

EFFICACY OF THE FLIPPED CLASSROOM APPROACH  
IN A WORLD LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

By

EUNJUNG JI

A dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School of Education

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Graduate Program in Design of Learning Environments

written under the direction of

---

Dr. Angela O'Donnell

---

Dr. Mary Curran

---

Dr. John Kerrigan

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May 2020

# EFFICACY OF THE FLIPPED CLASSROOM APPROACH

## ABSTRACT

This study assessed the feasibility and effectiveness of the “flipped classroom” instructional approach in a Korean language course. In this approach, the teacher provides video lectures for students to view outside of class and conducts student-centered active learning in the classroom. A mixed-methods design was used to investigate students’ perceptions of this approach in an intensive intermediate Korean language course at a private university in New Jersey. Outside of class, students watched instructor-created video lectures and took an online quiz. In class, students worked in pairs or small groups on content from the assigned videos, completed homework assignments, and engaged in other learning activities, while the teacher acted as facilitator. Data were collected through an online survey, semi-structured interviews, class observation, and the instructor’s daily journal. Descriptive statistics and qualitative analysis both revealed that the flipped classroom approach facilitated self-paced learning and increased active classroom learning time. This enhanced interactions between peers and with the instructor, and it provided more opportunities to practice the target language in a meaningful way. Qualitative analysis also showed that many students found that this approach increased their overall achievement by maximizing the quality time spent in the classroom. However, despite the students’ overall satisfaction, it was noted that students who are not self-motivated and not responsible for their own learning are more likely to struggle in a flipped classroom. Also, the findings suggested that the use of more interactive videos would increase students’ use of the videos and learning from them.

# EFFICACY OF THE FLIPPED CLASSROOM APPROACH

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my dissertation committee members, without whom I would not have been able to complete this study. I would like to thank my dissertation advisor, Dr. Angela O'Donnell, for her consistent support, guidance, and patience. I am also very grateful to Dr. Mary Curran and Dr. John Kerrigan for their considerate guidance, insightful comments, and encouragement throughout the process. A special thanks also goes to my former colleague, Dr. Hisae Matsui, for her thoughtful comments and collaborative effort during data collection. Many thanks to all the students who participated in the study and enabled this research possible. Finally, I would like to thank my husband, Yeong, for supporting me throughout the completion of this work.

# EFFICACY OF THE FLIPPED CLASSROOM APPROACH

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES .....	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	
Background .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	2
Research Questions .....	6
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
Theoretical Foundation of the Flipped Classroom	
Student-centered Learning .....	7
Benefits of Inverting Bloom's Taxonomy .....	11
Use of Assistive Technology .....	14
Research on Student Perceptions .....	15
Research on the Flipped Classroom's Impacts on Student Learning Outcomes....	19
Flipped Classroom in World or Second Language Education	
Classroom Interaction .....	23
Grammar Instruction and Technology .....	25
Summary .....	27
III METHODOLOGY	
Research Questions .....	30

## EFFICACY OF THE FLIPPED CLASSROOM APPROCH

Mixed Methods Design .....	30
Participants .....	32
Role of the Researcher .....	33
Measures	
Survey .....	34
Semi-structured Interviews .....	35
Observation .....	36
Implementation of the Flipped Classroom and Data Collection Procedures.....	37
Institutional Review Board .....	46
Data Analysis	
Survey .....	47
Semi-structure Interviews .....	47
Observation .....	49
IV RESULTS	
Participants .....	51
Results of the Survey Data	
Closed-ended Survey Questions .....	52
Open-ended Survey Questions .....	56
Summary .....	60
Results from the Interviews	
Strengths of the Flipped Classroom Approach .....	64
Weaknesses of the Flipped Classroom Approach .....	68
Impact on Learning Outcomes .....	70

# EFFICACY OF THE FLIPPED CLASSROOM APPROACH

Summary .....	72
V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	
Students' Perceptions of Their Learning Experiences and Implications of the	
Results .....	74
On the Lecture Videos .....	75
On the Face-to-Face Class Sessions .....	77
On the One-on-One Drill Sessions .....	81
On Language Learning Outcomes .....	81
Level of Participation in Lecture Videos and Implications of the Findings.....	83
Limitations .....	85
Suggestions for Further Improvements .....	86
Future Research Direction .....	88
Conclusion .....	89
REFERENCES .....	91
APPENDICES	
Appendix A. Survey Questions .....	103
Appendix B. Semi-structured Interview Protocol .....	105
Appendix C. Semi-structured Observation Protocol .....	106
Appendix D. Sample In-class Activity .....	107
Appendix E. Final Project Guidelines .....	108
Appendix F. Sample Final Project Brainstorming Activity .....	109

# EFFICACY OF THE FLIPPED CLASSROOM APPROACH

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Timeline of Data Collection Procedure and Lesson Plans .....	38
Table 3.2 Daily Lesson Schedule of the Flipped Classroom .....	40
Table 4.1 Demographics of All Students Enrolled in the Course .....	52
Table 4.2 Students' Perceptions about the FC Approach: Closed-ended Questions .....	53
Table 4.3 Students' Perceptions about the FC Approach: Open-ended Questions .....	57
Table 4.4 Characteristics of Participants.....	61
Table 4.5 Codebook .....	62
Table 4.6 Pre- and Posttest Scores .....	71

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Sample Blackboard Quiz on Lesson 9 .....	41
--	----

## **Chapter One: Introduction**

### **Background**

While teaching the Korean language to American college students over the years, I initially employed a traditional classroom teaching model in which I spent most of the class time delivering lectures while students listened, took notes, and completed some activities. However, despite considerable efforts to make lectures concise and effectively organize all of the materials, I was often unable to complete the daily lesson plans due to the density and complexity of the content. When faced with time constraints, I was forced to expect students to apply new knowledge on their own time with a homework assignment. As a result of this insufficient instructional time, student participation and speaking practice were minimized, which was contradictory to my belief that it is essential for language learners to engage in extensive and meaningful target language practice both in and out of the classroom. Thus, I began researching alternative instructional models to efficiently use class time for more meaningful, interactive language practices.

In recent years, I began using an instructional approach called “flipped classroom” that I believed could meet my needs, as it uses technology such as recorded lessons and videos to create more engaging experiences for learners. Flipped learning has gained the attention of many educators as an innovative and effective instructional approach and has been the new fad in education in the past several years. The concept of the flipped classroom is that the lecture-based instruction takes place outside the classroom and activities are performed in the classroom. Students in a flipped classroom gain exposure to new materials outside of class via lecture videos or various e-learning tools, then use class time to focus on absorbing that knowledge through

high-level cognitive work (e.g., analysis, evaluation, or creation) with the support of their teacher and peers (Bergmann & Sams, 2013; Brame, 2013).

Through my language teaching experience and research on various instructional approaches, I have come to believe that the flipped classroom approach can engage students in ways that will encourage them to practice the target language extensively, helping them achieve a higher level of Korean language proficiency. Although the flipped classroom approach had been only rarely employed in world language classrooms, I developed a lesson plan using this approach and began partially adopting it for one of my Korean language courses. Having seen the potential of the instructional applications of the flipped classroom even in this limited setting, I modified the design and fully implemented this approach in the following semesters. Designed for practical purposes, the current study is action research based on the implementation of a new instructional approach. This dissertation describes my efforts to investigate its effectiveness and feasibility, with the goal of improving my language teaching practices and enhancing student language learning.

### **Statement of the Problem**

For decades, educators and researchers have questioned the effectiveness of teaching methods that are entirely lecture-based. More recently, rapid advancements in technology and changes in student demographics have made online education more accessible and provided new directions for education. Traditional instructional methods of lecturing and sending students home with workbook assignments may not meet the needs of 21st century students who have been raised on technology (Roehl, Reddy, & Shannon, 2013). As a result, many educators have examined newer models of instruction to address the need to rethink 21st century students' needs

and tolerance for old ways of learning (Prensky, 2010) and to correct the deficiencies in the traditional lecture-based classroom model (Lage, Platt, & Treglia, 2000; Strayer, 2012).

One problem with the traditional lecture-based, teacher-centered instructional method lies in how a teacher paces instruction. Some students may find instruction too fast, whereas others find it too slow. Thus, many students in a traditional lecture-based classroom are unable to fully understand the key concepts and therefore do their homework “in a private hell of frustration and confusion” (Goodwin & Miller, 2013, p.78). In addition, these students are unable to absorb key concepts and thus do not apply the skills and strategies presented in the classroom (Bergmann & Sams, 2013). A potential solution for this problem, the flipped classroom model, has gained the attention of many educators. A flipped classroom is a “specific type of blended design that uses technology to move lectures outside the classroom and uses learning activities to move practice with concepts inside the classroom” (Strayer, 2012, p.171). Indeed, with the integration of new technologies and active learning strategies, the flipped classroom model has been suggested as one of the most promising approaches to transforming the learning experiences of today’s students (Hung, 2015; Roach, 2014).

Although the term “flipped classroom” is relatively new, the pedagogy underlying flipped learning is not. A number of corresponding terms such as inverted classroom (Lage et al., 2000) and just-in-time learning (Novak, 2011) have appeared in the literature to describe this evolving approach, which features student preparation before class. Advocates of flipped teaching, such as Berrett (2012) and Hung (2015, 2017), claim that various technologies have made it more feasible than ever. When students review video lectures at their own pace before class, instructors can make the most of class time to advance deeper, inquiry-based learning. Bergmann and Sams (2013) state that the flipped classroom re-refines class time to focus on student-

centered learning. Indeed, one of the advantages often cited for flipped teaching is that it provides students with more opportunities to develop higher-order thinking skills through active and collaborative learning during class time, because it is assumed that they come prepared with foundational knowledge.

Of the rapidly growing lines of research on flipped classrooms, the use of this method in STEM disciplines (i.e., science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) has received the most attention among researchers in higher education because these disciplines have traditionally depended heavily on in-class lectures and deductive teaching methods. Studies in these disciplines (e.g., Herreid & Schiller, 2013) have shown that flipped teaching, featuring lecture delivery prior to class time, increases student motivation and participation in classroom activities and improved academic performance. Because humanities disciplines often favor inductive teaching methods, they already tend to encourage students to construct knowledge based on assimilated information. This may explain in part the paucity of research on the flipped classroom in the humanities.

Although many studies (e.g., Hung, 2015; Hung 2017; Kahn, 2012; Roach, 2014) claim that the flipped classroom approach is applicable in a wide range of disciplines and at any level, surprisingly, it has been adopted primarily in K-12 classrooms (Granados-Bezi, 2015; Horn, 2013). Furthermore, despite some evidence of its use in STEM fields in higher education, no conclusive and complete findings on flipped teaching can be found in the currently available literature due to the lack of sufficient empirical validation in diverse disciplinary contexts. Indeed, despite increasing interest in the flipped approach, flipping classrooms is still in the early stages in world language education; therefore, there remains a lack of comprehensive, systematic research on how this innovative approach can impact student learning experiences and

educational achievement in world language education (Granados-Bezi, 2015; Hung, 2017; Lee & Wallace, 2017).

Defining effective world language instruction is not simple because it involves both theory and applicability in real contexts. Despite the lack of a single definition of effective world language instruction, the primary goal of world language education is to promote students' language proficiency, including practical language skills that can be applied to real-life situations and the ability to organize one's thoughts through language (Harley, Cummins, Swain, & Allen, 1990; Schulz, 2006). Indeed, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign languages (ACTFL) affirms in their Statement of Philosophy of the World-Readiness Standards for Learning Language that "[l]anguage and communication are at the heart of the human experience. The United States must educate students who are linguistically and culturally equipped to communicate successfully in a pluralistic American society and abroad" ("World Readiness," 2015). The flipped classroom will help world language educators meet this goal because the flipped approach allows students to spend more class time on the upper level of cognitive thinking with their peers and teachers, which may facilitate deeper understanding of grammar and reinforce language skills, thus promoting language proficiency.

Addressing the paucity of systematic research on the flipped classroom and the potential benefits of the flipped classroom in the field of world language education, this study contributes to the growing line of research on this approach by examining the efficacy of flipped teaching in language education, focusing on world language education at the post-secondary level. In addition, the present study may provide other world language teachers with a new perspective on the use of a flipped classroom approach and encourage them to examine the effectiveness of the flipped classroom to improve their teaching practices. The purpose of this study is twofold: to

examine Korean language learners' perceptions of the flipped classroom approach in a world language classroom, and to investigate to what extent the flipped classroom approach impacts the students' learning outcomes.

### **Research Questions**

A mixed methods research design is employed to explore the effects of a flipped classroom approach in a college-level Korean language classroom to assess its effectiveness and feasibility. Two primary research questions were generated to direct this study:

1. How do students describe their learning experience when a flipped classroom approach is used in a higher education Korean language classroom?
2. How does the flipped classroom affect student learning outcomes?

## **Chapter Two: Review of Literature**

In this chapter, a review of the literature on the flipped classroom and discussion of the relevance of a flipped classroom approach in world language learning are presented. The chapter begins with a theoretical foundation of the flipped classroom and examines empirical studies which rather directly address research questions of the study: student perceptions of the flipped classroom approach and its impacts on student achievement in varied fields of study. Then, the last portion of the review briefly discusses how the flipped classroom approach can be related to second or world language learning as a means to increase language learners' learning outcomes.

### **Theoretical Foundation of the Flipped Classroom**

The purpose of the flipped classroom is to enhance learning through a student-centered approach by using technology to allow for more interactive peer activities (Bergmann & Sams, 2013; Bishop & Verleger, 2013). Although there is still no specific, clear-cut framework established, the following principles lay a theoretical foundation for implementing a flipped classroom: a student-centered learning environment, an appreciation for the benefits of inverting Bloom's Taxonomy, and the use of assistive technology that helps teachers make their class time more interactive and meaningful.

### **Student-centered Learning**

A flipped classroom is a student-centered learning environment focusing on the students' learning experiences and not on the delivery of lectures in the classroom (Bergmann & Sams, 2013; Bishop & Verleger, 2013; Reidsema, Kavanagh, Hadgraft, & Smith, 2017; Roach, 2014; Strayer, 2012). As Bergmann and Sams (2012) and Foertsch, Moses, Strikwerda, and Litzkow (2013) claim, the flipped classroom approach is not merely replacing teachers with videos;

instead, this ‘flipping’ is primarily concerned with the active role of the learner in the classroom and the enhancement of their learning experience. That is, the flipped classroom is a learning environment where students take ownership of their own learning and therefore become active learners (Bergmann & Sams, 2012). In their recent review of the theoretical foundation for the flipped classroom, Bishop and Verleger (2013) argued that student-centered and active learning strategies support the effectiveness of the flipped classroom approach, in that student learning outcomes (e.g., performance or achievement) have increased in the flipped learning environment. They further state that at the heart of most student-centered learning theories and methods lies active learning. Indeed, many researchers (e.g., Reidsema et al., 2017; Silberman, 1996) have argued that the principles supporting the flipped classroom approach are based on theoretical understandings of active learning.

Active learning is an umbrella term for pedagogies which focus on student activity and student engagement in the learning process (Barkley, 2005; Prince, 2004). These methods include Collaborative Learning, Situated Learning, Problem-Based Learning, Project-Based Learning, and Experiential Learning. Prince (2004) stated that to promote active learning, activities should be designed to emphasize important learning outcomes by requiring thoughtful participation on the part of the student. In other words, active learning requires students to engage in meaningful learning activities that stimulate higher-order thinking, problem solving, critical analysis, and evaluation (Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Hung, 2015). McLaughlin et al. (2013) also noted that active learning practices (e.g., pair/group work, self-reflection, and debates) have positive influences on learning by prompting students’ engagement and increasing information retention. Similarly, Zayapragassarazan and Kumar (2012) posit that active learning provides opportunities for students to meaningfully talk, listen, read, write, and reflect on the content,

ideas, and issues of an academic subject. They further identified four broad categories of interactive arrangements among students used in active learning classrooms as follows: individual activities, paired activities, informal small groups, and cooperative student projects. These formats can be used to carry out many kinds of active learning activities such as conceptual mapping, brainstorming, collaborative learning, role-playing, simulation, project-based learning, and peer teaching (Zayapragassarazan & Kumar, 2012).

This holistic approach used in the classroom engages students with different learning styles and appeals to today's learners, as students grow in a learning environment with constant change and variety (Prensky, 2010). More recently, a comprehensive meta-analysis of undergraduate STEM education found that student performance in examinations and concept inventories was enhanced in an active learning environment (Freeman et al., 2014). However, as Stumpenhorst (2012) noted, student-centered instruction and active learning activities should already exist and be used in many classrooms. What makes the flipped classroom different from existent student-centered instructions is that this approach allows in-class lectures to be moved away from a sole focus on the entire group. This means that teachers can spend more class time with individual students and work with their misconceptions, and that students can have more opportunities to learn from their peers (Hamdan, McKnight, McKnight, Arfstrom, & Arfstrom, 2013; Reidsema et al., 2017). That is, by maximizing both individual attention from a teacher and opportunities for peers to work together, the flipped classroom creates a more interactive and collaborative learning environment.

Indeed, peer-assisted learning (PAL) and collaborative learning play an important role in the flipped classroom. Topping and Ehly (1998) defined PAL as “the acquisition of knowledge and skill through active helping and supporting among status equals or matched companions”

(p.1). They also identified PAL methods: peer tutoring, peer modeling, peer education, peer counseling, peer monitoring, and peer assessment. For both “helpers” and “helped”, PAL is beneficial in numerous ways; PAL positively influences the cognitive aspects (e.g., explaining, reorganizing, active listening, self-correcting) and affective aspects (e.g., encouraging, mutually bonding, feelings of inclusivity) of learners. These habits of successful learning strategies which are promoted through peer interaction are based on collaborative learning and peer tutoring (Foot & Howe, 1998). According to Foot and Howe, collaborative learning and peer tutoring are complementary, both supporting virtually all PAL techniques in educational practice.

Collaborative learning is also very important to the success of the flipped classroom approach. As Bergmann and Sams (2012) claimed, the flipped classroom is a venue where collaborative work is fluid among the students, who can shift between various discussions depending on their needs and interests. In collaborative learning, students working together share experiences and knowledge and therefore achieve learning that is not possible with an individual task. Pointing out the importance of collaborative learning in a flipped learning environment, Kavanagh, Reidsema, McCredden and Smith (2017) suggested that the flipped classroom should “use and maximize the benefits of collaborative learning and thus requires the creation of an environment of active and engaged learning, the conditions for increasing the student cohort’s ownership of learning, and the development of higher-level thinking skills in the individual” (p.16).

