



Blended Learning Models: A Necessity for Modern Education

Umesh Aryal¹

¹Lecturer of Population, Makawanpur Multiple Campus

Corresponding Author

Umesh Aryal

Email: aryal.umesh298@gmail.com

To Cite this article: Aryal, U. (2025). Blended learning models: A necessity for modern education. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 6(1), 41–52.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v6i1.77475>

Submitted: 1 March 2025

Accepted: 10 March 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Abstract

The research article explores the necessity of blended learning models to enhance more active engagement of students and their better academic performance. Using an exploratory research design, the study collected qualitative secondary data from books and journal articles. Qualitative descriptive analysis was executed to draw the findings. The findings reveal that blended learning models are necessary for modern education as they enhance flexibility, improve academic outcomes, boost student engagement, foster active learning, promote digital literacy, develop 21st-century skills, ensure accessibility and inclusivity, support educational continuity, encourage innovation in teaching, require professional development, promote inclusivity, and prepare students for the future. The study highlights the importance of integrating face-to-face and digital learning to enhance flexibility, engagement, academic outcomes, and inclusivity. Students, teachers, policy makers, and institutions will be benefitted from this study to prepare learners with 21st-century skills and digital literacy.

Keywords: flex model, a la carte model, enriched virtual model, self-blend model, project-based blended learning model, rotation model

1. Introduction

Blended learning, an instructional approach that combines traditional face-to-face teaching with digital learning environments, has gained widespread recognition for its potential to enhance educational outcomes (Graham, 2006). As an adaptive pedagogical model, it offers increased flexibility, student engagement, and personalized learning experiences (Bonk & Graham, 2012). By bridging the gap between conventional classroom instruction and digital platforms, blended learning fosters a more interactive and student-centered educational experience (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). Empirical studies indicate that

such models improve student motivation and learning efficiency by integrating structured in-person guidance with self-paced online activities (Means et al., 2013).

The growing adoption of blended learning in higher education has been linked to improved academic performance, increased student satisfaction, and the development of critical thinking skills (Picciano, 2009). One of its key strengths lies in its ability to support diverse learning styles, allowing students to learn at their own pace while retaining the benefits of direct teacher-student interaction (Hrastinski, 2019). Additionally, as advancements in educational technology continue to expand, universities and schools are progressively implementing blended learning strategies to cultivate more inclusive and effective learning environments (Moskal et al., 2013). However, the successful integration of blended learning necessitates adequate technological infrastructure, faculty training, and institutional support (Osguthorpe & Graham, 2003).

Despite its numerous advantages, blended learning presents certain challenges, including disparities in digital accessibility, the necessity for strong student self-discipline, and concerns regarding the effectiveness of assessment methods in hybrid learning contexts (Boelens et al., 2017). To optimize student learning outcomes, educators must design courses that seamlessly integrate both traditional and digital instructional methods (Vaughan et al., 2013). This research investigates various blended learning models and their influence on educational effectiveness, emphasizing best practices for maximizing student engagement and academic success.

The rapid evolution of technology has significantly reshaped the educational landscape, prompting educators to explore innovative instructional models. Blended learning, which merges conventional face-to-face instruction with digital tools, has emerged as an effective approach to addressing the diverse needs of 21st-century learners (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). This hybrid model capitalizes on the strengths of both traditional and digital pedagogies, fostering a flexible, personalized, and engaging learning environment (Means et al., 2013). Research suggests that blended learning can enhance student performance, increase retention rates, and promote the development of higher-order thinking skills (Bernard et al., 2014; Graham, 2006). Furthermore, it aligns with the increasing demand for digital literacy, thereby equipping students with essential skills for navigating a technology-driven world (Horn & Staker, 2015).

The effectiveness of blended learning is largely attributed to its ability to accommodate individual learning preferences and paces, granting students greater autonomy over their educational journey (Halverson et al., 2014). Through the integration of synchronous and asynchronous learning activities, educators can develop a well-balanced curriculum that caters to diverse learning styles (Boelens et al., 2017). Additionally, digital tools such as learning management systems (LMS), multimedia resources, and interactive platforms facilitate improved collaboration and communication between students and instructors (Picciano, 2009). Nevertheless, the successful implementation of blended learning requires strategic planning, continuous professional development for educators, and ongoing assessments to ensure alignment with learning objectives (Anthony et al., 2020).

