

Research paper

## An Investigation into the effects of blended learning on Iranian Higher Education Students' English for General Purposes Achievement

Mehdi Jowkar<sup>\*1</sup>, Mohammad Javad Riasati<sup>2</sup>, Fatemeh Behjat<sup>3</sup>

<sup>\*1</sup>*Department of English Language Teaching, NM. C., Islamic Azad University, Noorabad  
Mamasani, Iran*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of English Language, Shi. C., Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of English Language, Aba. C., Islamic Azad University, Abadeh, Iran*

Jowkar, M., Riasati, M. J., & Behjat, F. (2026). An investigation into the effects of blended learning o Iranian Higher Education Students' English for General Purposes Achievement. *Journal of new advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 151- 173 .  
Doi: 10.22034/Jeltal.2026.8.1.7

\* Corresponding Author: [mehdi.jowkar@iau.ac.ir](mailto:mehdi.jowkar@iau.ac.ir)

### Abstract

The originality of the present research stems from determining the influence of blended learning on the academic achievement of university students. The study tried to assess if blended learning could be effective in teaching English; furthermore, this research aimed to compare male and female learners concerning their achievement through blended learning. The participants included a sample of 60 intermediate male and female English Language learners. They were selected from among 90 university students based on their scores in the proficiency test. Their ages ranged between 18 and 25. These participants were assigned randomly to the experimental group and control group to investigate the implementation of the blended learning approach in English for General Purpose class over a six-week period. Results from pre-test, post-test comparisons suggested that blended learning could contribute to or influence student achievement in language learning. The second research question which sought to compare the male and female participants' performance after receiving treatment through blended learning, found no significant difference between them. The results indicated that blended learning could offer positive learning experiences for EFL learners. The findings of this research shed light on the significance of using methods such as blended learning to improve the participants' performance. Besides, the findings of this research helped to inform universities on best practices in blended learning contexts. This research tried to decrease the existing gap in the literature on this subject.

**Keywords:** Blended Learning, Higher Education Students, English for General Purposes, EFL Context

**Received:** 2026-03-22 **Revised** 2026-08-15 **Accepted** 2026-08-30

## Introduction

“Blended learning” is a kind of upgraded instructive method combining traditional educational approach and distance, and online methods (Albiladi & Alshareef, 2019; Rao, 2026; Yan et al., 2024). Due to the unfair application of traditional methods in language learning setting in the past, blended learning can be a great change in EFL context. Additionally, student-oriented learning is a newsworthy subject for most institutes, although it has not yet been extensively implemented. Different features of blended learning would contribute to learner-oriented learning since it provides them with collaborative and communicative tasks. In addition, it contributes to teaching by designing more student-oriented learning activities. Simultaneous with the improvement of new educational technologies, new styles of learning activities come into existence, which is named “Blended Learning”. Blended Learning is considered as a method including online learning, face-to-face learning, live electronic learning, and learning concluded through special methods (Akbarov et al., 2018; Gudoniene et al., 2025; Tayebinik & Puteh, 2012).

Regarding both scientific and theoretical fields, new methods in the academic setting are crucial. Blended learning is beneficial due to its efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and flexibility of the teaching method at any time and place. Blended learning as an important part of training and education is developing in the higher education contexts among the developed states.

“Computer-based Information and Communication Technology” (ICT) has revolutionized all dimensions of nowadays lives, while it may not be totally used in different educational aspects. From the emerging of the primary personal computers in the 60s to the tablets and smartphones in

the 21 century, and recent developments in wearable technology, ICT remains to be significant in communication (Martinsen, 2017; Wei, 2025). Providing chances to advance justice in education via worldwide and on-demand access to education, ICT is changing education around the globe (OECD, 2015).

Several studies (Chandra & Fisher, 2009; Geçer, 2013; Kocaman Karoğlu et al., 2014) have compared online and/or blended learning with face-to-face teaching and try to define which format creates a higher learning outcome, satisfies students more, or has a higher rate of course completion. Despite the importance of blended and online learning, there is a dearth of study in Iran, where the issue has not been dealt with sufficiently yet. Conclusively, the current study was an attempt to explore the effects of blended learning on Iranian higher education English as General Purposes (EGP) students' achievement. Besides, the effect of blended learning among female and male participants was compared. To accomplish these goals, the following research questions were formulated:

*RQ1. Does blended learning influence students' achievement in learning English for General Purposes?*

*RQ2. Are there any significant differences between male and female students' achievement in learning English for General Purposes?*

### **Review of the Related Literature**

Nowadays, students need to get benefits from different educational sources and approaches which pave the way for achieving educational goals. One of these approaches, which is of paramount importance, is blended learning. Many experts in the world have dealt with blended

learning and many specialists touched upon its various dimensions and models which facilitate the learning of students.