In addition, the Flipped Learning Network (FLN) (<https://flippedlearning.org>) asserted that the interaction of video lectures, student collaboration, organized activities, and the teacher’s availability is fundamental to making the flipped classroom work. The FLN further suggested that collaborative activities should be organized by the teacher to support relevant subject matter

and encourage students to be more active in the classroom. Designed for collaborative teamwork between or among the students, these activities include pair/group discussions, case studies, and pair/group projects (Bergmann & Sams, 2012; Hung, 2015).

A growing number of empirical studies (e.g., So & Brush, 2008; Strayer, 2012) have found a positive impact of collaborative learning on student learning experiences in a flipped learning environment. According to Strayer (2012), students' preference for increased cooperation is supported by flipped learning studies which suggest that this instructional approach produces more connections between students in the learning communities. So and Brush's (2008) study of a blended course in health education also found that student perceptions of collaborative learning have a statistically positive relationship with perceptions of satisfaction.

### **Benefits of Inverting Bloom's Taxonomy**

One emphasis of the flipped classroom lies in inverting Bloom's taxonomy so that teachers can make the most of their class time to help students develop higher order thinking skills (Bergmann & Sams, 2013). Since Bloom's taxonomy was introduced in 1956, it has been extensively studied and used as a tool that helps educators broaden the depth of their students' learning in the classroom. The original Bloom's taxonomy consists of six categories: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. These categories are arranged in a cumulative hierarchical framework; achievement of the next, more complex ability or skill requires mastery of the prior one. That is, Bloom's taxonomy is centered on critical, higher order thinking. Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) revised the original taxonomy to fit 21st century students by renaming the levels as remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate, and create. Synthesis was not only renamed *create* but also made the new top category. The revised

categories are also arranged in a hierarchical structure, but not as rigidly as those in the original taxonomy.

- Remembering is the lowest level. This level involves students retrieving relevant knowledge from memory through recognition and recall.
- Understanding is the next level, at which students determine the meaning of instructional messages, including written, oral, and graphic communication. Some skills practiced at this level are interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, and explaining.
- Applying is the third level, which involves students completing a learning task and implementing the task in a given situation.
- Analyzing is the fourth level, where students break materials into their essential parts and determine how the parts are associated with one another or with the overall structure.
- Evaluating is the fifth level and it requires students to make judgments based on standards and criteria that have been learned earlier. This level includes testing, checking, and critiquing.
- Creating is the highest level where students put everything learned together to form a coherent whole or produce an original product. This level includes generating, planning and producing.

Bergmann and Sams (2012) state that the higher-order thinking skills must be completed in the classroom, where the students have instant access to teachers. In traditional lecture-centered classrooms, however, teachers are present mostly for the lower cognitive levels of learning such as remembering and understanding. Outside the classroom, students are then asked to work on assignments or projects by themselves and these activities usually require the higher

cognitive levels of learning such as applying, analyzing, and evaluating. That is, this is the time when many students need their teacher physically present as they need clarification and the teacher's individual help.

Unlike the traditional classrooms, the flipped classroom inverts Bloom's taxonomy to help students reach higher order thinking skills in the classroom while the teacher is physically present (Bergmann & Sam, 2012; Hamdan et al., 2013). In the flipped model, students learn new materials outside the classroom at their convenience by watching lecture videos via various e-learning technology sites before they come to class. As lecture videos usually express basic contents of the target subjects, watching the videos involves the lower cognitive levels of learning such as remembering and understanding. The classroom then becomes a learning environment where the teacher can advance students into deeper learning by having them practice the higher order thinking skills such as applying, analyzing, and evaluating.

To promote higher order thinking skills, the flipped classroom allows a teacher to use a variety of classroom activities. Small group activities, worksheets, experiments, simulations, role-plays, and group projects are the most commonly utilized activities in a flipped classroom (Cole & Kritzer, 2009). Furthermore, problem-based learning (PBL) practices are often adopted in a flipped classroom, especially in the medical education field. PBL is an instructional methodology whose goal is to enhance learning by requiring learners to solve problems, and it assumes that learning is initiated by an authentic, ill-structured problem. Hmelo-Silver (2004) specified five goals of PBL, which aims to help students develop flexible knowledge, effective problem-solving skills, self-directed learning skills, effective collaboration skills, and intrinsic motivation. Hung, Jonassen and Liu (2008) described five characteristics of PBL which are somewhat parallel to these goals: it should be problem-focused such that learning occurs by

addressing an ill-structured problem, student-centered and self-directed such that students are individually and collaboratively responsible for generating learning issues and processes through self- and peer-assessment, self-reflective such that students monitor their understanding, and should have teachers present as facilitators or guides. As most of these characteristics are cultivated in the flipped classroom, it may provide a favorable environment where PBL practices can be effectively implemented.

### **Use of Assistive Technology**

One of the main premises of the flipped classroom is that teachers use assistive technology to maximize the time in which students “interact” with a teacher and peers in the classroom (Berrett, 2012; Sams & Bergmann, 2013). The use of digital video technology has indeed brought about a profound change to many teachers’ instructional practices and has led to the flipped classroom movement in education (Quillen, 2013). The flipped classroom allows teachers to use digital video technology to cover basic principles, terms, and facts as part of out-of-class student preparation, and to use class time to promote deeper understanding of new concepts and cultivate students’ higher order thinking skills. That is, most of the class time is taken up with interactive, collaborative activities that help students actively practice and apply what they have learned.

Teachers may create videos of themselves teaching, narrate and record screencasts of their own lectures on their computers, or use video lessons from Internet sites such as YouTube, Khan Academy, and Ted-Ed (Hamdan et al., 2013). They may also use podcasts to supplement lecture videos. Podcasts are video or audio files distributed in a digital format through the internet and can be downloaded from a website to personal computers or mobile devices. Using podcasts, teachers can record lectures in various forms including lecture capture, Keynote, or a

narrated PowerPoint presentation. The use of instructional podcasts promotes one way to help teachers make their course more suitable and appealing to millennial students (Gannod, Burge, & Helmick, 2008).

As students watch assigned lecture videos or podcasts before coming to class, they can spend class time working on pair or small group activities and begin to have deeper conversations with their teacher and peers regarding new content. This helps students better understand concepts, connect to the content being studied, and apply newly learned content to solving real-world problems. Given that a traditional teacher's role (i.e., transmission of new knowledge) is replaced by lecture videos or other online learning materials, a teacher in a flipped classroom serves as a guide who helps and provides individual guidance as needed. The teacher also serves as a facilitator to provide instant feedback and to support student learning using various scaffolding strategies.

### **Research on Student Perceptions**

Students familiar with traditional lecture-based classroom environments may initially resist the concept of flipped classrooms due to an underlying fear of shifted learning responsibility (Chuang, Weng, & Chen, 2018; Lage et al., 2000; McNally, 2014), of added workload (Kim et al., 2014; Lage et al., 2000; McNally, 2014) or of uncertainty about learning activities (Roach, 2014; Strayer, 2012). However, even with these fears, research on flipped classrooms in various disciplines has reported that students generally prefer the flipped classroom over the traditional lecture classroom (Fraga & Harmon, 2015; Kim et al., 2014; Lage et al., 2000; McLaughlin, 2013; Roach, 2014; So & Brush, 2008).

Strayer (2012) compared a flipped statistics class with a traditional class, finding that students in the flipped classroom preferred the more innovative teaching methods and favored

cooperative learning. That is, the findings indicated that many students in the flipped class mentioned the value of learning with peers, while fewer students from the traditional class noted group learning when reflecting on what a successful course would be like. Students in the flipped classroom, however, pointed out that they had difficulty in making sense of some of their learning activities. Similarly, So and Brush's (2008) mixed-methods case study of a blended course in health education found that student perceptions of collaborative learning have a statistically positive relationship with perceptions of satisfaction. That is, students who valued high levels of collaborative learning tended to be more satisfied with their blended-format course than those who perceived low levels of collaborative learning.

Roach's (2014) study also revealed that the flipped classroom format was well-received by students enrolled in a microeconomics class, with 76% of students responding that flipped learning helped them to learn. In response to questions that gauged student perception of interaction, student responses showed a great variation; while 94% of students responded that the flipped class was more interactive than other courses, only 62% agreed that discussing with classmates helped them to learn. This observation is somewhat in line with the findings of Strayer (2012) that students felt uncertain about various learning activities in a flipped learning environment.

Lage et al. (2000) also examined students' perceptions of the flipped class by conducting a survey in all sections of an introductory economics course taught using the flipped classroom. The findings showed that the majority of students prefer the flipped classroom format to a traditional lecture. Most students had favorable reactions to the group-work component of the course, stating that they learned a lot working in groups in the classroom, but moderately agreed that they had to work more in this class than their other classes. Lage et al. (2000) argued that

although the flipped classroom benefits students of all learning styles, this approach would greatly benefit collaborative learners in particular, whereas it would be less appealing to dependent learners who prefer the larger lecture component, and those who favor individual outside assignments.

What McNally et al. (2017) found in their study also aligns with the findings of these studies (i.e., Lage et al, 2000; Roach, 2014; So & Brush, 2008; Strayer, 2012). McNally et al.'s (2017) study revealed students' strong preference for the collaborative learning aspect of the flipped classroom approach. Surveying 563 undergraduate and postgraduate students participating in a flipped teaching environment, the study indicated that the most preferred aspects of the flipped classroom were the use of technology to assist learning, and collaborative learning with peers in class, whereas the least favorable aspect was the increased workload (i.e., pre-class preparation). The findings suggest that in higher education, students' attitudes toward the flipped classroom can vary based on their preferences in terms of learning styles. Chung et al.'s (2016) study supports what McNally et al. found, identifying individual characteristics (e.g., learner motivation, self-efficacy and beliefs) that have an impact on learning outcomes in a flipped classroom.

Conducting research across three undergraduate classes from different disciplines (i.e., engineering, social studies and humanities), Kim et al. (2014) provided useful data on discipline-specific flipped model applications such as possible instructional technologies and course structures. Additionally, their research revealed that most students were satisfied with the flipped classroom activities, with many perceiving that such activities were more student-centered than traditional classroom activities. Students also reported that video lectures available to them prior to class meetings followed by in-class interaction helped them become more confident and better

understand course concepts; however, students admitted that preparation for class was necessary to be successful.

McLaughlin et al. (2014) also pointed out that preparation for class was crucial for students to be successful in a flipped learning environment. Their survey of 162 students in a required first-year pharmaceuticals course (taught in a flipped manner) showed significant differences between pre- and post-course attitudes toward the flipped learning environment. Preference for the flipped classroom format increased from 23% in the pre-course survey to 84.6% after the course was completed. More than 90% of the students reported that the overall course format of the flipped classroom greatly enhanced their learning. According to the semester-end course evaluation, more than 90% of the students responded that the flipped classroom consistently encouraged active student engagement and promoted understanding and application of key concepts.

In the case of language learning, most students experiencing flipped language classrooms responded favorably to this type of instruction (Fraga & Harmon, 2015; Han, 2015; Hung, 2015; Li, 2016). Adopting a quasi-experimental study design, Hung (2015) revealed in his research that a different mode of instruction (i.e., flipped classroom) had a significant effect on participants' perceived learning engagement and their overall learning satisfaction. In his study, seventy-five college freshmen in the flipped classroom responded that they could more effectively engage in deep learning and thus showed higher ratings of overall learning satisfaction. Han (2015) also found that students' perceptions of the flipped ESL classroom were favorable, with 90% (n=14) of adult ESL learners responding that a flipped approach increased their autonomy as well as efficacy for the final presentation. Similarly, Li's (2016) mixed methods study on college students' attitudes towards employing the flipped model revealed that students were generally

satisfied with a flipped oral English teaching model. That is, the students had a common view that the flipped classroom model has a positive effect on promoting their various abilities as well as the efficiency of teaching in a college oral English course.

In Fraga and Harmon's (2015) research, participants in the flipped classroom were all preservice teachers, enrolled in the reading course for instructing students in the grade 4-8 teacher preparation program. Findings of this study indicated that the majority of the participants in the experimental group (n=25) felt that the flipped model of instruction supported their learning. Furthermore, more than half of the participants reported on pre- and post-questionnaire surveys that this model helped them build confidence in teaching some aspects of word study. Since the participants are preservice teachers who may implement flipped classrooms for their own students, their perspectives will be a valuable resource for the future application of flipped classroom learning.

### **Research on the Flipped Classroom's Impacts on Student Learning Outcomes**

As one of the primary goals of implementing the flipped classrooms is to achieve improved student learning outcomes, a growing number of researchers have examined the impact of flipped classrooms on those outcomes (Al-Zaharani's, 2015; Fraga & Harmon, 2015; Han, 2015; Huang & Hong, 2016; Hung, 2015; Hung, 2017; Lage et al., 2000; Lewis & Harrison, 2012; McLaughlin, et al., 2013). These studies typically compared the flipped learning environment with more traditional environments to measure its effectiveness in improving student achievement, by assessing pre- and post-test scores. Results from these studies are mixed. While some studies (Han, 2015; Huang & Hong, 2016; Hung, 2015; Hung, 2017; Sun & Wu, 2016) showed that the flipped classroom resulted in greater learning achievements, others

(Fraga & Harmon, 2015; Lage et al., 2000; Lewis & Harrison, 2012) found no differences in post-test scores between the two learning environments.

Hung's (2015) research employed a quasi-experimental design to examine the impacts of flipped teaching on student learning. The independent variable in this study was a different mode of instruction (i.e., flipped classroom approach) and the dependent variables were the students' academic performance and learning attitudes. Students' performances were measured by end-of-lesson assessments, and their learning attitudes were measured by a post-intervention learning experience questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The findings suggested that the flipped classroom better facilitated student learning than the traditional classroom; participants from the flipped classroom earned higher mean scores on lesson assessments than the traditional classroom control group.

Similarly, Sun and Wu (2016) revealed in their study that college freshmen in the flipped physics classroom had greater learning achievements. Utilizing one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), they showed that the between-group differences in the pre- and post-course achievement survey were statistically significant. Huang and Hong (2016) used paired-wise *t*-tests and also found that the flipped English classroom intervention positively and significantly affected high school students' information and communication technology (ICT) and English reading comprehension. Like the two studies above, Han's study (2015) revealed that employing the flipped classroom approach helped ESL learners produce more meaning-focused output and thus helped develop learner autonomy and fluency. Her claim, however, is primarily based on the teacher's observation of student performance (i.e., final presentation and Google Voice submission), as well as the participants' responses on questionnaires, rather than assessment data.

Hung's (2017) more recent study offers further support for the growing need to apply the flipped classroom approach to language teaching contexts. Employing design-based research (DBR) methodology, the study examined the effects of flipping the classroom on EFL students' academic achievement and learning attitudes. This DBR project consisted of two phases, with the first functioning as a baseline design and the other as a redesign of the observed course, a skills-based English course. Analyzing students' final exam scores (based on the course content), their responses to attitudinal questionnaires, and the researcher's direct observation, Hung (2017) confirmed the feasibility and potential of this approach with regard to both students' academic achievement and learning attitudes. His research findings as a whole show the great promise of flipping the classroom for university-level English language learners.

To examine whether the flipped classroom approach can actually promote students' language learning, Lee and Wallace (2017) compared traditional and flipped classrooms of the same introductory college English course at a South Korean university. Analyzing the students' responses to surveys, their achievement scores in three tasks, and the instructor's notes on the students' engagement in the learning process, the study found that most students (in the flipped classrooms) enjoyed learning English in a flipped learning environment and the flipped group achieved higher average scores in their three final tasks (i.e., exams, writing assignments, and presentation) than those in the non-flipped classroom. Findings also demonstrated that the instructor noticed the students in the flipped classroom to be more engaged in the entire process of their English learning. Despite the higher average achievement scores of the flipped group, however, it should be noted that only the mean score of the final exam was statistically significant.

While previous studies have indicated that flipped classrooms may have a positive impact on students' motivation and overall achievement, Al-Zaharani's research (2015) suggested that the flipped classroom can also promote college students' creative thinking. Employing an independent samples *t*-test to compare the creativity test scores of the flipped and traditional groups, Al-Zaharani revealed that there were significant differences in the scores in favor of the flipped classroom.

What Fraga and Harmon (2015) found, however, contradicts these positive findings. To examine the impact of the flipped model on student achievement, Fraga and Harmon (2015) analyzed the participants' performance (i.e., understanding of the word study topic) using a *t*-test. The results showed that there were no significant differences in word study exam results between the participants in the flipped and the traditional classrooms. In addition, the participants' responses on instructional components such as required readings, instructions, and the use of technology did not indicate much difference between the two groups. Lewis and Harrison's (2012) quasi-experimental field study also revealed that there was no significant difference in student performance between the traditional and the flipped social science classrooms. Yet, Lewis and Harrison (2012) still argued that the flipped classroom could be an effective approach to facilitate student academic success, reporting that the study findings demonstrated that the mean score of the flipped group was higher than that of the non-flipped group.

In comparison with research conducted on student perceptions, little research has been done to investigate the impact of the flipped classroom on student learning outcomes. For example, Kim et al.'s (2014) research did not include the participants' performance (i.e., achievement scores) and changes in motivation, although they suggested that more research

should be done in this area. Similarly, admitting the limitations of his study, Roach (2014) also pointed out that further studies must be conducted to test the efficacy of flipped learning in higher education, especially quantifying the gains from flipped classrooms in terms of students' test scores. In their scoping review of studies on the use of flipped classrooms in higher education, O'Flaherty and Phillips (2015) indeed stated that despite acknowledgement of the positive flipped classroom attributes, very few studies employed a robust scientific method to evaluate student learning outcomes as related to improved student learning, particularly higher-order thinking skills such as problem solving and creative thinking.

### **Flipped Classroom in World or Second Language Education**

The ultimate goal of world or second language teaching is to help students improve language proficiency, including functional language skills that can be applicable to real-life situations. The challenges world or second language teachers often face include determining appropriate instructional activities and pedagogies to meet this goal. Language learning, whether in a traditional or flipped classroom, requires extensive exposure to interactions and the authentic use of the target language (Gass & Mackey, 2006; Swain, 2000). Nonetheless, language learners in a traditional classroom have limited (interactive) contact time with a teacher in class and they often have limited exposure to, and opportunities for practice in, the target language (Gass & Mackey, 2006; Hung, 2017; Kosta & Lockwood, 2015). In this regard, the flipped classroom approach can enable students to focus on communicative tasks and to actively engage in a variety of in-class small-group activities while still giving them explicit grammar instruction through video lectures. Such interactions facilitate students' meaningful learning, which is relevant to their own experience outside of the classroom (Peyton et al., 2010).

