



Changes in Learner (De)Motivation and Confidence: A Longitudinal Analysis of an Online-offline Blended English Program

Tae-Young Kim

Chung-Ang University, South Korea

This paper examines the longitudinal changes of Korean college students in their motivation and their self-confidence in an online-offline blended EFL-learning course. The participants completed the same questionnaire three times (i.e., March, June, and December) with items regarding the ideal second language (L2) self, the ought-to L2 self, instrumentality, integrativeness, demotivation, and the perceived confidence in speaking English. Repeated-measures t-test/ANOVA indicated that students' initial motivation was maintained until the end of the academic year. Their confidence in speaking English increased in a statistically significant manner. However, student demotivation also increased despite the fact that it remained at a relatively low level. These findings portrayed that the online-offline blended English learning was an effective instructional medium for EFL students in their English courses. This study suggests that L2 practitioners need to find an optimal balance between online instruction and offline EFL classes, where in-class authentic L2 communication should be maximally fostered.

Keywords: online-offline blended learning, second language self, motivation, English learning, English as a foreign language, college English

Introduction

This paper aims to investigate the influence of a blended college English course on the motivation and self-confidence of college students in their English learning over two consecutive semesters for 10 months. The participants are first-year cohorts admitted to a university having two separate campuses; one in Seoul and the other in City A, a vicinity of Seoul in South Korea (henceforth Korea).

In line with the steady growth of the internet and the multimedia technology applications in language instruction (e.g., Chapelle, 1998; Compton, 2009; Hubbard, 2008; Lai & Gu, 2011; White, 2003), from the mid-1990s, the trend of English as a foreign language (EFL) education in Korean colleges has transformed from a curriculum centering on reading literature for the purpose of cultivating general receptive knowledge in English into one emphasizing authentic communicative competence (Kim & Yi, 2009; Nam, 2005). In addition to the change of this educational trend, due to the rapid development of information technology in the 2000s, the EFL course curricula in Korean colleges have significantly been reorganized in order to incorporate the benefits of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) or multimedia-assisted language learning (MALL) (Choi & Johnson, 2005; Huh & Lee, 2019; Kim, 2016; Nam, 2019; Warschauer & Meskill, 2000). Korea boasts high-speed internet connection nationwide, making it possible to offer easy internet access for users almost everywhere in the country (Jung & Kim, 2017). This resulted in an explosion of online education and distance learning in Korea. Recently, many universities endeavor to introduce online English education programs and also competitively offer

language learning programs through a multitude of e-resources (Kim & Santiago, 2005; Nam, 2019). From the mid-1990s, college students in Korea have begun to take college English courses focusing on communicative oral-aural competence (Lim, 2006). Therefore, according to Cho, Moon, and Lee (1997), multimedia/internet-assisted education setting was gradually incorporated into college English classrooms in Korea as an effective means of improving students' overall English proficiency.

The purpose of this study is to first investigate how an online-offline blended college EFL course affects the English speaking confidence and English learning motivation of first-year students from a variety of majors encompassing Bioresources and Bioscience, Chinese, Economics, English Education, Industrial Design, and Politics. The second purpose of the study is to examine how the participants' demotivation progressed over the research period of two semesters (i.e., Spring and Fall) of the same academic year. We can find a few notable previous literature, such as Bahari (2019), Murphy (2011), Nam (2019), Ushida (2005), and Xiao (2012), which investigate the intricate relationship between L2 learners' affective factors (i.e., personality, motivation, attitudes) and distance language learning. However, there has been little research in previous literature on the longitudinal effect of second language (L2) learning motivation and demotivation of college students taking an English language course where blended learning was applied. Given this, the current study would contribute to a deeper understanding on the applicability of blended L2 instruction to the tertiary context.

Three research questions are set in order to investigate how an online-offline blended college English course affects students' English learning.

1. How does an online-offline blended learning affect students' self-confidence in speaking English?
2. How does an online-offline blended learning affect students' English learning motivation?
3. How does an online-offline blended learning affect students' English learning demotivation?

Literature Review

Online Usage in College English Courses

Lectures in college L2 courses using multimedia, cyberspace, web 3.0, or mobile communication technologies have several advantages vis-à-vis teacher-centered, traditional classes: the easiness of obtaining or retrieving instructional materials, enhancing student-student or student-teacher interaction in either an informal or more reserved manner, and promoting learner autonomy (Rovai, 2001) and self-regulation (Lai & Gu, 2011; Lynch & Dembo, 2004). For these advantages, in line with the use of multimedia in Europe or the U.S. (e.g., Dutton, Dutton, & Perry, 2002; Murphy, 2011; Willging & Johnson, 2004), EFL instruction in Korea has rapidly begun to utilize CALL/MALL. For example, Nam (2019) also found that flipped learning instruction had a positive effect on enhancing college students' intercultural competence and autonomy.

However, the introduction of CALL/MALL is not without negative side-effects. At the university level, for example, Merisotis and Phipps (1999) reported that students could not receive prompt oral or written feedback from the instructor, and further, more space was required in order to allocate setups for relevant computer equipment. Moreover, it has been reported that the student dropout rate increased (particularly at a corporate e-learning system), compared to that of students who took traditional courses (Frankola, 2001; Oblender, 2002).