This research article critically examines various blended learning models, their theoretical foundations, and their impact on educational outcomes. By synthesizing existing literature and addressing prevalent challenges—such as digital equity and instructor

preparedness—this study provides actionable insights for optimizing blended learning strategies in diverse educational settings.

1.1 Objectives

The objectives of this article are:

- To identify and analyze the various types of blended learning models and their applications in diverse educational contexts.
- To investigate the challenges and barriers associated with implementing blended learning, such as digital equity, instructor readiness, and institutional support.
- To highlight the benefits of blended learning in fostering personalized, flexible, and student-centered learning experiences.

1.2 Significance of the Study

This study underscores the importance of blended learning in enhancing educational outcomes by combining traditional teaching methods with digital instruction. It investigates its effects on student engagement, flexibility in learning, and academic achievement, while also addressing challenges such as digital access, faculty training, and assessment practices. The research delivers critical insights for educators, policymakers, and curriculum developers, presenting evidence-based strategies to create inclusive and adaptable learning environments. By exploring innovative educational approaches, it advances the field of blended learning, supporting the development of 21st-century skills and fostering sustainable, technology-enhanced education.

2. Literature Review

Literature view incorporates a general definition and concept of blended learning, major blended learning models and necessity of these models for modern education system.

2.1 Blended Learning

Blended learning, which integrates traditional face-to-face instruction with digital components, has emerged as a transformative approach to enhancing educational effectiveness (Graham, 2006). By combining the structured guidance of in-person teaching with the flexibility of online learning, this model facilitates greater student engagement, personalized learning, and improved accessibility to educational resources (Bonk & Graham, 2012; Means et al., 2013). The integration of synchronous and asynchronous learning activities ensures that students benefit from both direct teacher interaction and self-paced study, catering to diverse learning needs and preferences.

Empirical research highlights that blended learning enhances student engagement and learning outcomes by accommodating diverse cognitive styles and integrating interactive digital resources (Hrastinski, 2019; Moskal et al., 2013). The incorporation of multimedia tools, online assessments, and collaborative platforms fosters active learning and knowledge retention. However, the effectiveness of blended learning depends on strategic implementation, requiring thoughtful course design, comprehensive faculty training, and strong institutional support to mitigate challenges related to digital equity and technological

infrastructure (Osguthorpe & Graham, 2003). Institutions must ensure equitable access to digital resources, particularly for students from underprivileged backgrounds, to prevent widening the digital divide.

Blended learning is rooted in constructivist and connectivist learning theories, which emphasize active participation, collaboration, and knowledge construction through digital networks (Boelens et al., 2017). Constructivist principles promote student-centered learning, where learners actively engage with content rather than passively receiving information. Meanwhile, connectivism highlights the role of digital technology in facilitating knowledge-sharing and continuous learning in a networked world. By leveraging these theoretical foundations, blended learning not only enhances student outcomes but also fosters digital literacy—a crucial competency in the 21st century (Bernard et al., 2014; Graham, 2006).

Despite its potential, the success of blended learning hinges on addressing key challenges such as unequal access to technology and variations in instructor readiness (Picciano, 2009; Anthony et al., 2020). Ensuring that educators are adequately trained to navigate digital platforms, design interactive online content, and assess student progress effectively is essential for optimizing learning experiences. Additionally, institutions must establish clear guidelines for course integration, balancing digital and in-person components to maximize pedagogical effectiveness.

As the demand for flexible and technology-driven education continues to grow, blended learning represents an innovative and scalable solution for modern pedagogy. By adapting to the evolving needs of learners and embracing digital advancements, this approach has the potential to redefine educational delivery and foster inclusive, engaging, and effective learning environments (Singh, 2021).

2.2 Blended Learning Models

Blended learning models integrate traditional face-to-face classroom instruction with digital learning environments, offering flexibility, personalization, and improved engagement in modern education. These models leverage technological advancements to enhance pedagogical approaches, catering to diverse learning needs. Among the primary blended learning models, each has distinct characteristics that make them suitable for different educational contexts and student preferences.

2.3 The Flex Model

The Flex Model emphasizes student autonomy, allowing learners to progress at their own pace primarily through online coursework, with teachers providing personalized support as needed (Staker & Horn, 2012; Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). This model is particularly beneficial for individualized learning, enabling students to take ownership of their education while still receiving targeted interventions from instructors. The flexibility of this model supports differentiated instruction, making it effective in catering to various learning abilities and styles. However, its success largely depends on students' self-motivation and digital literacy, as well as institutions' ability to provide adequate technological infrastructure.