### **Classroom Interaction**

With respect to the use of a flipped language classroom, perhaps the most important implication for language learning is that the flipped approach promotes interaction and creativity, which is essential to promoting students' language production and collaboration (Granados-Bezi, 2015; Han, 2015; Kosta & Lockwood, 2015). According to Swain (2000), interactions lead to language use and develop language learning because interaction activities such as collaborative learning practices require negotiations and feedback among language learners. By providing learners with interactive opportunities for maximum use of the target language during class time, therefore, the flipped classroom enhances meaningful input and interaction (Krashen, 1982, 2014). This aspect of the flipped classroom is even more important in world language learning environments, where the target language is not used outside the classroom. For example, in the EFL learning environment, creating a more communicative classroom based on the flipped classroom model will enable students to use the target language in somewhat authentic situations and thus facilitate their pragmatic language skills (Han, 2015; Mehring, 2016).

To understand language learning, current Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research has indeed expanded to focus on diverse paradigms of interaction. In his extensive meta-analysis of classroom interaction studies, however, Ellis (2012) found evidence for the importance of the role of classroom interaction in fostering world language proficiency, and also concluded that interaction facilitates language acquisition regardless of the type of interaction theory applied (i.e., Interactionist-Cognitive theories and Sociocultural theory). According to Interactionist-Cognitive theories, interaction "provides the learner with 'input' which is then processed internally by means of cognitive mechanisms responsible for attention, rehearsal, and restructuring of existing knowledge systems" (Ellis, 2012, p.238). While interactionist-cognitive theories view learning as an acquisition, sociocultural theories view it as a process. That is, in

sociocultural theories, language acquisition is realized through a collaborative process of building grammatical and cultural competence (Ellis, 2012; Ohta, 2000).

Classroom interactions which facilitate oral language proficiency involve various types of tasks and exercises such as a group or pair work. Based on studies conducted by many scholars in the field of SLA, Long and Porter (1985) identified six positive aspects of implementing interactional group activities: group work increases students' individual practice, which supplements constrained instructional time; it can provide a variety of types of functional practice; it enables students to correct each other and thus complete more classroom activities than in a teacher-centered classroom; it facilitates negotiated interactions for meaning-making, improving performance and understanding of the target language structure; it enables students to produce output with similar grammatical accuracy regardless of the interlocutor's language backgrounds under a non-supervised situation, thus gaining more opportunity to practice; and it increases the amount of talk, negotiation, and input opportunities, which are believed to promote language proficiency.

### **Grammar Instruction and Technology**

Many scholars (e.g., Ellis, 2006; Lightbown, 1990) agree that grammar instruction is beneficial in second language acquisition (SLA). Ellis (2006) posits that despite the controversy over the best approach to teaching grammar in the second language (L2) (e.g., direct method, audio-lingual method, and task-based learning), basic knowledge of grammar significantly helps students develop language proficiency. Ellis further suggests that grammar practice should be integrated into communicative activities, while grammar instruction itself should be provided in separate lessons.

Indeed, the value of explicit grammar instruction has been stated by many researchers

(e.g., Culman, Henry, & Vanpatten, 2009; Ellis, 2006; Friedman, 2007). Friedman's study provided empirical evidence that explicit grammar instruction is an important element in developing oral proficiency, and Ellis also found that teaching explicit grammatical knowledge assists subsequent acquisition of implicit knowledge. Comparing four groups of college-level German language learners, Culman et al. (2009) supported these findings by showing that explicit grammar information has a positive impact on processing the information and effectively leads to the acquisition of the target grammar.

Despite the general advantages of explicit grammar information, all methods of presenting such information may not be equally effective. For example, in a traditional language classroom, a grammar lecture usually occupies more than half of the class time, and often results in not completing student-centered activities as planned. This problem can be addressed by utilizing technology as it can leverage time and reorganize learning activities and rigorous instruction (Gullen & Zimmerman, 2013). Thus, the flipped classroom approach is one that meets these needs because it delivers the explicit grammar instruction outside of class (i.e., lecture videos) and devotes class time to meaningful, communicative activities.

The use of technology in a flipped classroom (e.g., pre-recorded lectures in the form of podcasts, screencasts, or captured videos) indeed alleviates the instructor's administrative burden of managing classes, large classes in particular (McGrath, Groessler, Fink, Reidseman, & Kavanagh, 2017). It also allows classroom time to focus on meaningful communicative activities, which in turn will help improve learners' ability to apply knowledge of language forms and features in various contexts. Such interactions facilitate students' meaningful learning, which is relevant to their own experience outside of the classroom.

While flipped-classroom teachers can leverage technology, they do not necessarily need

to be technology experts as they can use ready-made online materials (e.g., YouTube channels, online lecture podcasts). These existing resources are freely available on a given topic and can save teachers time and money. Many students, however, tend to prefer some videos created by their teacher (Kosta & Lockwood, 2015). It is becoming easier to create high-quality video recordings with commonly available software programs and devices such as tablets and smartphones. That is, teachers can create their own videos using web-based lecture technologies (WBLT) such as podcasting of digital audio and video files to record and transmit lectures. Indeed, many students were found to believe that WBLT could enhance their learning by offering greater physical and temporal flexibility.

Nonetheless, it should be noted that “a video of a boring lecture is a boring video that doesn’t enhance the learning experience” (Gluzman as cited in Muldrow, 2013). One possible solution to this issue is to make video content more interactive. O’Flaherty & Phillips (2015) observed that students are less likely to engage in pre-class activities that lack interactivity and further argued that a lack of engagement with the pre-class activities would result in variability of student preparedness, adding another level of learning challenges for students. Addressing students’ concerns about “boring” lecture videos, Kosta and Lockwood (2015) also pointed out the importance of creating “interactive” videos not only to increase students’ interest but also to ensure that students are prepared for in-class work and, more importantly, to ensure that they are learning.

### **Summary**

To summarize, the flipped classroom approach is steadily gaining popularity at all levels in the educational domain. A flipped classroom focuses on students’ use of concepts and ideas they have learned about prior to attending class and is less dependent on teacher-directed lecture

and instruction. With the help of advanced technologies, flipping the classroom provides students with more control over their learning and more opportunities to learn from their peers. In addition, the flipped class becomes a place where students can explore topics and learning objectives more deeply, and challenges them to acquire higher order thinking skills.

The body of literature described here has shown students' positive perceptions of the flipped approach and mixed learning outcomes. That is, the examination of the students' perceptions of and attitudes towards the flipped classroom approach revealed that students were generally satisfied with this approach (e.g., Fraga & Harmon, 2015; Granados-Bezi, 2015; Han, 2014; Huang & Hong, 2016; Hung, 2015; Hung, 2017; Lage et al., 2000; Li, 2016; Roach, 2014; So & Brush, 2008; Strayer, 2012; Sun & Wu, 2016). Furthermore, most students reported that a flipped classroom may facilitate their high-order thinking skills including creative thinking (Al-Zahrani, 2015) and self-monitoring (Strayer, 2012). The flipped classroom has also been seen as a promising pedagogical approach in raising student achievement (Huang & Hong, 2016; Hung, 2015; Hung, 2017; Sun & Wu, 2016) and increasing student motivation (Han, 2015; Kim et al., 2014). These conclusions are somewhat aligned with SLA research findings (e.g., Chung et al., 2018; Ellis, 2012; Gass & Mackey, 2006; Lightbown & Spada, 1990) which support the role of classroom interaction in fostering world language proficiency.

However, the actual design of a well-structured and efficiently implemented flipped classroom requires considerable amounts of time preparing and guiding. Most teachers, if not all, have difficulties designing their flipped classrooms, given that they have not experienced this type of learning as a student, and thus may not fully understand what it should look like. Al-zahrani (2015) pointed out that it is essential to maintain carefully planned in-class activities including discussion, cooperation and problem solving to facilitate students' engagement and

promote creativity in the flipped classroom. Elen and Calrebout (2001) also emphasized that a poor implementation of potentially powerful learning environments can result in unexpected or undesirable outcomes. They further suggest that when teachers and students are introduced to a new, innovative learning environment, a more gradual implementation of such innovative approaches is needed.

Furthermore, there are certain concerns and doubts regarding implementing the flipped classroom approach for foreign or second language teaching. For example, Milman (2012) questioned the adequacy of flipping the classroom for second language learners, arguing that this approach is best reserved for teaching and learning procedural knowledge. Another concern addressed by Lee and Wallace (2017) is that there is little empirical evidence about whether this approach can actually promote students' language learning. Furthermore, Kosta and Lockwood (2015) pointed out that few pedagogically oriented materials exist for teachers to flip their classes.

Therefore, future research on flipped language teaching should probe into the effects of well-structured and ill-structured flipped classes on student learning, using various instructional designs or active learning strategies in combination with other innovative applications of technology.

### **Chapter Three: Methodology**

This chapter presents the research questions, research design, demographics of the participants, measures, data collection procedures, and data analysis for the study. It also includes an account of how the lecture videos and online quizzes were created, as this study was intended to examine the efficacy of flipped teaching in world language education as a way to improve my language teaching practices and to serve as a guide for future flipped classroom language instructors.

#### **Research Questions**

This study explored the effect of a flipped classroom approach in a Korean language classroom in a private university in the U.S. to examine its effectiveness and feasibility. To study the effects of a flipped classroom approach, it was necessary to investigate students' perceptions, because students' beliefs about an instructional approach are related to their motivations (Brown, 2009). Therefore, this study aimed to examine Korean language learners' perceptions about implementing the flipped classroom approach in a world language classroom, and to investigate the extent to which a flipped classroom approach had an impact on the students' learning outcomes. Two research questions were generated to direct this study:

1. How do students describe their learning experience when a flipped classroom approach is used in a higher education Korean language classroom?
2. How does the flipped classroom affect student learning outcomes?

#### **Mixed Methods Design**

To address these research questions, the study used an explanatory mixed-methods design. This study was intended to quantitatively analyze student survey responses. However,

using a quantitative method alone was not sufficient to answer the research questions because of the small sample size of the study. According to Creswell and Plano-Clark (2007), two of the biggest advantages of using a mixed-methods design are (a) the ability to provide a deeper understanding of a research problem with the opportunity to examine various forms of data that are more extensive than data collected by either qualitative or quantitative method alone and (b) the ability to answer research questions that cannot be sufficiently addressed through the use of either qualitative or quantitative data alone. Creswell (2014) also claims that the vulnerability of small sample sizes in a quantitative method can be supplemented by a qualitative method, as the qualitative method enforces the richness of interpretation. By choosing a mixed method, therefore, the researcher strengthens the validity of the study, which is important for analyzing data to support the research questions being posed.

In this study, the quantitative component used closed-ended questions in a survey about the students' perceptions of implementing a flipped classroom approach, which aspects they find informative, which aspect they think need improvement, and how the flipped approach affects their learning. The results of pre-test and post-test scores also were used to illustrate students' learning outcomes and to explore the relationship between students' attitudes and their learning outcomes.

The qualitative component of the study explored students' perceptions and attitudes toward the flipped classroom approach through open-ended survey questions, student interviews, and the researcher's observation. The qualitative data were used to develop a deeper understanding of the quantitative results. The interviews allowed for greater depth and richness of information as the interviewer could get more extensive answers and clarify any questions being posed (McMillan, 2012).

### **Participants**

The participants of this study were 13 undergraduate students enrolled in KOR108, Intensive Korean II, at a private university in New Jersey during the spring semester of 2019. KOR103, Intensive Korean I and KOR108, Intensive Korean II, are beginning to low intermediate-level courses designed for heritage language learners. Together they cover both first-year and second-year Korean language materials in one year. Each of these intensive courses requires students to meet for two 80-minute class periods and one 20-minute one-on-one drill session each week. All nine students who had taken the Intensive Korean I during the fall semester of 2018 enrolled in Intensive Korean II while four additional students joined the class in the following spring semester.

In the present study, all 13 students were heritage language learners who are native speakers of English and have some proficiency in and cultural connection to the Korean language, but only two students had Korean language learning experiences in a formal setting. One had taken Korean language courses at a language institute in Korea during a gap year before starting college, and the other student had taken a Korean language course in Korea during summer vacation before attending college. In a typical intensive course, students' ages range from 18 to the early 20s. Detailed demographic information about the participants is presented in Chapter Four.

All 13 students were placed in this class based on their placement test scores comprising grammar, vocabulary, reading, and writing, as well as a short informal interview. As part of the placement process, oral interviews were conducted and graded by the Korean language program director, and all the teachers, including me, reviewed their writing. Results of the placement tests indicated that all the students in this class had low intermediate-level proficiency in speaking and

listening, and mid-beginning-level in reading and writing (based on ACTFL proficiency guidelines), and they had very limited knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. Thus, participants of the study were expected not to have difficulty understanding simple directions and explanations in Korean while watching lecture videos. However, language skills in the four areas of listening, writing, speaking, and reading were not equal among the students; this is discussed in Chapter Five.

A criterion-based purposive sampling is appropriate for this study because of the action research nature of the study. This group of students was purposefully chosen for this study as they meet the criteria relevant to the research questions of this study: (a) how students describe their learning experience when a flipped classroom approach is used in higher education Korean language classroom and (b) how the flipped classroom experiences interact with the students' learning outcomes (Collins, Onwuegbuzie, & Jiao, 2007; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2015; Miles & Huberman, 1994). This purposive sample was constructed to serve a very specific need of the current study, but it cannot represent a larger population.

### **Role of the Researcher**

In this study, I had two roles: primary investigator and course instructor for KOR108. Accordingly, in designing this study, a question arose about how to minimize the extent to which my viewpoint may intrude especially when collecting and analyzing qualitative data. Qualitative data analysis is easily open to “sloppy, biased processes that merely reinscribe the biases and perspectives of those in control of the research process” (Stringer, 2004, p. 57). Therefore, to enhance the soundness of the findings, this study adhered to the following processes: prolonged engagement in a setting, persistent observation, triangulation, and member checks (Gall et al., 2015; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stringer, 2004). As the instructor of Intensive Korean I, the

researcher had established rapport with the continuing students and gained a relatively sophisticated understanding of the context including individual students' actions in a setting. Furthermore, to ensure the internal validity of the qualitative data analysis, this study used member checks. During one-on-one drill sessions, the researcher had students review statements in the researcher's field notes for accuracy and completeness. This process provided the students with opportunities to tell if they recognize their experience in the observer's interpretation and to identify possible biases or misunderstandings (Merriam, 2009).

I have taught intensive courses at the research site since 2015. To more effectively use class time and increase student face-to-face interactions for the intensive courses, I had partially implemented a flipped classroom approach during the four semesters prior to this study; 30–40% of my course lectures were flipped in the spring semester of 2017, and I continued to flip 20–30% more for the following academic year. During the fall semester of 2018, more than 90% of the course lectures were flipped. Based on student feedback from those courses, instructional materials (e.g., lecture videos, in-class activity handouts) and lesson plans were modified for the current study. As this study is action-research oriented, the findings of this study will help to refine the flipped classroom model in my Korean language courses and be further used to provide guidance to relevant instructors.

## **Measures**

### **Survey**

Quantitative data were collected using a survey of students who participated in the flipped classroom during the spring semester of 2019. A survey is a good method for this study because it provides “a description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population” being studied (Creswell, 2014, p. 155). The goal of the survey is to get a general sense of how students

perceive the new instructional approach and their experiences of this process. The survey used in this study is a version of a questionnaire developed by Enfield (2013). Enfield's questionnaire gathered information on students' perspectives of the flipped classroom approach in his undergraduate multimedia course. Addressing different aspects of the students' learning experiences, Enfield's questionnaire is divided into three sections: (a) instructional videos assigned for out-of-class preparation, (b) in-class instructional activities, and (c) a more general impact of the course on students.

The questionnaire used for this study maintained the same format as Enfield's (2013), including both closed-ended and open-ended questions. However, because of the differences between multimedia and world language courses, many questions were modified. For example, Enfield's survey question containing the phrase "learn HTML and CSS" was replaced with the phrase "learn new grammar and vocabulary." The modified version was pilot-tested in the Fall 2018 semester to ensure that it serves the purpose of this study and addresses the research question. While Enfield's survey contains 22 questions, the survey used for this study had 17 questions (see Appendix A). These questions examined students' perceptions about the usefulness, suitability, and effect of the flipped classroom approach in language learning. More specifically, the survey comprised three sections; the first five questions were on the use of instructional videos, the next seven were on in-class activities, and the last four focused on the general impact of the flipped course on students.

### **Semi-structured Interviews**

Among the types of qualitative research interviews, this study used a semi-structured interview guide approach. A semi-structured interview guide approach involves outlining questions or issues to be explored. According to Patton (2002), a semi-structured interview guide

ensures that the same basic lines of inquiry are pursued with each interviewee. Serving as a basic checklist during the interview, the guide provides topics within which the interviewer is free to explore and probe, and it makes the use of limited interview time more efficient. To address the research questions of the study, these interview questions were generated:

1. Have you had other flipped classroom experiences? (If yes, what did you like/dislike the most and why?)
2. Based on your experience with the flipped model (in this class), what would you say are the strengths of the flipped instructional model?
3. Based on your experience with the flipped model (in this class), what would you say are the weaknesses of the flipped instructional model?
4. How does the flipped classroom model impact your learning outcomes (in terms of proficiency, test scores, problem-solving skills, motivation, engagement, and desire to continue studying Korean)?
5. What can be done to make the flipped classroom model better? In other words, what would you do differently to create a better flipped learning environment?

In addition to these five core questions, probing questions were generated in case the interviewer could not fully understand the participants' responses or needed more in-depth information (see Appendix B).

### **Observation**

The second part of qualitative data collection involved observing students in the flipped classroom from the beginning to the end of the Spring 2019 semester. This method was used to triangulate the data; thus it was expected to increase the validity of the findings of this study. The observer took a participant-as-observer role. This data collection method was effective for this

study because participant observation is particularly useful in studying small groups, or for observers who can stay in a situation over a long period of time to gather detailed information about what is happening (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

In this study, the observation was semi-structured. According to Cohen et al. (2007), a semi-structured observation will “have an agenda of issues but will gather data to illuminate these issues in a far less predetermined or systematic way” (p. 397). This study had an observation protocol that focused on particular behaviors and attitudes toward different aspects of the flipped classroom and the students’ improvement in language proficiency (see Appendix C). The protocol allowed me to provide descriptive data in a systematic fashion (Cohen et al., 2007) regarding (a) the students’ attitudes during the study, (b) the quality of student-student/teacher-student interactions, (c) the materials/methods used by the teacher, (d) the type of content being studied, and (e) the changes in the students’ proficiency. As Creswell (2007) suggested, these observations were recorded in the researcher’s field notes to provide a general sense of what was happening in the classroom regarding the students’ attitudes toward implementing a flipped classroom approach.