It should be noted that in a recent trend in the 21st century CALL instruction, L2 researchers and practitioners have reached a consensus that the use of technology in L2 classes is a *sine qua non* matter, and its application should be eclectic and judicious, which can maximize L2 proficiency development. Therefore, along with content knowledge instruction courses (e.g., Hoic-Bozic, Mornar, & Boticki, 2009), various attempts have been made to find an ideal blended L2 instruction, which incorporates online L2 instruction into conventional offline classroom L2 learning. In Hoic-Bozic et al.'s study, participants in a

blended information science course showed a high level of course satisfaction and as a result, their content knowledge boosted. In the area of CALL/MALL, there have been academic endeavors to introduce online-offline blended learning in order to complement the shortcomings of the online class. Yang (2011) divided students into two sub-groups, an online-offline blended class and an on-site instruction class, in order to investigate which class was effective for enhancing student reading proficiency. From the qualitative interview data, post-test, and research log, it was found that the online-offline blended class was perceived as being more useful for students than the on-site instruction class. In Kim and Kim's (2010) study, most participants showed a high level of satisfaction with the online-offline blended learning module because it had a statistically positive impact on their English abilities.

Students' Motivation in Online L2 Learning Contexts

In the contexts of CALL/MALL, a wide array of literature existed in investigating its impact on students' affective factors, particularly on motivation (e.g., Bahari, 2019; Kim & Lee, 2011; Murphy, 2011; Ushida, 2005; Xiao, 2012). Previous literature can be categorized into 1) qualitative, retrospective studies and 2) longitudinal, questionnaire survey ones.

First, in terms of qualitative, retrospective research, Murphy (2011) conducted a retrospective verbal-report study of the maintenance of L2 learning motivation and the conditions of motivational support. The participants learned various L2s, such as French, German, and Spanish, at the beginning level at Open University, UK. She found a couple of demotivational factors, which included 1) external factors (e.g., course contents, technical problems) and 2) internal factors (e.g., low grades, difficulty of speaking a target language). However, factors for remotivation were also identified; moreover, the participants' log entries indicated that positive interaction with others and receiving feedback on performance by attending tutorials helped increase motivational boost.

Following the tradition of the so-called "good language learner" studies in the 1970s (Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975), Xiao (2012) divided a total of 20 distance language learners in China into successful and unsuccessful ones based on their overall course achievement (10 successful, 10 unsuccessful). By using semi-structured interviews, he investigated the differences in the two groups' EFL learning motivations. The results indicated that all of the successful students had specific, well-defined goals for learning English, and eight of them stated that their EFL learning motivation remained at a high level. In the case of unsuccessful learners, only two were able to maintain motivation. These motivational differences were attributed to the concrete goal structure and perceived benefits of learning English. The unsuccessful students were not aware of the perceived benefits, and two of them did not have any specific reason to learn English.

By using the qualitative content analysis and descriptive coding (Saldana, 2015), Kim and Lee (2011) reported the cases of two participants who have been taking an online-offline blended EFL program held over a period of two consecutive semesters in Korea. They found that the participants in the same blended EFL course perceived its effectiveness on a drastically different basis. Hence, instructors' individualized e-learning class management was proven to be crucial for the success of blended EFL instruction in maintaining the motivation of L2 students.

In order to capture the longitudinally changing aspects of L2 learning motivation, a group of researchers administered Likert-type questionnaire surveys at different times to the same participants of e-learning contexts. For example, Ushida (2005) investigated how French or Spanish language online courses affected the motivation and attitudes of 30 students during the fall semester in 2002 by using repeated-measure questionnaires, class observation, and interviews. The results indicated that at the beginning, students exhibited a relatively high level of anxiety, primarily due to their unfamiliarity with the online course. However, as the semester progressed, their L2 learning motivation and attitudes gradually turned positive and stable.

Methods

Participants

A total number of 126 first-year Korean college students, 58 males and 68 females, participated in the study (47 at Seoul campus; 79 at City A campus). The students studied various undergraduate majors. The background information survey revealed that they were familiar with ICT and on average, used the internet three hours a day. Also, approximately 93 percent of them had experiences of taking part in online classes when they were high school students.¹ Their self-perceived English proficiency was mostly intermediate. Before entering college, all of them studied English as a major school subject for 10 years. When the blended learning began in Spring semester in March, the mean score of the speaking ability perceived by students themselves was 2.28 (SD .79) out of a five-point Likert-scale (1: low, 3: moderate, 5: high), which revealed that students perceived themselves as non-fluent, intermediate English speakers. By contrast, responding to the question of the expected use of English in their future career, the average was 4.14 (SD .83, 1: not at all, 3: moderate, 5: quite a lot), which demonstrated that they had expectations of using English frequently in their future professional career.

