

Hybrid Learning in New Normal Times: Shedding Light on the Current Teaching Practices Towards Second Language Acquisition in Higher Education Context

Andi Hudriati

Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: andi.hudriati@umi.ac.id

Muhammad Yunus

Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: muhammad.yunus@umi.ac.id

Muhammad Arham

Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: muhammadarhambasri@gmail.com

Received: 12 September 2022

Reviewed: 21 September 2023-3 December 2023

Accepted: 28 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Abstract

With the pandemics still an ongoing issue and the sudden shift to full distance learning, English language learning in Indonesia has been severely impacted. The current study sheds light on the current teaching practices within Academic writing Classes of Full-time online learning in Indonesian Higher Education Context during the pandemics. The aim of the study focuses on (1) the impact of the change in learning process during the pandemics in terms of EFL students' second language acquisition within academic writing environment and (2) lecturers' perception on the shift in the approaches they used to accommodate safety protocols during the pandemics (3) how lecturers cope with the technological changes made to provide a successful SLA input in a hybrid learning setting. This study was carried out through a qualitative approach with a case study design in mind. The study analyzed the current teaching process based on Westhoff's effective second language acquisition which served as the framework of the study. The study employed a qualitative approach using observation and interview as the instrument and analyzed based on Miles & Huberman's qualitative data analysis technique. The present study found that there were three approaches that the lecturers preferred, they are (1) Hybrid-led second language Acquisition, (2) Synchronous-led second language acquisition, and (3) Asynchronous-led second language acquisition. These approaches were influenced by the lecturers' views which was categorized into three namely; (1) hybrid-led which focuses both on theoretical and practical, (2) theoretical-led which leans solely on writing and reading skills, and (3) practical-led which emphasized on oral output production. The study presents a finding on how Indonesian lecturers current teaching practices during the pandemics within academic writing setting by looking into the teaching performance and how their views shape the learning process for students to learn the target language.

Keywords: Teaching practices; second language acquisition, academic writing, higher education

Introduction

Integrating learning with digital technology devices will be a highlight of future education (Collins & Halverson, 2010; Selwyn & Facer, 2014). Throughout this epidemic, many institutions offer learning through the use of technology as a teaching medium, but few successfully integrate technology and pedagogy or teaching methods. Online education can be extremely engaging, enjoyable, and beneficial. The secret is in the teaching staff's ingenuity. Educators are necessary to constantly expand their inventiveness in order for learners to interact openly with both teachers and peers. However, with the pandemic's education were forced to prioritize safety protocols by closing schools and move into online distance learning.

The epidemic that struck had a profound effect on the world of education. Not only educators and students are impacted, but parents are as well. Following the outbreak of Covid-19 in the hemisphere, the educational system began looking for ways to improve the teaching and learning process. Additionally, the Minister of Education and Culture's Circular No. 4 of 2020 suggests that all activities in educational institutions be kept at a distance and that all material deliveries be made to students' homes (Meydanlioglu, 2014; Dewi & Wajdi, 2021). Indonesia is currently still being hit by the Covid-19 virus outbreak but has been decreasing in recent times due to vaccination efforts by the government. And with the decrease of the spread, educational institutions in Indonesia have begun to shift into offline learning or hybrid learning depending on the rate of affected within a region. Regions with low Covid-19 had started offline synchronous learning while those mildly affected were required to carry out their learning process through Hybrid-learning approach and highly affected regions still full online learning.

Students' attitude towards online learning

With the ill preparation of Indonesia in the education sector, language learning in Indonesia has become ever more an increasing challenge to produce successful outcome. Even before the corona outbreak, the level of education in Indonesia was far from satisfactory. Indonesia is ranked seventh lowest in the 2018 worldwide evaluation of the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) out of roughly 80 countries (Nugrahanto & Zuchdi, 2019). This means that only one in every three Indonesian children reaches the required reading level. Learning loss, which can be read as a reduction in student competency, is quite likely to occur during the distance learning phase. Although assignments can be rather extensive at times, it is necessary to determine whether the grades earned truly reflect the student's competency.

Students in higher education had mostly positive attitude towards the shift in their learning process. Students' favorable attitudes about online education are dependent on factors such as teaching and learning, competency (lecturer ability), and facilities and infrastructure. However, online learning is still hindered by inadequate internet connectivity, particularly in rural regions, and by students' economic circumstances, which prevent them from accessing applications for online learning (Dewi & Wadji, 2021).

