Original Paper

Blended Learning: Strategies and Challenges in Teaching 21st Century Literature of the Philippines and the World to Grade 12 Students

Shenna Joy S. Bobila[1*] & Dr. Crisanto A. Daing[2]

[1] College of Arts and Sciences, Our Lady of Fatima University, Quezon City, Philippines

[2] Graduate School, Our Lady of Fatima University, Valenzuela Campus, Philippines

Abstract

This study examined various teaching strategies using Blended Learning in teaching 21st Century Literature of the Philippines and the World (21st CLPW) in the university, assessed various challenges that teachers encountered using Blended Learning in teaching the subject, identified the significant difference in the extent of the use of Blended Learning in teaching 21st CLPW according to their profile, and recognized the significant relationship between the strategies and the profile of the teacher-respondents. The study employed a mix method of quantitative and qualitative research approaches. The researcher utilized a researcher-made questionnaire to identify teachers using Blended Learning to teach 21st CLPW among Grade 12 students in a university. Data gathering was administered via Google form, and interpretated using mean, standard deviation, Kruskal-Wallis H Test, and Chi-square Test of Independence. Results revealed that most of the teacher-respondents are young adults who are Bachelor's Degree holders, have been teaching for five years or less, and the most common seminars and pieces of training they have attended were school-based. Challenges Encountered obtained an overall mean of 3.12 and a standard deviation of 0.47, which is interpreted as Agree. This means that challenges in using Blended Learning in teaching 21st CLPW is inevitable.

Keywords

blended, online, strategies, challenges, 21st CLPW, SHS, technology, hybrid

1. Introduction

In the world of globalization, English has progressively developed as the medium in every field of communication, composed of local and worldwide Over the past decades, technology played an

enormous role in teaching-learning. It has been utilized right after its birth to augment the status of every content, course, and even methodology in learning. Technology for learning can be divided into three broad categories: i) information technologies that support the delivery of and access to information; ii) communication and interactive technologies that mediate user interaction; and iii) social software technologies that support group-based activities such as decision-making, planning, and higher-order learning activities (Skrypnyk, 2017). Along with the birth of various outputs of evolving technology, hybrid methodologies arose. After its discovery, these methodologies provide a new face and shape to the learning process; thus, they capture the attention of many method-seeking practitioners who want to keep their ideas and ways of teaching updated to cope with students' changing learning expectations.

Specialists in education persist in dealing with and talking about the practical upshots of these varied hybrid methodologies as it is being practiced progressively as part of today's innovations. Their potent factor still challenges that adept in teaching to re-assess their significant role in teacher-student progress towards teaching and learning. In line with these hybrid methodologies, Blended Learning, which is under Flipped Classroom Approach, has become known to teaching practitioners as early as 1999.

In the Philippines, blended learning is already one of the current norms. It enhances the current status of classroom instructions where universities are starting to adapt and fully embrace digital education, including blended learning since most universities strive to meet academic excellence. Just like how a university in Manila provides a journal with clear standpoints of those professors and students who utilize the Learning Management System (LMS), a learning platform under blended learning was commendable. The LMS is regarded as the most logical way to reach out to students who are indeed locked to their devices all day (Catapang, 2018).

Several researchers noted that there are few challenges to be met in using this method. Since this blended learning is seen now as one of the trends in the progressive teaching-learning field, teachers are searching for the best strategies to employ in the use of blended learning in different courses or subject matters, whether in primary, secondary, and even in tertiary education.

This study is quite new in relation to existing ones as it focused on the strategies and challenges of using Blended Learning in teaching 21st CLPW which is only offered among senior high students in the K-12 curriculum. That is why this study was conducted to investigate different strategies in employing Blended Learning by teachers, especially for those who are teaching the 21st Century Literature of the Philippines and the World to Grade 12 students at a university. This will also be helpful to develop plans or action to cope with the challenges encountered and identified in the use of Blended Learning. This study is affixed to Anchored Instruction (John Bransford and The Cognitive and Technology Group at Vanderbilt (CTGV), 1993), a technology-based learning approach that stresses the importance of placing learning within a meaningful, problem-solving context. A form of situated learning, anchored instruction uses context—stories or micro—to situate the understanding and application of

knowledge. In other words, the learning is contextualized to provide students with realistic roles that serve to enhance the learning process.

Anchored instruction is a framework for learning that emphasizes complex problem-solving in integrated learning contexts. Integrated learning contexts take on the form of drawing real connections, making learning meaningful for students, and forming relationships within and between content domains. An anchored instruction activity supports learning opportunities that relate to and extend thinking to other content areas.

Under Anchored Instruction, Strategic Teaching Framework (STF) is used. The Strategic Teaching Framework provides seven critical dimensions that can be useful to describe teaching/learning environments. Based on the conceptual framework, the authors develop the STF Hypermedia Library, a video library of whole classroom sequences of instruction. It is planned to develop as many as 64 video classrooms, each accompanied by supporting auditory commentary, text and graphics materials (such as lesson plans and research articles), and a telecommunications function that allows electronic mail exchange between system users and experts featured in the classroom videos (Jones et al., 1993).

