Cultural Values that Impact Blended Learning Acceptance and Effectiveness

Dr\ Mohammed alsaif,
Assistant Professor , faculty of Business,
Arab Open University, Dammam Saudi Arabia
alsaif.mohd@gmail.com

Abstract

Flexibility in terms of time, cost reduction, and learning outcome enhancement has been considered to be one of the main benefits of blended learning; meanwhile, for sophisticated technology, support resources for course redesign, as well as learner responsibility, are generally regarded as the main challenges facing blended learning implementation. With this in mind, this study highlights the cultural values that directly impact blended learning acceptance and effectiveness; it intends to evaluate the existing literature using a systemic review. In summary, the study found that those within a culture of high collectivism, power distance, short-term orientation, and uncertainty avoidance, tend to favour the traditional classroom and structured learning. Hence, such individuals may struggle to adopt the blended learning system, as this requires an independent, active, and self-directed learner.
.

Keywords: Blended Learning; Cultural Values; E-Learning, Student-Centered Learning; Effectiveness

Introduction

Over the course of the last decade, the implementation of the blended learning system has been accelerated by a wealth of learning organisations on a global scale, who have been looking to convert the technology age to that of mainstream education, as well as to reap the benefits of the informational revolution currently occurring within the learning field. Many educational institutions have been able to implement distant learning; in fact, in many nations, it has become mandatory as one of many steps attempted to combat the Covid-19 virus's spread [1] .Experts, educators, and students, on the other hand, are concerned about the implications, with some providers questioning whether the transition from traditional to online teaching techniques will affect the quality or content of curriculum and how this new method of teaching will be accepted and adopted by various countries with different culture. [2] Claim that that 80–90% of college and corporate training classes will have adopted such blended learning by the decade's close. Notably, 'blended

learning' was defined by [3] as, 'The use of technology with face-to-face teaching'; meanwhile, [4] define the term as, 'Thoughtful integration of classroom face-to-face learning Experiences with online learning experiences.' Indeed, blended learning merges a wealth of different approaches to e-Learning (e.g., web-based instructions; video streaming; audio), all within face-to-face, traditional classes. Furthermore, whilst blended learning has been defined differently by different researchers [5] , [6] , [7] , [8] ,[9] Who are still in agreement regarding the concept being a mixture of traditional face-to-face teaching and virtual, online teaching.

Blended learning has been categorised into two main types: the first combining traditional learning with e-Learning via the merging of both instructor-centred and student-centred learning theory and practice. The Student-Cantered Approach is based on the assumption that students who are given the opportunity to explore areas based on their personal interests and who are

accompanied in their seek solutions by a supportive, understanding facilitator not only achieve higher academic results, but also have an increase in personal values such as flexibility, self-confidence, and social skills while the instructor is considered as a facilitator. The second considering both synchronous and asynchronous e-Learning technologies, regarding the time of attendance. Asynchronous online communication does not necessitate instructor and student engagement in real time, and can be facilitated by resources such as e-mails, discussion boards, blogs, wikis, or video/audio recordings[10] Synchronous mode entails the delivery of course materials in real time. Students and teachers can use synchronized software to "communicate vocally, exchange messages by typing, upload PowerPoint presentations, transmit video, [or] surf websites together [11].

Indeed, blended learning is expected to enhance learners 'competence and confidence, develop social communication skills, provide advanced critical thinking in the learning environment, deliver a high-quality learning experience, and integrate the technology as an effective tools for knowledge-delivering' [12]

Furthermore, when considering it alongside alternative new systems, blended learning possesses both advantages and disadvantages for students, instructors, and learning organisations. The benefits of blended learning include: time flexibility; improved student learning outcomes; the encouragement of independence and conviviality; cost reduction; interaction enhancement between students and instructors; and an increase in learning resources and experiences [13] , [14] , [15]. Conversely, the challenges presented by blended learning include: the requirement of sophisticated technology; digital divides; computer self-efficacy; the requirement of supporting resources; the need for students to take responsibility to learn; and the need of teaching and technology skills and experience [16] In the same vein, a wealth of other studies have discussed the advantages of face-to-face classes, revealing that exchanges of emotion, energy, and fluidity are critical advantages of such face-to-face exchanges. In addition, face-to-face classes provide immediate feedback, as well as nonverbal indicators (e.g., facial expressions; body language) [17]

Saying this, the context of blended learning alongside its successful outcomes are various, and wholly dependent on various factors (e.g., the objective of the course; the ratio of face-to-face sessions; the content of the delivered course; the skills of the instructor; and the abilities of the students in identifying the effectiveness of the blended learning).

Therefore, we should adhere to the framework for organising our thinking, and should also consider these various factors in a systemic way so as to ensure effective implementation of blended learning.