Language learning during the pandemics

The success of educational media is not just technical in nature; it also depends on the unique features of each student. As Nakayama M. (2007) point out that the body of knowledge on

e-learning implies that not all students would succeed in online learning. This is due to factors such as the learning environment and the characteristics of each student.

Language Learning during the pandemic has a positive side and a negative side that goes hand in hand. So far, language learning has been very inefficient when learning online especially with the pandemics in Indonesia today (Abduh et.al, 2018; Abduh et. Al. 2018; Basri et.al, 2018; Basri et.al 2019; Syam et al., 2019; López-Pérez, 2011). Depending on the components that support or contribute to the learning process, it is intended that language learning would produce the greatest results possible within the constraints of the available resources. Students are encouraged to be more self-sufficient and engaged in their learning, relying not only on the material provided but also on additional sources. Lecturers and Faculties/Universities should modify their curricula to the current scenario to ensure that online lectures may continue to be conducted while being manageable (Porter, 2014; Wilson, 2013; Singh, 2005).

There are universities in Indonesia today have begun to follow the blended/hybrid-learning approach with the decrease of Covid-19 spread. An attractive, active, and acceptable learning model is also needed by all types of students thus lectures have adapted the hybrid-learning approach utilizing LMS and zoom for online learning and scheduling for offline classes in between (Syam et al., 2019; Nurfadhilah et al., 2023). There is minimal study on SLA in academic writing setting during the pandemics. Thus, this study aims to on (1) the impact of the change in learning process during the pandemics in terms of EFL students' second language acquisition within academic writing environment and (2) lecturers' perception on the shift in the approaches they used to accommodate safety protocols during the pandemics (3) how lecturers cope with the changes made to provide a successful SLA input in academic writing setting.

Research method

The case study methodology is combined with a qualitative approach for this study. A case study elucidates a phenomenon by focusing on a single instance within a group in order to convey crucial information (Hodgetts, & Stolte, 2012). The study aims to explore the SLA teaching practices within an academic writing course for higher education. This study surveyed three lecturers teaching in Academic Writing course at Universitas Muslim Indonesia. The observation and interview were performed in an organized manner, and pertinent references were used as the base of the questions.

Table 1. Respondents

Name	Age	Gender	Educational Background
Lecturer 1	35	Female	Masters
Lecturer 2	32	Male	Masters (Abroad)
Lecturer 3	55	Male	Doctorate

The study used semi-structured interview and observation checklist with the lecturers as primary data and secondary data from a collection of available and assessed academic articles and references. The term "data collection techniques" refers to the procedures through which researchers obtain objective data (Margono, 2010). Respondents were interviewed and observed their lectures in order to elicit the data sought in this study. The lecturers provided comments and input on the current teaching practices which was assessed descriptively and qualitatively based on Miles & Huberman's qualitative data analysis technique.

Results

Observation

The research data below demonstrates markers of unique performance for each sample. Each category is explained in detail in relation to the performance indicator. According to the observation, lecturer 1 placed a higher premium on students' output production and lecturer 2 shows that his lessons were teacher-centered and students' language production were carried out offline only. Whereas lecturer 3 indicated low effort in language development since most learning were content-focused and carried out in LMS (asynchronous).

Teacher facilitates exposure to input at a minimally challenging level

Table 2. Lecturer 1 exposure to input

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
a. Exposure to input.				
1) Text selection			√	
2) Text adaptation		√		
3) Teacher talk in advance			√	
4) Text adaptation during teaching	√			
5) Fine-tuning of teacher talk	√			

Table 3. Lecturer 2 exposure to input

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
a. Exposure to input.				
1) Text selection				√
2) Text adaptation			√	
3) Teacher talk in advance			√	
4) Text adaptation during teaching	√			
5) Fine-tuning of teacher talk	√			

Table 4. Lecturer 3 exposure to input

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
a. Exposure to input.				
1) Text selection		√		
2) Text adaptation				√
3) Teacher talk in advance				√
4) Text adaptation during teaching	√			
5) Fine-tuning of teacher talk				√

The observation above show that lecturer 1 and lecturer 2 had almost similar aspect of exposure to input where the differences were in text selection. This is due to lecturer 2 had provided materials in the LMS system where students can freely access thus there was minimal effort from lecturer 2. Meanwhile, lecturer 3 carried out his teaching practices mostly student-centered utilizing LMS where practical aspects were minimal.