The Online-offline Blended English Program

The purpose of an online-offline blended English program was to provide students with more chances to speak English during offline English classes. Students were required to study vocabulary items, grammar, and reading passages via online on their own. In an offline class held twice a week, lasting 75 minutes each, students were able to focus on the communicative tasks and, if necessary, pattern drill practices. In the online-offline blended course, students prepared for each lesson at an average of 2.84 hours per week in order to successfully participate in the offline class tasks.

The online-offline blended English program consisted of integrated courses of online and offline components. There were two related but distinctive types of textbooks: a paper workbook and an online e-book. Over the two semesters (i.e., a full academic year from March to December), the blended English program comprised of 12 modules and 24 lessons, where one module has two interrelated lessons. Every time one module is completed, an online performance assessment was administered to the partaking students. Via online mode, each student's performance was recorded and stored real time. In order to meet the individual proficiency differences among students, the online contents had three levels: advance, intermediate, and beginner; students were able to select the appropriate levels within their comfort zone.

Procedures

After the approval of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), a questionnaire method was used in this study to investigate the longitudinal changes in students' English learning motivation, demotivation, and self-confidence. By referring to Dörnyei (2009, 2010, 2020) and Gardner (1985, 2010), the questionnaire consisted of seven constructs: the ideal L2 self (4 items), the ought-to L2 self (4 items), intrinsic motivation (1 item), extrinsic motivation (1 item), integrativeness (1 item), promotion-based instrumentality (2 items), and prevention-based instrumentality (2 items)². All items were measured by

¹ This relatively high percentage of experiencing online lessons would be attributable to the popularity of private cram school lessons via the Internet. Many internet study websites (e.g., MegaStudy, EBSi) have prospered in Korea primarily due to the preparation for the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT), which is a crucial determinant for university admission. The COVID-19 pandemic has also expedited the reliance on online education (Yoon, 2020).

² The ideal L2 self is "the representation of the attributes that someone would ideally like to possess (i.e., a representation of personal hopes, aspiration or wishes)," whereas the ought-to L2 self is "the attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., a representation of someone else's sense of duty, obligations or responsibilities)" (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009, pp. 3-4). Dörnyei (2009) endeavors to reconceptualize instrumentality into two distinct

using a five-point Likert-scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). The seven constructs have actively been practiced and utilized in L2 motivation literature, which confirms strong construct validity. Regarding item reliability, Cronbach's alpha index of .843 for the first semester and .850 for the second semester indicated that the questionnaire items had fairly high internal consistency.

Seven items related to participants' English learning demotivation were also added at the end of the first and second semesters in order to investigate how students' demotivation has changed between the first and the second semester. The questionnaire items for demotivation were modified from the previous demotivation studies conducted in Japan and Korea (e.g., Kim, 2011, 2012; Kim, Kim, & Kim, 2018; Falout, Elwood, & Hood, 2009; Kikuchi, 2009) (see Appendix). The questionnaire included internal source of demotivation (2 items) and external source of demotivation (5 items). Since it is used in a blended learning context, items on internet facility, textbook quality, and instructors' ICT knowledge were also added or modified. Cronbach's alpha index was .819 for the first semester and .795 for the second semester, which also indicated high internal consistency.

The administration of the questionnaires was in charge of English instructors in the English classes. The questionnaires were distributed and collected in class three times: March (the beginning of the first semester), June (the end of the first semester), and December (the end of the second semester). It took approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Overall, this study highlights the longitudinal changes in student (de)motivation for 10 months (i.e., from March to December). Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) underscored that the gradual dissipation of motivation, due to the elapse of time, cannot be considered as demotivation. Although there might be a slight change in student motivation over the summer vacation, since the English class was not offered, such change does not reflect any influence from the blended English course. Therefore, we did not administer a survey at the beginning of the second semester. The questionnaires of demotivation were not administered in March since the blended English instruction did not start yet, and therefore, they were conducted only twice (the end of the first and second semesters).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by using SPSS 22.0 descriptive statistics and inferential parametric statistics. For research question 1, the descriptive analyses, such as mean and standard deviation, were calculated in order to examine the influence of the blended English classes on students' self-confidence in speaking English. Furthermore, we examined how their self-confidence of speaking English changed for 10 months through repeated-measures ANOVA. For research question 2, descriptive analysis and repeated-measures ANOVA were conducted in order to look into how students' motivation was affected by the blended learning for 10 months. For research question 3, repeated-measures t-test was used and analyzed in order to investigate the changes in students' demotivation because the questionnaire of demotivation was carried out twice.

types: promotion-based instrumentality and prevention-based instrumentality. The former represent the learners' desire to attain high L2 proficiency in order to live a better life by means of making more money or being promoted at the workplace. The latter deals with their desire to learn L2 in order to fulfill externally required duties and obligations. For example, an L2 learners' desire to learn English is mainly coming from the wishes from his or her parents or from peer pressure; this is a typical instance of prevention-based instrumentality.

Results

Overall Influence of the Blended College English Course on Students

Before providing the results of the research questions, we introduce the general findings of the blended college English course. In order to successfully complete various speaking tasks provided in offline and on-site classes, it was necessary for each participant to study online materials of English vocabulary, grammar, and reading. Thus, checking the amount of time spent for online individual lessons would be a useful predictor for the successful completion of the blended English course.