As Moskal et al. (2013) declared blended learning is among successful approach to integrate different versions of technology into educational contexts. It is a pedagogical approach in which face-to-face learning is combined with online methods. Via blended learning, learners experience meaningful interactions with the instructor both with and without the mediation of technology. This kind of learning could provide a learner-centered and personalized learning experience while learners have already access to their teacher's support (Boulton, 2008; Horn & Staker, 2011).

A major challenge in implementing blended learning is sustaining learners' motivation and developing effective time-management skills. Blended learning, when it is designed with good teaching practices, could contribute into improving learners' achievements and engagement (Chandra & Briskey, 2012; Rao, 2026). Enhancing learners' engagement is the main issue in improving memberships and achievement in learning English (Chandra & Fisher, 2009).

With the increasing learners' population, classroom sizes, and the number of part-time studies, many course developers and instructors are turning to online media for teaching and learning purposes. Yet, challenges and tensions arise where institutes are also concerned with expanding access and retention. Very often instructors find online approaches not working quite as the face-to-face methods. There are some questions to cope up with "Is online learning good for all students?" "Does it indicate a cost-effective use of the instructor's time?" "Are we supporting our students, or abandoning them?" (Perez et al., 2011). Distance technologies have opened up new potentialities in higher education; for instance, networks provide students at a distance or separated from their peers and friends the new methods to access and integrate information using the unlimited resources of the Web (Calderon et al., 2012; Jowkar et al., 2026).

According to Marsh (2012), blended learning in higher education contexts could offer various learning methods and the creation of a fruitful learning setting could provide new approaches to learning, and it could lead to the emergence of different learning styles. Furthermore, Marsh (2012) declared that such learning contexts could add traditional face-to-face learning environments or offer a complete learning package that needs a small amount of face-to-face interaction. In the future, most of the teaching would be supported by digital solutions in the educational system (Babakhani & Tabatabaee, 2023; Johnson et al., 2015; Marsh, 2012).

The main significance and importance of blended learning is its potentiality. Blended learning could provide a real chance to produce learning practices that leads to true learning in the proper place and the accurate time for everybody, not only at work but also at universities, schools, and home. It could be actually global, crossing universal borders, and congregating student groups from various cultures. Blended learning could turn into one of the most important developments of the current century. Wallet (2014) maintained that the increasing use of ICT and the apparent benefits in learning situations has caused ongoing changes by educational decision-makers to formalize ICT policies as a part of educational renovation and change. Blended learning has been successful in combining classrooms with technology (Hahessy et al., 2014; Moskal et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2015).

In the previous decades, researchers have been focused on a change in the delivery of higher education course content, teaching, and teacher-student interaction which happens neither totally face-to-face, nor wholly online, but in a thoughtfully structured integration of online and in-person learning that uses diverse media and is grounded in a robust constructivist pedagogical framework. This combination is considered as blended learning could get various blended formats. In all

blended learning or teaching formats, the aspects of students' self-direction, their active involvement, also their motivation are significant (Johnson et al., 2015).

Obiedat et al. (2014) mentioned the positive and significant role blended learning plays in students' academic achievement at university. Furthermore, VanDerLinden (2014) found that blended learning could be effective in advancing the educational achievement of female learners, besides it can boost the female learners' attitudes towards this kind of learning. Fakhir (2015) confirmed that blended learning is more effective than conventional learning because it influences the learners' achievement.

Aslani and Tabrizi (2015) indicated that blended learning encourages Iranian learners. Besides, the positive influence of blended learning on learning grammar and reading was confirmed by Bataineh and Mayyas (2017), who conducted a study in Jordan to find the impact of blended learning on EFL students' reading comprehension skills and grammar subs-skills. Considering writing skill and grammatical knowledge, Jowkar et al. (2026) studied the effect of blended e-learning and found that the EFL learners experienced an improvement. Also, Akbarov et al. (2018), and Ju and Mei (2018) stated that the implementation of blended learning could improve EFL learners' professional performances; Indeed, the tendency to utilize blended learning has a direct influence on the students' academic achievements.