Teacher facilitates meaning-focused processing

Table 5. Lecturer 1 meaning-focused processing

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
b. Meaning-focussed				
1) Stimulate meaning identification	√			
2) Checking meaning identification		√		
3) Emphazise correct and relevant meaning	√			
4) Excercise correct and relevant meaning		√		

Table 6. Lecturer 2 meaning-focused processing

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
b. Meaning-focussed				
1) Stimulate meaning identification		√		
2) Checking meaning identification		√		
3) Emphazise correct and relevant meaning	√		√	
4) Excercise correct and relevant meaning				

Table 7. Lecturer 3 meaning-focused processing

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
b. Meaning-focussed				
1) Stimulate meaning identification				√
2) Checking meaning identification		√		
3) Emphazise correct and relevant meaning				√
4) Excercise correct and relevant meaning				√

Based on the tables above, lecturer 1 and 2 both stimulate meaning focused during their offline practical sessions and provided the necessary feedback with the difference of lecturer 2 minimal effort on exercising correct and relevant meaning. While lecturer 3 assessed students' tasks through the LMS requiring students' revisions uploaded through the system with no practical feedback observed.

Teacher facilitates form-focussed processing

Table 8. Lecturer 1 form-focused processing

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
c. Form-focused				
1) Facilitating noticing of problematic and relevant language forms			√	
2) Providing examples of correct and relevant language forms		√		
3) correcting use of problematic and relevant language forms		√		
4) Explaining problematic and relevant language forms, e.g. by giving rules			√	
5) Having pupils give peer feedback	√			

Table 9. Lecturer 2 form-focused processing

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
c. Form-focused				
1) Facilitating noticing of problematic and relevant language forms			√	
2) Providing examples of correct and relevant language forms			√	
3) correcting use of problematic and relevant language forms		√		
4) Explaining problematic and relevant language forms, e.g. by giving rules	√			
5) Having pupils give peer feedback				√

Table 10. Lecturer 3 form-focused processing

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
c. Form-focused				
1) Facilitating noticing of problematic and relevant language forms				√
2) Providing examples of correct and relevant language forms	√			
3) correcting use of problematic and relevant language forms				√
4) Explaining problematic and relevant language forms, e.g. by giving rules				√
5) Having pupils give peer feedback				√

The data above showed there were marked differences in the lecturers' teaching practices during the pandemics in a academic writing setting for students' SLA competence. Lecturer 1 had the highest degree of a successful SLA while lecturer 2 only slightly below where the differences were in students' peer feedback. While there was minimal indication of a successful SLA from lecturer 3 only providing relevant examples without any form of feedback and oral practice.

Teacher facilitates output production

Table 11. Lecturer 1 output production

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
d. Output production				
1) Asking for reactions	√			
2) Asking for interactions	√			
3) Letting students communicate		√		
4) Stimulating the use of target language	√			
5) Providing feedback, corrected output		√		
6) Organizing written practice			√	

Table 12. Lecturer 2 output production

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
d. Output production				
1) Asking for reactions			√	
2) Asking for interactions		√		

3) Letting students communicate		√
4) Stimulating the use of target language	√	
5) Providing feedback, corrected output		√
6) Organizing written practice	√	

Table 13. Lecturer 3 output production

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
d. Output production				
1) Asking for reactions			√	
2) Asking for interactions				√
3) Letting students communicate				√
4) Stimulating the use of target language				√
5) Providing feedback, corrected output				√
6) Organizing written practice	√			

Based on the observations indicated in the table above, lecturer 2 had the highest rate of a successful SLA since lecturer 1 lacked written tasks for students even though lecturer 1 had near similar indication to the output production. Lecturer 1 and 2 both stimulated students with questions on the content, elicits responses from them. Lecturers 1 and 2 had also provided feedback on incorrect language production with the difference of lecturer 2's feedback was carried out both synchronous as well as asynchronous. Due to solely relying on LMS for the learning process, Lecturer 3 had minimal output production by focusing on writing tasks.

