https://doi.org/10.22364/htqe.2022.37

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES REGARDING HYBRID LEARNING DURING THE PANDEMIC TIMES

Mustafa Kavak
University of Latvia, Latvia

ABSTRACT

Education has earned a novel façade and definition with the advent of technology. Furthermore, this ongoing education perspective has adapted itself to the challenges and difficulties it has encountered in recent years. Pandemic has been one of those challenges. During the pandemic, education remained stable and even retrogressed. Therefore, the necessity for new learning models has become a current issue. Hybrid learning has become one of the innovative learning models. Recently, hybrid learning has obtained a very crucial role in teaching. However, the quality and effectiveness of hybrid learning are still vague. This research paper aims to explore and analyse university students as well as a university professor's and a schoolteacher's perspectives regarding the hybrid learning in the context of pandemic. The research sample comprised of 73 university students, including pre-service teachers and master students as well as a university professor and a schoolteacher. Questionnaire was conducted through Google Docs which included 13 questions based on Likert's scale, and interviews were conducted on Microsoft Teams with a university professor, a schoolteacher and two students, through which five questions regarding their general perspectives on their experiences on hybrid learning were asked. In conclusion, the findings of this research paper provide answers to the questions regarding hybrid learning such as how hybrid learning is defined by the university students, what the most common problems that the students have encountered during hybrid learning in pandemic times are, which advantages and disadvantages of hybrid learning have been experienced and the related issues. These findings suggest that while hybrid learning takes place, the negative aspects (drawbacks) have outnumbered the positive aspects and indicates the need for further improvement and advance in future implication of hybrid learning.

Keywords: *education in pandemic, hybrid learning, online education, students' perspectives, synchronous learning*

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has broken out unexpectedly and it brought about far-reaching changes in every aspect of human daily life, including

radical changes to education systems at all levels (Karakose, 2021). The transition from traditional education model to online education model has exponentially been regarded as a must. Similarly, Mohammed and Mudhsh (2021) commented that the current era is witnessing several effects and a necessary change in the education system due to the spread of COVID-19, which shifted education from offline education to online education on educational teaching platforms. After the beginning of the pandemic, various educational models either came into existence or regained popularity. As there are some severe disadvantages to online learning in terms of communication (social isolation and absence of communication), limitations (feedback, inappropriateness, and accreditation), and authenticity (cheating) as proposed by Alodwan (2021), the necessity for the fully face-to-face delivery model or at least combination of face-to-face and online learning has come out again. Hybrid learning has become an appropriate learning model for this necessity and proved to be one of the most common models during the pandemic. Hybrid learning has various definitions from various points of view but the one that is provided by College du Page (n. d) states that hybrid learning combines face-to-face and online teaching into one cohesive experience. Nearly half of the class sessions are on-campus, while the other half have students working online at the same time. In other words, hybrid learning synchronously enables students to attend the session either in face-to-face (traditional) settings or on online platforms, which could be described as their preference rather than fully face-to-face or fully online learning alone. On the other hand, hybrid learning has frequently been misidentified by some scholars as they claim that the terms hybrid and blended can be used interchangeably. However, these terms refer to various aspects. College du Page (n. d.) theorizes that whereas hybrid refers to teaching that is roughly balanced between face-to-face and online learning (think 50/50), blended refers to a mostly traditional face-to-face course that also incorporates a few sessions' worth of online instruction (think 25/75). In other terms, hybrid learning has comparably more online learning while blended learning perceives online learning as a supportive delivery mode to face-to-face learning to create a more variable learning context. Hybrid learning has made its name as one of the most preferred learning models during the COVID-19 pandemic times. However, the perspectives and experiences regarding hybrid learning have remained stable and unanalysed, which has resulted in stagnation in hybrid learning literature depth. Therefore, this research is projected to contribute to the literature profundity through the investigation of the perspectives of university students regarding the hybrid learning during the pandemic.