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

The main objective of the research was to explore the various teaching strategies using Blended Learning in teaching 21st Century Literature of the Philippines and the World (21st CLPW) in the university. After determining the teaching strategies, the researcher also assessed various challenges teachers encountered using Blended Learning in teaching 21st CLPW. Thus, the study employed mixed method-the quantitative and qualitative research approaches.

2.2 Research Locale and Population and Sampling

The study was made in five campuses of a university. The university is a Higher Education Institution in the Philippines known for its allied medical sciences programs. It offers Basic Education units, Senior High School, Undergraduate, Graduate, and Post Graduate degrees.

The study focused only on the evaluation of the use of Blended Learning in teaching 21st Century Literature in the Philippines and the World. The subject is only offered among Grade 12 students during their first semester. The researcher identified the list of teachers on four campuses who teach 21st CLPW among Grade 12 students. Thus, a non-probability sampling technique was employed by the researcher in this study. Purposive or judgmental sampling, to be specific, is a technique wherein researchers consciously select certain participants to include in the study (Morse, 2007).

The respondents of the study were teachers who are teaching the subject 21stCLPW to Grade 12 Senior High School in the university's four campuses. Therefore, the researcher believed that the respondents could give appropriate and relevant data as they are identified teachers who utilized Blended Learning in the teaching of 21st CLPW to Grade 12 students at the university.

Other teachers of those four universities who were not using blended learning in teaching 21st CLPW

were not included in this study since the study focused only on evaluating the use of Blended Learning in teaching 21st CLPW.

2.3 Ethical Consideration

To ensure that the research is in line with the ethical and scientific standards, it underwent ethical review from the Institutional Ethics and Review Committee of Our Lady of Fatima University (OLFU-IERC).

Moreover, the researcher considered some ethical principles in research while conducting the study. The researcher observed the principle of confidentiality, anonymity, and data protection. These principles are included in the Philippine Data Protection Act of 2012 (RA 10173).

2.4 Research Instrument

The researcher utilized a researcher-made questionnaire. Statements designed by the researcher were based on the statements of the problem of the study. The survey content was comprised and taken from the literature review gathered in connection to the study. The survey tool considered the demographic profile of the respondents, the strategies and extent of the use, and the challenges that they encounter in using Blended Learning in teaching 21st CLPW.

The questionnaire was constructed in three Tables corresponding to the problem statements: Table 1. Demographic Profile of Teacher-respondents; Table 2. Teacher's Strategies and Its Extent of Using Blended Learning in Teaching 21st CLPW; and Table 3. Challenges Encountered by the Teacher-respondents Using Blended Learning in Teaching 21st CLPW. In addition, another page was provided for the interview questions, which has four follow-up questions.

Part I—A of the questionnaire considered the profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of age, highest educational attainment, number of years in teaching Literature, and pieces of training and seminars attended related to blended learning. The survey in this part required the participants to answer the questionnaire by placing a checkmark on the blank provided which corresponds to their answers.

Part I – B and C examined the teaching strategies that they commonly use in teaching 21st CLPW and the extent of the use of Blended learning in teaching the subject, and the challenges that they usually encountered during the use of Blended Learning in teaching 21st CLPW. Answers could range from 4 to 1, which means: 4-always, 3-sometimes, 2- often, and 1-never; in Table B and C. To answer this part, participants will encircle the number which corresponds to their best answers.

Part II of the questionnaire is the qualitative part. It contained four series of open-ended questions the chosen respondents wrote on the space provided the answers to the questions given. This further strengthened and validated their answers in the quantitative part of the survey. With this, they had the freedom to express what they think and feel towards the study or topic in writing.

2.5 Validation and Reliability of the Instrument

The researcher presented the researcher-made questionnaire to a panel of experts for content validation. The researcher asked an English professor who has been teaching the university and senior high school students for years. This professor is already considered an expert in the field due to his exposure to

39

various teaching and learning experiences. Likewise, his number of years in the academe teaching English subjects can help validate the content of the questionnaire.

Also, the researcher asked the help from an English coordinator who has been in the academe and has been in the position for a long time. Her expertise in the subject and experiences helped the researcher tailor the tool to draw out the best possible responses to address the concerns of the study.

Finally, the researcher sought help from the university psychometrician to check and validate the tool's content if it really focused on the variables being studied. After content validation, the researcher did the pilot testing of the questionnaire in a private higher educational institution and will subject the responses for validity through the Cronbach Alpha's correlation coefficient. The questionnaire yielded an overall score of 0.903 (Cronbach alpha), which is reliably good.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedures

The researcher released a letter to the Philippine Health Research Ethics Board (PHREB) asking for approval. When the board approved the proposal, another letter was sent to the School's Administrator seeking permission to conduct the research in the five campuses (School A, B, C, D, and E) as noted and checked by the adviser, and the Dean of the graduate school.