On this note, Khan's Octagonal Framework has proposed, eight dimensions representing a category of issues requiring eradication being represented. These dimensions are institutional, pedagogical, and technological, and concern interface design, evaluation, management, resource support, and ethics [18]

. Notably, the institutional dimension addresses problems related to financial, operational, academic, and student services, whilst the pedagogical aspect tackles a mixture of information to be presented (content analysis), learner needs (analysis of the audience), and learning goals (goal analysis). Furthermore, the technological dimension contain all the hardware and software required for the system's implementation (e.g., the server; the bandwidth; the accessibility; any security issues), whilst the interface design dimension addresses the user interface for the system, as well as the extent of the interface's accessibility and ease of use. The evaluation dimension is concerned with the usability of a given blended learning program, and the management dimension tackles the control of the activity, as well as the management of the system's logistic activity. Finally, whilst the resource support aspect is concerned with arranging various kinds of services (e.g., offline and online) for learners and making them accessible, the ethical aspect acknowledges the ethical problems that require discussion when designing a mixed learning system (e.g., equal opportunity; economics; diversity; nationality). The impact of varied personalities on learners' perceptions of online learning should be improved. Teachers may be able to better comprehend students and devise more appropriate teaching tactics if they can identify their personalities [19], [20]. Investigated the effects of gender, educational level, and personality on online learning outcomes during the COVID19 epidemic. The study found those with high levels of agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to new experiences outperformed those with high levels of extraversion and neuroticism.

Many regions of the world have entirely transitioned to virtual education as a result of the development of COVID-19. In nations where students are not used to virtual courses, the main issue has been their preparation for this style of education. The significance of multicultural education has long been acknowledged; however, in the aftermath of crises such as the current COVID-19 pandemic, the importance of multicultural education has popped up, with COVID 19 having a significant impact on the development of multicultural communication in online classes.

Multicultural contexts of culture are common at present. While cultural diversity leads to individual and collective development, cultural differences, which also affect the discipline of education, may result in numerous confrontations and misunderstandings between people. Multicultural education is gaining traction, referring not only to faraway countries, but also to more localized geographical and ethnic areas, particularly where and when social contradictions are resolved through inter-national conflicts and wars. Therefore, the design of online programs involves close study of how individuals learn, what individuals learn and what individuals think is necessary to learn, based on their culture.

On the grounds of the aim of this study, the following research questions are identified:
1) What are the advantages and disadvantages of implementing the blended learning system?
2) What are the cultural values that could impact the implementation of the blended learning system?

3) Does the effectiveness and acceptance of blended learning vary across cultures?

The Effectiveness of Blended Learning

Several studies have been conducted so as to evaluate the effectiveness of blended learning when compared to traditional, face-to-face classrooms; and, indeed, such studies indicate toward students implementing blended learning as being highly successful and satisfied with their learning experience and the approach's flexibility [19], [20], [21], [22], [23],[24].

Blended learning's use of digital technology has the potential to improve the educational process in terms of degree of flexibility, flexibility in terms of time and place, learning rhythm, learning forms (audio/video, text/pictures, online/offline, individual/team work), and, lastly, adaptability to the learner's needs. This effectiveness of blended learning were clearly noted during the pandemic of COVID-19. The pandemic of COVID-19 has had an impact on many facets of life, including education. To avoidCOVID-19 transmission, direct face-to-face contact should be limited, although educational institutions should continue to offer learning opportunities. Blended learning is one learning model that can facilitates the learning process and enhances learning outcomes, especially during the pandemic [25].

In this vein, a comparative study of college mechanics courses conducted by [26] discovered that students within a blended classroom (the experimental group) experienced more conceptual changes and higher performance compared to those of the traditional lecture-based class (the control group). Further, a similar study sought to compare the student's motivation, as well as their outcomes, skills, and achievements, through the experience of two modes of learning—traditional, face-to-face classes, and blended learning— when studying English. The result indicated toward blended learning as being more motivational for students, casting a more positive effect on their learning outcomes [27] This result was supported by that of [28], who, in their research evaluating student achievement and satisfaction with blended learning course delivery (compared to that of the traditional, face-to-face class format) in a general health course, found blended courses to be highly preferred over the traditional lecture format. Here, promising data emerged in terms of challenging traditional teaching.

Leading from this, another study compared the blended learning approach with the traditional delivery of an accounting class to engineering students, results revealing that significant improvements in each area showcase the blended approach in higher education as significantly improving the results and experiences of students, due to the more student-centred learning environment [29] This outcome was backed by that of [30] a case study research based on the experience of blended learning approach implementation within a university lecture course for students of the FLT methodology (the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Area Studies, Moscow State University). Here, experimentation with blended learning on a local scale aided course developers in getting an idea of the subjective reaction of their students to the challenges of their study's new arrangements—which, in turn, provided the author with the ability to reflect on a number of vital conditions that enabled a mixed format course. This, ultimately, aided in contributing to the development of the professional and informational skills of the students. [31]. Investigated the factors influencing Saudi university students' willingness to use online channels during the Covid-19 pandemic based on the UTAUT Information Technology Adoption Model. Perceived utility, perceived simplicity of use, instructor influence, university management commitment, and availability of student technical assistance were all found to have substantial and positive effects on users' desire to utilize online technology in the study.