The related literature review confirmed that blended learning is applicable in EFL classrooms. Additionally, research revealed that it leads to boost the learners' encouragement and their involvement in classroom activities (James, 2016). Improved academic successes could be achieved where the learners were exposed to blended learning (Almasaeid, 2014; Ceylan, & Kesici, 2017; Fakhir, 2015). On the other hand, a number of EFL learners mentioned that blended learning makes them being socially isolated and frustrated (Ja'ashan, 2015)

## **Methodology**

### **Participants**

The comprising population of the current research was consisted of 60 students, with different university majors from Mamasani Islamic Azad University, Fars, Iran. They were selected from among 90 participants, who were selected randomly. The researcher selected 60 students based on their performance in an English language proficiency test; whose scores were at the advanced level were selected as the participants of this study. The participants were recruited from among both genders (30 males and 30 females). All of them were selected from among native speakers of Farsi language whose English language was a foreign language and did not have the experience of living in countries whose spoken language is English. It should be added that the participants' age ranged from 18 to 25.

### **Instruments**

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the use of blended learning to supplement classroom learning, the following research instruments and materials were used:

#### *Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT)*

For selecting a homogenous sample of participants, the "Oxford Quick Placement Test" (OPT) was used to determine the participants' overall English language proficiency. This test is used as a language proficiency test in which the obtained scores according to the test norms are ranked in six different levels, ranged from beginners to advance. The OQPT comprises 60 items assessing vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension, and cloze proficiency, yielding a comprehensive measure of language ability. Participants had 60 minutes to complete this part. The reliability and validity of this test have been checked and it is regarded as a valid test of English language

proficiency. The reliability of this test in the present research was assessed through the Chornbach Alpha test that was equal to .89 (Table 1).

**Table 1**  
*Reliability Estimates for the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT)*

| Test | N. of items | Cronbach Alpha |
|------|-------------|----------------|
| OQPT | 60          | .89            |

### *Achievement Test*

An achievement test was administered as both a pretest and a posttest to measure the participants' general English knowledge before and after the treatment. The pretest was conducted at the beginning of the study to determine the learners' initial level of achievement and to establish a baseline for comparison. After the implementation of the instructional intervention, the same achievement test was given as a posttest to assess any changes in performance resulting from the treatment. The comparison of pretest and posttest scores made it possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention and determine whether there was a significant improvement in the participants' achievement over the course of the study. The achievement test was developed based on the instructional objectives and content of the study. A table of specifications was prepared, and test items were written accordingly. The draft test was validated by two university professors majoring in English language teaching. The professors were requested to comment on the following aspects: wording of the questions, degree of appropriateness to the level of the students at Mamasani Islamic Azad University, coverage of the lesson objectives, and content of the study. The questions were then modified, including rewording, deletion, or modification, in accordance with the professors' comments. To ensure the reliability of the test, the researcher administered the amended version on a similar group of students. The students took 45 minutes to complete the test. After 10 days, the test was again administered to the same group of students.

Based on the pilot results, the test was revised and finalized. Reliability was calculated using the Pearson equation, and the percentage of reliability was 0.83. The homogeneity coefficient, which was calculated using Cronbach alpha equation, was 0.85 (Table 2). Thus, this test was shown to possess acceptable reliability and validity. The final achievement test was then administered to the participants under standardized conditions, and the scores obtained were used for analysis.

**Table 2**  
*Reliability Estimates for the Achievement Test*

| Test             | N. of items | Pearson Equation | Cronbach Alpha |
|------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|
| Achievement Test | 45          | 0.83             | 0.85           |

### *Online Lessons*

There were six units in this program that were consolidated, reinforced and expanded on the classroom lessons. The e-learning lessons included various learning activities related to the content of each unit. It included 6 units divided into different sections, reading, grammar and vocabulary. For each section there is a purpose, for example, in the section of grammar focus, the learners read about grammatical points which are followed by grammatical exercises. During the development of the program, the units were tested by the English teachers at the English department to confirm that it covers similar content to the classroom lessons. Each unit were shared with and taught by using the proposed enhanced blended learning approach: intensive face-to-face sessions, online learning, free internet search and online discussions on the course content through Learning Management System. The students had access to the e-learning at their own place and in their own time. Instead of meeting in a classroom three hours a week, the class meets two hours per week with the third hour dedicated to an online discussion.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

In this study, based on the students' enrollment in General English course at Mamasani Islamic Azad University, Oxford Quick Placement Test was administered to 90 of the students to select homogeneous participants in terms of English language ability. According to the scoring criteria of the OQPT, L2 learners with a score ranging between 28 and 36 out of 60 were regarded as "intermediate." Finally 60 students were selected as intermediate language learners of the present study. They were divided into two groups of thirty, based on the class time suited to them, one control group and one experimental group. At the beginning of the semester, learners in both groups were pretested before the instruction. The control group went through a traditional face-to-face learning while the experimental group studied General English in a classroom setting supplemented with blended learning procedures. The participants included both male and female from 18 to 25 years of age with various ethnicities from different parts of the country.