Teacher facilitates the use of strategies

Table 14. Lecturer 1 use of strategies

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
e. Compensation strategies				
1) Eliciting receptive compensation strategies			√	
2) Eliciting productive compensation strategy	√			
	√			
3) Eliciting reflection on strategy use	√			
4) Scaffolding strategy use				

Table 15. Lecturer 2 use of strategies

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
e. Compensation strategies				
1) Eliciting receptive compensation strategies			√	
2) Eliciting productive compensation strategy		√		
3) Eliciting reflection on strategy use		√		
4) Scaffolding strategy use	√			

Table 16. Lecturer 3 use of strategies

Teaching performance indicators	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
e. Compensation strategies				
1) Eliciting receptive compensation strategies				√
2) Eliciting productive compensation strategy			√	
3) Eliciting reflection on strategy use			√	
4) Scaffolding strategy use				√

The tables above indicated that lecturers 1 and 2 had applied almost similar use of strategies. With the difference was lecturer 1 leaned on providing feedback to students' problems offline while lecturer 2 utilized LMS as a medium for students' corrective feedback which lecturer 3 had also employed. Lecturer 2 encouraged students to employ reading skills, whereas lecturer 1 assisted students with oral language output. All lecturers showed compensation strategies for any problems the students faced and gave output tasks in the form of presentations with the only difference was lecturer 3's students had to record their presentations and upload to the LMS.

Survey

The lecturers perception towards CLIL used by the lecturers were identified through open-ended interview. Based on the interview results and observation, the authors found that the lecturers' perception on the current teaching practices during the pandemics can be categorized in terms of their approach for SLA input they are (1) Hybrid-Led SLA, (2) Theoretical-Led SLA, (3) and Practical-Led SLA. Each lecturer interviewed had perceived differences to teach SLA in academic writing setting.

Hybrid-Led SLA (Lecturer 2)

Based on the findings of the survey, lecturer 2 had leaned on hybrid learning approach. This is due to several factors such as the lecturer's interest in the recent trends of blended and hybrid learning approach to accommodate the poor condition of online learning in Indonesian context. Lecturer 2 is experienced with technology use and believed the potential of a hybrid learning model it brings to a language learning class since these types of learning provided a blend of classroom instruction and online instruction using technology tools linked to the internet.

The implication of the reasons stated above is mainly due to academic factor where lecturer 2's academic profile is higher to that of the other samples. Lecturer 2 graduated from a highly accredited University in England whilst the other lecturers graduated from Indonesian universities. Furthermore, lecturer 2's past research involved technological aspects thus had positive opinion concerning the hybrid learning approach thus Lecturer 2 utilized offline and online interactions for an optimal SLA learning.

Theoretical-Led SLA (Lecturer 3)

The results show that Lecturer 3 had opted for writing and reading (theoretical) based approach to language learning by providing students with constant tasks and projects that must be handed in through LMS. Lecturer 3 believed that writing skill plays a more vital role in their future career and study. Students needed adequate reading and writing skills in order to continue their study for master and doctoral degree thus leaning more on written tasks for the learning process.

The findings imply that at the undergraduate level, writing skills are required to express and document ideas in academic writing. Writing scientific papers is an integral aspect of academic life, with the objective of resolving specific problems, attaining specific goals, contributing knowledge, developing knowledge and conceptions of knowledge about specific problems, and fostering the authors' ability to write and think scientifically (May, 2013). Along with the purpose of scientific work, it serves a purpose, particularly instructional, research, and functional purposes. Given the critical nature of scientific writing, authors of scientific papers must truly comprehend the contents of their works and organize them in a way that is scientifically justified. Academic text writing is a type of academic activity that tries to generate academic writing.

Practical-Led SLA (Lecturer 1)

Lecturer 1 had difficulties in understanding the technical features of utilizing some online teaching software. Despite the fact that lecturer 1 was technology illiterate or lacked the motivation, the preferable approach for a successful SLA for lecturer 1 was for students to constantly practice the target language which was suitable for those unfamiliar with education software. Based on observations, lecturer 1 had the most face-to-face offline interaction out of all the observed lecturers. Lecturer 1 believes that offline practices with live feedback provides numerous advantages. Offline sessions can also boost students' confidence in high level writing tasks. The findings implies that lecturer 1 had similar goals to that of lecturer 3 namely for students' future career but had chosen different approach to fulfill that goal. Lecturer 1 leaned more on students' on-site feedback practical aspect to academic writing.