Blended Learning and Culture

The blended learning approach has proven to be the most effective learning system by various studies and researches on an international scale. The extent of blended learning's success and effectiveness has been considered from a variety of different aspects (e.g., technical; pedagogical; management); saying this, very little attention has been paid to the cultural aspects—something of high relevance considering the degree of the effectiveness and acceptance, as well as the extent of the outcomes experienced, by students of the blended learning system, vary significantly amongst different cultures. Culture has been defined by [32] as "the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others" (p. 4). Indeed, culture touches members of society greatly, shaping their value, assumptions, perceptions, and behaviours. Educational technology is developing a new society in which, considering the disparities that Hofstede has described and expanded on in the past thirty years, we need to understand how we evolve together. This argument is supported by Marquardt and [33] who claim, 'Teaching methodologies suited for Western cultures may be totally ineffective in non-Western cultures.' Meanwhile, [34] differentiates between the concept of culture in general, and learning culture, the latter being defined as, 'The ways in which students perceive their educational materials, their class discussions (whether in-person or virtual), their teachers/professors as knowledge providers or facilitators, and the meaning and purpose of education (as being either a means to a specific objective like a particular career or an end in itself).' Cultural attributes can indeed also impact online presence and learner perceptions, and so it is important to consider the cultural backgrounds of learners if we are to understand the ways in which they respond to computer-based learning [35] Furthermore, it is paramount that the impact of culture on learner behaviour and acceptance of the learning environment is considered—something that becomes particularly important when it comes to teaching and learning, as well as embedding tools and functions that allow for different levels of learning and cultural 'fit' [36] The "one-size-fits-all" model may not work in a country like India, where specific issues must be met in the current scenario. As a result, numerous factors must be considered before implementing particular online/blended activities, including the target learners, their social, cultural, and economic

backgrounds, their age range, and their access to technology infrastructure [37].

Moreover, [38]. state there to be distinct features within online collaborative learning experiences, participation, and satisfaction of students from different cultural backgrounds, additionally suggesting that social constructivism, as well as the adoption of e-Learning and online collaborative learning, can be directly related to cultural differences.

The unequal distribution of power/hierarchy is defined as the Power Distance Index (PDI); hence, countries described as 'high power distances' often rely heavily on their leaders, possess less open-mindedness to new ideas, demonstrate individual decision-making, and use a centralized management style that prevents new innovations from being adopted [39] Hence, high power distance culture instructors control the type, amount, and form of knowledge delivered to students through the traditional learning style. Hence, when it comes to the shift in accountability from the instructor to the student within the e-Learning system, Western students are seen to be more accepting, comfortable, and confident in working within the student-centred environment, compared to Asian students, who preferred the more traditional, instructor-centred approach.

the Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) as, 'The degree to which members of a group feel uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity.' The understanding of the cultural aspect of UA has enhanced the capacity of this educator to identify potential problems that may affect the implementation of blended learning [40] ,[41] Hofstede 's power distance component clarified the lack of self-confidence of students and the fact that they had difficulty taking initiative, preferring to encourage the seemingly stronger professor to assume the responsibility. This was compounded by elevated levels of misunderstanding. Evasion, which would explain why students needed a great deal of guidance in terms of criteria and evaluation rubrics, and why the In the early phases of the programme, the student goods were very similar. The degree to which individuals relate to other groups, as well as the ways in which they integrate within, society is measured by the Individualism (IDV) Index. [42] characterises collectivist societies as follows: 'Societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, often extended families (with uncles, aunts and grandparents) which continue protecting them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. Students want to be regarded as morally equal to peers and faculty and teachers are responsible for stimulating passive learners to accomplish this goal by utilizing rewards and negative reinforcement or punishment. Hence, societies described as 'collectivist' are typically strongly influenced by the ideas and norms of their society—something that contrasts 'individualist' societies, whereby individual citizens are more likely to make their own decisions and choices [43] This is particularly illustrated within societies with high IDV scores, whereby individuals are more willing to embrace new technology and to express their opinions—which stands in stark contrast to how new technology clashes with social norms and values within collectivist societies. Controversial

and argumentative speech, rather than official slogans and subdued hyperbole, can characterize individualist cultures. With a focus on the reality and what is modern, rather than on relationships and tradition, the social prominence of people is favored. Low IDV societies are called "constructivist." Teachers are only facilitators of the teaching learning environment, a "constructivist" society.'

Hofstede defines 'masculine' values as success, performance, competition, and assertiveness, and 'feminine' values as caring, solidarity, service, warm, personal relationship maintenance, and warm, personal quality of life maintenance. This index attempts to split the emotional roles of the two genders, so masculinity would encourage rewards for individuals who recognise them and enhance their personal development and training in accordance, in turn ensuring innovation adoption would be emphasised [44]

Geerte Hofstede's Five Dimensions of Culture

1. Individualism/Collectivism	Describes the strength of the relation between an individual and other individuals in the society.
2. Power Distance	Concerns the way the culture deals with unequal distribution of power and defines the amount of inequality that is normal.
3. Uncertainty Avoidance	Describes how cultures handle the fact that the future is unpredictable.
4. Masculinity/Femininity	The emphasis a culture places on practices or qualities that have traditionally been considered masculine or feminine.
5. Long-term/Short-term Orientation	Suggests whether the focus of cultural values is on the future (long term) or the past and present (short term).