### **Implementation of the Flipped Classroom and Data Collection Procedures**

This study was conducted during the spring semester of 2019. Table 3.1 illustrates the lesson plan and timeline of the data collection procedures of the study. The flipped classroom as an educational intervention comprised two parts: direct computer-based individual instruction outside the classroom and interactive pair- or small group-learning activities in the classroom. The teacher created 100% of the learning videos based on two textbooks used in the course. This helped students feel a strong connection to the videos as they could see and hear their teacher on the videos instead of having random instructors from Internet sites (Bergmann & Sams, 2012).

Table 3.1

*Timeline of Data Collection Procedure and Lesson Plans*

Timeline	Outside the classroom	Inside the classroom	One-on-one drill session with the teacher
Week 1	N/A	FC orientation, pre-test, consent form, L1 (traditional instruction)	N/A
Week 2- Week 5	L2–L7 lecture videos & online quizzes	review& activities	20 min. per student every week
Week 6	N/A	midterm period	20 min. per student
Week 7- Week 11	L8–L14 lecture videos & online quizzes	review & activities W8 (one class recording) W10 (one class recording)	20 min. per student every week
Week 12 (Final week)	L15 lecture videos & online quizzes	review, activities, post-test, & online survey	20 min. per student every week
Week 13 & Week 14 (Reading period)	student interviews by appointment	N/A	N/A

There are a total of fifteen chapters in the two textbooks and each chapter comprises two conversations and one narration. While each conversation includes its own vocabulary list, a narration section does not. As this was an intensive course, each chapter was covered in 1.5 or 2 days. In the traditional classroom before the Spring 2017 semester, instructors spent a considerable amount of class time lecturing on new grammar and vocabulary, often minimizing in-class activities due to time constraints. As a result, students were expected to apply newly

introduced information on their own time, mostly with a homework assignment. In the flipped classroom, however, face-to-face lectures were minimized and activities that previously were assigned as homework were conducted in the classroom.

Before the flipped classroom was implemented, students received a 15-minute orientation outlining the characteristics of the flipped classroom. During this orientation, the teacher provided a brief introduction of the flipped classroom: what traditionally took place inside the classroom takes place outside the classroom. She provided instructions on where to locate lecture videos and online quizzes and showed a short clip of the first lecture video and a sample online quiz. In addition, students were informed that they were required to complete an online quiz before coming to class and the quizzes would be graded on a done/not-done basis. As the proposed study involved publication or (public) presentation of findings, the students were asked to sign a consent form to be included in the study or to decline. All students were informed that their decision about participating in the study would not affect their grades. Furthermore, on the first day of class, students were asked to take a two-page test. Most of the test questions focused on new grammar and vocabulary that they had not learned but would learn during the course. Students were also asked to take the same test on the last day of class. The results of the pre-tests and post-tests are presented in Chapter Four.

From the second week, students were assigned to watch teacher-prepared lecture videos posted on Google Drive and required to take an online quiz before coming to class. A daily lesson schedule of the flipped classroom is presented in Table 3.2. Lecture videos were released approximately one week prior to the class date that they would be discussed.

Table 3.2

*Daily Lesson Schedule of the Flipped Classroom*

	Time*	Activity	Materials
Review Grammar check Question & Answer	10–15 min.	A teacher reviews key grammar concepts of the day's lesson, asking students a few questions. A teacher clarifies students' questions if any.	PPT slides
Activity 1: Grammar	10 min.	All students individually complete questions and share their answers with partners and with the entire class.	Handouts
Activity 2: Vocabulary & Expressions	15 min.	All students in pairs do some activities on the expressions/vocabulary/culture they have learned. All pairs share their answers with the entire class.	Handouts
Activity 3: Create and role play your own dialogue	20 min.	All students in pairs create their own dialogue using the target grammar/expression. All pairs role play/share their dialogues with the class.	Handouts
Activity 4: Final project brainstorming	10 min.	All students individually answer a few questions related to the final project. All students share their ideas and discuss problems if any.	Handouts
Wrap-up activities (Tuesday)	10–15 min.	All students complete remaining questions on the worksheet, have their answers checked by the teacher, or ask questions on the day's lesson.	
Lesson quiz (Thursday)	15 min.	All students take a weekly lesson quiz in class.	

\*Note: 80 min. total

Three videos were prepared for each chapter of the book, which was usually covered in two class meetings or less. Of the three, one video explained key vocabulary and expressions of the chapter with example sentences, relevant visual images, and/or short video clips. Two videos focused on grammar rules in each conversation: their concepts, conjugation, and their applications in various contexts. The grammar lecture videos also used animation effects,

illustrations, photos, and/or video clips to represent the concepts the instructor was addressing. Each video was approximately eight minutes long. When preparing lecture videos, the instructor first created PowerPoint slides and created narrated screen recordings of the slides using QuickTime Player.

After watching all three lecture videos, students were asked to take a short quiz posted on the Blackboard learning management system. Each quiz had five questions including multiple-choice questions in the form of error recognition and error correction tasks; all the questions and response options were written in Korean (see Figure 1). Most questions were about applying grammar rules, both form and use in various contexts. For example, students were asked to choose the most or the least appropriate noun-modifying expression for the given situation.

The screenshot displays the Blackboard 'Create/Edit a Mobile Compatible Test' interface. On the left, a sidebar lists course navigation options: Announcements, Syllabus, Course Description, Course Materials, Assignments, Contacts, Tools, Reserves, Reading List, My Groups, and Course Management. The main area is titled 'Lesson 9 Quiz' and shows a list of five questions. The first question is selected, and its details are shown on the right. The question is in Korean and asks for the correct noun-modifying expression. The 'Question Type' is 'Multiple Choice'. There are four answer options, each with a radio button. The 'Value' is set to 10 points. The interface includes buttons for 'Cancel', 'Save Progress', and 'Save and Close'.

Figure 1. Sample blackboard quiz on Lesson 9. Each quiz had five questions.

This study initially planned to include short answer questions such as writing a noun-modifying form of X; however, as some students had difficulty typing in Korean, questions requiring typing were not included. Students did not need to take a quiz immediately after

watching the videos, but they had to complete the quiz prior to attending class. Students could take the quiz only once and they could check if their answers were correct immediately after completing the quiz. A quiz for each chapter was available from about one week before the class until 10 minutes before the class began. The instructor could track individual students' attempts and therefore easily identify students' common errors. Some points were assigned for each quiz as it was required by Blackboard; however, the online quizzes were graded on a done/not-done basis.

Each class started with a brief review of the day's lesson. Then students engaged in activities in pairs or small groups and completed their assignments in the classroom. Classroom activity was less teacher-led. Instead, the teacher provided individual guidance as needed. Rather than merely imparting knowledge, the teacher acted as a facilitator to provide feedback on students' language use and to support students' language learning using various scaffolding strategies such as summarizing and pushing for an explanation (Hmelo-Silver & Barrows, 2006). For example, when asked about a difference between two kinds of inferential judgement expressions in Korean, instead of providing an answer, the teacher pushed students toward thinking about possible situations in which each type could be used. The teacher neither evaluated students' responses nor offered additional information, but continuously pushed students for an explanation. This helped students realize the limits of their understanding.

Classroom activities included completing fill-in-the-blank questions, role-playing using both teacher-prepared and students' own scripts (see Appendix D), collaborative learning (e.g., creating a dialogue or sentence and finding appropriate words for the contexts with peers), brainstorming, and project-based learning (for a final project on the topics covered in the videos). In so doing, the flipped classroom allowed the teacher to devote class time to more meaningful

and communicative activities while delivering explicit grammar instruction outside of class using video lectures. The flipped classroom allowed students to spend more time on the higher level of Bloom's taxonomy with tasks requiring them to apply, analyze, and create (Bergmann & Sams, 2012). The instructions for some classroom activities and topics are:

#### Creating and role-playing a dialogue

Instruction: Based on the context given below, create a dialogue in Korean with your partner using the most appropriate honorific expressions (e.g., words, particles, verbs, and speech styles) and role-play your dialogue.

Context: S is a college student, taking an economics class. Yesterday, S could not attend class and so missed a quiz because s/he was very sick. Today, S walks into the professor's office during office hours and asks if s/he can take a makeup quiz. S really wants to make up the missed quiz. P is a professor in his/her mid-50s. The professor knows that S is a good student, but the professor has a strict attendance policy.

#### Brainstorming

Instruction: Consider the following questions on your own (two minutes). Share your thoughts with your partner (two to three minutes) and share your pair's ideas with the entire class.

Questions: The Korean language has six different speech styles. What do you think are important factors in determining the adequacy of a speech style(s) and why?

#### Writing a paragraph

Instruction: Describe people in your photo using the most appropriate honorific expressions (i.e., predicates, particles, and nouns), colors, and clothing items in

Korean. You must use at least three noun-modifying forms, three clausal connectives (such as because, if, and but), and five different color/clothing item words. Use the most formal, deferential speech style.

Material: The teacher will provide each pair of students with a different photo which includes more than five people of differing ages.

Project-based learning for the final project: Creating a student newsletter (see Appendices E and F)

Guidelines: As a current student of this university, you are a student writer with research tasks for developing a guide or resources for prospective students. The team (the entire class) is asked to write about college life at this school to help prospective Korean students to be better informed and therefore better prepared for their freshman year of college. Each student will contribute to this project. The newsletter will be posted on the program Facebook and/or distributed to the students at the Korean language program party at the end of the semester.

Directions: Choose one topic from the box below and you, as an editor, will be in charge of the topic you chose. In class, every student will brainstorm and write three to five sentences on each topic. For your own topic, write at least 1.5 pages using the plain speech style. You may edit and use your classmates' sentences and collect more information using the Internet or student interviews.

These interactive classroom activities provided students with opportunities to integrate with what they already know, practice new rules or concepts to better understand what they had learned in class, and identify places that need improvements. After completing all the activities,

students were allowed, but not required, to submit their worksheets if they wanted to receive teacher feedback.

In addition, all students were required to attend a weekly 20-minute one-on-one drill session with the teacher, where the teacher provided tutoring support tailored to each student's specific needs and learning style. At the start of an individual drill session, students used a paper-and-pencil format to answer the same questions that were in the Blackboard quiz. Then they discussed their answers with the teacher if needed. Also, the teacher had students review statements in her (i.e., the researcher's) field notes asking if their experience in her interpretation was accurate. The one-on-one drill sessions were conducted in a private study room or in the instructor's office when no one else was present.

From the second week to the eleventh week of the semester, the researcher recorded observations in her field notes to provide a general sense of what was happening in the classroom regarding the students' behaviors and attitudes towards the new instructional approach (e.g., how they responded and reacted to it). As the researcher was also the instructor, the notes were recorded subsequent to each class. In addition, the entire 80-minute class session was video-recorded on two randomly selected dates between the third week and the final week of classes. All the students were informed of these dates at least one week prior to each recording date. They were also informed that these recordings would be viewed only by the researcher herself and would be stored in a safe place. The researcher obtained all students' permission to be video-recorded. For the first recording (Week 8), two video cameras were set up on a tripod in the front-left and the front-right corners of the classroom. For the second recording (Week 10) one video camera was set up in the back of the classroom.

During the final week of classes (i.e., Week 12), the survey was distributed by email to all students. A website link to the questionnaire, Google Form, in the body of the email was easily accessible by various technological devices. A follow-up email was sent after three days, asking for more students' participation.

During the reading period (Weeks 13 and 14), a semi-structured interview was conducted with seven volunteer students. These students were assured that the analysis would preserve their anonymity and confidentiality. Each interview, which took approximately fifteen minutes, was conducted in-person, audio-recorded via Voice Memos on the interviewer's iPhone and iPad, and later transcribed by the *Temi* audio transcription online service. As this service offers automated transcription, the researcher repeatedly listened to the primary audio files to confirm that the transcribed words were correct. All the interviews were conducted in English by an instructor of Japanese at the same institution where the study took place. None of the volunteer interviewees were enrolled in that instructor's class at the time of the interview. The Japanese instructor has used the flipped classroom approach for some of her courses over the past five years and had made presentations about her flipped teaching experience at several conferences. At the start of the final week of classes, she shared with all KOR108 students a Doodle link where they could schedule an interview. All the interviews were conducted in her office where no one else was present.

### **Institutional Review Board**

As this study was associated with a university course, the researcher adhered to the reviewing process required by the Institutional Review Board of the university. The researcher created informed consent forms to inform the students of their rights and to obtain permission to be included in the study. Every student consented to participate in the study on the first day of

class. In addition, all who took part in the interviews signed a separate informed consent form prior to their interview.

## **Data Analysis**

### **Survey**

The 14 closed-ended questions (Q1 to Q4, Q6 to Q11, and Q13 to Q16) used a five-point Likert scale (i.e., 1 = *disagree*, 2 = *somewhat disagree*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *somewhat agree*, 5 = *agree*), and they were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The researcher conducted a descriptive analysis using Excel as it works well enough for calculating basic descriptive statistics (Gall et al., 2015). Two tables showed: (a) the participants' demographic information (e.g., pseudonym, gender, academic year, and ethnicity) based on the researcher's knowledge of the students, and (b) the participants' perceptions of the flipped model in terms of mean and standard deviation.

The three open-ended questions (Q5, Q12, and Q17) were presented to elicit more extensive and deeper responses about the new instructional model. The participants' responses helped me gather more details, clarify their responses, and learn something that the closed-ended questions cannot capture. The small sample size and the lack of a control group may result in low validity of the findings, so it may be necessary to repeat the study over multiple years to get an accurate assessment and increase validity.

### **Semi-structured Interviews**

All seven interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. The overall process of data analysis began by identifying segments in the transcripts that addressed the research questions of the study. The interview data were then analyzed by following the qualitative data analysis steps suggested by Hay and Singh (2012): (a) collect data, (b) memo and summarize, (c) organize text,

(d) code, and (e) identify themes or patterns. As making memos is a crucial step in forming broader categories of information such as codes (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007), the researcher recorded initial thoughts by writing short memos in the margins of transcripts. While rereading transcripts and modifying initial memos as needed, the researcher labeled ideas and grouped them into codes, then grouped some codes into broader themes. This information was organized in a codebook, a statement of the codes for a database (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007).

Themes or categories were answers to the research questions, often called findings of this study. However, themes are abstractions derived from the data, not the data themselves (Merriam, 2009). Keeping the importance of constructing relevant themes in mind, therefore, the researcher carefully read through the transcripts and the codebook and checked if the constructed themes met several criteria: (a) responsive to the purpose of the study, (b) exhaustive, (c) mutually exclusive, (d) sensitive to the data, and (e) conceptually congruent (Merriam, 2009). Merriam (2009) pointed out that constructing conceptually congruent themes requires the researcher to have sufficient theoretical background.

The researcher conducted a pilot study on the efficacy of the flipped classroom approach in her Intensive Korean I class and collected data using a semi-structured interview protocol during the fall semester of 2018. Based on the findings from those semi-structured interviews and anecdotal comments from informal interviews with students who had experienced flipped Korean language learning, the researcher constructed two themes: active learning and peer-assisted, collaborative learning. These themes reflect the major principles that support the use of the flipped classroom (Foot & Howe, 1998; Strayer, 2012; Topping & Ehly, 1998).

Moreover, the researcher noticed that interviewees might not provide any criticism or negative impressions about the flipped classroom approach especially when the interviewer was

their own instructor/researcher. Merriam (2009) claims that interviewing, whether it is highly structured or open-ended, can be both harmful and beneficial to the interviewees. That is, respondents may feel that their privacy has been invaded and therefore may not reveal what they really feel or think. In the current study, respondents might also feel somewhat uncomfortable or anxious about having interviews with their teacher, so they might not reveal what they really think. If the interviewees' accounts cannot be trusted, findings do not capture what is really there, so the internal validity of the findings would be suspect (Merriam, 2009). Therefore, to ensure internal validity, a Japanese language instructor from the same institution conducted the interviews using the semi-structured interview protocol developed by the researcher.

### **Observation**

Throughout the semester, the researcher recorded observations about the class immediately after every lesson. These field notes provided a general sense of what was happening in the classroom regarding the students' behaviors and attitudes toward the new instructional approach. While analyzing class observations, including two video-recorded sessions, the researcher used a semi-structured observation protocol mentioned in the measures section. As Cohen et al. (2007) claimed, the protocol helped to provide descriptive data in a systematic fashion regarding the students' attitudes or specific behaviors during the study, the quality of student-student/teacher-student interactions, the type of content being studied, the activities being conducted, and the changes in the students' proficiency if any. To enhance the validity of the study, the researcher used member checks, in which students reviewed some statements during one-on-one drill sessions to ensure that the researcher's interpretations were "fair, reasonable, accurate, and complete" (McMillan, 2012, p. 303).

### **Chapter Four: Results**

The findings of this study are reported in two main sections: results for survey data and results for interview data. All data were collected from an intensive Korean language course taught by the researcher/instructor during the spring semester of 2019 and analyzed by the researcher. This chapter first describes the background of the participants and proceeds to the findings of the survey and interview data analysis. A brief note of observation is also presented to support the findings of the interview data analysis. The survey used for this study was a modified version of a questionnaire developed by Enfield (2013). It maintains the same format as Enfield's, including the use of both close-ended multiple-choice questions and open-ended questions. The survey had three sections with the first five questions (Q1 to Q5) on the use of instructional videos, followed by seven questions (Q6 to Q12) on in-class activities, and the last five questions (Q13 to Q17) focused on the general impact of the flipped classroom approach on students (see Appendix A).

The interviews, approximately fifteen minutes for each participant, were conducted in-person during the last two weeks of the Spring 2019 semester. All interviews were conducted by a Japanese language instructor at the same university and she used the semi-structured interview protocol developed by the researcher (see Appendix B). The analysis of interview data began by identifying segments (usually phrases, sentences, or short paragraphs) that addressed the research questions. While repeatedly examining transcripts and revising initial memos, the researcher labeled ideas and grouped them into codes, then grouped some codes into broader themes. Such information was organized in a codebook which includes a list of codes, specific definitions and examples for each code. Like codes, the codebook was developed through an iterative process

that necessitated modifying definitions as the researcher gained clearer insights about the interview data (DeCuir-Gunby, Marshall, & McCulloch, 2011).

In addition to the students' responses from the survey and interviews, a researcher/instructor's field notes and two video observations supplemented the survey and interview data, producing some insight into students' attitudes toward the flipped classroom approach. Using a semi-structured observation, the study focused on students' overall actions of engagement in a flipped classroom. That is, rather than focusing on small units of behavior such as short phrases of conversation, the researcher dealt in large units of behavior such as student-student and/or teacher-student interaction and active learning habits (Kim et al., 2014). Such semi-structured observation allowed the researcher to have an agenda of issues but gather data to highlight these issues in a far less predetermined manner (Patton, 2002).