The blended learning approach of instruction was implemented over a six-week period to 30 intermediate students of experimental group who were enrolled in English for General Purposes at Mamasani Islamic Azad University. The first in-person session helped students get acquainted with the course technology and began building a sense of connection that lasted for the duration of the class. During this two-hour introduction, they learned how to use the learning management system (LMS) for the course. The LMS included all necessary interactive features, such as posting course materials and content, sharing links to external resources, conducting online assessments, and providing tools for digital communication.

In General English, the students were taught and assessed in five aspects, they were: grammar, content, mechanics, vocabulary and organization. In educational contexts, a six-week timeframe aligns well with typical academic schedules, such as modules or units in semester systems. It

allows educators to design focused interventions that can be assessed and reflected upon within a manageable period (Nortvig, 2018).

There were six units in this program that were consolidated, reinforced and expanded on the classroom lessons. The units divided into different sections, reading, grammar and vocabulary, and there is a purpose for each section. For example, in the section of grammar focus, the learners read about grammatical points which are followed by grammatical exercises. Finally at the end of each unit, the learners read about and further discuss the unit's topic in the reading section. The e-learning lessons included various learning activities related to the content of each unit. These online lessons were developed by the researcher. During the development of the program, the units were tested by the English teachers at the English department to confirm that it covered similar content to the General English classroom lessons. Each unit were shared with and taught by using blended learning approach. Two days before each actual face-to-face class session, the materials were delivered to the experimental group through the Learning Management System. In contrast, the control group received traditional instruction within a face-to-face framework.

Instructional sessions incorporated tailored lesson plans featuring both direct and indirect teaching methods. These included guided readings, individual and collaborative tasks, writing exercises, vocabulary building, worksheets, and various in-class and homework activities. While English served as the primary language of instruction, the instructor occasionally used Farsi to clarify concepts that were challenging for learners. Grammar and vocabulary were explained as necessary, with unfamiliar ideas presented through a blended learning approach. A portfolio of student work was maintained to help both the learners and the instructor monitor the development of language skills. Since this research planned to measure the General English of the learners, an Achievement Test was used not only as the pre-test, but also as a post-test for both the control and

experimental groups. In fact, having taken the achievement test as the pretest in the first session, the learners received the same achievement test as the post-test after six weeks of the study during which the learners in the experimental group received the treatment, which is general English course in the form of blended learning. Juxtaposing the results of the pretest and the post-test in each of the control and experimental group, the researcher was able to understand if there was any change regarding the linguistic achievement of the learners in each group.

After the treatment step, the researcher analyzed the data collected from the instruments to assess the overall outcome of the treatment to investigate and answer the research questions within the theoretical framework. The combination of qualitative and quantitative data which were collected simultaneously throughout this study was therefore seen to yield a more complete and accurate interpretation of students' achievement of using blended learning in language learning.

### **Data Analysis Procedures**

In order to analyze the data, the 26<sup>th</sup> version of the “Statistical Package for Social Sciences” (SPSS) was used; the researcher run both descriptive and inferential statistics. As inferential statistics, a set of independent samples *t*-tests were run in order to answer the study research questions. An independent samples *t*-test was used for comparing the pre-and post-test mean score of both comprising groups (control and experimental). Besides, another independent sample *t*-test was run to compare male and female participants of the experimental group in order to find if there was any significant difference between the male and female performance.

### **Results**

The following sections are devoted to analysis and report of the related data of the study.

### Checking the Normalizing of Tests

The researcher tried to make sure about the normal distribution of the obtained data. To ensure the normality distribution, the Smirnov-Kolmogorov test was run.

**Table 3**  
*Tests of Normality*

|      | group        | Kolmogorov-Smirnova |    |      | Shapiro-Wilk |    |      |
|------|--------------|---------------------|----|------|--------------|----|------|
|      |              | Statistic           | df | Sig. | Statistic    | df | Sig. |
| pre  | experimental | .174                | 30 | .021 | .956         | 30 | .245 |
|      | control      | .158                | 30 | .053 | .933         | 30 | .059 |
| post | experimental | .198                | 30 | .033 | .891         | 30 | .035 |
|      | control      | .169                | 30 | .028 | .948         | 30 | .151 |

As shown in Table 3, p-value of all variables are more than .05 ( $p=.174 > .05$  for experimental group pre-test;  $p=.158 > .05$  for control group pre-test, and  $p=.198 > .05$  for experimental post-test, and  $p=.169 > .05$  for control post-test ) indicating the normal distribution of the data. Accordingly, it was allowed to test the hypotheses by using parametric tests like independent samples *t*-test.

### Investigating the Pre-test Performance

To ensure all the experimental and control group members were at the same level at the start of the study, the pre-test of both groups was compared. Therefore, to make sure that both groups were the same at the outset of the research before implementing the treatment, their pre-test mean scores were compared by an independent sample *t*-test. The related results are reported in Table 4.