While waiting for the letter to be approved, the researcher, with the aid of the adviser, drafted the questions and statements needed in the composition of the survey tool. This draft underwent content validation. After the said content validation, the tool was pilot tested to the teachers of a private higher education institution. The responses were subjected for reliability testing. There were revisions of the items in the questionnaire to make the tool valid and reliable. After it has been tested and when the result is acceptable, the researcher is now ready for the actual conduct of the survey questionnaire.

When the letter seeking permission was approved, the researcher proceeded to the survey among teacher-respondents. The researcher explained the purpose of the study either through a face-to-face communication or through written communication. The researcher asked each teacher-respondent to read and understand the provisions of the consent form and explained to them that signing on the form would mean their willingness to participate in the research.

After this, the researcher administered the survey tool to the desired respondents. The survey questionnaire has two parts: the checklist and the written interview questions, in which four follow-up questions were included. Both parts of the survey (Part I and Part II) were answered through the Google form. Finally, the researcher sent an invitation and the link to the respondents. The survey tool could be accomplished in 10 to 15 minutes. After the respondents answered the tool, the researcher retrieved the survey questionnaire.

After the retrieval, the researcher tallied all the respondents' responses according to the responses in the survey tool, starting from the demographic profile of the respondents, the frequency of the teaching strategies used by the respondents, and the challenges they encountered. Once the tallying has been complete, the researcher sought the help and assistance of a statistician to treat the data. After which, the researcher interpreted the results and findings of the study and gave recommendations of the study.

2.7 Data Analysis

The data that were gathered were statistically treated. To answer SOP number 1, mean, standard deviation, frequency and frequency percentage were utilized to determine the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents.

To answer SOP numbers 2, 3, and 4, in determining the teaching strategies, the extent of the use of blended learning, and the challenges encountered by the teachers, mean and standard deviation were employed.

The data gathered were organized and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS v.20). The results that appeared on Tables 4, 5, and 7were computed using weighted mean to come up with the findings to answer the SOP numbers 2, 3 and 4, respectively. For example, in the scale of 4-1: 3.50- 4.00 (4) Always, 2.50-3.49 (3) Sometimes, 1.50- 2.49 (2) Often, and1.00- 1.49 (1) Never ratings were used to interpret teacher-respondents' answers.

To answer the significant difference in the extent of the use of Blended Learning in teaching 21st CLPW and the profile of the teacher respondents in SOP number 5, mean, standard deviation, and Kruskal-Wallis H test were applied. And to answer the significant relationship between the strategies and the profile of the teacher-respondents, mean, standard deviation, and Chi-square Test of Independence were utilized.

Part II Interview Questions were treated qualitatively, according to the pattern of the respondents' answers. Similar answers were combined as one pattern. The responses were part of the interpretation of data as well.

3. Result

Shown in Table 1 is the frequency and percentage distribution of Teacher-Respondents' Demographic Profile according to age. Fifty-nine (N=59) teacher-respondents were surveyed. These teacher-respondents were those who were teaching 21st Century Literature of the Philippines and the World in Grade 12. Most of the respondents were from 26-30 years old (42.4%), followed by 20-25 years old (28.8%). It can be analyzed that those teaching the subject were relatively young teachers as most of them belong to young adulthood age, which is between 20 to 40 years old.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of Respondents according to Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
20-25 years old	17	(28.8%)
26-30 years old	25	(42.4%)
31-35 years old	7	(11.9%)
36-40 years old	3	(5.1%)

41-45 years old	4	(6.8%)
46-50 years old	1	(1.7%)
51-55 years old	0	(0.0%)
56-60 years old	2	(3.4%)

Table 2 presents the Teacher-Respondents' Demographic Profile regarding Highest Educational Attainment. Most of the respondents are Bachelor's Degree holders (54.2%). However, there are only seven teachers who have a Master's Degree. Seventeen respondents have master's units, while only one respondent has a Ph.D. Degree. Taking a master's degree or master's is also essential for teachers to teach at senior high school level.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of Respondents according to Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	32	(54.2%)
Master's Units	17	(28.8%)
Master's Degree	7	(11.9%)
Ph.D. Units	2	(3.4%)
Ph.D. Degree Holder	1	(1.7%)

Table 3 shows the Teacher-Respondents' Demographic Profile in terms of the number of years in teaching literature. It shows that there were forty-five (45) teachers (76.3%) who have been teaching between1-5 years, and six (6) teacher-respondents (10.2%) have been in the profession between6-10 years. On the other hand, those who have been teaching between 11-15 years and 21-25 years have the same percentage of 3.4%. There were three (3) teachers (5.1%) who have taught for 16-20 years, and one (1) teacher-respondent (1.7%) has taught for 26-30 years. A greater number of teachers have been teaching 21st CLPW subject for ten (10) years and below, and only eight (8) teachers were teaching for 11 years and above.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of Respondents according to Number of Years in Teaching Literature