### **Participants**

The participants of this study were 13 students enrolled in an Intensive Korean language course, KOR108, during the Spring 2019 semester at a private university in New Jersey. The students were all heritage language learners who were native speakers of English and had some proficiency in the Korean language. The students' ages ranged from as young as eighteen to twenty-three-years-old. The students' demographic information is presented in Table 4.1. Of the 13 students, 11 took the online survey and 7 volunteered for the 15-minute interview. A criterion-based purposive sampling (Collins et al., 2007; Gall et al., 2015; Miles & Huberman, 1994) was chosen because of the action research nature of this study. That is, this group of students was purposefully chosen as they were especially experienced with a phenomenon of interest; that is, they met the criteria relevant to the research questions of this study:

1. How do students describe their learning experience when a flipped classroom approach is used in a higher education Korean language classroom?
2. How does the flipped classroom affect student learning outcomes?

Table 4.1

*Demographics of All Students Enrolled in the Course*

Demographic	<i>Number (n = 13)</i>	
Age	18	6
	19	4
	20	1
	21	1
	23	1
Gender	Male	7
	Female	6
Academic Year	Freshman	7
	Sophomore	3
	Junior	1
	Senior	2
Ethnicity	Korean American	13

This purposive sample, therefore, is constructed to serve a very specific need for the most effective use of limited resources, but it cannot ensure the generalizability of findings (Patton, 2002). All students consented to participate in this study, and the seven interviewees completed a separate consent form.

### **Results of the Survey Data**

#### **Closed-ended Survey Questions**

The responses to the 14 closed-ended multiple-choice questions (Q1 to Q4, Q6 to Q11, and Q13 to Q16) were measured with a five-point Likert scale (i.e., 1 = *disagree*, 2 = *somewhat disagree*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *somewhat agree*, 5 = *agree*), and analyzed using descriptive statistics. A descriptive analysis using Excel was used because it works well enough for calculating basic

descriptive statistics (Gall et al., 2015). Data about the 14 closed-ended questions are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

*Students' Perceptions about the Flipped Classroom Approach: Closed-ended Questions (n=11)*

	Item (closed-ended question)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	The instructional videos help me learn new grammar and vocabulary.	4.91	0.29
2	The average duration of each video (approx. 8 min.) is appropriate for the given content.	4.64	0.64
3	The use of Blackboard quizzes helps me get more motivated to watch the videos.	4.09	1.00
4	In general, the content of the videos is appropriately challenging.	4.45	0.78
6	The flipped classroom helps me actively participate in in-class learning activities.	4.27	1.21
7	The flipped classroom helps me effectively collaborate with my classmates.	4.55	0.66
8	The flipped classroom facilitates more in-class communication between my teacher and me.	4.73	0.45
9	I received sufficient feedback during in-class activities.	4.55	1.16
10	In-class activity materials were sufficiently prepared.	4.82	0.57
11	In-class activities help me develop my problem-solving skills.	4.45	0.89
13	The flipped classroom helps me enrich my learning experience.	4.55	0.89
14	The flipped classroom helps me manage my learning.	4.64	0.88
15	The flipped classroom helps improve my language proficiency.	4.64	0.64
16	I prefer the flipped classroom over the traditional lectures (for this course).	4.18	1.19
		4.52	

As seen in the table, the participants showed overall satisfaction with this approach ( $M = 4.52$ ). While the participants showed satisfaction on most items. However, for Question 3 about the Blackboard quizzes, they expressed skepticism about whether the quizzes helped motivate

them to watch lecture videos ( $M = 4.09$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ). Indeed, the students' answers vary to a degree, with five students (46%) responding "agree," three students (27%) responding "somewhat agree," two students (18%) answering "neutral," and one student (9%) answering "somewhat disagree." In addition, despite the participants' overall satisfaction with the new instructional approach, their responses to Q16 revealed that the participants did not prefer the flipped model over the traditional lecture classroom ( $M = 4.18$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ). More specifically, on this question, seven students (64%) answered "agree," one student (9%) answered "somewhat agree," one student (9%) responded "neutral," and two students (18%) responded, "somewhat disagree." This is not very surprising given that most participants were first introduced to the flipped classroom model in the fall, so students familiar with traditional lecture-based classroom environments might initially resist the concept of flipped classrooms because of an underlying fear of shifting learning responsibility (Lage et al., 2000) or uncertainty about learning activities (Strayer, 2012).

Questions 1 to 4 asked about the lecture videos. All 11 respondents found the lecture videos helpful in learning grammar and vocabulary, with 10 students (91%) responding "agree" and one student (9%) answering "somewhat agree." Question 2 pertained to the length of the lecture videos, asking the appropriateness of the average duration of each video which was approximately eight minutes. Most students (91%) responded that the video lengths were appropriate, with eight students (73%) responding "agree" and two (18%) responding "somewhat agree." Only one student (9%) answered "neutral." This seems to contradict the interview data in which many participants reported that they thought the lecture videos were a little long. As described above, students' responses on Question 3 varied somewhat, indicating the Blackboard quizzes might not be appropriately motivating to watch the videos. Question 4 asked if the

content of the videos was appropriately challenging. Most students (82%) found the videos appropriately challenging, with seven students (64%) responding “agree,” two students (18%) responding “somewhat agree,” and another two (18%) answering “neutral.”

Questions 6 to 11 asked about the in-class component of the flipped course. Question 6 asked if this approach helped students to participate actively in in-class learning activities. In response to this question, eight students (73%) responded “agree,” one student (9%) responded “neutral,” and two students (18%) responded, “somewhat disagree.” When asked if the flipped approach helped them collaborate with their classmates, the majority (91%) agreed, with seven students (64%) responding “agree” and three students (27%) responding “somewhat agree.” Question 8 asked about in-class communication between the teacher and students. All the students responded that the flipped classroom facilitated more in-class communication between the teacher and students, with eight students (73%) answering “agree” and three students (27%) answering “somewhat agree.” On the question that asked if the in-class activity materials were sufficiently prepared, 10 students (91%) found them sufficient and one student (9%) responded “neutral.” Regarding problem-solving skills, most students (91%) found that in-class activities helped develop problem-solving skills, with seven students (64%) responding “agree” and three students (27%) responding “somewhat agree.” However, one student (9%) responded, “somewhat disagree.”

Questions 13 to 16 pertained to the students’ general perception towards the flipped classroom approach. In response to Question 13, the majority (91%) answered that this approach helped them enrich their learning experience. One student (9%) answered, “somewhat disagree.” When asked if the flipped approach helped manage their own learning, most students (91%) agreed. While nine students (82%) answered “agree” and one student (9%) answered “somewhat

agree,” only one student (9%) responded, “somewhat disagree.” On the question about the helpfulness of this approach in improving their language proficiency, the majority (91%) found this approach helpful, with eight students (73%) answering “agree” and two students (18%) answering “somewhat agree.” One student answered “neutral.”

### **Open-ended Survey Questions**

The participants’ responses to the open-ended questions (Q5, Q12, and Q17) helped gather more details and clarified their responses (see Table 4.3). Of the 11 respondents who took the survey, 10 responded to the 3 open-ended questions about the lecture videos, in-class activities, and their experience in the flipped course. The qualitative findings of the survey indicate the students’ overall satisfaction with the lecture videos and in-class activities. On the question about the lecture videos, 6 out of 10 students provided positive comments. One of the positive comments was, “The lecture videos were very comprehensive and helpful for learning about grammar and culture beyond what the textbook can provide.” Another positive comment was, “I think that the instructional videos are really helpful in terms of learning and absorbing new material.” Three students commented on the ability to review and learn from the videos multiple times. They stated, “Having the videos on google drive was really nice,” “I like it that it is on a separate Google Drive,” and “The videos prove very helpful, especially when studying for exams.” These comments signify the very essence of the use of lecture videos in a flipped classroom setting in which students can view the videos at their own pace, as many times as preferred, anytime and anywhere (Enfield, 2013; Mason et al., 2013).

Two students made somewhat neutral comments: “The videos were all right” and “No problem.” Another two provided negative feedback, but they did not express any drawbacks of the lecture videos themselves. Rather, they commented on the lack of immediate teacher

Table 4.3

*Students' Perceptions about the Flipped Classroom Approach: Open-ended Questions (n=10)*

Item (open-ended question)
Comments related to the instructional videos (Question 5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Videos worked well.</li> <li>• Having the videos on google drive was really nice.</li> <li>• They were all right.</li> <li>• Sometimes the nature of learning the material outside of class meant that when I had questions about the concepts, I would later forget to ask the questions in class.</li> <li>• All good. Very comprehensive and helpful for learning about grammar and culture beyond what the textbook can provide.</li> <li>• I think that the instructional videos are really helpful in terms of learning and absorbing new material. The length is not too long as well.</li> <li>• No problem.</li> <li>• The videos prove very helpful, especially when studying for exams.</li> <li>• Sometimes the nature of learning the material for the first time resulted in me neglecting to follow up and ask questions I had, since I would either forget to ask in class or forget to write the question down. I think overall, however, because the individual sessions are offered, for me personally, I never felt that I couldn't get clarification.</li> <li>• I like that it is on a separate google drive.</li> </ul>
Comments related to the in-class component of this course (Question 12)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good quality</li> <li>• I think that we spent too much time going over the slides again in-class, given that we had already seen them through the videos.</li> <li>• Class was typically quiet when discussing actual class material (vocab/grammar/etc.) because either people knew exactly what was going on and were bored or people had no clue what was going on and didn't want to talk.</li> <li>• I felt that in-class activities really solidified my understanding of the grammar. I wish there were more free-form conversation practice, as I am not a native speaker, but understand that may not be appropriate given this is heritage track and also the time constraints of the lecture time.</li> <li>• Excellent. The course was engaging, thorough, and truly enjoyable.</li> <li>• I think that in-class activities and discussions help me the most to learn the information, and it also helps me think more about the material.</li> <li>• More essay writing.</li> <li>• The course was well-taught and very well organized. The in-class activities were fun and really pulled me out of my comfort zone, which is good.</li> </ul>

- If less time was spent in class doing the worksheets (and instead we brought them completed to the class and received feedback in class) I think more interactive practice could be achieved; however, it does not seem feasible due to the extra amount of homework this would mean.
- Flipped classroom allows for more interactions with classmates and teacher.

---

Reflections about your experience in the course (e.g., strengths or weaknesses of the flipped classroom) (Question 17)

---

- It was very useful to have those videos as another resource to study from.
  - I liked doing the worksheets in class to get immediate feedback.
  - Strengths: People know the material before coming in. The lecture doesn't need to cover everything so time can be spent on more personalized learning. If people know material coming in, they're not as bored. Don't need to show up 5 times a week.
  - Weaknesses: Lectures act like a precept more than a lecture. People who know material just get a review while people who don't know are reviewing something they didn't know.
  - Personally, I have enjoyed the flipped structure; although I do not think it works well for math and science classes (which was the case in my high school), I liked how it allowed us to learn the principles in a condensed manner outside of class, then actually get feedback and put them into use during what would otherwise be lecture time.
  - I felt sufficiently prepared for each class having watched the appropriate lesson videos and was sometimes able to get ahead on lectures due to their availability online. Because I understood grammar before coming to class, I was better able to focus on my writing and speaking during class for more interpersonal interactions.
  - I think that traditional lectures are better because I can ask the teacher directly if I don't understand something in class, and I can get direct help.
  - I thought it worked extremely well for a language class.
  - Overall, I enjoyed the flipped classroom much more than a traditional lecture course. It's very engaging and fun and I appreciate it.
  - Although I do not prefer flipped classrooms for STEM courses (or most course in general) which was often the case for my high school, I was pleasantly surprised that I liked the flipped class style for language courses. I think it made what would otherwise be "lecture time" a more interactive and helpful use of time.
  - We get to allocate the time we need to prepare before each class with videos. However, it really does depend on our motivation to actually do so. But overall, I thought flipped classroom is an effective method for language learning.
-

feedback while watching the videos. One student wrote, “Sometimes, the nature of learning the material outside of class meant that when I had questions about the concepts, I would later forget to ask the questions in class.” Similarly, another said, “Sometimes the nature of learning the material for the first time resulted in me neglecting to follow up and ask questions I had, since I would either forget to ask in class or forget to write the question down.”

On the question about the in-class component of the flipped classroom, 6 of the 10 students provided positive comments. Three students specifically stated that the in-class activities helped them learn new information effectively. One said, “I think that in-class activities and discussions help me the most to learn the information, and it also helps me think more about the material.” Another wrote, “I felt that in-class activities really solidified my understanding of the grammar.” A third student stated that “the in-class activities were fun and really pulled me out of my comfort zone, which is good.” Another positive comment was about the increased interactions with classmates and the teacher.

However, two students provided negative comments, stating, “I think that we spent too much time going over the slides again in class, given that we had already seen them through the videos” and “Class was typically quiet when discussing actual class material (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, and etc.) because either people knew exactly what was going on and were bored or people had no clue what was going on and didn’t want to talk.” As described in Chapter Three, the first ten minutes of each class was spent on reviewing key grammar rules and/or expressions. Upon request, however, the teacher spent extra time (approximately five minutes) answering the students’ specific questions. Regarding the in-class activities, two students were clearly in favor of more interactive (speaking) activities and thus wished more free forms of (speaking) practice. One student stated that “if less time was spent in class doing the worksheets and instead we

brought them completed to the class and received feedback in class, I think more interactive practice could be achieved. However, it does not seem feasible due to the extra amount of homework this would mean.” One student wrote that he/she wanted “more essay writing.”

Question 17 asked about the students’ overall experience in the flipped course. Of the 10 students, most provided positive comments, such as having videos as another resource to study from, receiving immediate feedback while doing in-class activities, and being prepared before coming to class. Notably, four students stated that the flipped classroom approach was effective for language learning. Of those four comments, two students described in detail how the flipped approach was more effective in this class than when it was used in STEM courses in high school:

Personally, I have enjoyed the flipped structure; although I do not think it works well for math and science classes, which was the case in my high school, I liked how it allowed us to learn the principles in a condensed manner outside of class, then actually get feedback and put them into use during what would otherwise be lecture time.

Although I do not prefer flipped classrooms for STEM courses (or most course in general), which was often the case for my high school, I was pleasantly surprised that I liked the flipped class style for language courses. I think it made what would otherwise be “lecture time” a more interactive and helpful use of time.

However, one student wrote that “I think that traditional lectures are better because I can ask the teacher directly if I don’t understand something in class, and I can get direct help.”

## **Summary**

Most students responded rather positively toward the flipped classroom approach. Their responses reflected favorable attitudes toward the lecture videos and in-class activities. Most students took Blackboard quizzes prior to coming to class, but their responses showed mild

skepticism about whether those online quizzes helped motivate them to watch the videos. Four students reported that the flipped classroom approach was effective for language learning, and two of them specifically stated that this approach was more effective for language classes than STEM courses. However, one student felt that the traditional classroom was better in that students could directly ask the teacher questions and receive immediate feedback while listening to lectures.

### Results from the Interviews

The researcher explained the interview objectives and process to all students, and of 13 potential participants, 7 students volunteered for the interview (see Table 4.4). This group of participants was a voluntary, purposeful sample because they met the criteria for the research questions of this study. A purposeful sample is widely used in qualitative research to select information-rich cases related to the phenomenon of interest (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Table 4.4

#### *Characteristics of Participants*

Name (pseudonym)	Gender	Age	Ethnicity	School year	Major	Prior experience with Flipped Classroom
Ben	M	19	Korean- American	Freshman	Pre-med	No
Anna	F	18	Korean- American	Freshman	Psychology	No
Grace	F	18	Korean- American	Freshman	Psychology	No
Sarah	F	19	Korean- American	Sophomore	Public policy	Yes (in high school)
John	M	18	Korean- American	Freshman	Pre-med	No
Jane	F	19	Korean- American	Sophomore	Economics	No
Helen	F	19	Korean- American	Freshman	Pre-med	Yes (in high school)

As shown in Table 4.5, two major themes emerged while analyzing the data: active learning and collaborative, peer-assisted learning. These themes are the major principles that support the use of the flipped classroom (Bergmann & Sams, 2012; Foot & Howe, 1998; Strayer, 2012; Topping & Ehly, 1998).

Table 4.5

*Codebook*

Theme	Subtheme/Code	Definition	Examples
Active learning	Engagement	More interested and actively participate in in-class activities	<p>“As I had watched videos, I was very much more engaged [in class].”</p> <p>“I would say in-class activities were very engaging.”</p> <p>“In-class activities were pretty fun and engaging.”</p> <p>“I think doing the problems in class helps you stay engaged.”</p> <p>“I feel like it was more engaging because we were doing exercises and constantly applying what we learned.”</p>
	Autonomy	Study at one’s own pace	<p>“You can watch the videos anytime you want...when I don’t have time, sometimes I skim over the videos and I only focus on the things I need to work on the most.”</p> <p>“You can fast forward videos.”</p> <p>“You can pause [videos] and go like the pace that you want.”</p> <p>“It’s nice because you can fast forward parts that you already know and then slow down at parts if you struggle with.”</p> <p>“I think it’s just like everyone works at their own pace.”</p>
	Preparation	Study lessons ahead of time and have more practice in class	<p>“I’d come to class and being a lot more knowledgeable about what I was going to learn and it felt a lot more productive, that I was really learning and grasping what the teacher was telling me.”</p> <p>“I guess [the strength is] being exposed to more on concepts and words outside of class and then you come into class and talk about them.”</p> <p>“I thought it was really helpful because it lets you speak and practice a lot more in class instead of just listening to lecture.”</p>

Theme	Subtheme/Code	Definition	Examples
Active learning			<p>“Outside of class we could look at the lectures and study words or grammar, and in class, we would do activities where we do the homework...It was more effective because we practice during class.”</p> <p>“You’re doing the problems during class and you can directly apply what you learn.”</p>
	Teacher’s role: facilitator not a lecturer	The teacher supports and provides scaffolding when necessary	<p>“The teacher is always very attentive to students...She’s always coming by to make sure that we’re on track. So, it’s very constructive.”</p> <p>“I like when she goes around and checks our work while we’re doing activities.”</p> <p>“[Getting live feedback in class] is really helpful because if you get feedback after class, you’re more likely to ignore it...but if you’re in class and the teacher’s giving feedback to you, it’s really helpful.”</p> <p>“When she goes around and has us answer at least one question, that was very helpful, like a mini speaking practice.”</p> <p>“She would look over what we had done and mark things and ask us to find what we did wrong...without her telling us.”</p>
Collaborative learning	Collaboration with peers	Collaborate with peers or help/support each other	<p>“[while doing activities in class], I was able to know my classmates better.”</p> <p>“It’s more like collaborative...it’s really helpful to get to know your partners better.”</p> <p>“If you are stuck [while doing activities in class], you have a partner to help you.”</p> <p>“We have dialogues with other classmates and read out loud with each other...That was really helpful.”</p> <p>“We work with someone else to answer problems.”</p>
Learning outcomes	Improved comprehension/ test scores		<p>“Even if it does take time, the actual learning process is a lot faster.”</p> <p>“I think that FC helped me get better at Korean faster because we have more time to practice...Outside of the classroom, I don’t think we’d be able to practice as accurately or productively.”</p> <p>“I improved in terms of test scores.”</p> <p>“I feel like FC definitely helped a lot.”</p> <p>“I think FC has helped actually, with getting feedback in class and knowing what I need to work on.”</p>

### **Strengths of the Flipped Classroom Approach**

When asked, “Based on your experience with this course, what would you say are the strengths of the flipped instructional model?” the students reported benefits such as being prepared for class, having more hands-on activities during class, studying at one’s own pace, and having more contact time with classmates and the teacher. First, all the interviewees stated that the flipped classroom allowed them to review materials before class at their own pace and to engage with materials they had already studied. Grace stated, “I thought it was really helpful because it lets you speak and practice a lot more in class instead of just listening to lecture... I think that it has helped me get better at Korean faster just because we have more time to practice. Outside of the classroom, I don’t think we’d be able to practice as accurately or productively.” John said, “It’s like you’re doing the problems during class and so you can directly apply what you learn. I’ll learn during class instead of having to do it myself later.”