**Table 4**  
*Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test*

| group      | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|------------|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| Control    | 30 | 12.75 | 1.37           | .251            |
| experiment | 30 | 12.46 | 1.56           | .286            |

The table 4 above indicates the mean score of experimental and control groups were 12.75 and 12.46, respectively. These groups' mean scores were compared through an independent sample t-test that is reported in the following table.

**Table 5**

*Results of Independent Samples t-test for Pre-test*

|                             | Levene's Test<br>for Equality of Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |       | Sig.<br>(2-tailed) | Mean<br>Difference | Std.<br>Difference | Error | 95% Confidence Interval<br>of the Difference |       |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------|------------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------|-------|
|                             | F                                          | Sig. | t                            | df    |                    |                    |                    |       | Lower                                        | Upper |
| Equal variances assumed     | .651                                       | .423 | .744                         | 58    | .460               | .283               | .381               |       | -.479                                        | 1.046 |
| Equal variances not assumed |                                            |      | .744                         | 57.01 | .460               | .283               | .381               |       | -.479                                        | 1.046 |

As Table 5 above reveals, there is not any statistical significant differences (df =58, t =.744, p =.460>.05) between control (N =30, M =12.75, SD =1.37) and experimental (N =30, M =12.46, SD =1.56) groups in the pre-test which indicates that participants were homogeneous at the start of the study.

### Investigating the Post-test Performance

Participants' performances in the post-test were compared in order to find if there was any statistically significant difference in their mean scores after the treatment sessions. For this purpose, an independent samples t-test was run to compare these two comprising groups' post-test. The following tables reveal the related data.

**Table 6**

*Descriptive Statistics of the Post-test Mean Score*

| group      | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|------------|----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| control    | 30 | 13.7 | 1.317          | .24             |
| experiment | 30 | 15.0 | 1.174          | .21             |

The control group's mean score in the post-test was 13.7 and that of the experiment group was 15. These two groups' mean scores were compared through an independent samples *t*-test, which is reported in table 6.

**Table 7**  
*Results of Independent Samples t-test for the Post-test*

|                             |  | Levene's Test for<br>Equality of Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |        |                 |                 | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |             |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------|
|                             |  | F                                          | Sig. | t                            | df     | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference                     | Lower Upper |
| Equal variances assumed     |  | .879                                       | .352 | 4.03                         | 58     | .000            | 1.30            | .32                                       | .65 1.94    |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |                                            |      | 4.03                         | 57.255 | .000            | 1.30            | .32                                       | .65 1.94    |

Table 7 reveals that there is a statistically significant difference ( $df = 58$ ,  $t = 4.03$ ,  $p = .000 < .05$ ) between experimental ( $N = 30$ ,  $M = 15$ ,  $SD = .21$ ) and control ( $N = 30$ ,  $M = 13.7$ ,  $SD = .24$ ) groups in the post-test.

### Comparing Male and Female Performance

The performance of male and female participants in the post-test was compared in order to find if there was any statistically significant difference in the effect of the blended learning intervention among male and female participants. To yield this aim, an independent samples *t*-test was run to compare these participants' performance in the post-test. The following tables are devoted to revealing the related data.

**Table 8**  
*Descriptive Statistics of Male and Female Post-test Mean Score*

| gender | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| male   | 15 | 14.13 | 1.302          | .336            |
| female | 15 | 14.80 | 1.082          | .279            |

The male group's mean score in the post-test was 14.13 and that of the female group was 14.18. These two groups' mean scores were compared through an independent samples t-test, which is reported in the following table.

**Table 9**  
*Results of Independent Samples t-test for Male and Female Post-test*

|                             | Levene's Test<br>for Equality of<br>Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |        |                        |                    |                          |                                                 |      |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|------------------------------|--------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------|
|                             | F                                             | Sig. | t                            | df     | Sig.<br>(2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Difference | Std. Error<br>Difference | 95% Confidence<br>Interval of the<br>Difference |      |
| Equal variances assumed     | .322                                          | .575 | -1.52                        | 28     | .138                   | -.66               | .437                     | -1.562                                          | .228 |
| Equal variances not assumed |                                               |      | -1.52                        | 27.095 | .139                   | -.66               | .437                     | -1.563                                          | .230 |

Table 9 reveals that there is no statistically significant difference ( $df = 28$ ,  $t = 1.52$ ,  $p = .138 < .05$ ) between male ( $N = 30$ ,  $M = 14.13$ ,  $SD = 1.3$ ) and female ( $N = 30$ ,  $M = 14.8$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ ) groups in the post-test.