2.4 The A La Carte Model

The A La Carte Model allows students to enroll in one or more courses entirely online while continuing to attend traditional face-to-face classes for their other subjects ([Christensen Institute, 2023](#)). This model expands course availability and accommodates diverse academic interests, offering greater flexibility and access to specialized subjects that may not be available in a student's physical school ([Means et al., 2013](#)). While it provides learners with opportunities to explore various disciplines, challenges such as maintaining consistent engagement in online courses and ensuring equitable access to digital resources must be addressed for optimal effectiveness.

2.5 The Enriched Virtual Model

The Enriched Virtual Model requires students to complete most of their coursework online but mandates periodic in-person sessions for reinforcement, teacher support, and interactive learning experiences ([Horn & Staker, 2014](#); [Bonk & Graham, 2012](#)). This model strikes a balance between digital learning autonomy and structured face-to-face interaction, making it particularly useful in higher education and adult learning settings. It fosters self-directed learning while maintaining a level of accountability and instructor guidance. However, its implementation necessitates strong digital infrastructure and well-trained educators to facilitate seamless integration between online and offline learning experiences.

2.6 The Self-Blend Model

The Self-Blend Model provides students with the opportunity to supplement their traditional face-to-face education by enrolling in additional online courses outside their regular school curriculum ([Christensen Institute, 2023](#); [Horn & Staker, 2014](#)). This model is particularly useful for students seeking to accelerate their learning, explore personal interests, or bridge gaps in their academic journey. Despite its flexibility, it places significant responsibility on students to manage their coursework effectively, requiring strong self-discipline and time-management skills. Additionally, disparities in access to online learning resources can create challenges in its widespread implementation.

2.7 The Project-Based Blended Learning Model

The Project-Based Blended Learning Model integrates both online and face-to-face instruction while focusing on student-driven projects that incorporate technology, collaboration, and real-world problem-solving ([Larmer & Mergendoller, 2015](#)). This approach enhances critical thinking, creativity, and teamwork, aligning with 21st-century learning objectives. By engaging in interdisciplinary projects that utilize digital tools, students develop a deeper understanding of subject matter. However, successful execution requires teachers to be proficient in project-based learning methodologies and technology integration, which may necessitate professional development and institutional support.

2.8 The Rotation Model and Its Sub-Models

The Rotation Model structures learning by having students move through different instructional modalities on a fixed schedule ([Horn & Staker, 2014](#)). This model enhances

engagement by combining multiple learning formats, reducing monotony, and catering to varied learning styles. It includes four primary sub-models:

- i. Station Rotation: Students transition between different learning stations within a classroom, including an online learning station (Horn & Staker, 2014). This approach fosters small-group instruction and differentiated learning experiences.
- ii. Lab Rotation: Students attend a dedicated computer lab for online coursework while continuing to participate in traditional classroom activities (Graham et al., 2013). This method is particularly effective in managing resources, as it does not require every student to have a personal device.
- iii. Flipped Classroom: Students engage with instructional content online before attending class, allowing in-person sessions to focus on interactive discussions and hands-on activities (Bishop & Verleger, 2013; Bergmann & Sams, 2012). This model promotes active learning and higher-order thinking but requires strong student commitment to pre-class preparation.
- iv. Individual Rotation: Students follow personalized learning pathways, rotating through instructional stations based on their individual needs and progress (Staker & Horn, 2012). This highly adaptive approach supports differentiated instruction but requires sophisticated data tracking and teacher intervention.

Among these models, the Lab Rotation Model emerges as the most suitable option in our context due to its flexibility, cost-effectiveness, and reduced dependency on individual device ownership. Unlike models requiring students to have continuous access to personal devices and high-speed internet, the Lab Rotation Model leverages a centralized computer lab for online instruction while maintaining traditional classroom engagement (Graham et al., 2013).

This approach ensures that students benefit from digital learning resources without exacerbating technological inequities. Moreover, it enables teachers to provide structured guidance and real-time feedback, addressing the challenges of fully online or self-paced learning models.