Literature review

Hybrid learning has come out as a current, popular, and novel learning model in recent years. There has been some research that contributed to its literature depth. These literature sources have shed light upon further studies in the field. In these sources, hybrid learning has thoroughly been discussed, developed, defined, and analysed in various aspects by different authors. Martyn (2003) states that the hybrid online model employs the best characteristic of online education and interactivity that typically characterizes face-to-face classroom instruction. As it can be concluded that face-to-face and online learning are complementary of each other in terms of the advantages they can share. Likewise, hybrid learning offers a possibility to provide engaging learning opportunities to students by combining a face-to-face medium of instruction with online learning opportunities (Singh, Steele, & Singh, 2021). Therefore, hybrid learning provides students with a sense of preference over both learning models and optimality in general. On the other hand, students might not know about the hybrid model as they could have not experienced this model before. To overcome this, Yang and Spitzer (2020) found out that class observations showed that in the first two weeks, the students asked more questions on the set-up of the course and the requirements of the online activities. Therefore, to familiarize the students with the aforementioned model, the first couple of weeks would function as a set-up or primary implementation of the model, in which the students get to know it by personally getting involved and practicing.

Hybrid learning has stood out among the other learning models as it serves numerous advantages. Primarily, it combines advantages of both face-to-face and online learning. For instance, Hall and Villareal (2015) concluded that in the busy lives of students who managed full-time family and work responsibilities, the online components of hybrid learning provided independence with which to pace their learning process. Accordingly, students follow more autonomous pathways mainly based on their performance, hence they can spare more time for their personal life and responsibilities. Additionally, Zein et al. (2019) found out that hybrid learning shows improved results than conventional learning. This is possible because learning has changed from the teacher-centred learning paradigm to learning that emphasizes the activeness of students to construct their knowledge through problem challenges, discovery activities, and works in small groups or class discussions. In other words, hybrid learning enables students to experience more modern and student-centred learning settings and to build their knowledge based on their discovery and autonomous personalities. This leads to more quality and creativity-prone learning and supports the fact that hybrid learning outperforms the conventional learning model.

Similarly, hybrid learning enables the students to practise and reinforce their digital literacy. Therefore, students may develop self-confidence and self-efficacy Prior et al. (2016) also agree that the similarities between digital literacy and self-efficacy suggest a close, positive relationship between these concepts. Therefore, the study hypothesizes that digital literacy will lead to self-efficacy in online distance education. Implicitly, self-efficacy may lead to a more autonomous and productive student setting.

In addition to previously mentioned, there have been a few standpoints to be regarded as crucial aspects. In this respect, Karabulut-Ilgu and Jahren (2016) emphasized that hybrid course design requires a careful reconsideration of learning objectives, learning activities, assessments, as well as communication channels. To make it clear, hybrid learning must determinately focus on the elaborate progression steps and consistently follow the procedures that are pre-determined in the syllabi in order to take benefit of the conducted model as much and successful as it could. The other aspect to take into account is to analyse and observe the relationship between the students and teachers during the hybrid learning as previously mentioned above, this model has already realized the transition from teacher-centred notion to student-centred setting with the advent of the latest technological advances in last two decades. Masalimova et al. (2021) also stated that the introduction of collaborative technologies radically changes the interaction between the teacher and students. For this reason, teachers must seek to find a way to conduct this model, in which they are aware of their roles in the hybrid model setting, and this can happen as long as the courses are held synchronously rather than asynchronously. In this respect, facilitator or supporter teacher roles could preferably be more appropriate while conducting this model on both the students and the course. In contrast to all these aforementioned advantages and key points to regard in hybrid learning, there have been some limitations that come with the hybrid learning model. The term “hybrid learning” made a name for itself in the COVID-19 pandemic context even though its birth dates back two decades ago. Its advantages are newly acquired. Similarly, Holley and Oliver (2010) conclude that previous background knowledge in any unconventional learning plays a crucial role in students’ performance as well as their studies. Consequently, if the students are not subject to any introduction or warm-up session in hybrid learning, they may not put up a satisfactory performance and concentration, which may affect the general relevance and flow of the learning negatively. The other point to regard as a limitation is the access to technological devices and computer literacy. Many students are still struggling to find technological devices and the internet to connect to online classes. Accordingly, Moreno et al. (2021) emphasize that during the pivot