## Discussion

In today's world, due to people's much work pressure, and their inclination to study in part-time conditions, there is a great tendency for teaching and learning online through different Technologies. Blended learning could present various methods of learning and it could construct a potentially better learning context. Blended learning possesses the potentiality to include different learning styles. As Marsh (2012), stated, blended learning is expected to complement traditional face-to-face learning settings and it could offer a comprehensive learning package involving little face-to-face interaction. He further stated that internet-based or digital flexible solutions would surround educational organizations in the near future. As the researcher

investigated and studied the relevant literature, Blended learning can provide language learners with a real chance to produce learning experiences and has the potentiality to create the right learning at the exact time and in the correct place. Blended learning has the capability to be globally utilized and penetrate all universal boundaries and bring together all groups of learners with different cultures and different time zones (Jowkar et al., 2026; Marsh, 2012; Rao, 2026).

Wallet (2014) declared in the increasing use of ICT in society could formalize ICT policies and renovate and reform educational strategies. Blended learning could potentially combine technology with standard classrooms (Moskal et al., 2013). Blended learning directly influences learners' performance and engenders academic achievements. Besides, it facilitates the language learning process and supports EFL educators in achieving multi pedagogical goals. (Akbarov et al., 2018).

Concerning the first research question, "*Does blended learning influence students' achievement in learning English for General Purposes*" An independent samples t-test was run to compare the means scores of the two comprising groups (control& experimental) in the post-test. Results of the t-test indicated significant outperformance of the experimental group over the control group. The results indicated that the experimental group experienced an improvement in their post-test compared to their counterpart, which may be due to the effect of blended learning. In sum, results from pre-test and post-test comparisons suggest that blended learning can contribute to or influence students' achievement in learning English as a foreign language.

This finding is in line with that of Pop and Slev (2012) and Adams et al., (2018) who view blended learning as an effective first step towards a transformational model that irrevocably leads to better outcomes in EFL teaching and learning. An optimum blend of methods and tools seems to optimize learning experiences through positive effects on motivation, satisfaction,

collaboration, autonomy, and engagement. "...blending adds flavor to EFL teaching and can represent a potentially effective strategy of extending students' exposure and use of the language in an engaging, memorable and authentic way" (Pop & Slev, 2012, p.5519).

The obtained result is not supported by Tosun's (2015) findings who found that blended learning does not enhance EFL students' vocabulary. The author found that the students' vocabulary achievement was not improved through a blended learning strategy. According to Tosun (2015), although students showed their agreement to the proposed blended learning strategy in vocabulary teaching, they were not motivated to learn new vocabulary outside of the classroom. Blended online vocabulary instruction could be effective to help EFL learners improve their vocabulary knowledge if digital tools are selected in accordance with students' needs and interests (Gudoniene et al., 2025; Tosun, 2015).

Regarding the second research question, "*Are there any significant differences between male and female students' achievement in learning English for General Purposes?*" An independent samples t-test was used to find the differences between male and female participants who experienced blended learning. Results of the t-test revealed no significant difference between male and female participants.

The findings were supported by a study done by Askar et al. (2008) who reported no statistically significant differences between female and male participants. Besides, the results were supported by Adas and Abu Shmais (2011) who reported no significant differences in terms of a gender performance difference in blended learning.

In conclusion, the findings indicate that blended learning significantly enhances students' achievement in English for General Purposes compared with traditional instruction. Its integration of technological and face-to-face methods can promote engagement, autonomy, collaboration, and

meaningful language practice. However, its effectiveness may depend on the appropriate selection of digital tools and alignment with learners' needs and interests. Furthermore, no significant gender-based differences were identified, suggesting that blended learning can benefit male and female students equally.

### **Conclusion**

Application of blended learning could improve the linguistic proficiency of university students. Implementing blended learning tasks could improve the learners' language learning and could have a positive effect on Iranian higher education EGP students' achievement. Thus, the application of blended learning activities is required for the students to improve their English language ability. Besides, blended learning could be utilized as an influential tool for English language classes. The instructor should facilitate learning by using online activities so these activities could support and improve learners' critical thinking skills, like inducing, deducing, classifying, comparing, analyzing errors, abstraction, analyzing perspectives and constructing support. The teacher's ability in designing fun and dynamic interactive tasks would lead to stimulation of the learners' learning motivation and interest.

The study focused on practical development that blended learning enhances the EFL learners with communicative language activities and enables them with communicative language skills. The research also showed EFL learners' perceptions about using the blended learning method and expanded a positive viewpoint for its efficacious application. Nevertheless, research indicated some obstacles in implementing blended learning method in the EFL educational setting, which requires to be focused in the next studies.