Blended learning offers a dynamic framework for modern education, merging the strengths of in-person and digital instruction to create engaging and personalized learning experiences. The various models—ranging from student-directed approaches like the Flex and Self-Blend Models to structured designs like the Rotation and Enriched Virtual Models—cater to different institutional contexts and learner needs. However, successful implementation demands strategic planning, adequate technological infrastructure, and ongoing faculty training to address challenges such as digital accessibility, student engagement, and instructor readiness (Staker & Horn, 2012; Bonk & Graham, 2012; Anthony et al., 2020). Given its adaptability and cost-efficiency, the Lab Rotation Model presents a practical and scalable solution, ensuring that blended learning can be effectively integrated into diverse educational settings.

2.9 Necessity of Blended Learning Models

Blended learning models, which integrate face-to-face instruction with digital tools, have gained widespread recognition for their ability to enhance flexibility, engagement, and

academic performance (Graham, 2006). The incorporation of both traditional and digital learning environments allows for a more dynamic and student-centered approach, aligning with modern educational demands.

Extensive research highlights the positive impact of blended learning on student outcomes. Means et al. (2010), Bernard et al. (2014), and Dziuban et al. (2014) demonstrate that blended learning improves knowledge retention, critical thinking, and overall academic success. These findings suggest that the multi-modal nature of blended learning—where students engage with content through various digital and face-to-face interactions—promotes deeper cognitive processing. Additionally, by offering opportunities for self-paced learning and repeated exposure to materials, blended learning enhances students' ability to internalize complex concepts more effectively compared to purely traditional or online methods.

One of the critical advantages of blended learning is its ability to foster higher levels of student engagement. Hrastinski (2019) found that integrating online and in-person learning environments promotes deeper interaction, as students benefit from both structured classroom discussions and the flexibility of digital platforms. Similarly, Sun and Rueda (2012) and Chen and Jang (2010) observed that students exhibit increased motivation and participation when learning through a combination of digital tools and face-to-face instruction. This increased engagement stems from the interactive nature of digital platforms, which offer gamified learning, discussion forums, multimedia content, and real-time feedback, making learning more appealing and participatory.

Blended learning revolutionizes traditional teaching methods by enabling a more flexible, interactive, and personalized instructional approach. Garrison and Vaughan (2008) and Picciano (2009) emphasize that blended learning enhances teaching effectiveness by allowing educators to integrate diverse teaching strategies, such as flipped classrooms, online discussions, and adaptive learning technologies. This hybrid approach ensures that students with varying learning styles receive content in ways that best suit their needs, thereby improving overall comprehension and reducing learning gaps.

Moreover, blended learning enhances accessibility and accommodates students with diverse schedules, such as working students or those with other commitments. Anderson (2008), Vaughan (2010), and Owston et al. (2013) highlight that self-paced online components empower students to learn at their convenience, mitigating the limitations of rigid classroom schedules. However, to fully maximize these benefits, institutions must ensure that technological infrastructure and instructor support are in place to facilitate a seamless learning experience.

Another crucial advantage of blended learning is its role in developing essential 21st-century skills, including digital literacy, critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration. As workplaces increasingly rely on digital technologies, students need to develop proficiency in navigating digital tools for communication, research, and problem-solving. Selwyn (2016), Alammary et al. (2014), and Shea & Bidjerano (2010) argue that blended learning prepares students for technology-driven careers by integrating digital competency into the learning process.

Additionally, Trilling and Fadel (2009) and Pellegrino and Hilton (2012) assert that blended learning fosters higher-order cognitive skills by encouraging students to engage in problem-solving, collaborative projects, and interactive discussions—activities that are

crucial for success in modern workplaces. By incorporating technology into everyday learning, students not only gain subject-specific knowledge but also develop the ability to analyze, synthesize, and apply information in innovative ways.

Blended learning has also proven to be an essential tool for maintaining educational continuity, particularly during disruptions such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Watson et al. (2014) and Anthony et al. (2020) highlight those institutions that had already adopted blended learning models were able to transition more smoothly to fully online education during lockdowns, minimizing learning disruptions. This adaptability underscores the resilience and sustainability of blended learning in ensuring uninterrupted education, especially in emergencies.

Despite its numerous benefits, the successful implementation of blended learning requires significant institutional planning, faculty training, and technological infrastructure. Boelens et al. (2017) emphasize that professional development for educators is crucial to ensure they can effectively integrate digital tools into their teaching. Furthermore, blended learning strategies must be designed to address potential barriers, such as unequal access to technology, digital literacy gaps, and varying levels of instructor readiness. Without adequate institutional support and investment in digital resources, the effectiveness of blended learning may be compromised.