Figure (1) (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2010, p.89).

Methodology

Hence Several studies have investigated the advantages of blended learning, many discussing the challenge facing the implementation of blended learning, compared with its effectiveness and acceptance across nations. Therefore, this study utilized a systemic review method when it came to exploring the effectiveness and acceptance of blended learning amongst different culture; furthermore, a systemic review was used to synthesize a body of evidence on a topic, so as to achieve robust and broad conclusions and implications [45]. Indeed, such a review is also useful when it comes to summarizing the current evidence within a specific domain, as well as in improving the accuracy of conclusions; this is seen by the fact that it shows whether findings across multiple studies are consistent and generalizable. The best reviews synthesis studies so as to draw broad, theoretical conclusions concerning what a study means, linking theory to evidence and evidence to theory [46] The systematic review was defined [46] as, 'A review of a clearly formulated question that uses systematic and explicit methods to identify, select, and critically appraise relevant research, and to collect and analyze data from the studies that are included in the review.' Indeed, this review methodology was used mainly to minimize subjectivity, selectivity, and bias; it is also lauded for

providing an explicit approach and clear criteria for a given study's inclusion or exclusion from the literature review [47]

Hence, a clear protocol was used for this study so as to minimize bias and subjectivity—a protocol that starts with the identification of the study's research questions, inclusion and exclusion criteria, the scientific databases suitable for the review, the search terms used to retrieve relevant studies, and the methods for study selection, screening, data extraction, and analysis [50]

Notably, the criteria used for study inclusion within this research included: higher education studies; and studies that compare at least two nations in terms of blended learning adaptation and implementation. Moreover, the research attempted to include up-to-date studies, as well as to not limit to English language studies.

The selected scientific databases and considered to be suitable for review due to their high reputation and published research (e.g., ProQuest journals; Eric; IEEE Xplore; Sciencedirect; Taylor and Francis online; SAGE Journals; Computer database; Scopus).

After that, we considered the search terms used to retrieve relevant studies, starting with the general term (e.g., 'blended learning; 'cultural values'), before settling on a more specific term (e.g., 'blended learning cross nations'; 'blended learning cross cultures').

Finally, our last step was to scan through the abstract and the main headings of the searched studies in deciding whether to include or exclude them, some time being taken to read each full paper for definite judgment. Additionally, a quality evaluation was applied to the excluded studies (e.g., a small sample; an unreliable method). Further, the backward reference searching technique was used as a method of inclusion of relevant research.

Reviewing the Literature

Many studies identified differences in learner expectations and outcomes amongst various culture; for instance, the motivation of learning varied between European and Asian students in [51] whilst the [52] found Arab learners to be more passive learners, lacking applied learning in 'the higher-order cognitive skills such as flexibility, problem solving and judgment' (p.89). Furthermore, Arab students were found to be highly dependent on their teachers for knowledge acquisition[53].

Arab countries hence facing clear challenges in applying the blended learning system; students 'have to take the initiative and responsibility for what they select, manage, and access in a limited time outside formal contact hours' [54].

One of the cultural challenges that faced the learning system was stated by [55] who found that, unlike their Western peers, Asian students tend to work with highly structured materials and participate in self-paced programmes. Along these same lines, [56] also place high emphasis on the importance of culturally sensitive instruction, whilst [57] focus on blended learning in four different Asian countries, finding that the success of the new system varies amongst Asian countries, despite it being well-accepted by Western culture. This conclusion who claim Asian students to prefer memorization and the reproduction style of learning, Western students meanwhile preferring to grasp a concept and understand the style of knowledge acquisition with more independent learning skills. [58] meanwhile, claims that the Asian culture considers learning as a process of self-perfection by seeking lifelong commitment, diligence, endurance of hardship, persistence, and concentration, whereas the Western culture places more emphasis on the thinking processes and learner's psychological characteristics (e.g., learning style; intelligence). Meanwhile, another study conducted by [59] which assessed the ways in which cultural orientation and learner characteristics impact learning motivation of online learners in different countries, revealed a significant difference in learning motivation between online learners in the US and Korea.

In the same vein, [60] sought to investigate the relationship between the cognitive style—as measured by the Cognitive Styles Index [61] and classroom community—as measured by the Classroom Culture Index [62]. in a group of students taking courses within a blended learning setting; the findings revealed students with intuitive cognitive styles to have lower senses of community than those of intermediate/analytical students.

[63] conducted a study to evaluate international IT postgraduate students' reactions to blended learning designed when it came to using the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) framework; ultimately, it was found that social influence wields a profound effect on both performance and effort expectations, as well as on behavioural intentions; overall, it was stated that the social environments from which the cohort originated provided sufficient economic, social, and cultural capital for the development of some digital capital. Meanwhile, a similar study by [64] investigated the impact of cultural dimensions on online learning from learners' perceptions, as well as their relationships with the six-dimensional cultural model, in four different countries (Spain, the USA, China, and Mexico), the four countries then being partitioned into two classes during the course (a group composed of Spanish, Chinese, and Mexican students, and another group composed of American students); the analysis showcased cultural differences as being very perceptible at the beginning of the educational cycle, these differences becoming less noticeable as the study drew to a close.