TABLE 1
Average Amount of Time Spent for the Online Individual Study

Time (hours) per week	1 st Semester		2 nd Semester	
	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
0 hour	2	1.6	3	2.4
1 ~ 2 hours	33	26.2	21	16.7
2 ~ 3 hours	49	38.9	28	22.2
3 ~ 4 hours	25	19.8	32	25.4
4 ~ 5 hours	6	4.8	18	14.3
5 ~ 6 hours	3	2.4	10	7.9
More than 6 hours	5	4	6	4.8
No answers	3	2.3	8	6.3
Sum	126	100	126	100
Average hours per week (SD)	2.39 (SD=1.79)		2.84 (SD=1.48)	

In Table 1 above, compared with the first semester, where students had spent 2.39 hours (SD 1.79), students in the second semester spent an extra 30 minutes for the online materials. This depicts that students had to study more than they had in the previous semester because the contents in the blended English classes were becoming complicated and furthermore, the amount of content was accumulated from the first semester.

Table 2 below shows the time that each student spent in speaking English during the 75-minute class. The rationale for implementing the online-offline blended English course was to enhance students' English speaking ability. Therefore, it was important to check how much opportunity the students were allowed for speaking English during the class. As Table 2 illustrates, in the second semester, the participants spoke in English for approximately 27.3 minutes per each 75-minute class in the second semester. That is, each student spoke in English for about 27.3 minutes during each class, and they practiced key English expressions and listened to the instructor's explanation and classmates' verbal interactions for the remaining class time. Compared with the first semester, where students spoke in English for 18.4 minutes, students spoke in English for an extra 8.9 minutes in the second semester. Considering both Tables 1 and 2, students spent 30 minutes more for online individual learning in the second semester than they did in the first semester, and their opportunity to speak in English increased during the second semester. These changes indicate that receptive language activities requiring written language were completed individually for online and on-site activities focusing on speaking and moreover, listening was successfully implemented in the offline classes. The division of labor between written and oral modes was becoming clearer as semesters progressed. Online classes were in charge of concentrating on written L2 (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, reading), whereas offline classes spent time focusing on enhancing oral and aural L2 proficiency (e.g., listening and speaking).

TABLE 2
Minutes Spent on Speaking in English During a 75-minute Class

Minute	1 st Semester		2 nd Semester	
	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than 10	19	15.1	14	11.1
11~20	41	32.5	48	38.1
21~30	33	26.1	31	24.6
31~40	14	11.1	16	12.7
More than 41	17	13.5	10	8.0
No answers	2	1.6	7	5.6
Sum	126	100	126	100
Average (SD)	18.4 (SD=2.43)		27.3 (SD=2.14)	

Changes in Student Self-confidence in Speaking English

Table 3 shows the changes among students in their self-confidence of speaking English over the two semesters. As stated above, students' levels of self-confidence as well as their motivation while taking the blended English classes were measured at three different times, i.e., March, June, and December. Also, we used repeated-measures ANOVA in order to identify any statistical significance in the three different periods. In Table 3, compared with the beginning of the first semester ($M = 2.83$), the self-confidence of speaking English among the students at the end of the first and the second semesters increased ($M = 3.56$ and 3.39 , respectively).

TABLE 3
Descriptive Statistics of Student Self-confidence in Speaking English

	N	M	SD
Beginning of the first semester	125	2.83	.75
End of the first semester	122	3.56	.67
End of the second semester	122	3.39	.69

Table 4 shows the results of repeated-measures ANOVA, which proves that the differences of means of the three groups are statistically significant ($F(2, 366) = 36.534, p < .001$). Scheffe post-hoc test indicates that the difference between the beginning of the first semester and the other two periods is significantly different, although the mean of the end of the second semester was slightly on a downturn. Therefore, it seems that students' self-confidence in speaking English was positively affected by the blended English classes and was also maintained until the end of the second semester.

TABLE 4
Repeated-measures ANOVA for Student Self-confidence in Speaking English

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Scheffe
Between Groups	36.130	2	18.065	36.534***	a < b, c
Within Groups	180.975	366	.494		
Total	217.105	368			

*** $p < .001$ Scheffe: a = beginning of the first semester, b = end of the first semester, c = end of the second semester

Longitudinal Changes in Students' English Learning Motivation

Table 5 shows the changes among students in their English learning motivation at three different periods. Overall, the mean scores from the beginning of the first semester to the end of the second semester show a slight decrease. However, based on repeated-measures ANOVA, no statistical difference was found among the three periods, except for instrumentality (promotion-based). In the case of

promotion-based instrumentality, Scheffe's post-hoc test indicated that there was no statistical difference between the beginning of the first semester and at the end of the first semester. Only promotion-based instrumentality at the end of the second semester was statistically different.

However, out of the five-point Likert scale questionnaire, the mean scores of promotion-based instrumentality were all above 4.0, indicating that students still had a fairly high level of instrumentality. This casts serious doubt that the statistical significance found in promotion-based instrumentality is an indicator of students' demotivation. In general, based on Table 7, we can interpret that various sub-types of motivation, initially generated from the blended college English classes, were maintained over the two consecutive semesters.