hybrid learning, many students do not have access to adequate devices and Internet access for remote education. Thus, the students are unable to improve their digital and technological literacy, which significantly damages their learning process. Sanpanich (2021) draws attention to the fact that computer literacy is an essential skill in hybrid learning as students tend to use computers and technology to get access to course materials, complete their tasks, plan their studies, and interact with teachers and peers. However, this limitation has stabilized itself in hybrid learning and still is regarded as a drawback in a quality learning setting. Interaction is another important aspect of learning. Ayuwanti et al. (2021) remark that teacher-student interaction needs to be created, and students need attention, stimulation, and guidance in learning. However, hybrid learning, in line with its functions lacks a consummate and conventional interaction inside the triangulation teacher, student, and content as hybrid context includes online aspects either. When the interaction, which is a key factor in learning is neglected. The hybrid learning could not fully be benefited. Abrami et al. (2011) agree that teacher, student, and content triangulation are directly proportionate to the success of learning as long as the interactions are well-performed in the context. Likewise, Parker and Parker (2013) concurred that interaction in online learning possesses a considerable effect, and without interactions among students or between students and instructor, the process of online learning would be severely limited or halted. Therefore, this may lead students to isolation, demotivation, and absence in online learning (McElrath & McDowell, 2008).

Methodology

Purpose of the Research

This research paper aims to explore and analyse university students as well as a university professor's and a schoolteacher's perspectives regarding the hybrid learning in the context of pandemic. This research paper also will seek to answer the following research questions;

1. What the university students' perspectives regarding the hybrid learning during the pandemic times are;
2. What a university professor's and a schoolteacher's perspectives regarding the hybrid teaching during the pandemic times are.

Research Participants

This research has included 73 university students for both questionnaire and interview as well as a schoolteacher and university professor for interview for the purpose of data collection procedure. The data have been collected from 60 Bachelor Programme, nine Master Programme and one

Doctoral Programme students as well as one secondary teacher and one university professor. The respondents have experienced the hybrid learning and teaching.

Table 1. Questionnaire Respondents' Background ($n = 73$)

Respondents' Study Level	Frequency (Entries)	Percentage (%)
Bachelor Programme	60	82.2
Master Programme	9	12.3
Doctoral Programme	4	5.5

Table 2. Interviewees' Background ($n = 4$)

Interviewee (Pseudonym)	Gender	Background
Jack	Male	English Language Teacher Programme Student
Mary	Female	English Language Teacher Programme Student
Sofia	Female	English Teacher Schoolteacher
Katty	Female	Professor of Teacher Education in English Language Teacher Program

Research Model

The research was conducted through mixed data collection models, which validate the findings using quantitative and qualitative data combined (Wisdom & Creswell, 2013). For quantitative component, the survey has been used through a self-administered online questionnaire to determine the number of students that perceive hybrid learning from various aspects and provide statistical description of the respondents. For qualitative data, semi-structured interviews have been conducted with a schoolteacher, a university professor and two university students for their perspectives regarding the hybrid learning. The findings of both data collection models are analysed and transcribed into numerical data and shown in the tables and figures.

Data Collection Tools

As a quantitative data collection model, self-administered and online five-point Likert's scale questionnaire has been conveyed to the respondents through Google Forms. The respondents were asked thirteen questions regarding hybrid learning including a question of their study programme level (Bachelor, Master and Doctoral Programmes). As a qualitative data

collection tool, semi-structured interviews were conducted with university students, schoolteacher and university professor. The interviewees were asked questions regarding their experience with the hybrid learning and teaching, problems they had encountered, and advantages and disadvantages of hybrid learning and teaching and general overview on the model.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were collected in the period of two months through Google Forms and diverted into statistical data through SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The data such as mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentage were obtained. Similarly, qualitative data were collected in a two and half months period by interviews conducted on Microsoft Teams. They were transcribed in the next day after the interview. All the data obtained were used in the research paper through excerpts to support the statements.

Results and discussion

In the next section, the findings from quantitative and qualitative data are elaborately presented to give reasonable answers to aforementioned two research questions.

Students were asked to choose the most relevant definition (see Table 3) depending on their hybrid learning experiences (all of these definitions were correct).