[65]conducted research so as to assess the impact of the high uncertainty avoidance culture dimension in UAE on the blended learning system, ultimately revealing that Uncertainty concerning the introduction of blended learning was found when membership was assigned for group work. Meanwhile, higher quality research methods were introduced where course structure lacked detail, and increased time was required for new and different online activities. When exposed to blended learning, these foreign students (from countries with a high Uncertainty Avoidance) demonstrated such an aspect, these cultures also being high-context cultures (whereby direct communication is minimal due to the majority of information being encoded in the immediate physical and social environment). This type of communication is common within collectivist cultures (e.g., that of Saudi Arabia), which represents the great importance of body language as a whole—particularly when it comes to gestures. A

low-context culture, on the other hand, can be defined as 'one in which the mass of information is vested in the explicit code which is typical of individualist cultures' [66] meanwhile, formed the assumption that the cultural background of students influenced their perception and performance in online learning environments, in that some students from certain cultures need more help than some students from other cultures when it comes to becoming independent learners. Further, [67] discussed the culture differences for designing blended learning and emphasis on the traditions, politics, the economy, values, language differences, graphical interface preferences, cross-cultural differences in interaction and communication, and learner characteristics. In line with this, they recommended stress to be placed on cultural expectations and learning traditions, as well as the provision of easy-to-use cultural interfaces, cultural interfaces, and a balance between the new and the traditional education environment, when it comes to introducing the blended learning approach. Furthermore, Lanham and [68] argue that students from different cultures possess varying compatibility with different learning environments.

[69] Recognize the key role of the 'cultural and organizational' aspects of accepting student e-Learning initiatives within their cross-cultural study, aiming to explore the implementation of e-Learning environments in Sweden and Lithuania as part of a master's course in public health education. Ultimately, they reported, 'Lithuanian students at Swedish university have been found to experience a significantly higher degree of acceptance of e-Learning environments than additionally, concluded, 'Lithuanian male students experienced a lower level of perceived usefulness of the e-Learning environment than Lithuanian female students.' In the same vein, another study evaluated blended learning for cross-cultural entrepreneurial education, developed jointly by North Carolina State University and Josip Juraj Strossmayer University, Croatia. The study revealed that the teachers needed to focus not only on the technical aspects of course delivery, but also in understanding students' expectations and perceptions, as well as in supporting student learning across the whole course [70]

investigated cross-cultural blended teaching and learning using cultural dimensions; this was in order to reflect on the cross-cultural communicative experiences of professors from South Africa, as well as that of students from Sudan, during a two-year internet-supported masters' course in Computers in Education. He claimed that a high power distance explained students lack of confidence—something that was compounded by high levels of uncertainty avoidance—, which would explain why students required an abundance of guidance in terms of their requirements and assessment rubrics. Meanwhile, the group work was unexpected by the individualist.

A given culture with a high collectivism value, high power distance, short-term orientation, and high uncertainty avoidance, prefer traditional classrooms and structured learning, and may struggle with adopting the blended learning system—something that requires an independent, active, self-directed learner to complete some activities (e.g., 'Peer discussion and collaboration, accessing library resources, reading, research and

development and working through tutorial materials and workbooks' [71]

Conclusion

In The advantages of blended learning are undeniable especially during the period of the pandemic of COVID-19, as evidenced by several studies; some of these benefits include: flexibility of time and place; enhanced learning outcomes; more student interaction; improved organization reputation; and lower operational expenses. Hence Challenges of self-regulation and the use of learning technologies are the main difficulties faced by students. The problems facing teachers are primarily the use of technology for teaching. Challenges in the provision of adequate teaching technologies and successful teacher preparation support are the key challenges that educational institutions face. Saying this, the success of the system's implementation depends on a variety of factors (e.g., the technology; the management; the culture values). Due to the increasingly multicultural nature of e-learning settings, it is important for teachers and educational designers to be conscious of the importance of educational cultural factors and to provide culturally adaptive teaching. The main objective of this study was to assess various blended learning studies that consider the impact of cultural values on the acceptance and effectiveness of blended learning—and, based on systemic reviewing of the literature, The literature reveals that teachers need to concentrate not only on the technical aspects of the delivery of the course, but must also strive to consider the desires and preferences of students and facilitate student learning during the course. Teachers, peer engagement and overall course design and organization play an important role in the satisfaction of students. This study concludes that cultures with a high collectivism value, high power distance, short-term orientation, and high uncertainty avoidance, tend to favour traditional classrooms and structured learning, and may struggle to adopt the blended learning system due to its requirements of independence, activeness, and self-direction.