TABLE 5
Repeated-measures ANOVA of Students' English Learning Motivation

	Time	M	SD	<i>F</i>	<i>sig</i>
Instrumentality (Promotion)	Beginning (1)	4.69	.47	4.552*	.011
	End (1)	4.62	.59		
	End (2)	4.47	.66		
Instrumentality (Prevention)	Beginning (1)	3.47	.89	.952	.387
	End (1)	3.59	.98		
	End (2)	3.62	.91		
Integrativeness	Beginning (1)	4.21	.91	.602	.548
	End (1)	4.15	.88		
	End (2)	4.08	.91		
Extrinsic Motivation	Beginning (1)	4.30	.82	2.310	.101
	End (1)	4.24	.92		
	End (2)	4.07	.90		
Intrinsic Motivation	Beginning (1)	3.84	1.01	.929	.396
	End (1)	3.85	1.10		
	End (2)	3.69	1.03		
Ideal L2 Self	Beginning (1)	4.10	.73	1.307	.272
	End (1)	4.10	.76		
	End (2)	3.97	.68		
Ought-to L2 Self	Beginning (1)	3.44	.85	.265	.767
	End (1)	3.46	.79		
	End (2)	3.39	.81		

* $p < .05$

Longitudinal Changes in Students' English Learning Demotivation

This part addresses research question #3, *how an online-offline blended English course affected students' English learning demotivation*. Table 8 below shows the result of a t-test comparing students' demotivation at the end of the first semester and that at the end of the second semester. Overall, Item #1, which asked about students' negative attitudes toward classmates in the blended learning class, shows the highest level of demotivation ($M = 2.51$) at the end of the first semester and the third highest level ($M = 2.56$) at the end of the second semester among seven items on demotivation. However, the mean scores are still below 3 (i.e., "undecided") based on the five-point Likert scale; further, we can assume that the degree of students' demotivation is not serious.

TABLE 6

T-test for Demotivation at the End of the 1st Semester and at the End of the 2nd Semester

	1st semester (n = 123) <i>M(SD)</i>	2nd semester (n = 123) <i>M(SD)</i>	t-test for equality of means		
			<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig.</i>
Item 1: negative attitudes toward classmates in class	2.51 (1.14)	2.56 (1.07)	-.344	244	.731
Item 2: negative attitudes toward English	1.90 (.91)	2.32 (1.07)	-3.317***	238	.001
Item 3: decrease in self-confidence	2.27 (1.18)	2.65 (1.11)	-2.551*	244	.011
Item 4: strict class atmosphere	1.86 (1.08)	2.15 (1.13)	-2.074*	244	.039
Item 5: insufficient class facilities	2.21 (1.12)	2.44 (1.14)	-1.538	243	.125
Item 6: problems of contents and materials	2.49 (1.19)	3.00 (1.17)	-3.331***	243	.001
Item 7: teacher personality and lack of specialty	1.60 (.85)	2.17 (1.15)	-4.441***	224	.000

* $p < .05$; *** $p < .001$

In Table 6, we can identify the overall increase in students' demotivation over two semesters; five out of seven items on demotivation reached the statistical significance. At a closer look, however, the highest mean among demotivation items at the end of the second semester was 3.00 in Item #6 (i.e., problems of contents and materials). As the semester progressed, the learning contents in the blended English classes were perceived to be increasingly difficult, and this must have made the participants to become greatly demotivated at the end of the second semester. The mean scores of the other four items reaching statistical significance (Item #2: 'negative attitudes toward English,' Item #3: 'decrease in self-confidence,' Item #4: 'strict class atmosphere,' and Item #7: 'teacher personality and lack of specialty') were below 3 at the end of the second semester. This means that students' demotivation in the blended English classes are suppressed at a relatively low level despite its moderate increase, and therefore, it is difficult to conclude that the online-offline blended college English classes are ineffective means of preventing students' demotivation in learning English.

TABLE 7

T-test for Demotivation Based on Student Majors

	language majors (n = 43) <i>M(SD)</i>	non-language majors (n = 80) <i>M(SD)</i>	t-test for equality of means		
			<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig.</i>
Item 1: negative attitudes toward classmates in class	2.65 (1.06)	2.51 (1.09)	.678	121	.499
Item 2: negative attitudes toward English	2.33 (1.08)	2.33 (1.07)	.003	121	.998
Item 3: decrease in self-confidence	2.86 (1.28)	2.54 (1.01)	1.431	70.234	.157
Item 4: strict class atmosphere	2.53 (1.16)	1.95 (1.06)	2.811**	121	.006
Item 5: insufficient class facilities	2.81 (1.19)	2.25 (1.07)	2.631**	120	.010
Item 6: problems of contents and materials	3.26 (1.17)	2.86 (1.15)	1.806	120	.073
Item 7: teacher personality and lack of specialty	2.47 (1.12)	2.03 (1.15)	2.033*	121	.044

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 7 above shows the difference in demotivation between students who majored in language studies and those who were non-language majors. The mean score of students who majored in language studies was higher than that of students who were non-language majors. However, the mean scores of six items, except for Item #6, 'problems of contents and materials', were below 3 based on the five-point Likert

scale. It is difficult to conclude that blended college English classes were ineffective or caused demotivation for language major students.