Table 3. Hybrid Learning Definition Preferences by the Respondents ($n = 73$)

Questionnaire Items	Frequency	Percent (%)
Hybrid learning is the integration of electronic learning (e-learning) with classical/traditional classroom instruction and fosters some highly desirable developments, such as more individualized and flexible learning. (Bärenfänger, 2005)	28	38.4
Hybrid learning combines face-to-face group and online teaching group into one cohesive experience group at the same time in the classroom. (College of DuPage, n. d.)	24	32.9
The hybrid online model employs the best characteristics of online education and the interactivity that typically characterizes face-to-face classroom instruction. (Martyn, 2002)	13	17.8
Hybrid learning creates a more adaptive and engaging learning environment compared to fully online or fully on-site instruction. (Raes et al., 2019)	8	11.0

Through this question, the perspective of the respondents towards hybrid learning were determined. Even though the majority of respondents (38.4% which is 28 of 73) agreed that the definition by Bärenfänger (2005) complied with their hybrid learning experience, other vast group of respondents (32.9% which is 24 of 73) supported the statement made by College of DuPage (n. d). Others preferred the explications by Martyn (2002) and Raes et al. (2019) by 17,8% (which is 13 of 73) and 11.0%, (which is 8 of 73) respectively.

According to Table 4.1, in terms of workload and responsibility, the majority of students (45.2% which is 33 of 73) expressed their opinions in favour of increased workload in hybrid learning compared to pre-pandemic times. However, other large group of students (39.7% which is 29 of 73) claimed that their workload had decreased in contrast to face-to-face setting. Other students perceived their workload the same as it used to be. The workload and responsibilities the students adapted mainly focused on their experiences in hybrid setting. However, since the online attendees were expected to do extra-curricular activities such as online material use, control technical issues and lack of active interaction with the present students and teacher, the online attendees might be required to do more than those who attended face-to-face. According to Jack, one of the interviewees, the workload issue is interpreted as follows "*…in hybrid learning, you have much more work to do by yourself. You mainly have to run activities related to your studies by yourself. It is even much further to focus on your work at home as your family members or pets may not allow you to do your work…" (Jack, Interviewee 1, P. 2)*. More than half of the respondents (54.8% which is 40 of 73) agreed that they were more attentive and showed active participation when they attended online in hybrid setting compared to fully online setting. In other words, they felt like they needed to catch up with present students in the classroom. Therefore, they were motivated to demonstrate more in participation and attendance. On the other hand, some other participants (31.5% which is 23 of 73) claimed that they were not able to actively get involved in the sessions and showed less interest in attendance. Sofia, English teacher and one of the interviewees stated that *"The participation was not very affected in hybrid setting. Furthermore, they were also quite willing to attend the classes face-to-face as much as possible. Those who attended online were mainly infected with COVID-19 and they managed to attend the classes online." (Sofia, Interviewee 3, P. 1)*. In contrast to Sofia's statement, Katty, university professor and other interviewee summarized her experience from a different aspect*"...In terms of participation, I would say many more were attending online. But on the other hand, you cannot be 100% percent sure that they are sincerely attending. Especially, when they are not switching on their cameras..." (Katty, Interviewee 4, P. 2)*.

Table 4.1. Perspectives of University Students Regarding the Hybrid Learning During the Pandemic Times (n = 73)

Questionnaire Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Std. Dev.	Mean
1. My workload has increased during both synchronous face-to-face and online sessions in hybrid setting as compared to fully face-to-face sessions.	8 (11.0%)	25 (34.2%)	11 (15.1%)	26 (35.6%)	3 (4.1%)	73 (100.0%)	1.14	2.88
2. I am more attentive to the sessions and get involved with more active participation during the synchronous online sessions in hybrid setting compared to fully online sessions.	9 (12.3%)	31 (42.5%)	10 (13.7%)	19 (26.0%)	4 (5.5%)	73 (100.0%)	1.15	2.70
3. I experience and learn in synchronous online sessions as much as I do in synchronous face-to-face sessions in hybrid setting.	7 (9.6%)	23 (31.5%)	7 (9.6%)	27 (37.0%)	9 (12.3%)	73 (100.0%)	1.25	3.11
4. I demonstrate satisfactory performance during the synchronous online sessions in hybrid setting.	13 (17.8%)	26 35.6(%)	16 (21.9%)	14 (19.2%)	3 (4.1%)	72 (One missing datum) (98.6%)	1.12	2.56