Students reported positively on having more in-class activity/practice time. Sarah and Helen specifically stated that the flipped classroom approach was effective for language learning as students can practice the target language more in class. Notably, Sarah and Helen were the only two students who had a flipped classroom experience in high school. Sarah reported:

I like 108 [intensive Korean] class, but I didn’t like them [flipped math classes] in high school. I definitely thought it was more effective for languages because outside of class we could look at the lecture [videos] and study words or grammar, and in class, we would do activities, do the homework and we would talk to our classmates in practice. It was more effective because we got to practice during class.

She also said, “I think the flipped approach is better for languages than mathematics because there is not so much individual work to prepare for.” Similarly, Helen stated:

The first time I had a flipped classroom was in high school. It started with math.

Personally, in the past, it hasn't worked very well with my learning style although I would make the caveat that that's just for STEM classes. I had never taken a world language or English or humanities-oriented class that was flipped, but I actually felt like, I think I prefer the flipped class for at least world languages. I think that's partially because the videos were short, so I could focus better and also because in some cases the grammar was usually simpler than trying to keep track of many equations and stuff [in a flipped math class]. And then I appreciated having more time to practice the actual language part rather than just going home and doing the worksheets.

Helen further compared the flipped Korean class with her traditional Spanish classes:

It's probably true for anyone learning for language. It's really the practice that gives you the fluency, and in previous classes where a lot of time would be spent learning a concept that is pretty simple. I felt like I learned Spanish in a normal lecture-style class for five or six years and I achieved very little fluency even though my academic knowledge was quite broad and deep. So, in the Spanish class, you learned grammar points in class and practice this little bit. It was like we would look at the vocabulary or keep the vocabulary. It just was not very useful. I finished the Spanish curriculum at my high school and then started taking sophomore, junior-level classes at the university in my town. Even at that point, my fluency was really nowhere near what I can say and speak Korean right now. I also think because we get a lot of direct live feedback in class that points out mistakes. I think it helps us learn a lot faster.

Another strength reported by several students is that the flipped classroom approach allowed them to become more autonomous and independent in their own learning. Jane said that

“having the videos is really helpful because you can skip through parts that you already know and then slow down at parts where you struggle with. So, it’s nice because you can moderate it to your speed.” Anna also reported that “[before coming to class] we can watch the video anytime we want and take the [Blackboard] quiz anytime we want to. When I don’t have time, I sometimes skim over the videos and I only focus on the things that I think I need to work on the most.” Similarly, Grace and John found having lecture videos very helpful as they could pause and fast forward the videos and so they could learn the materials at their own pace. These comments support the claim that the flipped classroom approach promotes the democratization of the learning as students have the autonomy to view the lecture videos any time and study any time before coming to class (Baker, 2000; Pinnelli & Fiorucci, 2015).

In addition, most students stated that the flipped classroom allowed them to have more interaction with the teacher and receive individualized feedback from the teacher. Emphasizing the importance of immediate feedback in class, Jane stated:

I think [the teacher’s feedback] is really helpful because I think if you get feedback after class, you’re more likely to ignore it. If you just get worksheets she commented, it’s hard to take the time to look in the comments, but if you’re in class and she’s giving them to you, it’s really helpful. You look at them.

Similarly, Helen reported that in class students received a lot of feedback, which points out their mistakes. She stated, “[Teacher’s feedback] was all very helpful and when she goes around and has us answer at least one question, that was also helpful for a mini speaking practice.” Grace’s comment indicates that through feedback the teacher often provided guidance for self-correction; she reported

in class the teacher would go around and answer any questions we had or she would look over what we had done and mark things and ask us to find what we did wrong. So, I think it was like engaging enough as we had to figure out what we had done wrong without her telling us.

However, while the students showed overall satisfaction with in-class teacher feedback, most of the students (i.e., six of the seven interviewees) specifically pointed out that they received most of the teacher's feedback during one-on-one drill sessions. As described in Chapter Three, this intensive course requires two 80-minute class periods and a 20-minute one-on-one drill session each week. The teacher held individual drill sessions before implementing the flipped classroom approach. However, in the flipped classroom she focused more on each student's weaknesses and needs rather than providing speaking practice to every student. Ben reported that the teacher's in-class feedback was sometimes not sufficient, but he received sufficient, individualized feedback during one-on-one drill sessions. Ben stated:

I would say that [teacher's feedback] was definitely sufficient. Maybe the in-class one wasn't so sufficient but we were required to go to the individual session, and that's where the bulk of my feedback comes from. She looks individually at everyone. For me, my weakness is definitely speaking and so she focused [on speaking]. I can tell she focuses on that a lot during our individual sessions.

Similarly, Anna stated:

I know that there are different levels of speaking ability, writing ability, especially in 108 [intensive Korean], and I think the teacher is really good at catering to everyone's needs based on their level of ability to speak, write and read [during drill sessions].

John also pointed out the importance of drill sessions stating,

I think feedback is really important. If there wasn't any feedback, it would be kind of pointless. I always study for the [in-class] quiz and then go to the drill session and I realized I really didn't know as much as I [had thought], so drill was where I think I learned a lot too.

Lastly, multiple students provided positive comments on in-class activities, finding such hands-on activities engaging, collaborative, and productive. John and Helen reported that they found in-class activities more engaging because they had to apply what they learned constantly. Of the seven students, four were clearly in favor of working in pairs or groups of classmates. Jane said that "going back to the worksheets, I think if you are stuck, you have a partner to help you with any kind of talk about [your problems]. I can work with someone in class, which has been helpful." Grace also reported, "In class, we would have a lot of different worksheets and we would have dialogues with other classmates and then we would read out loud [sic] to each other. So that was really helpful." Ben pointed out that the most useful activity was to construct conversations with a partner; he said,

I think the most useful activity was to construct our own type of conversations [with a partner or in a small group] because being in a kind of real-life, you have to come up with something on your mind. When you're actually coming up with conversations, being able to talk with someone, it's a lot more real.

Anna stated that "I was answering [questions in the worksheets] and it's like collaborative. It's really helpful to get to know your partners better."

### **Weaknesses of the Flipped Classroom Approach**

The main weaknesses reported by the students were that it takes more time to prepare for class and not all students are self-motivated or independent in their learning. Several students

stated that they had to spend more time preparing for the flipped class compared to other traditional classes. John observed that the biggest weakness was that he had to find the time to actually watch the videos before class. He stated,

I think the length [of videos] was fine. I don't think the teacher could've shortened it anymore without skipping. First semester I watched all the videos as I didn't have writing stuff. I had a lot of time, so I watched them as soon as the teacher uploaded. Then this semester I was a lot busier and so I didn't really watch the videos... I learned it in class as I went and then what I'd do is to go back in order to study [in-class] quizzes.

Similarly, Ben said:

[The] only weakness is the time. That's the biggest thing...It's hard to find time to actually watch the videos. I think the teacher keeps each video as concise as she can but being able to watch all three videos is a little bit difficult especially when you're so busy with other things.

Some students specifically pointed out that the length of the video was sometimes a little long.

Anna stated, "Sometimes it can be really long because [each lesson has] three videos...sometimes, I won't be able to get to one of them or I have to stay late to watch [all of] them." Grace reported that "I watched the videos at twice the speed because each video was like between eight to ten minutes. That was a sizable amount of time." For Jane, the videos seemed a little long, but she thought it might be the right amount of time for other students.

Helen also acknowledged that it took more time for her to prepare for the flipped class, yet her explanation was different from others.

I think the videos were actually quite good in length and concise enough that I didn't get sidetracked easily... [It's] just my learning style. I can't really ask anyone questions

while watching the video, so it requires a lot of maintenance and upkeep for me to constantly make sure I ask questions and follow up... I guess the one thing that I still feel a negative point is that if I have questions while I'm watching the lecture [videos] and I don't remember to write it down and take it to class, I'll often forget.

Helen printed out all the lecture slides and brought them to every class. The teacher often observed notes on her printouts, and Helen asked questions about some of those notes.

Another weakness reported by several students was that not all students were independent in their own learning. Grace observed,

I think that some students don't watch the videos, so they come to class less prepared than other students. I think just the fact that the flipped classroom relies on the accountability of the students, it can be sometimes difficult because sometimes students don't have time to watch the videos, so they might feel a little lost during class.

Sarah said,

I think it was more like the usual flaws with the flipped classroom because it depends on how much effort you put in outside the class like you look in the lectures...and I guess it depends on your motivation and your time management and sometimes it might not work out so well before lectures. So, you might not come prepared.

Jane stated that some students did not watch the videos, but it might not be effective if the teacher reviewed the slides again in class, since this would take practice time away from those who had watched it.

### **Impact on Learning Outcomes**

The findings of this study have shown that most students felt the flipped classroom approach positively influenced their overall achievement by maximizing the quality time spent in

the classroom. When asked, “How does the flipped classroom approach impact your learning outcomes?” multiple students provided positive comments. For example, Ben responded that “even if it does take time [to prepare], the actual learning process is a lot faster.” Grace stated,

I think it helped. I think if we just had a lecture [in class] I would have a harder time in terms of understanding exceptions and irregulars, so I think it has definitely helped me and I think that’s the key reason why I’m doing well in the class. It has been helpful that I get that practice [in class].

John pointed out that the flipped classroom was especially helpful in learning grammar.

The results of pre-tests and post-tests indicated that all the students’ post-test scores improved dramatically (see Table 4.6). (One student did not take the post-test.) Because of the

Table 4.6

*Pre- and Posttest Scores (n=13)*

Name (pseudonym)	Pre-test score (36)	Post-test score (36)
Anna	10.0	28.0
Ben	2.5	23.0
George	1.0	14.0
Gloria	17.5	32.5
Grace	11.5	27.5
Helen	9.0	29.5
James	8.5	31.0
Jane	13.5	31.5
Joel	11.5	28.0
Mark	8.5	26.5
Samuel	17.5	32.5
Sarah	18.5	30.5
William	11.0	N/A

lack of data from a control group (i.e., traditional classroom), it cannot be said that the flipped classroom approach resulted in greater learning achievements. Some students stated that they were not certain about how the test scores would have been different if they had learned the same materials in a traditional environment. The test results, however, suggest that this new instructional approach should not harm student learning outcomes in terms of test scores.

Furthermore, when asked if the flipped classroom approach helped improve their communicative performance, most students showed skepticism. Four students stated that the flipped classroom did not improve their communicative performance. Whereas most students acknowledged that the flipped classroom helped them learn grammar, they reported that they were not sure how the test scores would have been different without the flipped classroom. John stated, “I feel like the flipped classroom definitely helped a lot, but I also feel even without the flipped classroom I probably would have just studied everything, so I don’t really know how I would’ve done without it.” Similarly, Sarah said that “I think it helped...but I’m not sure about exactly how the test scores would be different.” Helen stated that the test scores would be essentially the same.

### **Summary**

Students reported that the flipped classroom was beneficial in that the lecture videos helped them to prepare for (and review) class better, and they allowed the students to work at their own pace. Students also acknowledged that the flipped classroom helped them to stay engaged with in-class activities and provided more time for working with their classmates. In addition, it was noted that the teacher was able to provide immediate feedback on worksheets and student questions in the classroom and during the individual drill sessions.

The negative comments included the observation that the flipped classroom approach required more preparation time and that there was no immediate teacher feedback while watching the lecture videos. Some observed that not all students are self-motivated and responsible for their own learning, so those students are more likely to struggle in a flipped classroom as that approach requires students to study materials on their own before coming to class. Some students suggested that the teacher should use a different platform to track student video watching or assign a grade to ensure that everyone watches all the videos before coming to class.

These findings were supported by the researcher/instructor's field notes and two video observations. It was clear through the observations that teacher-student and classroom interaction occurred frequently in the flipped classroom. Also, students engaged actively by asking questions, making self-evaluations, and collaborating with peers. When working on the final project of creating a newsletter in particular, students continually developed high-order thinking skills such as analyzing, creating, and evaluating with peer support and teacher's guidance.

## **Chapter Five: Discussion and Conclusion**

The motivation for implementing the flipped classroom approach in Korean language courses arose from the researcher's desire to improve her own classroom instruction to promote students' language proficiency and to provide a reference for instructional practices to other language teachers interested in the flipped classroom approach. To assess the effectiveness and feasibility of the flipped model in world language education, this study examined the Korean language learners' perceptions of the flipped classroom approach and to what extent this approach had an impact on the students' learning outcomes. As presented in Chapter Three, a mixed methods design was used to address the research questions of this study. The quantitative data were collected from fourteen closed-ended questions on a questionnaire modified from Enfield's (2013). Students' pre-test and post-test scores were also presented to show the potential influences of the flipped approach on student learning achievement. The qualitative data were collected through three open-ended questions from the questionnaire, a semi-structured interview, and class observation. In this chapter, the researcher discusses major findings of the study and draws conclusions. This chapter also provides recommendations for world languages instructors interested in employing the flipped classroom approach and suggestions for future research on this instructional approach.

### **Students' Perceptions of their Learning Experiences and Implications of the Results**

This study has found that the majority of the students who participated in the survey and/or interview responded positively toward the flipped classroom approach. Most students thought that the lecture videos were helpful in learning new grammar and that they would use them in the future. In addition, students' responses to the questionnaire indicate that they felt that the length of the videos, approximately eight minutes per video, was appropriate; however, the

findings from interviews showed somewhat mixed results. The study has also revealed that the majority of the students were satisfied with the in-class activities, as they thought the activities were helpful in solidifying their knowledge and understanding of grammar concepts covered in the video. In particular, most students found that collaborative learning tasks such as creating a dialogue with a partner allowed them to better understand the content and helped maintain their focus. The students also viewed the increased teacher-student interactions as valuable because such interactions helped the teacher learn each student's weaknesses, interests, and learning preferences so that the teacher could customize her help to meet each student's specific learning needs.

### **On the Lecture Videos**

The findings of this study have shown that the content of the lecture videos was appropriately challenging, with no students expressing dissatisfaction with the content of the videos. In particular, most students thought that the videos helped them understand grammar concepts because they were able to rewatch the videos and learn the material at their own pace. This supports the very essence of the flipped classroom approach in world language education, which aims to facilitate individual learning of grammar concepts so that the face-to-face sessions are more effectively used for active learning (Granados-Bezi, 2015). According to Granados-Bezi, the flipped classroom allows educators to effectively use technology to facilitate grammar acquisition. She claims that in a flipped model, "grammar instruction stops being an ineffective class activity and can be 'outsourced' from the classroom. Each learner is given the opportunity to determine the amount of grammar exposure he or she needs to have to learn a given structure" (Granados-Bezi, 2015, p.67).

Despite students' overall satisfaction with the content of the video, the findings of the study also suggest that the videos could be made more interesting and engaging to the students. As discussed in Chapter Three, several features were incorporated into the lecture videos (i.e., recorded screencasts), including segmented video clips, various animation effects, visual flows, and appealing images associated with the target content (Faulkner & Green, 2015; Grimsley, 2015; Guo et al., 2014). Indeed, the majority of the students thought that the use of segmented lecture videos was effective in helping them stay focused in lectures and move at their own pace, as they did not need to play the entire video to find their location if an interruption occurred.

Many students also positively commented on the fast-forwarding and rewinding functions of the video, as they allowed the students to skim through content that they already knew while spending more time focusing on complicated, difficult content. The students' comments reflect the essence of the flipped classroom approach, which offers flexibility in and individualization of the learning process (Moffett, 2015; Strayer, 2012). Notably, as mentioned in Chapter Three, the intensive Korean I and II courses are designed for heritage language learners who are native speakers of English and have "some" proficiency in the Korean language. Although participants were placed in this course based on their test scores on the placement exam, their proficiency levels – especially in speaking and writing – were not necessarily the same. Indeed, I have learned from my teaching experience that heritage language learners enrolled in lower-level language courses usually demonstrate a wide variation in vocabulary and knowledge of grammar, consistent with my observation of the participants of the current study. Therefore, because the flipped classroom approach allows students to view video lectures as desired and control their own learning, this approach could provide an enhanced learning experience for the

students enrolled in this course. Furthermore, this approach could also help students in other courses in which the students start with different amounts of knowledge on the topic.

Nevertheless, some students expressed that the videos should be made more interactive. One student commented on the boring nature of the video lectures, stating that the videos were “pretty dry because they were listing vocabulary with some example sentences or cultural references and then providing another piece of grammar.” Another student pointed out the lack of opportunity to ask questions while watching the lecture videos, stating that “if I have questions while I’m watching the lecture and I don’t remember to write it down and take it to class, I’ll often forget.” Mazur, Brown, and Jacobsen (2015) reported in their research that some students prefer to attend traditional lectures instead of watching online lectures, as they miss the opportunity to ask questions when the information is initially presented.

Although the lecture videos used for this study incorporated a variety of animation effects, visuals (e.g., pictures relevant to a given topic and short YouTube video clips), and an upbeat tone of voice suggested by Grimsley (2015), the videos did not include interactive activities such as orally responding to prompts in the video and answering questions embedded in the video. Therefore, to enhance student interest in the video and create interactivity, lecture videos could directly incorporate various types of questions (e.g., a prompt for a short oral response or an appropriately challenging question to promote higher-order thinking) (Hill & Nelson, 2011). Hill and Nelson claim that these questions will also help formatively assess student performance.