In Table 7, three items that reached a statistical significance between language-major students and non-language-major ones are shown: Item #4 (strict class atmosphere), Item #5 (insufficient class facilities), and Item #7 (teacher personality and lack of specialty). In these items, language major students had a statistically higher mean than the non-language majors. However, the mean score of the items were all below 3; hence, it is still difficult to interpret that the level of demotivation for language-major students was problematic.

Discussion

Students' self-confidence of speaking English had a mean score of 2.83 at the beginning of the first semester, which shows that their level of self-confidence remained at a low level in general. While taking the online-offline blended college English classes by emphasizing oral communication for two consecutive semesters, the mean scores of students' self-confidence in speaking English gradually increased. To be specific, their self-confidence in speaking English at the end of the first semester and at the end of the second semester was 3.56 and 3.39, respectively. Table 4 strongly indicates that students' self-confidence significantly increased at the end of the first semester and this was maintained throughout the second semester, as Scheffe post-hoc test verifies. Thus, the online-offline blended college English course assisted students to foster and maintain a higher level of confidence in speaking English.

Previous studies have consistently pointed out that learning a foreign language takes a long time when students' persistence, effort, and motivation tend to decrease over time (Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Williams & Burden, 1999). However, as shown above, the use of blended English classes successfully prevented this decreasing trend in student motivation. Although a statistically significant decrease was found in promotion-based instrumentality, its mean score at the end of the second semester was still 4.47, which is a noticeably high score (see Table 5).

Demotivation found among participants is also worth mentioning. Through the blended English learning classes, students' demotivation remained at a relatively low level even at the end of the second semester. It would be true that student demotivation increased, and some of the questionnaire items, such as #2, 4, 6, and 7, on demotivation reached statistical significance, as indicated in Table 6. Nonetheless, as stated above, most mean scores in the items of demotivation at the end of the second semester were still below 3 out of the five-point Likert scale. Table 7 represented the different impact of motivation on students categorized by their academic major, where three items (Item #4: strict class atmosphere; Item #5: insufficient class facilities; Item #7: teacher personality and lack of specialty) have reached statistical significance. Despite such a result, it would be an exaggeration to state that students with language majors were more demotivated than those with non-language majors. It is because their level of demotivation for Items # 4, 5, and 7 remained below 3 out of the five-point Likert scale. A more reasonable interpretation about this would be that students who majored in language studies must have grown a higher expectation in college English classes since they had prior experiences in communication-oriented English classes prior to university admission. In fact, a significant portion of language major students graduated from a foreign language high school where authentic language instructions were offered to students, at times with supplementary tuition fee. For those who have already experienced such quality education, the blended English classes, although innovative, might still have been unsatisfactory, and this could have induced their increasing demotivation over the two semesters. After all, the online-offline blended college English courses proved more efficient for non-language major students who have had less exposure to English.

From a theoretical stance, the relationship between motivation and demotivation in English learning deserves our attention. Kim (2012, 2020) argued that English learning motivation and demotivation are not opposite concepts, and they seem to function at a different psychological plain. In his study involving

2,783 students from Grade 3 in elementary school to Grade 12 in high school in metropolitan areas in Korea, Kim (2012) claimed that the degree of various types in English learning motivation showed a consistent decrease from elementary to middle school levels. In high school, on the contrary, the degree of motivational subtypes increased. As a result, the overall shape of motivation from elementary to high schools formulated a V-shaped curvilinear trend, indicating a steep decrease at the middle school stage and its gradual recovery at the high school stage. However, changes in demotivation of the same population consistently increased as they advanced to higher grades.

The relationship between student motivation and demotivation identified in the current study provides supporting evidence for Kim's (2012) previous research. On the one hand, as indicated in Table 5, participants' level of English learning motivation did not change and was maintained at a relatively high level over the two semesters. On the other hand, however, Table 6 demonstrates that five items out of seven questionnaire items on demotivation showed statistically significant increases over the two semesters. Accordingly, the comparison of Table 5 with Table 6 provides empirical evidence that the trajectory of motivation and that of demotivation progress on a differential basis, and L2 learning demotivation is not a mirror image of L2 learning motivation (Kim, 2020).

Summary and Implications

The current study was conducted for the purpose of investigating self-confidence and English learning (de)motivation in speaking English among college students enrolled in an online-offline blended college English program. Based on the findings, we can conclude that the online-offline blended English learning classes, implemented at the participating university, had a positive influence on promoting students' self-confidence and motivation in speaking and learning English as a foreign language.