Blended learning has emerged as a transformative approach to modern education, offering enhanced academic outcomes, increased engagement, flexible learning opportunities, and the development of essential 21st-century skills. Its ability to provide personalized learning experiences, facilitate digital literacy, and ensure educational continuity makes it a cornerstone of future learning models. However, for blended learning to reach its full potential, institutions must invest in faculty training, technological infrastructure, and equitable access to digital resources (Graham, 2006; Singh, 2021). As education continues to evolve in a digital era, blended learning remains a crucial strategy for fostering inclusive, adaptable, and innovative learning environments.

3. Materials and Methods

The research study employed a qualitative approach to investigate the effectiveness of blended learning models. Secondary data were collected from books and journal articles. It adopted an exploratory research design, in which the secondary data were examined through a descriptive qualitative analysis.

4. Conclusion

Blended learning enhances flexibility by combining face-to-face instruction with digital tools, allowing students to learn at their own pace while accommodating diverse schedules. This approach improves academic outcomes by fostering better student performance, knowledge retention, and critical thinking. By integrating both online and in-person learning formats, it boosts student engagement, increasing participation and motivation. The incorporation of digital tools also fosters active learning, leading to deeper comprehension and more effective teaching. Additionally, blended learning promotes digital literacy by preparing students for technology-driven careers and familiarizing them with

essential digital tools. It supports the development of critical 21st-century skills such as creativity, collaboration, problem-solving, and critical thinking, which are crucial in modern workplaces. Ensuring accessibility and inclusivity, blended learning provides greater educational opportunities for working students and those requiring flexible schedules. Its ability to maintain educational continuity during disruptions, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, highlights its resilience in safeguarding learning experiences. Moreover, blended learning encourages innovation in teaching by allowing educators to adopt modern methodologies and leverage digital tools for enhanced instruction. Successful implementation, however, requires institutional support and professional development for educators to improve overall teaching quality. By catering to diverse learning styles and needs, blended learning fosters inclusivity and equity in education while equipping students with the adaptability and skills necessary for future careers in a rapidly evolving technological landscape.

References

1. Alammary, A., Sheard, J., & Carbone, A. (2014). Blended learning in higher education: Three different design approaches. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 30(4), 440-454. <https://ajet.org.au/index.php/AJET/article/view/693>
2. Anderson, T. (2008). *The theory and practice of online learning*. Athabasca University Press. https://www.aupress.ca/app/uploads/120146_99Z_Anderson_2008-Theory_and_Practice_of_Online_Learning.pdf
3. Anthony, B., Kamaludin, A., Romli, A., Raffei, A. F. M., Phon, D. N. A. L. E., Abdullah, A., & Ming, G. L. (2020). Blended learning adoption and implementation in higher education: A theoretical and systematic review. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 25(2), 1-48. DOI: [10.1007/s10758-020-09477-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-020-09477-z)
4. Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip your classroom: Reach every student in every class every day*. International Society for Technology in Education. https://books.google.com.np/books/about/Flip_Your_Classroom.html?id=nBi2pwAACAAJ&redir_esc=y
5. Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R. M., & Abrami, P. C. (2014). A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: From the general to the applied. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 26(1), 87-122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-013-9077-3>
6. Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. (2013). The flipped classroom: A survey of the research. *ASEE National Conference Proceedings*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285935974_The_flipped_classroom_A_survey_of_the_research/citation/download
7. Boelens, R., De Wever, B., & Voet, M. (2017). Four key challenges to the design of blended learning: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research Review*, 22, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.06.001>
8. Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (2012). *The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer. https://curtbonk.com/toc_section_intros2.pdf