Number of Years in Teaching Literature	Frequency	Percentage
1-5 Years	45	(76.3%)
6-10 Years	6	(10.2%)
11-15 Years	2	(3.4%)

16-20 Years	3	(5.1%)
21-25 Years	2	(3.4%)
26-30 Years	1	(1.7%)

Table 4 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the Teacher-Respondents' Demographic Profile according to training/seminars attended related to Blended learning. It is depicted that the majority of the teacher-respondents attended trainings/seminars in the school-based with 32 respondents or 54.2%, while there was one (1) or 1.7% attended the national training/seminar. There were also 8 teachers who had training from School-Based, District-wide, Division-Based, Regional-Based, National-Based, and International-based training and seminars.

Practically, teachers' participation in various training and seminars should be seen essential, so they could effectively and efficiently deliver the content of the course, 21st CLPW. Furthermore, additional skills, knowledge, and experience from various training and seminar will most likely improve teachers' teaching skills. Thus, this is beneficial in the teaching-learning process inside the classroom and beyond school activities.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of Respondents according to Trainings and Seminars Related to Blended Learning

Trainings and Seminars Related to Blended Learning	Frequency	Percentage
School-Based	32	(54.2%)
Regional-Based	1	(1.7%)
School-Based, National-Based	2	(3.4%)
School-Based, Regional-Based	2	(3.4%)
School-Based, District-wide, Division-Based, Regional-Based, National-Based, International-based	8	(13.6%)
School-Based, National-Based, International-Based	7	(11.9%)
School-Based, Division-Based, Regional-Based	1	(1.7%)
National-Based, International-Based	1	(1.7%)
School-Based, District-Wide, National-Based, International-Based	1	(1.7%)
School-Based, Regional-Based, National-Based, International-Based	1	(1.7%)
School-Based, District-Wide, Division-Based, Regional-Based	1	(1.7%)

In order to assess the teaching strategies of the teacher-respondents, mean scores and standard deviation scores were computed for each item in every identified strategy in using blended learning in the teaching of 21st CLPW in Grade 12 class. Ten (10) strategies were identified in the questionnaire to determine which were mostly employed by the teachers-respondents and which were the least used.

Table 5 shows the Teacher's Strategies Used in Blended Learning. It is shown in the table that most of the respondents rated the item 1, which states: I encourage my students to ask questions whenever I discuss, as Always, with a mean of 4.00 and standard deviation of 0.18. This proves that most of the teachers' strategy is to encourage students to ask during the teaching-learning process. This is because teachers saw the significance of asking questions to determine if the students understood the lesson and/or the students had clarification about the lesson.

Conversely, the least strategy being employed by the teachers was item #7, I divide the class into two groups and raise issues for them to argue with. It had a 3.35 mean and standard deviation of 0.88).

Table 5. Summary of Scores in Terms of Teacher's Strategies Used in Blended Learning

Strategies Used	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I encourage my students to ask questions whenever I discuss.	4.00	0.18	Always
2. I ask my students to share their experience based on the video/story they have watched or read.	3.88	0.38	Always
3. I ask my students to choose the character that affect them and share.	3.82	0.65	Always
4. I let the students choose a significant scene from the story or movie to role play by group.	3.76	0.65	Always
5. I require the class to dramatize a story as their final performance.	3.47	0.81	Sometimes
6. I group the class and distribute topics to be discussed by each group.	3.41	0.77	Sometimes
7. I divide the class into two groups and raise issues for them to argue with.	3.35	0.88	Sometimes
8. After reading or watching a story, I let them choose a literary approach that would best analyze and critique the story.	3.71	0.75	Always
9. I give time to the class to reflect on and share their experience similar to the story being discussed.	3.76	0.57	Always
10. I give students problems or issues to discuss among their group members and present to the class their	3.59	0.65	Always

solution.

Scale: 1.0 - 1.49 Never; 1.50 - 2.49 Seldom; 2.50 - 3.49 Often; 3.50 - 400 Always.

Table 6 shows the Extent of Using Blended Learning in Teaching 21st CLPW. As shown in the table below, item #4, which states: I use posted quizzes, assignments, and activities in the LMS to assess my students learning, is rated as Always by most respondents. It has a mean of 3.90 and a standard deviation of 0.36. This verifies that teachers-participants consistently use technology in the teaching-learning process. They utilize LMS as a Blended Learning tool to assess students learning, especially in 21st CLPW subject.

Item number #3 states, I ask students to watch online videos of story and its background and have the interaction during the class, may be the least being employed, but rated as Sometimes, which is still quite significant. It has a mean of 3.46, and a standard deviation of 0.68.