### **On the Face-to-Face Class Sessions**

The findings emerging from this study indicate that the students greatly valued opportunities for active engagement in face-to-face class sessions as a means to improve their

understanding of the learning materials and maintain their interest during the sessions. That is, through their active participation, students were better able to remain focused and attentive throughout the face-to-face class sessions, which helped increase students' understanding of the unit content. These findings are consistent with previous studies that found that the flipped classroom approach increases student engagement (Baker, 2000; Bergmann & Sams, 2012; Brown, 2012; Hamdan et al., 2013). In addition, the students observed that the relatively short time frame of each activity allowed them to complete various learning activities – both individual and cooperative – and helped them concentrate on the given task and make the best of the opportunities for building their understanding of the grammar concepts. This may be explained by Schulz's (2006) claim that language learners need more structured practices when they are at the early stages of learning the language.

The majority of the students valued the enhanced interactions with both peers and the teacher. Most students confirmed the helpfulness of having opportunities to apply the grammar concepts learned from the video to new situations, especially through cooperative pair and/or class-wide activities. That is, students with varying abilities could benefit from having peers available during in-class activities to clarify concepts and help find answers. These findings support claims of a relationship between interaction and second language (L2) development, as well as the importance of active participation in the interaction (Egi, 2010; Ellis, 2012; Gass & Mackey, 2007; Mackey, 1999; McDonough, 2005; Swain, 2000). According to these studies, cooperative activities (i.e., input and output exchanges) promote student interactions, thereby providing language learners with more opportunities to notice differences between their own formulations of the target language and those of their conversational partners. This further

pushes language learners to modify their output during conversation and therefore helps foster world language proficiency.

Furthermore, students' responses to interview questions revealed that they found interactions with the teacher very helpful in increasing conceptual understanding and skills, which in turn enhanced their confidence in speaking and writing in the Korean language. In particular, students liked having the teacher immediately available while they attempted to apply their newly-learned knowledge and skills. According to Willis (2017), who used the flipped classroom approach in her English and Literacy course, the increased number and quality of student-teacher interactions during workshops clarify and deepen understanding of the course concepts. Willis (2017) stated that one possible reason for her students' consistently high scores was that flipping the course made it easier for her to provide immediate and targeted feedback to particular students.

In line with Willis's study (2017), this study has shown that the majority of the students provided positive comments on the "individualized" aspect of teacher-student interactions. One student stated that "the teacher looks individually at everyone. For me, my weakness is definitely speaking and so she focused on that whereas with others she'll probably focus on what they struggle with." Another student commented that the individualized practice with the teacher helped improve her academic achievement. These responses support the claims by many researchers that the flipped classroom approach adequately serves a diverse group of learners with various needs by customizing the teacher's instruction to each student (Bergmann & Sams, 2012; Faulkner & Green, 2015; Willis, 2017). In the flipped classroom, students are able to receive an individualized lesson rather than having a "one size fits all lesson like in a traditional lecture" (Faulkner & Green, 2015, p.212).

With regard to the nature and design of the in-class activities, most students provided positive comments, though some suggested that the activities should include more opportunities for active and efficient language production. In this study, worksheets given to students during face-to-face class sessions focused primarily on application type exercises and questions requiring conceptual understanding. In-class activities often included repetitive grammatical practices such as error correction and verb/adjective conjugation in different tenses, which aimed to test student understanding of key grammar concepts and their use (i.e., lower levels of cognitive processes). Although the face-to-face class sessions involved a great deal of simple, short speaking practices between peers or with the whole class, they did not provide sufficient opportunities to hone their skills in using the target language for practical purposes, such as constructing one's own conversations with a partner and collaborative problem solving.

One possible reason that this class did not sufficiently incorporate activities that promote higher levels of cognitive processes (e.g., evaluating and creating in the revised Bloom's Taxonomy) may be related to my preoccupation with covering the large amount of material presented in the textbook (Granados-Bezi, 2015). As noted by Granados-Bezi, a typical college world language class involves a large amount of grammatical practice provided by most first- and second-year textbooks. These activities usually require students to memorize vocabulary and conjugate verbs in various contexts, but do not include sufficient opportunities for active language production, which is essential for successful second/world language development. Indeed, I, the instructor in this study, might still place more emphasis on accuracy than on fluency, as the Korean Language program recommends that instructors design "standard" tests to measure vocabulary knowledge and grammar accuracy for first- and second-year language learners.

**On the One-on-One Drill Sessions**

All language programs in the East Asian Studies Department of the university at which this study was conducted require language instructors to provide one-on-one drill sessions to first- and second-year language learners. For the intensive course under study, I held a weekly 20-minute individual session for every student throughout the spring semester of 2019. Before adopting the flipped classroom approach, I had utilized this time for speaking practice only, whereas in the flipped classroom, I used this time to enhance individualized learning. That is, during the drill sessions, I tailored my teaching practices and/or responses to meet individual students' specific needs (e.g., grammar drills, speaking practice, writing workshop). The findings of the study have indeed indicated that most students thought that they derived benefit from having their teacher immediately available during the individual drill sessions to clarify concepts and answer their questions. They also believed that the individualized practices during the drill sessions helped improve their speaking skills, as the session was oriented to create scenarios in which the target language was used for practical purposes. Thus, offering one-on-one drills sessions could maximize the effectiveness of the flipped classroom approach, in line with reports that the flipped approach can adequately serve a diverse group of learners with various needs (Faulkner & Green, 2015; Willis, 2017).

**On Language Learning Outcomes**

As mentioned above, some students suggested that in-class activities should include more opportunities for meaningful language production. Also, despite positive comments on the flipped approach's impact on students' learning outcomes, some students could not answer with certainty if the flipped classroom approach improved their communicative language proficiency. It is noteworthy, however, that the survey data revealed that four students thought the flipped

classroom approach worked well in a language course. In addition, in comparing their flipped classroom experiences in high school mathematics classes, two interviewees specifically stated that the flipped classroom approach was more efficient for a language course than for STEM courses. These two students noted that this approach helped them allocate class time to use the target language entirely during class; both students valued the expanded opportunity to practice the target language with peers in class under their teacher's guidance. Furthermore, in comparing Spanish classes that she took in a high school, one student stated that, in her traditional lecture-style Spanish classes, a lot of class time was spent on learning simple concepts while little time was left for practice; therefore, she achieved very little fluency. In contrast to her ineffective Spanish courses, the student asserted that the flipped classroom approach helped improve her fluency, stating that "as it's probably true for anyone learning for language, it's really the practice that gives you the fluency."

These findings support the benefits of the flipped classroom approach for language learners. According to Mehring (2016), flipped classrooms enable teachers to create an environment in which students have greater opportunities to use the target language in collaborative learning experiences that advance the use of the language and allow for immediate feedback from the teacher. Further, Mehring claimed that this flipped approach could devote class time for practicing the language which, in turn, would improve students' language proficiency. Rather than merely increasing practice time alone, however, teachers should create pre-class and in-class activities that enable students to practice the target language in more authentic situations.

One method that is available for successfully facilitating meaningful input and interaction and that is also well aligned with the learning mechanism of the flipped approach is project-

based learning (PBL). PBL uses a real-world project to engage students in collaborative learning and focuses on (real-world) application of knowledge rather than on acquisition of knowledge (Kavanagh et al., 2017). The flipped Korean language class under study incorporated PBL, creating a newsletter as a final project. Although it was clear through observations that all students showed satisfaction with their final “product” (i.e., the newsletter), it was surprising that none commented on this project during interviews. One possible reason is that, due to time constraints, the teacher provided insufficient class time for all students to fully share their experiences and knowledge or to participate in a form of learning that is not possible with individual tasks. As collaborative learning is important to the success of the flipped approach and PBL, a teacher should carefully design tasks that facilitate students asking each other questions, evaluating their answers, and integrating responses (Kavanagh et al., 2017).

### **Level of Participation in Lecture Videos and Implications of the Findings**

Despite students’ overall satisfaction with the flipped classroom approach, the findings of this study have revealed that motivating them to watch lecture videos is one of the largest challenges I faced. Although the lecture videos were available 24 hours a day, some students procrastinated in reviewing learning materials or had not watched any videos prior to class. I observed that one student, William, struggled to adapt to flipped learning and fell behind in hands-on activities and class discussions, as he had not watched any videos before coming to class. In addition, most students responded that they sometimes could not watch all of the assigned videos, which negatively affected their engagement with in-class activities. These findings align with the claims by many researchers (e.g., Chen et al., 2014; Grimsley, 2015; Kim et al., 2014) that successful face-to-face interaction in a flipped classroom depends on the extent to which students have prepared before engaging with in-class activities.

In an attempt to increase lecture video viewership, I assigned five online quizzes that had to be completed before attending the next class session. These quizzes were graded on a done/not-done basis. The Blackboard statistics tracking system revealed that the majority of the students (98%) completed the quizzes on time; however, students' responses to interview questions indicate that they were often able to complete some of these quizzes without watching the corresponding videos. One possible reason for this is that points were not assigned for each quiz. Also, another possible contributing reason is that the quizzes were not challenging enough to motivate students to watch the videos. As noted in Chapter Three, a quiz was typically composed of five multiple-choice questions in the form of error recognition and error correction tasks. Short answer questions were not included because some students had difficulty typing Korean using a computer keyboard.

To ensure higher viewership, it may be necessary for the teacher to provide more challenging questions that require higher-order thinking skills (Grimsley, 2015). For students with keyboard typing issues, the teacher may allow them to handwrite answers on their notes, take a picture of their answers, and upload them on Blackboard. Students could also download the Blackboard app and install Korean on their smartphone, which would make it easier to type in Korean than typing using a computer keyboard. As an alternative, a short quiz could be given at the beginning of the face-to-face session prior to in-class activities. This strategy may ensure that students have to watch videos and help students stay on track as they move through the course (Chuang et al., 2018).

Furthermore, Grimsley (2015) asserts that to promote lecture video viewership, the teacher should clarify concepts or ideas, but not introduce those concepts or ideas during class. Those who failed to watch the video still have to participate in the in-class activities and

complete assignments during class. This will make students realize that they are responsible for their own learning and thus motivate them to watch the videos. Indeed, the researcher observed that reviewing the video's key concepts at the beginning of each class discouraged students, to some extent, from watching the videos before coming to class. Some students also noted that reviewing the lecture videos in the classroom was not effective, as it would demotivate students from watching the entire video.

### **Limitations**

Although the overall findings of this study confirmed the feasibility and effectiveness of the flipped classroom approach in a world language classroom, this study is limited in the following ways. First, the scope of data was limited in terms of participant groups. That is, participants were chosen based on their high accessibility rather than selected on a random basis. In addition, the low number of subjects (i.e., thirteen) in the flipped classroom makes it difficult, if not impossible, to generalize the findings to other world language learners. The study may have been improved if students with a similar proficiency level in the traditional classrooms had also been exposed to the flipped classroom approach so that the entire population could have been analyzed using the flipped classroom instead of only thirteen students.

Another limitation of this study involves the validity of qualitative analysis. As discussed in Chapter Three, in an effort to increase validity, interviews were not conducted by the researcher but by a language instructor from a Japanese language program at the same institution. Although the interviewer shared her overall opinion of the interview data with the researcher, qualitative analysis was conducted by the researcher herself. Thus, when analyzing students' responses to interview questions, it is possible that the researcher emphasized some findings over others or missed important information (i.e., researcher bias). Personal

involvement as the instructor of the course also increased the possibility that observations in the teacher journal highlighted particular incidents while ignoring others. Another potential limitation was not confirming the validity of interview and survey data analysis summaries with students.

### **Suggestions for Further Improvements**

Based on the findings of this study, the following ideas for improving the flipped classroom approach in world language education were developed:

1. Improve pre-flipped classroom orientation to students: Before the implementation of the flipped classroom approach, it is important that students are well informed about the rationale for adopting this new approach, as well as the amount of pre-work and assessment criteria. It is also important to explicitly teach students how to watch videos for learning; the teacher should play the first video and model how to watch a lecture video (Faulkner & Green, 2015; Grimsley, 2015). The orientation should include a discussion of strategies to make the best of lecture videos, such as taking notes while watching videos. A tutorial video could be created and made accessible any time during the semester.
2. Limit the amount of pre-class work: Length of lecture videos or recorded screencasts needs to be carefully determined to optimize content. It is important not to overwhelm students with too much pre-class work. Lecture videos could be segmented into shorter, concise video clips, and the length should be maintained (Faulkner & Green, 2015; Grimsley, 2015).
3. Assign video lectures as mandatory: Constantly reminding students to watch videos may not always lead to promising results. Assigning all lecture videos as mandatory and

weighted with a grade will motivate students to watch them prior to coming to class (Grimsley, 2015). Furthermore, to reinforce accountability, interactive video platforms (e.g., Edpuzzle and PlayPosit) could be used, as they allow the teacher to easily track student viewership.

4. Include active learning components in the lecture videos: A teacher could prepare a short (one- or two-page) study guide for each lesson. While watching the lecture videos, students can use this study guide to take notes about what they are learning (Bergmann & Sams, 2012; Ogden, 2015), answer a few fill-in-the-blank (Ogden, 2015) and/or “appropriately challenging” questions (Grimsley, 2015), and add their own questions to ask later in the classroom. In addition, including some activities in the videos, such as orally responding to prompts and answering questions, can help motivate students to watch the videos and keep them engaged with the lectures rather than passively watching them. Interactive video platforms (e.g., Edpuzzle and PlayPosit) could be used for this purpose.
5. Assign a short grammar check quiz: A few questions (four or five) can be an effective motivator for students to watch the lecture videos. The teacher can assign a short online quiz to check student understanding of the content covered in the video. After watching the video, students would need to complete the quiz prior to coming to class. Quiz questions would include both key concepts and specific points/problems covered in the videos.
6. Spend a few minutes at the beginning of class to clarify students’ questions: Taking questions and checking for understanding of material covered in the lecture videos ensures that all students learn the material and accommodates those who need extra in-

person explanations. This strategy will be also helpful in arousing student interest (Grimsley, 2015; Lage et al., 2000). It is important not to spend too much time on this Q & A and not to review the entire content.

7. Use a variety of in-class activities: Activities should be aimed at increasing learning outcomes, not only in terms of knowledge and oral proficiency, but also in relation to problem solving skills and cultural awareness (Granados-Bezi, 2015). Activities more conducive to collaborative problem solving will promote higher levels of cognitive processes. These types of activities can be often used for long-term projects.
8. Spend some class time on “individualized” practices: For a class with fewer than 20 students, a teacher can spend some class time for one-on-one practice to meet the unique pace and specific learning needs of each student. This will help each student master the skills they need as defined by established academic standards. This “individualized” practice will maximize one of the proposed advantages of the flipped classroom approach: individual learning (Bergmann & Sams, 2012; Granados-Bezi, 2015; Willis, 2017).

### **Future Research Directions**

Although empirical evidence related to the flipped instructional approach continues to grow, flipping the world language college classroom is still in the beginning stages. Future studies can be undertaken to examine how to best integrate interactive tasks in video lectures. In addition, future studies can systematically research the effectiveness of the flipped classroom model versus traditional language instruction in promoting student engagement, motivation, and oral proficiency. Future research can also investigate how and/or what individual traits will lead to significant differences in the educational benefits of the flipped classroom approach.

### **Conclusion**

The flipped classroom approach is a new instructional trend and has therefore become a hot topic in the field of world language education (Wang, An, & Wright, 2018). However, despite rapidly growing interest in the flipped classroom approach, there is still a lack of comprehensive, systematic research on the effectiveness of the flipped classroom approach in world language education. The main conclusion to emerge from this study is that the flipped classroom has the potential to replace old-fashioned instructional practices in a world language classroom and make the language courses more suitable and appealing to learners. Despite the aforementioned limitations, this study may serve as a preliminary step for further systematic investigation of the effectiveness of the flipped classroom approach in the field of world language education, providing some evidence that it does increase student engagement, peer interaction, and teacher-student interaction.

As Willis (2017) stated, flipping the classroom is “an ongoing learning experience for teachers and students” (p.286). Teachers considering employing the flipped classroom approach should plan to spend a considerable amount of time creating videos and revising the course curriculum to maximize active participation and collaboration in class. It also takes considerable time and effort to design in-class activities that help develop students’ higher-order thinking skills and to develop assessments aligned with the revised course curriculum and learning objectives. An even greater challenge is that instructors should continually review their flipped classrooms and make adjustments to optimally serve a diverse group of learners with various needs. Despite these difficulties, adopting a flipped classroom approach has enabled me to critically reflect on the quality of my teaching practices and to focus more on enhancing teaching

effectiveness and increasing student engagement in learning, thereby making learning more meaningful to the students.

### References

- Al-Zaharani, A. (2015). From passive to active: The impact of the flipped classroom through social learning platforms on higher education students' creative thinking. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 46, 1134-1148.
- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives* (Complete ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Baker, J. W. (2000, April). *The classroom flip: Using web course management tools to become the guide by the side*. Paper presented at the Eleventh International Conference on College Teaching and Learning, Jacksonville, FL. Retrieved from [http://www.classroomflip.com/files/classroom\\_flip\\_baker\\_2000.pdf](http://www.classroomflip.com/files/classroom_flip_baker_2000.pdf)
- Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2005). *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook of college faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip your classroom: Reach every student in every class every day*. Eugene, OR: International Society for Technology in Education.
- Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2013). Flip your students' learning. *Educational Leadership*, 70(6), 16.
- Berrett, D. (2012). How "flipping" the classroom can improve the traditional lecture. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 58, 16-18.
- Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. (2013). *The flipped classroom: A survey of the research*. Paper presented at the 120th American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference and Exposition, Atlanta, GA.
- Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom*.

