
- Moderately useful
- Slightly useful
- Not very useful
- Not useful at all

- Face-to-face lectures...
- Online activities...
- Textbooks...
- Group work...
- Self-tests...

4. How well did the online activities **relate** to the face-to-face class sessions?

Not at all *Very well*

5. How well did the online activities **prepare** you for the face-to-face class sessions?

Not at all *Very well*

6. How well were the out-of-class activities integrated with the face-to-face class sessions?

Not at all *Very well*

7. Do you think any of the online learning exercises would have been more effective if they had been done during the face-to-face session instead?

- Yes, **many** would have been more effective in the face-to-face sessions.
- Yes, **a few** would have been more effective in the face-to-face sessions.
- No.

8. Do you think any of the in-class (face-to-face) activities would have been more effective if they had been done out-of-class as online exercises instead?

- Yes, **many** would have been more effective as online exercises.
- Yes, **a few** would have been more effective as online exercises.
- No.

9. How easy or difficult was it to motivate yourself to complete the online class lessons?

- Very easy
- Easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Difficult
- Very difficult

10. Suppose you were going to enroll in another class in the Dept of Foreign Languages and Literature. All things being equal, would you enroll in a hybrid-format language course or a traditional-format language course?

- I don't know enough about the hybrid-format course to answer.
- Would **definitely** enroll in a **hybrid**-format class
- Would **probably** enroll in a **hybrid**-format class
- Not sure
- Would **probably** enroll in a **traditional**-format class
- Would **definitely** enroll in a **traditional**-format class

11. Would you recommend the hybrid format or the traditional format to someone who was planning to enroll in a language class?

- I don't know enough about the hybrid-format course to answer.
- Would **definitely** recommend the **hybrid**-format class
- Would **probably** recommend the **hybrid**-format class
- Not sure
- Would **probably** recommend the **traditional**-format class
- Would **definitely** recommend the **traditional**-format class

Please explain your response.

Section B. Spanish Skills

12. Select one response for each question below.

RESPONSE CHOICES:

<Displayed as a pull-down list on web survey>

- Very much
- Moderately
- Slightly
- Not very much
- Not at all

• How much did the **online grammar practice activities** improve your Spanish ...

- i. reading comprehension?
- ii. listening comprehension?
- iii. writing skills?
- iv. speaking skills?

• How much did the **online vocabulary practice activities** improve your Spanish ...

- i. reading comprehension?
- ii. listening comprehension?
- iii. writing skills?
- iv. speaking skills?

• How much did the **online assessment/testing activities** improve your Spanish ...

- i. reading comprehension?
- ii. listening comprehension?
- iii. writing skills?
- iv. speaking skills?

• How much have the **online country profile activities** improved your understanding of Hispanic culture?

Section C. Interactions with Spanish 107 Faculty and Classmates

13. How **much** interaction have you had with your **instructor**?

- Much more** than in other language courses
- More** than in other language courses
- About the same** as in other language courses
- Less** than in other language courses
- Much less** than in other language courses

14. How **much** interaction have you had with your **classmates**?

- Much more** than in other language courses
- More** than in other language courses
- About the same** as in other language courses
- Less** than in other language courses
- Much less** than in other language course

<NOTE: ASK QUESTIONS 14-17 IN HYBRID CLASS ONLY>

15. Compared with how you normally interact with teachers in **language** courses, how did the **MyCourses Discussion Forum** improve your interactions with your **instructor**?

- It **greatly** improved it.
- It **moderately** improved it.
- It **slightly** improved it.
- It **barely** improved it.
- It **did not** improve it at all

16. Compared with how you normally interact with classmates in **language** courses, how did the **MyCourses Discussion Forum** improve your interactions with your **classmates**?

- It **greatly** improved it.
- It **moderately** improved it.
- It **slightly** improved it.
- It **barely** improved it.
- It **did not** improve it at all

17. How **often**, on average, did you use the **MyCourses Discussion Forum** to interact with your **teacher**?

- 0 times/week <Displayed as a pull-down list on web survey>
- 1 time/week
- 2 times/week
- 3 times/week
- 4 times/week
- 5 times/week
- 6 or more times/week

18. How **often**, on average, did you use the **MyCourses Discussion Forum** to interact with your **classmates**?

- 0 times/week <Displayed as a pull-down list on web survey>
- 1 time/week
- 2 times/week
- 3 times/week
- 4 times/week
- 5 times/week
- 6 or more times/week

<QUESTION 18 ASKED TO ALL STUDENTS>

19. How **often**, on average, did you use e-mail or a generic chat tool to interact with your **classmates** about the course?