In hybrid educational model, the most remarkable feature is that it gives students the chance to experience online and face-to-face learning synchronously. Hence, the necessity to elicit their perspectives on whether online attendees learn as much and equally as present attendees in hybrid setting. As a result, more respondents (49.3% which is 36 of 73) indicated that online attendees were unable to receive as productive and plentiful benefits as face-to-face attendees. To put differently, the unfair gap in learning between these two groups is evidently experienced by the students. In opposition to this, comparably fewer respondents (41.1% which is 30 of 73) opposed to this perspective and claimed that they had managed to learn as much as present students did in hybrid learning despite of the fact that they might suffer some technologic, educational or organizational challenges that they came across. Student's performance in hybrid learning setting is also a key point to take into regard. In order to learn more about the hybrid learning and boost the potential future implication of hybrid educational model, how the students perform and learn through hybrid learning must be thoroughly investigated. In the case of online attendee students, the vast majority of respondents (53.8% which is 39 of 73) evaluated their performance pretty well in hybrid learning context. In other words, students continued their learning without any significant obstacles in hybrid setting. Katty reviewed her performance as more critical-thinking oriented experience*"...I had to think about all the possible situations and cases. Even I could not know what would really happen. I also constantly kept in mind that what one group might do and what other group might not do. The hybrid model was practical for me as I had chance to see how to make these things applicable in both online and face-to-face settings..." (Katty, Interviewee 4, P. 1)*. Conversely, relatively small amount of respondents (23.3% which is 17 of 72) came up with the opposite idea that online attendees were unable to label their performances as good as they imagined in hybrid learning. According to the rest of respondents (21.9% which is 16 of 72), their performances were satisfactory during the synchronous online sessions in hybrid setting.

Table 4.2. Perspectives of University Students Regarding the Hybrid Learning During the Pandemic Times (n = 73)

Questionnaire Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Std. Dev.	Mean
5. I have more convenient access to the synchronous online sessions in hybrid setting than fully face-to-face sessions.	24 (32.9%)	32 (43.8%)	6 (8.2%)	7 (9.6%)	4 (5.5%)	73 (100.0%)	1.13	2.11
6. I perform more independently on my tasks and assignments and explore the materials autonomously in synchronous online sessions in hybrid setting as compared to fully face-to-face sessions.	19 (26.0%)	28 (38.4%)	12 (16.4%)	12 (16.4%)	2 (2.7%)	73 (100.0%)	1.11	2.32
7. During synchronous online sessions in hybrid setting, I actively interact with the content, teacher and other students and easily engage with them in cooperation.	8 (11.0%)	17 (23.3%)	18 (24.7%)	22 (30.1%)	8 (11.0%)	73 (100.0%)	1.19	3.07
8. In hybrid setting, as an online attendee, I am more literate about technology and use of online sources as compared to synchronous face-to-face attendees.	11 (15.1%)	39 (53.4%)	14 (19.2%)	7 (9.6%)	2 (2.7%)	73 (100.0%)	.94	2.32
My learning expectations are met within hybrid learning setting.	2 (2.7%)	29 (39.7%)	22 (30.1%)	13 (17.8%)	7 (9.6%)	73 (100.0%)	1.03	2.92