Discussion

From the findings above, the first question implies that the lecturers were all capable of adapting to the shift in their teaching process from full-time offline to a hybrid learning approach by utilizing university's LMS for asynchronous learning, online and offline for synchronous learning. There were marked differences in their effort of teaching academic writing through the hybrid learning approach. For instance, lecturer 2 had evenly distributed the exposure to input in offline and online environment for synchronous learning which followed a strict schedule. Additionally, lecturer 2 had given assignments and collaborative tasks to students which they can access and hand in their work through the LMS for asynchronous learning. Online classes. Meanwhile Lecturer 3 had mostly carried out their teaching process leaning on student-centered learning approach within a hybrid setting where the focus of the learning process is carried out mostly in asynchronous learning through LMS.

Based on the findings above, the study implies that there were marked differences in the lecturers' teaching practices to accommodate SLA in academic writing setting. There were 3 forms of approach that lecturers utilized for their teaching practices during the pandemics namely, (1) Hybrid-led second language Acquisition, (2) Synchronous-led second language acquisition, and (3) Asynchronous-led second language acquisition. Lecturer 2 who preferred the hybrid-led utilized LMS, zoom virtual class and offline face-to-face evenly where offline classes were used to accommodate the practical aspect for a successful SLA. Meanwhile, lecturer 1 who preferred synchronous learning had the most offline interaction in order to emphasize on output production and real-time corrective feedback. On the other hand, lecturer 3 had chosen theoretical aspect where there was minimal interaction with the students and solely rely on LMS for a student-centered learning.

Conclusion

The results of the study revealed that there were marked differences in the effectiveness of their teaching practice and how these differences were influence by the lecturers' perception on the target language use and accommodate what the students needed for a successful SLA. Lecturer 1 had a more practical teaching practice in an offline environment while Lecturer 2 utilized both online and offline teaching medium optimally to have a successful content-language learning and Lecturer 3 focused more on students' writing skills utilizing LMS which lacked any form of oral practice for students. The present study found that there were three approaches that the lecturers

preferred, they are (1) Hybrid-led second language Acquisition, (2) Synchronous-led second language acquisition, and (3) Asynchronous-led second language acquisition.

The preferred approach was mainly influenced by the lecturers' perception on teaching English in a university context. The results of the study on lecturers' perception were divided into three categories; (1) hybrid-led which focuses both on theoretical and practical, (2) theoretical-led which leans solely on writing and reading skills, and (3) practical-led which emphasized on oral output production. The shift to utilizing online learning for teachers and among students alike in informal and formal setting personalizes learning and provides a needed support framework (García, 2011; García, 2013; Finkelstein, 2006; Rosmaladewi, 2019). The study presents a finding on how Indonesian lecturers current teaching practices during the pandemics by looking into the teaching performance and how their views shape the learning process for students to learn the target language (Rosmaladewi, 2019). The study reveals insights of how hybrid learning within academic writing are used within a developing country during the pandemics.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

Funding acknowledgements

The research received no external funding.

References

- Abduh, A., Rosmaladewi, R., & Basri, M. (2018). Internationalization awareness and commitment of Indonesian higher education. *The New Educational Review*, 51(1), 162-172. Available: 10.15804/tner.2018.51.1.13.
- Abduh, A., & Rosmaladewi, R. (2018). Promoting intercultural competence in bilingual programs in Indonesia. *SAGE Open*, 8(3), 2158244018788616. Available: 10.1177/2158244018788616.
- Basri, M., Abduh, A., & Hudriati, A. (2018). Writing and Lexical Development of Indonesian Bilingual Children Studying in Australian Primary Schools. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(12), 241-257.
- Basri, M., & Paramma, M. A. (2019). EFL Students' Perspective on the Usefulness of ICT based Learning in Indonesian Higher Education. *ELT Worldwide*, 6(2), 105–120
- Collins, A., & Halverson, R. (2010). The second educational revolution: Rethinking education in the age of technology. *Journal of computer assisted learning*, 26(1), 18-27.
- Dewi, M. P., & Wajdi, M. B. N. (2021). Distance learning policy during pandemic COVID-19. *EDUTECH: Journal of Education and Technology*, 4(3), 325-333.
- Finkelstein, J. E. (2006). *Learning in real time: Synchronous teaching and learning online* (Vol. 5). John Wiley & Sons.
- García, O. (2011). *Academic writing in the 21st century: A global perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.
- García, R. A. M. (2013). Higher education bilingual programmes in Spain.
- Graaff, R. De, Koopman, G. J., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). An Observation Tool for Effective L2 Pedagogy in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), 10(5), 603–624. <http://doi.org/10.2167/beb462.0>
- Hodgetts, D. J., & Stolte, O. E. E. (2012). Case-based research in community and social psychology: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 22(5), 379-389.