The current research has an educational implication. The participants' English learning motivation was maintained for a full academic year in an online-offline blended L2 course. Usually, students' L2 learning motivation tends to decrease as learning progresses (Kim, 2011, 2012). The balance between online individual study and offline face-to-face interactions resulted in an increase in students' individual study-hours and frequency of English interaction in class. Particularly in EFL countries, not ESL ones where students may not have much difficulty in finding an L2 conversation partner, maximizing authentic English interaction in class needs to be fully guaranteed. This can be made possible by each student's individual learning of grammar and vocabulary, which are essential to the interaction of L2 class. All these dynamic processes should be achieved without sacrificing students' motivation and self-confidence. In this regard, this study presents the possibility of motivational maintenance in EFL online-offline blended learning.

Despite all the findings and an educational implication, this research has the following suggestions for future research. First, researchers need to bear in mind that a mere introduction of a blended L2 course may not lead to the maintenance of L2 learning motivation. L2 practitioners should find an optimal balance between online instruction and offline classes on their own. Second, in order to obtain a broad understanding of the topic, more research would be needed where diverse populations in different regions having various educational backgrounds are involved.

The Author

Tae-Young Kim (Ph.D. OISE/University of Toronto) is a professor in the Department of English Education at Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Korea. His research interests center around L2 learning and teaching (de)motivation, Vygotskian sociocultural theory/activity theory, learner factors, and qualitative methods. He authored or co-authored over 140 papers and book chapters, and his recent work has been published in international journals such as *System*, *Language Sciences*, *The Canadian Modern Language*

Review, Educational Gerontology, Educational Studies, The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, and The Journal of Asia TEFL.

Department of English Education
College of Education
Chung-Ang University
84 Heukseok-ro, Dongjak-gu, Seoul, 06974, Korea
Phone: +82-2-820-5392
Email: tykim@cau.ac.kr

References

- Bahari, A. (2019). FonF practice model from theory to practice: CALL via focus on form approach and non-linear dynamic motivation to develop listening and speaking proficiency. *Computers and Education, 130*, 40-58.
- Cho, S.-K., Moon, S.-C., & Lee, K.-H. (1997). A study of English teaching: Facilities and curriculum development. *English Teaching, 52*(4), 303-330.
- Choi, H.-J., & Johnson, S. D. (2005). The effect of context-based video instruction on learning and motivation in online courses. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 19*(4), 215-227.
- Christophel, D. M., & Gorham, J. (1995). A test-retest analysis of student motivation, teacher immediacy and perceived sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes. *Communication Education, 44*, 292-306.
- Chapelle, C. (1998). Multimedia CALL: Lessons to be learned from research on instructed SLA. *Language Learning and Technology, 2*(1), 21-39.
- Compton, L. K. L. (2009). Preparing language teachers to teach language online: A look at skills, roles, and responsibilities. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 22*(1), 73-99.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9-42). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Innovations and challenges in language learning motivation*. New York: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Education.
- Dutton, J., Dutton, M., & Perry, J. (2002). How do online students differ from lecture students? *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 6*(1), 1-20.
- Falout, J., Elwood, J., & Hood, M. (2009). Demotivation: Affective states and learning outcomes. *System, 37*, 403-417.
- Frankola, K. (2001). Why online lectures drop out. *Workforce, 80*(10), 53-59.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: The socio-educational model*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Hoic-Bozic, N., Mornar, V., & Boticki, I. (2009). A blended learning approach to course design and implementation. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 52*(1), 19-30.
- Hubbard, P. (2008). CALL and the future of language teacher education. *CALICO Journal, 25*(2), 175-188.