- Washington, DC: Washing University Press.
- Brame, C. J. (2013). Flipping the classroom. Retrieved from <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guidelines-sub-pages/flipping-the-classroom/>
- Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective world language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 46-60.
- Chen Y., Wang, Y., Kinshuk, & Chen, N-S. (2014). Is flip enough? Or should we use the flipped model instead? *Computer and Education*, 79, 16-27.
- Chuang, H-H., Weng, C-Y., & Chen, C-H. (2018). Which students benefit most from a flipped classroom approach to language learning? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49, 56-68. doi:10.1111/bjet.12530
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). Research methods in education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55, 469-470.
- Cole, J. E., & Kritzer, J. B. (2009). Strategies for success: Teaching an online course. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 28(4), 36-40.
- Collins, K. M. T., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Jiao, Q. G. (2007). A mixed methods investigation of mixed methods sampling designs in social and health science research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(3), 267-294.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano-Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Culman, H., Henry, N., & VanPatten, B. (2009). The role of explicit information in instructed SLA: An on-line study with processing instruction and German accusative case

- inflections. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 42(1), 19-31.
- DeCuir-Gunby, J. T., Marshall, P. L., & McCulloch, A. W. (2011). Developing and using a codebook for the analysis of interview data: An example from a professional development research project. *Field Methods*, 23(2), 136-155.
- Dochy, F., Segers, M., Van den Bossche, P., & Gijbels, D. (2003). Effects of problem-based learning: A meta-analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 13(5), 533-568.
- Egi, T. (2010). Uptake, modified output, and learner perceptions of recasts: Learner responses as language awareness. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 1-21.
- Elen, J., & Clarebout, G. (2001). An invasion in the classroom: Influence of an ill-structured innovation on instructional and epistemological beliefs. *Learning Environment Research*, 4, 87-105.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 83-107.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and pedagogy*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Enfield, J. (2013). Looking at the impact of the flipped classroom model of instruction on undergraduate multimedia students at CSUN. *Techtrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, 57(6), 14-27.
- Faulkner, T., & Green, J. (2015). The peer instruction flipped learning model. In A. G. Scheg (Ed.), *Implementation and critical assessment of the flipped classroom experience* (pp.196-217).
- Fielding, N. G. (2012). Triangulation and mixed methods designs: Data integration with new research technologies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 124-136.
- Foertsch, J., Moses, G., Strikwerda, J., & Litzkow, M. (2013). Reversing the lecture, homework

- paradigm using eTEACH® web-based streaming video software. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 91(3), 267-274.
- Foot, H., & Howe, C. (1998). *Peer-assisted learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fraga, L. M., & Harmon, J. (2015). The flipped classroom model of learning in higher education: An investigation of preservice teacher's perspectives and achievement. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 31, 18-27.
- Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(23), 8410-8415.
- Friedman, V. (2007) Targeted testing: Where grammar meets proficiency and authentic content. *Glossos*, 9. Retrieved from <http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/issues/9/friedman.pdf>
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2015). *Applying educational research: How to read, do, and use research to solve problems of practice*. U.S.A.: Pearson.
- Gannod, G. C., Burge, J. E., & Helmick, M. T. (2008). *Using the inverted classroom to teach software engineering*. Paper presented at the 30th International Conference on Software Engineering, Leipzig, Germany. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1368088.1368198>
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2006). Input, interaction and output: An overview. *AILA Review*, 19, 3-17.
- Goodwin, B., & Miller, K. (2013). Evidence on flipped classrooms is still coming in. *Educational Leadership*, 70(6), 78-80.
- Granados-Bezi, E. (2015). Strategies to transform the foreign language classroom and increase

- learning outcomes with the flipped model. In A. G. Scheg (Ed.), *Implementation and critical assessment of the flipped classroom experience* (pp. 60-73).
- Grimsley, C. R. (2015). How students in a first-year composition course respond to the flipped classroom. In A. G. Scheg (Ed.), *Implementation and critical assessment of the flipped classroom experience* (pp. 99-118).
- Gullen, K., & Zimmerman, H. (2013). Saving time with technology. *Educational Leadership*, 70(6), 63-66.
- Guo, P., Juho, K., & Rubin, R. (2014). How video production affects student engagement: An empirical study of MOOC videos. *Proceedings of the ACM conference, USA*. 41-50.  
doi:10.1145/2556325.2566239
- Hamdan, N., McKnight, P., McKnight, K., Arfstrom, P., & Arfstrom, K. M. (2013). The flipping learning model: A white paper based on the literature review titled a review of flipped learning. *Flipped Learning Network*. Retrieved from <http://www.flippedlearning.org/cms>
- Han, Y. J. (2015). Successfully flipping the ESL classroom for learner autonomy. *NYS TESOL Journal*, 2, 98-109.
- Harley, B., Cummins, J., Swain, M., & Allen, P. (1990). The nature of language proficiency. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins & M. Swain (Eds.) *The development of second language proficiency* (pp. 7-25). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Herreid, C. F., & Schiller, N. A. (2013). Case studies and the flipped classroom. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 42(5), 62-66.
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn?

- Educational Psychology Review*, 16(3), 235-266.
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E., & Barrows, H. S. (2006). Goals and strategies of a problem-based learning facilitator. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 1(1), 21-39.  
<https://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1002>
- Horn, M. (2013). The transformational potential of flipped classrooms. *Education Next*, 13, 78-79.
- Huang, Y-N., & Hong Z-R. (2016). The effects of a flipped English classroom intervention on students' information and communication technology and English reading comprehension. *Education Tech Research Development*, 64, 175-193.
- Hung, H. (2015). Flipping the classroom for English language learners to foster active learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28, 81-96.
- Hung, H. (2017). Design-based research: Redesign of an English language course using a flipped classroom approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(1), 180-192.
- Hung, W., Jonassen, D. H., & Liu, R. (2008). *Handbook of research on educational communication and technology*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kahn, S. (2012). *The one world schoolhouse: Education reimaged*. London, U.K.: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Kavanagh, L., Reidsema, C., McCredde, J., & Smith, N. (2017) Design consideration. In C. Reidsema, L. Kavanagh, R. Hadgraft, & N. Smith (Eds.), *The Flipped Classroom: Practice and practices in higher education* (pp.15-35). Singapore, Singapore: Springer.
- Kim, M. K., Kim, S. M., Khera, O., & Getman, J. (2014). The experience of three flipped classrooms in an urban university: An exploration of design principles. *Internet and Higher Education*, 22, 37-50.

- Kosta, I., & Lockwood, R. B. (2015). What's on the Internet for flipped English language instruction? *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 19, 1-12.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, U. K.: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (2014). Case histories and the comprehension hypothesis. *TESOL Journal*, 8(1), 1-16.
- Lage, M. J., Platt, G. J., & Treglia, M. (2000). Inverting the classroom: A gateway to creating an inclusive learning environment. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 31, 30-43.
- Lee, G., & Wallace, A. (2017). Flipped learning in the English as a foreign language classroom: Outcomes and perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(1), 62-84.
- Lewis, J. S., & Harrison, M. (2012). Online delivery as a course adjunct promotes active learning and student success. *Teaching of Psychology*, 39(1), 72-76.
- Li, S. (2016). A study of learners' satisfaction towards college oral English flipped classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6, 1958-1963.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1990). *The development of second language proficiency*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-448.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-228.
- Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: An empirical study of

- question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(4), 557-587.
- Mazur, A. D., Brown, B., & Jacobsen, M. (2015). Learning designs using flipped classroom instruction. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 41(2). Retrieved from <https://www.cjlt.ca/index.php/cjlt/article/view/26977>
- McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL question development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(1), 79-103.
- McGrath, D., Groessler, A., Fink, E., Reidsema, C., & Kavanagh, L. (2017) Technology in the Flipped Classroom. In C. Reidsema, L. Kavanagh, R. Hadgraft, & N. Smith (Eds.), *The Flipped Classroom: Practice and practices in higher education* (pp.37-56). Singapore, Singapore: Springer.
- McLaughlin, J. E., Griffin, L. M., Esserman, D. A., Davidson, C. A., Glatt, D. M., Roth, M. Tl, et al. (2013). Pharmacy student engagement, performance, and perception in a flipped satellite classroom. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 77, 196.
- McMillan, J. H. (2012). *Educational research: Fundamental for the consumer*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- McNally, B., Chipperfield, J., Dorsett, P., Dabbro, L. D., Frommolt, V., Goetz, S., Lewohl, J., Molineux, M., Pearson, A., Reddan, G., Roiko, A., & Rung, A. (2017). Flipped classroom experiences: Student preferences and flip strategy in a higher education context. *Higher Education*, 73, 281-298.
- Mehring, J. (2016). Present research on the flipped classroom and potential tools for the EFL classroom. *Computers in the Schools*, 33(1), 1-10.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Milman, N. B. (2012). The flipped classroom strategy: What is it and how can it best be used?

*Distance Learning*, 9(3), 85-87.

Moffett, J. (2015). Twelve tips for “flipping” the classroom. *Medical Teacher*, 37(4), 331-336.

Muldrow, K. (2013). A new approach to language instruction: Flipping the classroom.

Retrieved from [https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/TLE\\_pdf/](https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/TLE_pdf/)

TLE\_Nov13\_Article.pdf

Novak, G. M. (2011). Just-in-time learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*,

2011(128), 63-73.

O’Flaherty, J., & Phillips, C. (2015). The use of flipped classrooms in higher education: A

scoping review. *Internet and Higher Education*, 25, 85-95.

Ogden, L. (2015). Student perceptions of the flipped classroom in college algebra. *PRIMUS*,

25(9-10), 782-791. doi:10.1080/10511970.2015.1054011

Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the

zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.),

*Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 51-78). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford

University Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peyton, J. K., Moore, S. C. K., & Young, S. (2010). Evidence-based, student-centered

instructional practices. Retrieved from

<http://www.cal.org/caelanetwork/pdfs/EvidenceBasedFinalWeb.pdf>

Pinnelli, S. & Fiorucci, A. (2015, October). *University and flipped learning TIC & DIL project:*

- Framework and design*. Paper presented at the twelfth Conference on Cognition and Explanatory Learning in the Digital Age, Dublin, Ireland. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED562195.pdf>
- Prensky, M.R. (2010). *Teaching digital natives: Partnering for real learning*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93, 223-231.
- Quillen, I. (2013). Video transforms teaching practices: But it is still a challenge for educators to identify quality digital content. *Education Week: Digital Curricula*. Retrieved from [www.edweek.org/go/digital-report](http://www.edweek.org/go/digital-report)
- Reidsema, C., Kavanagh, L., Hadgraft, R., & Smith, N. (2017). *The Flipped Classroom: Practice and practices in higher education*. Singapore, Singapore: Springer.
- Roach, T. (2014). Student perceptions toward flipped learning: New methods to increase interaction and active in economics. *International Review of Economics Education*, 17, 74-84.
- Roehl, A., Reddy, S., & Shannon, G. (2013). The flipped classroom: An opportunity to engage millennial students through active learning strategies. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences*, 105(2), 44-49. doi:10.14307/JFCS105.2.12
- Silberman, M. L. (1996). *Active learning: 101 strategies to teach any subject*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- So, H. J., & Brush, T. A. (2008). Student perceptions of collaborative learning, social presence and satisfaction in a blended environment: Relationships and critical factors. *Computers & Education*, 51, 318-336.

- Schulz, R. A. (2006). Reevaluating communicative competence as a major goal in postsecondary language requirement courses. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(2), 252–255.
- Strayer, J. F. (2012). How learning in an inverted classroom influences cooperation, innovation, and task orientation. *Learning Environment Research*, 15, 171-193.
- Stringer, E. T. (2004). *Action research in Education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Stumpenhorst, J. (2012). *Not flipping for flipped*. Retrieved from <http://stummpteacher.blogspot.com/2012/12/not-flipping-for-flipped.html>.
- Sun, J. C., & Wu. Y. (2016). Analysis of learning achievement and teacher-student interactions in flipped and conventional classrooms. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17, 79-99.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Topping, K. J., & Ehly, S. W. (1998). *Peer-assisted learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wang, J., An, N., & Wright, C. (2018). Enhancing beginner learners' oral proficiency in a flipped Chinese world language classroom. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(5-6). 490-521. doi:10.1080/09588221.2017.1417872
- Willis, L-D. (2017). Implications for pedagogy: Flipping the classroom to engage pre-service teachers. In C. Reidsema, L. Kavanagh, R. Hadgraft, & N. Smith (Eds.), *The Flipped Classroom: Practice and practices in higher education* (pp.273-287). Singapore, Singapore: Springer.

*World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages*. (2015) (4th ed.). Alexandria, VA.

Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/publications/all/world-readiness-standards-learning-languages#sthash.4xLkukFW.dpuf>

Zayapragassarazan, Z., & Kumar, S. (2012). Active learning methods. *NTTC Bulletin*, 19(1), 3-5.

Appendix A  
Survey Questions

1. The instructional videos help me learn new grammar and vocabulary.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
2. The average duration of each video (approx. 8 min.) is appropriate for the given content.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
3. The use of quizzes helps me get motivated to watch the videos.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
4. In general, the content of the videos is appropriately challenging.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
5. Please provide any additional comments related to the instructional videos used for this class (e.g., technical issues).
6. The flipped classroom helps me actively participate in in-class learning activities.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
7. The flipped classroom helps me effectively collaborate with my classmates.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
8. The flipped classroom facilitates more in-class communication between my teacher and me.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
9. I received sufficient feedback during the in-class activities.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
10. In-class activity materials were sufficiently prepared.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
11. In-class activities help me develop my problem-solving skills.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree
12. Please provide any additional comments related to the in-class component of this course (e.g., in-class activities).
13. The flipped classroom helps me enrich my learning experience.  
☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree

14. The flipped classroom helps me manage my learning.

☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree

15. The flipped classroom helps improve my language proficiency.

☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree

16. I prefer the flipped classroom over the traditional lectures.

☐ disagree    ☐ somewhat disagree    ☐ neutral    ☐ somewhat agree    ☐ agree

17. Please provide any additional reflections about your experience in the course (e.g., strengths or weaknesses of the flipped classroom).

Appendix B  
A semi-structured Interview Protocol

1. Have you had other flipped classroom experiences? (If yes, what did you like/dislike the most and why?)
2. Based on your experience with the flipped model (in this class), what would you say are the strengths of the flipped instructional model?
  - 2.1 What do you think of the lecture videos? Are they easy to follow?
  - 2.2 What do you think of the in-class activities? Are they engaging/promoting problem-solving skills?
  - 2.3 What do you think of the teacher's feedback in class? Are they sufficient/relevant?
3. Based on your experience with the flipped model (in this class), what would you say are the weaknesses of the flipped instructional model?
  - 3.1 What do you think of the lecture videos? Are they too long/short?
  - 3.2 What do you think of the in-class activities? Do you need more time for individual work (in class)?
  - 3.3 What do you think of the teacher's feedback in class?
  - 3.4 Any other issues such as students' learning styles?
4. How does the flipped classroom model impact your learning outcomes?
  - 4.1 Do you think the flipped classroom model helped improve your communicative performance, test scores, problem-solving skills, motivation, engagement, or desire to continue studying Korean)?
5. What can be done to make the flipped classroom model better? In other words, what would you do differently to create a better flipped learning environment?

Appendix C  
Semi-structured Observation Protocol

Length of Activity (                      ) minutes	
Descriptive Notes	Reflective Notes
Date Number of students Physical setting Lesson content  Materials	
Social environment: patterns of interaction or communication	
Social environment: patterns of specific behaviors/behaviors while doing in-class activities	
Student comments that relate to the FC	
Student oral proficiency, grammar accuracy	

## Appendix D

### Sample In-class Activity



다음 표현과 문법을 이용해서 대화를 만들어 보세요.

Using the words/grammar listed below, create a dialogue with your partner. Try to incorporate as many grammar rules as possible.

Country (Choose one)	Expressions	Grammar
한국 (Korea)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~이/가 유명하다 (be famous for)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~어/아 본 적이 있다</li> </ul>
스페인 (Spain)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 인상적이다 (to be impressive)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (expressing experience)</li> </ul>
독일 (Germany)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~이/가 아름답다 (~beautiful)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~어/아 보세요</li> </ul>
중국 (China)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~기(가) 쉽다/편하다</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (suggestion)</li> </ul>
영국 (U.K.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (it's easy/convenient to do...)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~지 마세요 (don't do...)</li> </ul>
호주 (Australia)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 기념품 (souvenirs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~(으)려고 하다 (intend to..)</li> </ul>
Or your own choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 기억에 남다 (still remember...)</li> <li>• 셀카를 찍다 (take a selfie)</li> <li>• 셀카봉 (selfie stick)</li> <li>• ~는 게 좋아요 (it's good to do...)</li> <li>• 인스타 맛집 (popular restaurants on Instagram)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~(으)면 (if)</li> <li>• ~(으)니까 (because)</li> </ul>

*Note: image & activity adapted from Sogang Korean 2*

[illegible]

Appendix E  
Final Project Guidelines

**Create a Student Newsletter: College Life**

- As a current student of this university, you are a student writer with research tasks for developing a guide or resources for prospective students.
- The team (the entire class) is asked to write about college life at this school to help prospective Korean students to be better informed and therefore better prepared for their freshman year of college.
- Each student will contribute to this project.
- The newsletter will be posted on the program Facebook and/or distributed to the students at the Korean language program party at the end of the semester.

1. Choose one topic from the box below and you, as an editor, will be in charge of the topic you chose. In class, every student will brainstorm and write three to five sentences on each topic.

Topic		Lesson	Student Name
1	Weather & Seasons (this town, NJ and/or East Coast)	Lesson 1	(1)
2	Clothing & Fashion (this university or American universities in general)	Lesson 2 Lesson 9	(1) (2)
3	Neighborhood (near campus)	Lesson 3 Lesson 7	(1) (2)
4	Housing (dorms) & School Buildings	Lesson 4 Lesson 5	(1) (2)
5	School Events (for students)	Lesson 8	(1)
6	Hobbies/School Clubs Eating Clubs	Lesson 10	(1) (2)
7	Hospital & Health Services	Lesson 12	(1)
8	Majors & Jobs	Lesson 15	(1) (2)

2. For your own topic, write at least 1.5 pages (letter-sized, typed, double-spaced) using the plain speech style.
3. You may edit and use your classmates' sentences and collect more information using the Internet or student interviews.
4. Use at least two pictures relevant to your topic.

Appendix F  
Sample Final Project Brainstorming Activity

**Lesson 4 & Lesson 5**  
**Housing & Buildings**

A. Talk about the following questions. You may use the words provided in the box below.

- 어느 기숙사에 살아요? 뭐가 좋아요/편해요/불편해요?
- 어느 건물이 제일 유명해요? 왜 유명해요? 무엇으로 유명해요?
- 어느 건물에 제일 자주 가세요? 그 건물에 뭐가 있어요?

난방	냉장고	도서관	미술관	바닥	배달	병원	부엌	사무실	소파
세탁기	식탁	연구실	옷장	우체국	우체통	은행	졸업식	직원	
		책장	침실	학생회관	휴게실				
가져가다	눕다	똑같다	(소포를 /편지를) 보내다/ 찾다			부족하다	불편하다		
비슷하다	사귀다	사 먹다	사용하다	생기다	신기하다	안전하다	웁시다		
		적응하다	(돈을) 찾다	친절하다					
		특별하다	편리하다	편안하다					

B. Based on your answer, write three to five sentences about **Housing & Buildings on campus**.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.