Based on my experience as a branch director of the Arab Open University—which used the blended learning approach as a means of teaching at nine branches in the Arab world, and six within Saudi Arabia. I found that students' acceptance and effectiveness of the blended learning approach varied significantly—not only between the external branches within different countries, but also amongst the different branches within one country. I have observed huge differences between the number of enrolled students in main-city branches (e.g., the capital Riyadh, Jeddah, and Dammam), whereas small cities branch (e.g., Madinah, Alahsa, and Hail) are suffering from student acceptance and dissatisfaction toward blended learning.

The recommendation for practitioners' consideration concerns the differences in cultural values during the initial planning and designing of any blended learning, as well as paying attention to the details of the course design and student involvement in the course. Moreover, the researcher could place more emphasis on the impact of culture values and its influence on the acceptance and effectiveness of blended learning amongst different cultures using preliminary data. Particular insights include selecting a relevant blended learning course topic, addressing student

diversity and distinct learning motives, and bringing 'tangible diversity' through the exchange of faculty. A culture context also provides the instructor with useful information to successfully incorporate blended learning to international students.

References

[1] Al-Hunaiyyan, A., Alhajri, R., & Bimba, A. (2021). Towards an Efficient Integrated Distance and Blended Learning Model: How to Minimise the Impact of COVID-19 on Education. International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies, 15(10), 173–193. https://doiorg.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.3991/ijim.v15i10.21331

[2] Kim, K.-J., Bonk, C. J., and Zeng, T., 2005. Surveying the Future of Workplace e-Learning: The Rise of Blending, Interactivity, and Authentic Learning. eLearn Magazine.

[3] Torrisi-Steele, G., and Drew, S., 2013. The Literature Landscape of Blended Learning in Higher Education: The need for better understanding of academic blended practice. The International Journal for Academic Development. 18. 10.1080/1360144X.2013.786720.

[4] Garrison, D. and Kanuka, H., 2004. Blended Learning: Uncovering its Transformative Potential in Higher Education. The Internet and Higher Education. 7. 95-105. 10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001.

[5] Cakiroglu, U., 2012. Comparison of Novice Programmers' Performances: Blended versus Face-To-Face. Turkish Online Journal of Education, 13, 135-151.

[6] Hartfield, P., 2013. Blended Learning as an Effective Pedagogical Paradigm for Biomedical Science. Higher Learning Research Communications, 3(4), 59-67.

[7] Moazami, F., Bahrampour, E., Azar, M.R., Jahedi, F., and Moattari, M., 2014. Comparing Two Methods of Education (Virtual versus Traditional) on Learning of Iranian Dental Students: A Post-Test Only Design Study. BMC Medical Education, 14(45), 3-5. doi:10.1186/1472-6920-14-45.

[8] Napier, N.P., Dekhane, S., and Smith, S., 2011. Transitioning to Blended Learning: Understanding Student and Faculty Perceptions. Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 15, 20-32.

[9] Huang, X. S., & Hsiao, E. L. (2012). Synchronous and asynchronous communication in an online environment: Faculty experiences and perceptions. Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 13(1), 15–30. Retrieved from: https://www.learntechlib.org/p/131977.

[10] Mc Brien, J. L., Jones, P. & Cheng, R. (2009). Virtual Spaces: Employing a synchronous online classroom to facilitate student engagement in online learning. International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 10(3), 1–17.

[11] Kumar, S. 2009. Undergraduate perceptions of the usefulness of web 2.0 in higher education: Survey development. In D. Remenyi (Ed.) Proceedings of the 8th European Conference on e-Learning (pp.308–314). Italy

[12] Richardson, J. C., & Ice, P. 2010. Investigating students' level of critical thinking across instructional strategies in online discussions. The Internet and Higher Education, 13(1), 52–59.

[13] Chan, Y. F., Narasuman, S., Dalim, S. F., Sidhu, G. K., & Lee, L. F. 2016. Blended learning as a conduit for inquiry-based instruction, active learning, formative assessment and its impact on students' learning outcomes in higher education. :74–78.

[14] Vaughan, N., 2007. Perspectives on Blended Learning in Higher Education. International Journal on E-Learning, 6(1), 81-94. Waynesville, NC USA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved May 17, 2020 from https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/6310/.

[15] Meyer, K. A., 2008. Online Program Capacity: Limited, Static, Elastic, or Infinite? Planning for Higher Education, 36(2), 52–63.

[16] Singh, H., 2003. Building Effective Blended Learning Programs. Educational Technology, 43,

[17] Lai, S., Sun, B., Wu, F. T., & Xiao, R. (2020). Automatic personality identification using students' online learning behavior. IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 13(1), 26–37. https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2019.29242 23

[18] Zhonggen Yu. (2021). The effects of gender, educational level, and personality on online learning outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18, 1–17. https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00252-3.

[19] Cakiroglu, U., 2012. Comparison of Novice Programmers' Performances: Blended versus Face-To-Face. Turkish Online Journal of Education, 13, 135-151.

[20] Hartfield, P., 2013. Blended Learning as an Effective Pedagogical Paradigm for Biomedical Science. Higher Learning Research Communications, 3(4), 59-67.