- Huh, K., & Lee, J. (2019). Fostering creativity and language skills of foreign language learning through SMART learning environments: Evidence from fifth-grade Korean EFL learners. *TESOL Journal*, 2019; e489. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.489>
- Jung, N.-W., & Kim, S.-W. (2017) High-speed internet service as Universal service. *Journal of Digital Convergence*, 15(2), 11-25.
- Kikuchi, K. (2009). Listening to our learners' voices: What demotivates Japanese high school students? *Language Teaching Research*, 13(4), 453-471.
- Kim, C.-J., & Santiago, R. (2005). Construction of e-learning environments in Korea. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53(4), 108-114.
- Kim, E.-J., & Lee, J.-H. (2011). Lessons learned from college freshmen's participation in a new college English program. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 14(3), 63-86.
- Kim, H. (2016). Mobile app design for individual and sustainable MALL: Implications for an empirical analysis. In A. M. Gimeno Sanz, M. Levy, F. Blin & D. Barr (Eds.), *WorldCALL: Sustainability and computer-assisted language learning* (pp. 244-264). New York: Bloomsbury.
- Kim, H., & Kim, E.-J. (2010). The development of online-integrated college English curriculum for enhancing speaking performance. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 13(3), 197-214.
- Kim, T.-Y. (2011). Korean elementary school students' English learning demotivation: A comparative survey study. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(1), 1-11.
- Kim, T.-Y. (2012). L2 motivational self system of Korean EFL students: Cross-grade survey analysis. *English Teaching*, 67(1), 29-56.
- Kim, T.-Y. (2020, November). *L2 learning and teaching (de)motivation in South Korea: State of the art*. Plenary speech presented at the 18th Asia TEFL International Conference with Korea TESOL. Goyang, Gyeonggi-do, South Korea.
- Kim, T.-Y., Kim, Y., & Kim, J.-Y. (2018). A qualitative inquiry on EFL learning demotivation and resilience: A study of primary and secondary EFL students in South Korea. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 27(1), 55-64.
- Kim, Y.-S., & Yi, J.-Y. (2009). A study of students' and teachers' perceptions towards level-differentiated general English classes in the university. *English Teaching*, 64(4), 337-368.
- Lai, C., & Gu, M. (2011). Self-regulated out-of-class language learning with technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(4), 317-335.
- Lim, J.-W. (2006). A case study of general English course evaluation based on learner's needs analysis. *Modern English Education*, 7(2), 130-149.
- Lynch, D., & Dembo, M. (2004). The relationship between self-regulation and online learning in a blended learning context. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 5(2), 1-16.
- Merisotis, J. P., & Phipps, R. A. (1999). What's the difference? Outcomes of distance vs. traditional classroom based learning. *Change*, 31(3), 13-17.
- Murphy, L. (2011). 'Why am I doing this? Maintaining motivation in distance language learning. In L. Murphy, G. Murray & X, Gao (Eds.), *Identity, motivation and autonomy in language learning* (pp. 107-124). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Nam, J.-M. (2005). *Perceptions of Korean college students and teachers about communication-based English instruction: Evaluation of a college curriculum in South Korea*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbus, OH, Ohio State University.
- Nam, H. (2019). The effect of flipped learning using multimedia on learners' academic achievement, intercultural competence, and autonomy. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 22(3), 84-101.
- Oblender, T. (2002). A hybrid course model: One solution to the high online drop-out rate. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 29(6), 42-46.
- Rovai, A. P. (2001). Building classroom community at a distance: A case study. *Educational Technology Research and Development Journal*, 49(4), 33-48.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us? *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41-51.

- Saldana, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31(4), 304-318.
- Ushida, E. (2005). The role of students' attitudes and motivation in second language learning in online language courses. *CALICO Journal*, 23(1), 49-78.
- Warschauer, M., & Meskill, C. (2000). Technology and second language learning. In J. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Handbook of undergraduate second language education* (pp. 303-318). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- White, C. (2003). *Language learning in distance education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Willging, P. A., & Johnson, S. D. (2004). Factors that influence students' decision to dropout of online courses. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 8(4), 105-118.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1999). Students' developing conceptions of themselves as language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 193-201.
- Xiao, J. (2012). Successful and unsuccessful distance language learners: an 'affective' perspective. *Open Learning*, 27(2), 121-136.
- Yang, Y. F. (2011). Blended learning for college students with English reading difficulties. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1, 1-18.
- Yoon, D. (2020, September 9). South Korea's Coronavirus lesson: School's out for a while. *The Wall Street Journal*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/remote-learning-in-south-korea-becomes-a-fixture-of-pandemic-life-11599668494>

Appendix

Sample Questionnaire Items of Motivation, Self-confidence and Demotivation in Learning English

PART I. Motivation and Self-confidence in Learning English

Survey	Answer				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Ideal L2 self	I believe I'll be good at English in the future.				
	Every time I imagine my future, I imagine being good at English.				
	I imagine that I can freely talk with native English teachers.				
Ought-to L2 self	In order to get the job I want in the future, I need English.				
	If I am good at English, people around me will envy me.				
	I need to learn English in order not to disappoint people around me.				
Intrinsic motivation	I need to learn English because people I admire always say that English is important.				
	My parents said that I need to be good at English if I am an educated person.				
	English is very important for me because I'm interested in English.				
Extrinsic motivation	It is very important to learn English because I have learned it and will keep learning it at school.				
	It is very important for me to use English in order to meet foreigners and to learn about other countries.				
	English is very important for me to get a good job.				
Promotion – based instrumentality	English is very important for me to go to graduate school or go study abroad.				
	It is difficult to graduate from university without English ability.				
Prevention – based instrumentality	It is difficult to get a job without English ability.				

PART II. English Learning Demotivation

Survey	Answer				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral.	Agree	Strongly agree
I don't like classmate's attitude (1) (e.g., Classmates that my personality or level isn't corresponded, Distracting atmosphere in class)					
Increasing my negative attitude in English (2) (e.g., Negative mind about English, English-speaking countries and cultures, No specific goal)					
Decrease of self-confidence (3) (e.g., Low score in English, Comparison between me and my friends around me, Didn't find an appropriate way of learning English)					
Strict atmosphere of classroom (e.g., Teacher lesson that didn't reflect my studying style and tastes, Lesson centered on teacher)					
Insufficient facility, classroom setting (5) (e.g., Short of using audio-visual materials, Difficulty of using e-class, Computer program error, Inappropriate number of students)					
Problems of contents and materials (e.g., Boring textbook, High level of textbook, Many learning activities)					
Teacher personality and lack of specialty (7) (e.g., Short of teacher explanation, Teacher personality is not compatible with me, Lack of ICT knowledge, Short of encouragement and compliment about learning)					