Table 6. Summary of Scores in Terms of the Extent of Using Blended Learning

Extent of Use	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I present a topic or story using a PowerPoint presentation and saved videos.	3.71	0.59	Always
2. I upload/post lessons, activities, and assignments in LMS for students advance learning.	3.73	0.49	Always
3. I ask students to watch online videos of story and its background and have the interaction during the class.	3.46	0.68	Sometimes
4. I use posted quizzes, assignment, and activities in the LMS to assess my students learning.	3.90	0.36	Always
5. I check regularly the LMS to record students' scores.	3.71	0.70	Always

Scale: 1.0 - 1.49 Never; 1.50 - 2.49 Seldom; 2.50 - 3.49 Often; 3.50 - 400 Always

Table 7 summarizes the results in terms of Challenges Encountered by the Teacher-respondents Using Blended Learning in Teaching 21st CLPW. The teacher-participants most encountered challenge is item #4, which states, Internet connection in some areas is poor, which is rated Strongly Agree with a mean of 4.00 and standard deviation of 0.45. This confirms that teacher-respondents were also exposed to certain challenges while using technology during the teaching-learning process.

On the other hand, item number #5, which states, I am technically challenged operating/using online resources, is rated as the least challenge that teachers encountered in using blended learning in teaching 21st CLPW. This has a mean of 2.76 and SD of 0.95, and is rated as Agree by the respondents. This connotes that teacher already have prior knowledge of using technology or online resources for blended learning.

45

Table 7. Summary of Scores in Terms of Challenges Encountered

Challenges Encountered	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Students prefer teachers spoon feeding the lesson than personal learning.	3.00	0.88	Agree
2. Internet connection in some areas is poor.	4.00	0.45	Strongly Agree
3. The time allotted for the subject matter is inadequate.	2.88	0.79	Agree
4. Students complain that they cannot access the LMS (Learning Management System) for their e-books/modules, assignments, and activities.	3.00	0.86	Agree
5. I am technically challenged operating/using online resources.	2.76	0.95	Agree
6.Students still come to school unprepared with the discussion or without homework.	3.06	0.71	Agree
7. Some of the students are not exposed to ICT tools used in learning.	3.35	0.87	Agree
8. Longer exposure to ICT tools for posting assignments and activities to my classes strain my eyes and my students' as well, when they're working on it.	3.71	0.70	Strongly Agree
9. Some of my students do not own personal computer and internet.	3.59	0.65	Strongly Agree
10. Students complain of taking their personal time for the completion of assignments or activities in LMS.	3.12	0.79	Agree

Scale: 1.0 - 1.49 Strongly Disagree; 1.50 - 2.49 Disagree; 2.50 - 3.49 Agree; 3.50 - 400 Strongly Agree.

Table 8 shows the Test of Difference in the Extent of Using Blended Learning in Teaching 21st CLPW when the profile of the teacher-respondents is considered. A Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there is no significant difference in the Extent of Using Blended Learning in Teaching 21st CLPW when it comes to age, H (6) = 5.85, p = 0.440; highest educational attainment H (4) = 4.97, p = 0.291; number of years in teaching literature H (5) = 5.89, p = 0.317; and training and seminar related to Blended Learning, H (12) = 5.89, p = 0.064. These verify that the teachers' profile had no significant difference in the Extent of Using Blended Learning in Teaching 21st CLPW.

As shown in the Table, it has a mean of 4.00. Those 46-50 ages have extensively used blended learning compared to other participants while those in ages 31-35 seldomly use Blended Learning (M= 3.43) in teaching 21st CLPW. On the average, those who are with Ph.D. degrees and/or units, those who have 11-15 years and 26-30 years in teaching, and those who had trainings and seminars related to blending

learning in school-based, division-based, regional-based, national-based, and international-based were the categories of teachers who were using blended learning extensively as compared to other participants.

Table 8. Test of Difference in the Extent of Use of Blended Learning

Variables	M	H Test	df	Pvalue	Interpretation
Age					
20-25	3.67				Non-significant
26-30	3.71				
31-35	3.43				
36-40	3.93	5.85	6	0.440	
41-45	3.90				
46-50	4.00				
51-55	0.00				
56-60	3.90				
Highest Educational Attainment					
Bachelor's Degree	3.68				Non-significant
Master's Units	3.80			0.291	
Master's Degree	3.43	4.97	4		
Ph.D. Units	4.00				
Ph.D. Degree Holder	4.00				
Number of Years in Teaching Literature					
1-5 Years	3.67				Non-significant
6-10 Years	3.80				
11-15 Years	4.00				
16-20 Years	3.93	5.89	5	0.317	
21-25 Years	3.60				
26-30 Years	4.00				
Trainings and Seminars Related to Blended Learning					
School-Based	3.71			0.064	Non-significant
Regional-Based	3.80				
School-Based, National-Based	3.50	20.2	12		
School-Based, Regional-Based	3.70				
School-Based, Regional-Based, National-Based	3.60				