[21] Moazami, F., Bahrampour, E., Azar, M.R., Jahedi, F., and Moattari, M., 2014. Comparing Two Methods of Education (Virtual versus Traditional) on Learning of Iranian Dental Students: A Post-Test Only Design Study. BMC Medical Education, 14(45), 3-5. doi:10.1186/1472-6920-14-45.

[22] Napier, N.P., Dekhane, S., and Smith, S., 2011. Transitioning to Blended Learning: Understanding Student and Faculty Perceptions. Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 15, 20-32.

[23] Roscoe, D.D., 2012. Comparing Student Outcomes in Blended and Face-To-Face Courses. Journal of Political Science Education, 8, 1-19.

[24] Alina-Daniela Popescu. (2020). Essential Aspects of Blended Learning. Ovidius University Annals: Economic Sciences Series, XX(1), 457–462.

[25] Ayuda Nia Agustina. (2021). Blended Learning Models to Improve Student Learning Outcomes During the Covid-19 Pandemic. KnE Life Sciences, 228–239. https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.18502/kls.v6i1.8607

[26] Bazelais, P., Doleck, T., 2018. Blended Learning and Traditional Learning: A Comparative Study of College Mechanics Courses. Educ Inf Technol 23, 2889–2900 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-018-9748-9.

[27] Tseng, H., and Walsh, E. J., 2016. Blended vs. Traditional Course Delivery: Comparing Students' Motivation, Learning Outcomes, and Preferences. Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 17(1).

[28] Melton, Bridget Frugoli, Bland, Helen W, and Chopak-Foss, J., 2009. Achievement and Satisfaction in Blended Learning versus Traditional General Health Course Designs. International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Vol. 3: No. 1, Article 26.

[29] Abraham, A., 2007. Student-Centred Teaching of Accounting to Engineering Students: Comparing Blended Learning and Traditional Approaches. Faculty of Commerce - Papers.

[30] Nazarenko, A., 2015. Blended Learning vs Traditional Learning: What Works? (A Case Study Research). Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 200. 77-82. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.018.

[31] Chatti, H., & Hadoussa, S. (2021). Factors Affecting the Adoption of E-Learning Technology by Students during the COVID-19 Quarantine Period: The Application of the UTAUT Model. Engineering, Technology & Applied Science Research, 11(2), 6993–7000. https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.48084/etasr.3985

[32] Hofstede, G., 2001. Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations. 2nd ed. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

[33] Kearsley, G. and Shneiderman, B., 1999. Engagement Theory: A Framework for Technology-Based Teaching and Learning

[34] Hamdan, A., 2014. The Reciprocal and Correlative Relationship Between Learning Culture and Online Education: A Case from Saudi Arabia. International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning. 15. 309-336. 10.19173/irrodl.v15i1.1408.

[35] McLoughlin, C. and Oliver, R., 2000. Designing Learning Environments for Cultural Inclusivity: A Case Study of Indigenous Online Learning at Tertiary Level. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology. Melbourne, Australia, 16(1). doi: 10.14742/ajet.1822.

[36] Younis, R. A., 2011. Internationalization, Blended Learning, Diverse Cultures. _International Journal of Arts and Sciences_ 4 (8):2011.

[37] Bordoloi, R., Das, P. and Das, K. (2021), "Perception towards online/blended learning at the time of Covid-19 pandemic: an academic analytics in the Indian context", Asian Association of Open Universities Journal, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 41-60. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAOUJ-09-2020-0079.

[38] Zhu, C., 2012. Student Satisfaction, Performance, and Knowledge Construction in Online Collaborative Learning. Educational Technology and Society, 15(1), 127-136.

[39] Erumban, A., and De J, S., 2006. Cross-Country Differences in ICT Adoption: A Consequence of Culture?. http://www.alexandria.unisg.ch/Publikationen/62745.

[40] Bailey, J., 2006. From the Editor: Mission Possible. Academy of Management Learning and Education, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 5_7.

[41] Sulkowski, N. and Deakin, M. K., 2010. Implications of Internationalisation on Learning and Teaching— Listening to the Winds of Change? Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sports and Tourism Education, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 110_116.

[42] Hofstede, G. and Hofstede, G. J., 2010. Cultures and Organizations: Software for the Mind. 3rd Ed. [online] Available at: http://lib.myilibrary.com.ezproxy.aus.edu?ID=296125.

[43] Erumban, A., and De J, S., 2006. Cross-Country Differences in ICT Adoption: A Consequence of Culture?. http://www.alexandria.unisg.ch/Publikationen/62745.

[44] Arslan, C., 2009. Anger, Self-Esteem, and Perceived Social Support in Adolescence. Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 37(4), 555-564.

[45] Baumeister, R. F., 2013. Writing a Literature Review. In M. J. Prinstein and M. D. Patterson (Eds): The Portable Mentor: Expert Guide to a Successful Career in Psychology (pp. 119-132; 2nd ed.). New York: Springer Science+ Business Media.

[46] Siddaway, A. P., Wood, A. M., and Hedges, L. V., 2019. How to Do a Systematic Review: A Best Practice Guide to Conducting and Reporting Narrative Reviews, Meta-Analyses, and Meta-Syntheses. Annual Review of Psychology, 70.