The obtained results of the current research indicated that implementing blended learning could be very helpful in teaching English language abilities. The results and conclusions of the present study recommended teachers at the university level pay more attention to the implementation of blended learning in English language skills teaching and learning by carrying out further research and investigations. Besides, EFL teachers at the university level are required to carry out additional research focusing on the use and the effects of blended learning in order to learn about its effectiveness for solving their learners' learning problems. Additionally, EFL teachers at the university level are recommended to share their ideas for evaluating EFL students' achievement using blended teaching to support their students obtain the best results from their English language learning classes. Correspondingly, EFL syllabus designers and course planners are recommended to add blended learning activities into their teaching course they implement blended learning tasks to assist EFL university students to improve their English language abilities.

The research was confined to Mamasani Islamic Azad University, located in Mamasani, Iran. The findings, therefore, are primarily indicative of this specific institutional context within the Iranian undergraduate system and may not be fully generalizable to other universities in Iran with different infrastructures, student demographics, or cultural dynamics. Consequently, the results reflect the achievements of this specific demographic (young adult, intermediate-level EGP learners) and cannot be directly extrapolated to students at beginner or advanced proficiency levels, to students in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) programs, or to learners in secondary or postgraduate education. The blended learning intervention and data collection period were strictly limited to a six-week timeframe.

Further research is required to search the effect of blended learning among the students at different proficiency levels. For successful blended learning, it seems critical to search about the

students' needs to promote a successful learning experience. To yield this aim, a larger sample of participants would be required. Finally, the research could be extended to include students of other universities.

## References

- Adams, D., Sumintono, B., Mohamed, A., & Noor, N. S. M. (2018). E-learning readiness among students of diverse backgrounds in a leading Malaysian higher education institution. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 15(2), 227-256.
- Adas, D., & Abu Shmais, W. (2011). Students' perceptions towards blended learning environment using the OCC. *An-Najah University Journal for Research – Humanities*, 25(6), 1681-1710.
- Akbarov, A., Gonen, K., & Aydogan, H. (2018). Students' Attitudes toward Blended Learning in EFL Context. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, 11(1), 61-68. <https://10.24193/adn.11.1.5>
- Albiladi, W. S., & Alshareef, K. K. (2019). Blended learning in English teaching and learning: A review of the current literature. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(2), 232-238. <https://10.17507/jltr.1002.03>
- Almasaeid, T. F. (2014). The effect of using blended learning strategy on achievement and attitudes in teaching science among 9th grade students. *European Scientific Journal*, 10, 133-145.
- Askar, P., Altun, A., & Ilgaz, H. (2008). *Learner satisfaction on blended learning*. E-leader conference, Krakow, Poland.
- Aslani, M., & Tabrizi, H., (2015). Teaching Grammar to Iranian EFL Learners through Blended Learning Using Multimedia Softwares. *Journal of applied linguistics and language research*, 2(8), 18-27.
- Babakhani, A., & Tabatabaee-Yazdi, M. (2023). The Power of Gamification on Iranian EFL Learners' Self-efficacy. *Journal of new advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 1118-1129. <https://10.22034/jeltal.2022.4.2.5.1.3>
- Bataineh, R., F and Mayyas, M., B. (2017). The utility of blended learning in EFL reading and grammar: A case for moodle, *Teaching English with Technology*, 17(3), 35-49, <https://www.tewtjournal.org>
- Boulton, H. (2008). Managing e-learning: What are the real implications for schools? *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 6(1), 11-18.
- Calderon, O., Ginsberg, A. P., & Ciabocchi, L. (2012). Multidimensional assessment of pilot blended learning programs: Maximizing program effectiveness based on student and faculty feedback. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 16(3), 23-37.
- Ceylan, V., & Kesici, A. (2017). Effect of blended learning to academic achievement. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(1), 309-320. <https://10.14687/jhs.v14i1.4141>
- Chandra, V., & Briskey, J. (2012). ICT driven pedagogies and its impact on learning outcomes in high school mathematics. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 7(1), 73-83.
- Chandra, V., & Fisher, D. L. (2009). Students' perceptions of a blended web- based learning environment. *Learning Environments Research*, 12(1), 31-44.