School-Based, District-wide, Division-Based, Regional-Based, National-Based, International-based	3.98
School-Based, National-Based, International-Based	3.57
School-Based, Division-Based, Regional-Based	4.00
National-Based, International-Based	4.00
School-Based, District-Wide, National-Based, International-Based	3.20
School-Based, Regional-Based, National-Based, International-Based	2.80
School-Based, District-Wide, Division-Based, Regional-Based	3.20

Table 9 shows the Test of Relationship between the Strategies and the Profile of the teacher-respondents. A chi-square test of independence found that there was no statistically significant relationship between age $X2$ (12) = 16.6, p = 0.165; highest educational attainment $X2$ (8) = 9.65, p= 0.291; number of years in teaching literature $X2$ (10) = 4.74, p= 0.908; training and seminar related to blended learning $X2$ (24) = 20.5, p= 0.655; and strategies used by the teacher-respondents in blended learning in teaching 21st CLPW.

In a successful study by San Jose (2015), it is stated that teachers faced an enormous challenge in responding to the complex and rapidly changing society. Schools, through their teachers, are being asked to educate various learners with different cultural backgrounds, economic statuses, and cognitive abilities. Darling-Hammond pointed out that to realize students' cognition requires vast skillful teaching on the part of the teachers.

In short, the use of teaching strategies was inevitable in the classroom. Teachers used them for different reasons; however, one thing was clear: teachers used teaching strategies to deliver the lessons and help the learners absorb and grasp the pertinent information embedded in the lessons. Their research did not indicate any significant relation between strategies' utilization and the teachers' profile.

Table 9. Test of Relationship between Strategies and Profile

Variable	X^2	df	P value	Interpretation
Age				
20-25				Non-significant
26-30				
31-35				
36-40	16.6	12	0.165	
41-45				
46-50				
51-55				
56-60				
Highest Educational Attainment				
Bachelor's Degree				Non-significant
Master's Units			0.291	
Master's Degree	9.65	8		
Ph.D. Units				
Ph.D. Degree Holder				
Number of Years in Teaching Literature				
1-5 Years				Non-significant
6-10 Years				
11-15 Years	4.74	10	0.908	
16-20 Years				
21-25 Years				
26-30 Years				
Trainings and Seminars Related to Blended Learning				
School-Based				Non-significant
Regional-Based				
School-Based, National-Based				
School-Based, Regional-Based				
School-Based, Regional-Based, National-Based				
School-Based, District-wide, Division-Based, Regional-Based, National-Based, International-based	20.7	24	0.655	
School-Based, National-Based, International-Based				
School-Based, Division-Based, Regional-Based				

National-Based, International-Based

School-Based, District-Wide, National-Based,

International-Based

School-Based,   Regional-Based,

National-Based, International-Based

School-Based, District-Wide, Division-Based,

Regional-Based

Using a post-interview questionnaire, the researcher asked the respondents to answer four (4) open-ended questions. Number one on the list is about the challenges they face when creating activities and implementing these. Below are the given common challenges that teachers encountered:

(a) technical difficulty such as poor internet connection and students' limited access to it;

(b) availability of the resources like students' gadgets for the blended learning;

(c) limited time to execute the activity;

(d) suitability of the activities created to the different types and learning styles of the students;

(e) students' participation, comprehension, and language barrier.

Looking at the list above as common answers given by the respondents, one factor could be linked to the next and the other. The technical difficulty was the most answered one. Most students do not have a stable internet connection depending on their location and internet service provider use. Some do not have access at all and just rely on prepaid load for the internet data they need. Availability of the resources seemed to be also significant as most students only use their mobile phone for learning which has limited features and access; others do not have any.

It is also a challenge among the respondents to have limited time to implement the activity they have created. Time is not enough for students to accomplish given tasks or activities. In line with this, it is hard for the teachers to assess the suitability of the activities as students are diverse, and have different needs, learning styles, and intelligence. That could also be why it is also a challenge to inhibit participation among the students. Less participation could also be equated to less comprehension. Language barrier seemed to be another reason why it is hard to engage students' participation because they could not comprehend the English language as it is the medium of instruction in teaching the subject, 21st CLPW.

The next question was, if there were any activities in the strategy that they found difficult to create. Most of the respondents answered that giving a group work or tasks like reporting, role-playing, or dramatization were really difficult to create. Another standard answer given was the literary analysis or criticism. Inviting the students to read or watch a literary piece to help them understand the content of the lesson may be possible, but asking them to make an analysis or criticism of what has been read or watched seemed to be a struggle. These difficulties they experienced could be interconnected to the challenges they have. The technical difficulty and limited resources could be the reason why it was

50

difficult for a group to collaborate among the students. Literary pieces or lessons on the 21st CLPW may not suit the students' age and interests, making it difficult to engage them to participate and comprehend the topic. This only means that if teachers face a different situation that makes their strategies difficult to create, it is because of the challenges they encounter.