9. Chen, K. C., & Jang, S. J. (2010). Motivation in online learning: Testing a model of self-determination theory. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(4), 741-752. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.01.011>
10. Christensen Institute. (2023). *Blended learning definitions*. Retrieved from <https://www.christenseninstitute.org/blended-learning-definitions-and-models/>
11. Christensen, C. M., Horn, M. B., & Staker, H. (2013). *Is K-12 blended learning disruptive? An introduction to the theory of hybrids*. Clayton Christensen Institute. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED566878.pdf>
12. Garrison, D. R. (2011). *E-learning in the 21st century: A framework for research and practice*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203838761/learning-21st-century-randy-garrison>
13. Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277197718_Blended_Learning_in_Higher_Education_Framework_Principles_and_Guidelines
14. Graham, C. R. (2006). Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), *The handbook of blended learning* (pp. 3-21). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258834966_Blended_learning_systems_Definition_current_trends_and_future_directions
15. Graham, C. R., Henrie, C. R., & Gibbons, A. S. (2013). Developing models and theory for blended learning research. *Blended Learning: Research Perspectives*, 2, 13-33. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258245984_Developing_models_and_theory_for_blended_learning_research
16. Graham, C. R., Woodfield, W., & Harrison, J. B. (2013). A framework for institutional adoption and implementation of blended learning in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 18, 4-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.09.003>
17. Halverson, L. R., Graham, C. R., Spring, K. J., & Drysdale, J. S. (2014). A thematic analysis of the most highly cited scholarship in the first decade of blended learning research. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 20, 20-34. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258245982_A_thematic_analysis_of_the_most_highly_cited_scholarship_in_the_first_decade_of_blended_learning_research
18. Horn, M. B., & Staker, H. (2014). *Blended: Using disruptive innovation to improve schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Blended%3A+Using+Disruptive+Innovation+to+Improve+Schools-p-9781118955154>
19. Hrastinski, S. (2019). What do we mean by blended learning? *TechTrends*, 63(5), 564-569. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11528-019-00375-5> <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED558147>
20. Larmer, J., & Mergendoller, J. R. (2015). *Gold standard PBL: Essential project design elements*. Buck Institute for Education. <https://www.pblworks.org/blog/gold-standard-pbl-essential-project-design-elements>

21. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811311500307>
22. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2010). *Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf>
23. Moskal, P.D., Dziuban, C.D., & Hartman, J. (2013). Blended learning: A dangerous idea? *Internet High. Educ.*, 18, 15-23. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1007155>
24. Osguthorpe, R. T., & Graham, C. R. (2003). Blended learning environments: Definitions and directions. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 4(3), 227-233. <https://doi.org/info:doi/>
25. Owston, R., York, D., & Murtha, S. (2013). Student perceptions and achievement in a university blended learning strategic initiative. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 18, 38-46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.12.003> Get rights and content
26. Pellegrino, J. W., & Hilton, M. L. (Eds.). (2012). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century*. National Academies Press. <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/13398/education-for-life-and-work-developing-transferable-knowledge-and-skills>
27. Picciano, A. G. (2009). Blending with purpose: The multimodal model. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 13(1), 7-18. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ837540.pdf>
28. Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates*. Bloomsbury Publishing. <https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/education-and-technology-9781350145566/>
29. Shea, P., & Bidjerano, T. (2010). Learning presence: Towards a theory of self-efficacy, self-regulation, and the development of a communities of inquiry in online and blended learning environments. *Computers & Education*, 55(4), 1721-1731. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.07.017>
30. Singh, H. (2021). Building effective blended learning programs. *Educational Technology*, 43(6), 51-54. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351176047_Building_Effective_Blended_Learning_Programs/citation/download
31. Staker, H., & Horn, M. B. (2012). *Classifying K-12 blended learning*. Clayton Christensen Institute. <http://www.christenseninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Classifying-K-12-blended-learning.pdf>
32. Sun, J. C. Y., & Rueda, R. (2012). Situational interest, computer self-efficacy, and self-regulation: Their impact on student engagement in distance education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(2), 151-158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2010.01157.x>
33. Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*. Jossey-Bass. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2009-18745-000>
34. Vaughan, N. (2010). A blended community of inquiry approach: Linking student engagement and course redesign. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13(1-2), 60-65.

- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257495978_A_blended_community_of_inquiry_approach_Linking_student_engagement_and_course_redesign
35. Vaughan, N., Cleveland-Innes, M., & Garrison, D. R. (2013). Teaching in blended learning environments: Creating and sustaining communities of inquiry. *Athabasca University Press*.
https://www.aupress.ca/app/uploads/120229_99Z_Vaughan_et_al_2013-Teaching_in_Blended_Learning_Environments.pdf
36. Watson, J., Murin, A., Vashaw, L., Gemin, B., & Rapp, C. (2011). *Keeping pace with K-12 online learning: An annual review of policy and practice*. Evergreen Education Group. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED535912>