[47] The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from http://handbook.cochrane.org.

[48] Cooper, H. M., 2003. Editorial. Psychological Bulletin, 129, 3-9.

[49] Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., and The PRISMA Group., 2009. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-

Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. British Medical Journal, 339, 332-336. Comprehensive reporting guidelines for systematic reviews

[50] Selvarajah, C., 2006. Cross-Cultural Study of Asian and European Student Perception: The Need to Understand the Changing Educational Environment in New Zealand. Cross-Cultural Management, vol. 13, pp. 142_155.

[51] World Bank., 2008. New Challenges Facing the Education Sector in MENA, The Road Not Traveled, Education reform in the Middle East and North Africa, MENA Development Report, [online] pp. 83_114. Available at: siteresources.worldbank.org/.../EDU_Flagship_Full_ENG.pdf.

[52] Lansari, A., Tubaishat, A. and Al-Rawi, A., 2010. Using a Learning Management System to Foster Independent Learning in an Outcome-Based University: A Gulf Perspective. Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology, vol. 7, pp. 73_87.

[53] Deepwell, F. and Malik, S., 2008. On Campus, But Out of Class: An Investigation into Students' Experiences of Learning Technologies in their Self-Directed Study. Research in Learning Technology, [online] Available at: http://www.researchinlearningtechnology.net/index.php/ rlt/article/view/10881.

[54] Ramburuthi P. and McCormick, J., 2001. Learning Diversity in Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Asian International and Australian Students, Higher Education 42: 333–350, 2001, © 2001 Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.

[55] Protheroe, N. and Turner, J., 2003. Culturally Sensitive Instruction. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

[56] Tham, K., and Tham, C., 2011. Blended Learning— A Focus Study on Asia. IJCSI International Journal of Computer Science Issues, Vol. 8, Issue 2, March 2011 ISSN (Online): 1694-0814

[57] Li, J., 2000. What do US and Chinese College Students Think 'Learning' Is? Comparing Cultural Models of Learning of Americans and Chinese. Unpublished Manuscript.

[58] Doo H. L., 2004. Cross Cultural Differences in Online Learning Motivation. Educational Media International, 41:2, 163-175, DOI: 10.1080/09523980410001685784

[59] Graff, M., 2003. Cognitive Style and Attitudes towards Using Online Learning and Assessment Methods. Electronic Journal of e-Learning. 1. 21-28.

[60] Allinson, C., and Hayes, J., 1996. The Cognitive Style Index: A Measure of Intuition Analysis for Organizational Research. Journal of Management Studies, 33, 119-135.

[61] http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1996.tb00801.x.

[62] Rovai, A. P., 2002. Development of an Instrument to Measure Classroom Community. The Internet and Higher Education, 5, 197-211.

[63] Prasad, P.W.C. and Maag, A., and Redestowicz, M. and Hoe, L., 2018. Unfamiliar Technology: Reaction of International Students to Blended Learning. Computers and Education. 122. 10.1016/j.compedu.2018.03.016.

[64] Gómez-Rey, P., Barbera, E., and Fernández-Navarro, F., 2016. The Impact of Cultural Dimensions on Online Learning. Educational Technology and Society, 19 (4), 225–238.

[65] Kemp, L., 2013. Introducing Blended Learning: An Experience of Uncertainty for Students in the United Arab Emirates. Research in Learning Technology. 21. 10.3402/rlt.v21i0.18461.

[66] Hamdan, A., 2014. The Reciprocal and Correlative Relationship Between Learning Culture and Online Education: A Case from Saudi Arabia. International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning. 15. 309-336. 10.19173/irrodl.v15i1.1408.

[67] Al-Hunaiyyan, A., AL-Sharhan, S. and Al-Huwail, N., 2008. Blended e-Learning Design: Discussion of Cultural Issues. International Journal of Cyber Society and Education, 1(1), 17-32. ATISR. Retrieved April 25, 2020 from https://www.learntechlib.org/p/209249/.

[68] Lanham, E. and Zhou, W., 2003. Cultural Issues in Online Learning - Is Blended Learning a Possible Solution? International Journal of Computer Processing of Oriental Languages Vol. 16, No. 4 (2003) 275–292.

[69] Keller, C., Hrastinski, S., and Carlsson, S. A., 2007. Students' Acceptance of e-Learning Environments: A Comparative Study in Sweden and Lithuania. International Business, 395 406.

[70] Ivan Stefanic, Ronald K. Campbell, John S. Russ and Edita Stefanic., 2020. Evaluation of a Blended Learning Approach for Cross-Cultural Entrepreneurial Education. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 57:2, 242-254, DOI: 10.1080/14703297.2019.1568901.

[71] Deepwell, F. and Malik, S., 2008. On Campus, But Out of Class: An Investigation into Students' Experiences of Learning Technologies in their Self-Directed Study. Research in Learning Technology, [online] Available at: http://www.researchinlearningtechnology.net/index.php/ rlt/article/view/10881.