Respondents were also asked if they would like to recommend another English subject using blended learning. Most of the respondents recommended blending learning to be utilized in other subjects (40%). However, 20% of the respondents did not want to recommend blended learning, 7% of them gave unrelated answers, 2% of the teachers were undecided, and 3% of them did not answer the question. The subject that was recommended by most is the Oral Communication or Speech subject. Next to it was Grammar subject, followed by EAPP (English for Academic and Professional Purposes) then Reading and Writing, and last, Creative Writing. It was expressed that videos and other online learning materials would be a valuable tool to develop proficiency and other essential skills on the subject.

Lastly, respondents were asked, what else do they think they need to effectively implement Blended Learning in their class in teaching 21st CLPW. Most of them said that they need the right resources, which are essential for blended learning, like a stable internet connection and a gadget, preferably a laptop or desktop. Followed as most answered were the need for learning materials suitable to the learners and aligned to the subject's content. Next to it as one of their needs was seminars, training, or workshops on blended learning and the teaching of the 21st CLPW subject. Another common answer was the ability or knowledge to access and navigate different learning platforms and other ICT tools for blended learning. Finally, they admitted that they were not proficient in using various technologies and platforms for blended learning, and they needed proper training to execute it.

4. Discussion

Based on the aforementioned findings of the study, it shows that: most of the respondents belong to the young adult age, which is between 20 to 40 years old.; more than half of the total are Bachelor's Degree holders (54.2%); and there are only seven teachers who have Master's Degree, seventeen have master's units, and only one respondent has a Ph.D. degree. Also, since most of the teacher-respondents were young adults who are Bachelor's Degree holders and have been teaching for five years or less, the most common seminars and trainings they have attended were school-based.

The use of different strategies in blended learning was evident. Most of the teachers answered Always, 7 out of 10; the remaining three strategies were employed Sometimes, which is also quite significant. Teachers use varied strategies in blended learning to engage with the students. They used several of these strategies to deliver the lessons and help the learners absorb and grasp relevant information embedded in the lesson.

The use of technology can make the teaching-learning process more interesting for learners and teachers. Thus, it brings liveliness to the subject. Moreover, it lifts the learners' energy and prompts

51

their participation or engagement in the discussion. This is one of the reasons why teacher-respondents utilized technology in teaching 21st CLPW.

The result showed that most of the teachers answered Always, in four (4) out of five (5) descriptors. The remaining one was rated Sometimes, which is still substantial in evaluating how often they use Blended Learning in teaching the subject.

Challenges faced by the teacher-respondents were inevitable, especially when it comes to the internet connection. But, since most of them are young adults, they know how to utilize the technology in blended learning. This is evident in the result as this is the least of the challenges, they experienced which was rated as Agree.

There was a no significant difference in the extent of using blended learning in teaching 21st CLPW when the profile was considered.

There was no significant relationship between the utilization of strategies and the teachers' profile.

References

Aguinaldo, B. E. (2013). Implementing Blended Learning in an Impoverished Academic Institution Using a Bricolage Approach Model. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.7763/ijiet.2013.v3.266

Alontaga, J. V. (2012). Hybrid Learning in the Philippines: The De La Salle University Experience. Retrieved from http://knowledgecommunity.ph/pdf/

Amiri, E. (2012). A Study of the Application Digital Technologies in Teaching and Learning English Language and Literature. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, *1*(5). Retrieved from https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.436.8173&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Arikan, A. (2014). Visual Materials, Staging, and the Internet in Literature Classrooms. *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities*, *4*(1), 45-51. https://dx.doi: 10.13114/mjh.201416422

Aviles, C. (2014). The Flipped Classroom™ is a Lie. Teched Up Teacher.   Retrieved   From http://www.techedupteacher.com/the-flipped-classroom-is-a-lie/

Ballesteros, J., Porciello, M., Balkon, N., & Backus, D. (2007). *The Blackboard Learning System, Journal of Educational Technology Systems*.

Bhat, A. (2019). *Evaluation Research: Definition, Methods and Examples*. Retrieved from https://www.questionpro.com/blog/ evaluation-research-definition-methods-and-examples/

Blended Learning. (2013). *The Glossary of Education Reform*. Retrieved from http//www.edglossary.org

Bransford, J. D., & Stein, B. S. (1993). *The Ideal problem solver* (2nd ed). New York: Freeman.

Brioso, J. O. P. (2017). *An E-classroom Management System Implementation: Contextualization, Perception, and Usability*. Retrieved from http://buscompress.com/journal-home.html

Catapang, C. D. E. (2018). *Blended Learning: The New Norm*. Retrieved from http://lpulaguna.edu.ph/blended-learning-the-new-norm/

Chukwuma, N. (2018). *Usefulness and Challenges of ICT Use in the Teaching and Learning of Communication in three Nigerian Universities*.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Teacher Learning that Supports Student Learning. *Teaching for Intelligence*, *2*, 91-100.