- Chandra, V., & Watters, J. (2012). Re-thinking physics teaching with web-based learning. *Computers & Education*, 58(1), 631-640.
- Fakhir, Z. (2015). *The impact of blended learning on the achievement of the English language students and their attitudes toward it* (Master's thesis). Amman: Middle East University
- Geçer, A. (2013). Lecturer-student communication in blended learning environments. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 13, 362-367.
- Gudoniene, D.; Staneviciene, E.; Huet, I.; Dickel, J.; Dieng, D.; Degroote, J.; Rocio, V.; Butkiene, R.; Casanova, D. (2025). Hybrid Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sustainability* 2025, 17, 756. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17020756>
- Hahessy, S., Burke, E., Byrne, E., Farrelly, F., Kelly, M., Mooney, B., & Meskell, P. (2014). Indicators of Student Satisfaction in Postgraduate Blended Learning Programmes: Key Messages from a Survey Study. *AISHE-J: The All Ireland Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*, 6(3), 1941-19423.
- Horn, M. B., & Staker, H. (2011). *The rise of K-12 blended learning*. San Mateo, CA: Innosight Institute.
- Ja' Ashan, M. M. (2015). Perceptions and attitudes towards blended learning for English courses: A case study of students at University of Bisha. *English Language Teaching*, 8(9), <https://10.5539/elt.v8n9p40>.
- James, J. (2016), ICT integration in academic writing: An experiment in blended learning. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 7(3), 336-355.
- Johnson, L., Adams, B.S., Estrada, V., and Freeman, A. (2015). *NMC Horizon Report: 2015 Higher Education Edition*. Austin Texas: New Media Consortium.
- Jowkar, M., Riasati, M. J., & Behjat, F. (2026). An Investigation into the Potential and Pitfalls of Blended Learning among Iranian Higher Education Students Learning English as a Foreign Language, *Journal of New Trends in English Language Learning*, 5(1), 1-9. <http://doi.org/10.57647/JNTELL.2026.0501.06>
- Ju, S. Y., & Mei, S. Y. (2018). Perceptions and practices of blended learning in foreign language teaching at USIM. *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, 12(1), 170-176. <https://10.26417/ejser.v12i1>.
- Kocaman Karoğlu, A., Kiraz, E., & Özden, M. Y. (2014). Good practice principles in an undergraduate blended course design. *Education and Science*, 39(173), 249-263.
- Marsh, D. (2012). *Blended Learning Creating Learning Opportunities for Language Learners*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Martinsen, Bryn. W. (2017). *The potential and pitfalls of blended learning: an investigation of student and teacher perceptions of blended learning in two Australian secondary science classes*. Ph. D. thesis, James Cook University. Retrieved from <https://dx.doi.org/10.4225/28/5a67cf33adb88>
- Moskal, P., Dziuban, C., & Hartman, J. (2013). Blended learning: A dangerous idea? *Internet and Higher Education*, 18, 15-23.
- Nortvig, A. M., Petersen, A. K., & Balle, S. H. (2018). A Literature Review of the Factors Influencing ELearning and Blended Learning in Relation to Learning Outcome, Student Satisfaction and Engagement. *The Electronic Journal of eLearning*, 16(1), 46-55.
- OECD. (2015). *Students, computers and learning: Making the connection, PISA*. Retrieved from <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264239555-en>

- Perez, M. V., Pérez-López, M. C., & Rodríguez-Ariza, L. (2011). Blended learning in higher education: Students' perceptions and their relation to outcomes. *Computers & Education*, 56(3), 818-826. <https://10.1016/j.compedu.2010.10.023>
- Pop, A., & Slev, A., M. (2012). Maximizing EFL Learning Through Blending, *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46, 5516-5519
- Rao, Laxmi. (2026). A Review of Blended Learning: An Innovative Hybrid Teaching and Learning. *The Review of Contemporary Scientific and Academic Studies*, 6. <https://10.55454/rcsas.6.01.2026.001>.
- Tayebnik, M., & Puteh, M. (2012). Blended learning or e-learning? *International Magazine on Advances in Computer Science and Telecommunications*, 3(1), 103-110.
- Tosun, S. (2015). The Effects of Blended Learning on EFL Students' Vocabulary Enhancement, *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199(2), 641-647.
- VanDerLinden, K. (2014). Blended learning as transformational institutional learning. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 165, 75-85.
- Wallet, P. (2014). *Information and communication technology (ICT) in education in Asia*. Retrieved from Montreal, Quebec: <https://www.uis.unesco.org/Communication/Documents/ICT- asia-en.pdf>.
- Wang, Y., Han, X. & Yang, J. (2014). Revisiting the blended learning literature: Using a complex adaptive systems framework. *Educational Technology & Society*, 18(2), 380-393.
- Wei, X. (2025). The effectiveness of flipped classroom in improving English communication skills: A Focus on Listening and Speaking. *Advances in Social Behavior Research*, 14, 84-88. <https://dx.doi.org/10.54254/2753-7102/2025.20434>
- Yan, Z., Liu, Q., & Chen, Y. (2024). Examining the impact of flipped learning on second language development: A quasi-experiment in higher education. *Heliyon*, 10(13). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e33593>