- 0 times/week <Displayed as a pull-down list on web survey>
- 1 time/week
- 2 times/week
- 3 times/week
- 4 times/week
- 5 times/week
- 6 or more times/week

Section D. Workload

20. <Ask hybrid section only.> On Tuesdays and Thursdays, how many **minutes** did you typically work **per day on the online activities**? (Do not include special class projects in your estimate.) ____ (mins/day) <Responses will be a pull-down list with values 0, 1-15, 16-30, 31-45, 46-60, ... , 165-180, More than 180. >

21. On average, how many hours/week did you spend on this course (including class time)? ____ (hours/week) <Responses will be pull-down list with values: 1, 2, 3, ..., 19, 20 >

22. Compare this course with other face-to-face language courses you have taken.

RESPONSE CHOICES:

<Displayed as a pull-down list on web survey>

- Much more** than in other language courses
- More** than in other language courses
- About the same** as in other language courses
- Less** than in other language courses
- Much less** than in other language courses

- How flexible was this course in allowing you to juggle your Spanish 107 course work around the rest of your schedule.
- How well were you able to control the overall pace of your learning?
- How well were you able to motivate yourself to complete the out-of-class assignments?
- How much time did you spend on this course per week?
- How convenient was this course for you?

23. To improve this course, how would you suggest changing the number of face-to-face class hours?

- Add 2 additional face-to-face hours per week.
- Add 1 additional face-to-face hour per week.
- Do not change the number of hours.
- Drop 1 face-to-face hour per week.
- Drop 2 face-to-face hours per week.

Section E. Technology Issues

24. Did you have any problems using MyCourses (WebCT)?

- No
- Yes (Please explain)

25. Did you have any trouble accessing the online activities?

- No
- Yes (Please explain)

26. Did you need to learn any **entirely new** technology skills for this class?

No

Yes (Please explain) _____

27. Did you receive adequate technical assistance to support the course's online components?

I didn't need any technical support.

Yes, the support was adequate.

No, the support was inadequate. (Please explain.) _____

27a. How many times during the entire semester did you receive technical assistance for **this** course? (Do **not** count technical assistance received during the face-to-face in-class sessions.)

I did not need any supplemental technical assistance for this course.

1-5 times

6-10 times

11 or more times

28. Did you feel that you were or were not at a disadvantage because you didn't understand how to use the technology **as well as others**?

I was **not** at a disadvantage.

I was at a **slight** disadvantage

I was at a **moderate** disadvantage

I was at a **great** disadvantage

28a. **If you felt that you were at a disadvantage**, please explain why.

Section F. General Information

29. What is your gender?

Male

Female

30. What is your official UD class status?

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Graduate student

Other (please specify) _____

31. How many credit hours will you earn this semester? (Include courses in which you registered as a "listener.") <Responses will be pull-down list with values 8, 9, 10, ..., 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 or more>

32. This semester, how many hours/week do you work for pay, on average?
_____ (hours/week)

<NOTE: Web implementation: a pull-down list with choices: 0, 1, 2, ..., 40, 41 or more hrs>

33. On average, how long does it take you to get to campus?

I live on campus. <Responses will be pull-down list.>

1-10 mins

11-20 mins

21-30 mins

31-40 mins

41-50 mins

51-60 mins

61-90 mins

91 mins or more

34. How do you connect to the Internet from your residence?

I don't have access to a computer or can't connect from my residence.

Dial-up modem

High-speed broadband (e.g., cable modem, Verizon DSL, campus network)

I don't know

35. How many UD classes have you ever taken that used MyCourses (WebCT)? (Include this semester.)

<Responses will be pull-down list with values 1, 2, ... 39, 40 or more>

36. Have you ever taken a college-level class that is entirely online, with no face-to-face component, such as a UD_Online course?

No

Yes

37. How do you characterize yourself? Select one answer for each question below.

RESPONSE CHOICES:

<Displayed as a pull-down list on web survey>

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

• I am self-motivated...

- I prefer a highly structured classroom environment...
- I prefer to work alone...
- I am self-disciplined...
- I have problems managing my time...
- I prefer communicating with teachers by
 - speaking face-to-face...
 - speaking on the phone...
 - electronically (e.g., e-mail, chat)...
- I prefer communicating with classmates by
 - speaking face-to-face...
 - speaking on the phone...
 - electronically (e.g., e-mail, chat)...
- Using information technologies in my other classes generally helps me learn the course material...

38. There are many ways to present language course materials to students. How do you rate each of the following for you personally?

RESPONSE CHOICES:

<Displayed as a pull-down list on web survey>

- Very desirable
- Desirable
- Neither desirable nor undesirable
- Undesirable
- Very undesirable
- Don't know
- Reading text (e.g., articles, documents, textbook)
- Listening to lectures
- Viewing graphics (e.g., pictures, diagrams)
- Watching video presentations
- Listening to audio presentation (e.g., comments, explanations)
- Taking ungraded self-tests.

Section G. Course improvements

39. What did you like about the course?

40. What would you change to improve the course?

41. Describe the one use of technology in this course you liked most.

**Thank you very much for completing this survey.
Please review your responses and then press the SUBMIT button below.**