Du, S. C. et al. (2014). The Flipped Classroom–Advantages and Challenges. *International Conference on Economic Management and Trade Cooperation*. https://dx.doi.org/10.2991/emtc-14.2014.3

Duran-Dominguez, A., Gomez-Pulido, J. A., & Pajuelo-Holguera, F. (2018). *Virtual Classrooms as Data Sources for Prediction Tools*, *2*(2), 170-180. https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijtel.2018.22.170180

Dwaik, R. et al. (2016). Using Blended Learning to Enhance Student Learning in American Literature Courses. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *15*(2).

Flipped Learning. (2018). *Higher Education Academy*. Retrieved from www.heacademy.ac.uk

Friesen, N. (2012). *Report: Defining Blended Learning*.

Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended Learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet in Higher Education*, *7*(2), 95-105. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ihedue.2004.02.001

Haugestad, A. (2015). *Blended Learning in English Literature*. The University of Bergen. https://hdl.handle.net/1956/10034

Hinkelman, D., & Gruba, P. (2012). Power within Blended Language Learning Programs in Japan. *Language Learning & Technology*, *16*(2), 46-64.

Huson, J. A. (2019). *The Advantages of Traditional Classroom*. Retrieved from http://www.educationseattlepi.com

Hybrid Class. (2017). *Best Colleges Online*. Retrieved from http://www.bestcollegesonline.org

Information and Communication Technology. (2010). *Tech Terms*. Retrieved from

53

http://www.techterms.com

Jain, M. (2012). ICT as an Aid in Teaching English Literature and Bridging the Digital Divide. *Bhatter College Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *2*.

Jones, B. F. et al. (1993). *Theory Name: Strategic Teaching Framework (STF)*. Retrieved from https://web.cortland.edu/frieda/id/IDtheories/39.html

Kendra, C. (2019). *How Correlational Studies Are Used in Psychology*. Retrieved from https://www.verywellmind.com/correlational-research-2795774

Laadem, M. (2017). E-learning Integration in Higher Education: Focus on Moroccan Departments of English. *PUPIL: International Journal of Teaching, Education and Learning*, *1*(2), 115-133. https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijtel.2017.12.115133

Mcneil, B. (2018). *Descriptive Research*. Retrieved from https://www.coursehero.com/file/38072782/CA408-McNeilW5assignmentdocx/

Napier, N. P., Dekhane, S., & Smith, S. (2011). Transitioning to Blended Learning: Understanding Student and Faculty Perceptions. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *15*(1), 20-32. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v15i1.188

Orlich, D. et al. (2012). *Teaching strategies: A Guide to Effective Instruction*. Cengage Learning.

Panes, L.L. D. (2019). Dimensions of Learners' Satisfaction in the Delivery of Instruction in Blended Learning Program in Teacher Education Institutions. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*(3), 865-881.

Poon, J. (2013). Blended learning: An institutional approach for enhancing students' learning experiences. *Journal of online learning and teaching*, *9*(2), 271-288. Retrieved from http://dro.deakin.edu.au/eserv/

Research Design: Defined and Explained. (2013). *Write A Writing*. Retrieved from https://www.writeawriting.com/academic-writing/research-design/

Rivera, V. M. (2016). *Flipped Classrooms: Advantages and Disadvantages from the Perspective of a Practicing Art Teacher*.

San Jose, A. (2015). *Strategies in Teaching Literature: Students in Focus*.

Shand, K., & Farrelly, S. G. (2018). The Art of Blending: Benefits and Challenges of a Blended Course for Preservice Teachers. *Journal of Educators Online*, *15*(1).

Skrypnyk, O. et al. (2017). *The History and State of Blended Learning*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313751703

Strategy. (2019). *Study Lecture Notes*. Retrieved from http://www.studylecturesnotes.com

Teaching Methods. (2019). *Teach: Make a Difference*. Retrieved from http://www.teach.com

The Cognitive and Technology Group at Vanderbilt (CTGV). (1993). *Anchored instruction and situated cognition revisited. Educational Technology*, *33*(3), 52-70.

The Room 241 Team. (2012). *Which is the Nest: Teacher-Centered or Student-Centered Education*. Retrieved from http://www.education.cu-portland.edu

Vaughan, N., Reali, A., Stenbom, S., Van Vuuren, M. J., & MacDonald, D. (2017). Blended Learning from Design to Evaluation: International Case Studies of Evidence-based Practice. *Online Learning*, *21*(3), 103-114. http://dx.doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i3.1252

Westland, J. (2016). *Hybrid Methodologies*. Project Manager. Retrieved from http://www.projectmanager.com

What is Teaching Learning Process? (2019). *IGI Global*. Retrieved from http://www.igi-global.com

Young, J. R. (2015). Reader's Definitions of Ed-Tech Buzzwords: Confusion and Skepticism Continue. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com.libdatabase.newpaltz.edu/blogs/wiredcampus/readers-defintions-of-ed-tech-buzzwords-confusion-and-skepticism-continue/57301-To-Improve-Students-Communicative-s-66645721.html