- López-Pérez, M. V., Pérez-López, M. C., & Rodríguez-Ariza, L. (2011). Blended learning in higher education: Students' perceptions and their relation to outcomes. *Computers & education*, 56(3), 818-826.
- Margono, S. (2010). *Metodologi penelitian pendidikan*. Jakarta: Rineka
- May, S. (Ed.). (2013). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and academic writing*. Routledge
- Meydanlioglu, A., & Arikan, F. (2014). Effect of hybrid learning in higher education. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 8(5).
- Nakayama M, Yamamoto H, & S. R. (2007). The Impact of Learner Characteristics on Learning Performance in Hybrid Courses among Japanese Students. *Elektronik Journal ELearning*, Vol.5(3)
- Nugrahanto, S., & Zuchdi, D. (2019, April). Indonesia PISA result and impact on the reading learning program in Indonesia. In *International Conference on Interdisciplinary Language, Literature and Education (ICILLE 2018)* (Vol. 297, No. 0, pp. 373-377). Atlantis Press.
- Nurfadhilah, A. S., Basri, M., & Nur, S. (2023). DIY (Do-It-Yourself) English Language Learning and Practice at Universitas Negeri Makassar. *Tamaddun*, 22(1), 40-51.
- Porter, W. W., Graham, C. R., Spring, K. A., & Welch, K. R. (2014). Blended learning in higher education: Institutional adoption and implementation. *Computers & Education*, 75, 185-195.
- Rosmaladewi, A. A. R. (2019). Language policy, identity, and bilingual education in Indonesia: a historical overview. ", *XLinguae*, 12(1), 219-227. Available: 10.18355/xl.2019.12.01.17.
- Singh, G., 'donoghue, J. O., & Worton, H. (2005). A Study Into The Effects Of eLearning On Higher Education. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice* , 2(1)
- Rosmaladewi and Abduh, A. (2019). The impact of Information Technology on EFL Teaching in Indonesia. *ELT Worldwide*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2559.2000.00838.x>
- Selwyn, N., & Facer, K. (2014). The sociology of education and digital technology: past, present and future. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(4), 482-496.
- Syam, H., Basri, M., Abduh, A., & Patak, A. A. (2019). Hybrid e-Learning in Industrial Revolution 4. 0 for Indonesia Higher Education. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, 9(4), 1183-1189.
- Wilson, R. (2013). Skills anticipation—The future of work and education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 61, 101-110.

Appendix

Observation Checklist (Graaff, Koopman, Anikina, & Westhoff, 2007).

Exposure to input

Teacher facilitates exposure to input at a (minimally) challenging level	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
1.1. text selection in advance				
1.2. text adaptation in advance				
1.3. adaptation of teacher talk in advance				
1.4. text adaptation during teaching				
1.5. fine-tuning of teacher talk				

Meaning-focused Processing

Teacher facilitates meaning-focused processing	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
2.1. stimulating meaning identification				
2.2. checking meaning identification				
2.3. emphasising correct and relevant identifications of meaning				
2.4. exercises on correct and relevant identifications of meaning				

Form-focused processing

Teacher facilitates form-focused processing	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
3.1. facilitating noticing of problematic and relevant language forms				
3.2. providing examples of correct and relevant language forms				
3.3. correcting use of problematic and relevant language forms				
3.4. explaining problematic and relevant language forms, e.g. by giving rules				
3.5. having pupils give peer feedback				

Output production

Teacher facilitates opportunities for output production	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
4.1. asking for reactions				
4.2. asking for interaction				
4.3. letting students communicate				
4.4. stimulating the use of the target language				
4.5. providing feedback, focusing on corrected output				
4.6. organizing written practice				

Strategic activities

Teacher facilitates the use of strategies	Always	Often	Seldom	Never
5.1. eliciting receptive compensation strategies				
5.2. eliciting productive compensation strategies				
5.3. eliciting reflection on strategy use				
5.4. scaffolding strategy use				