Having been the standout factors of the most promising features of hybrid educational model, convenience and availability are key terms that highly explain what hybrid learning model is according to the respondents (See Table 4.2). A remarkable number of students (76.7% which is 56 of 73) commented that they had more accessibility and convenience than pre-pandemic times as they could simply choose which hybrid model (onsite or online) that they could take part in contrast to a few students (15.1% which is 11 of 73) who disagreed. According to the interviewees' experiences, convenience and accessibility came up with numerous aspects. For instance, in Jack's case, he summarized his experience as follows *"Some people couldn't come in-person. Therefore, hybrid model is an alternative for all student to attend the class. At the beginning of the semester, I personally could not come as I was not fully vaccinated and not allowed to step in the school. However, we were able to attend online simultaneously. It gave me an opportunity to benefit from convenience and availability." (Jack, Interviewee 1, P. 1)*. Likewise, Mary also shared her experience from similar perspective *"As for the hybrid learning aspect, it was quite convenient for me as I could write everything on my computer. However, if I were an in-person attendee, it would be challenging for me to bring my computer and multitask at the same time." (Mary, Interviewee 2, P. 3)*. A respectable number of respondents (64.4% which is 47 of 73) highlighted that in hybrid setting, they had more unguided time compared to pre-pandemic times as individuals as the teacher had to pay attention to both groups. In this case, the more independent works and performances emerged. Specifically, online attendees had much more individualized and autonomous work to do as since they needed to explore the materials and do the tasks and assignments online. This led online attending students to adapt new roles and responsibilities to work on their assignments and tasks as more independent individuals. Jack mentioned the challenge for working independently on his studies as follows *"In pandemic times, I was always at home. There was more time for the studies as I didn't have to travel Riga from my hometown like pre-pandemic times. If I had any questions, I had to send an e-mail to the lecturer or tried to find my own answers. That is, the communication barrier between the lecturer and the students could be clearly felt." (Jack, Interviewee 1, P. 1)*. The term "interaction" had also reformed its existing meaning with its new birth in hybrid setting. Online attendees in hybrid learning were basically not able to interact with the teacher, other students and contents (session) and easily engage them in cooperation according to considerable number of respondents (41.1% which is 30 of 73) as opposed to agreeing respondents (34.3% which is 25 of 73) and neutral respondents (24.7% which is 18 of 73). Technical, educational or organizational issues might prevent an appropriate interaction between teachers, present students and content and online attendee students. In the

interviews, interviewees experienced various obstacles that prevented them from a healthy and secure interaction with the others. Mary demonstrated a story regarding the hybrid learning *"The hybrid learning was quite similar to that of fully online but my attention to the course was a bit shorter as teacher was not paying equal attention to those who attended online. She was focusing more on onsite students. I felt not quite involved in the lectures. But when it was fully online, teacher used to pay attention to all the students equally. For instance, when I had to ask a question, I had to switch on the camera and microphone and ask it, but it would take time for teacher to realize the question." (Mary, Interviewee 2, P. 3)*. In the eyes' of her role as professor, Katty presented her position in hybrid teaching as follows *"I had one fully qualified and equipped auditorium. In this less equipped auditorium, I had to pay more attention to those who were present. However, I remember, in one class, I had two students present and five or six students were attending online. In this case, I had to pay more attention to online attendees. Did you see? The number of students determines those to whom I should pay attention." (Katty, Interviewee 4, P. 1)*. Technological literacy was also one of the pioneering features that hybrid model led students to adopt. Despite of a few objecting respondents (12.3% which is 9 of 73) and neutral respondents (19.2% which is 14 of 73), dominating part of respondents (68.4% which is 50 of 73) favoured that when they attended online, their technological literacy, use and awareness in the scope of learning were greatly improved. In other words, as it was stated previously, online attendees had to work independently and were supposed to perform more on the computer. In the same way, their practical knowledge in technology use and technical awareness in the hybrid setting increased significantly compared to those who were present in the classroom. Katty supported this idea by indicating *"...what I find challenging about the hybrid model is that it requires a strict and structured lesson plan and higher technological literacy. Every day, latest updates and developments regarding the teaching platforms such as Microsoft Teams or Zoom are coming out. I need to keep up with them." (Katty, Interviewee 4, P. 1)*. In general overview of hybrid model, the majority of students (42.4% which is 31 of 73) indicated that their learning expectations were met. They assured that they learnt as much as they would do in fully online or face-to-face learning. However, some more respondents (27.4% which is 20 of 73) claimed that their learning in hybrid setting was not as satisfied as they had expected. They attended that either fully online or fully face-to-face setting must be set as default learning model. On the other hand, more respondents (30.1% which is 22 of 73) demonstrated that their experience in hybrid learning was neither above nor below their expectations.

Table 5.1. Educational Problems Encountered by Respondents (multiple choice was possible)

Problems	**Number of Responses**	**Percent (%)**
Disengagement and demotivation during the session	48	34.3%
Monotonous sessions	46	32.9%
Ineffective teaching model	36	25.7%
Unfair assessment	10	7.1%
Total	**140**	**100%**

Valid		**Missing**		**Total**	
N	**Percent**	**N**	**Percent**	**N**	**Percent**
68	93.2%	5	6.8%	73	100.0%

In hybrid setting, some problems that stemmed from educational or organizational impacts were determined by the respondents. In this case, considerable amount of respondents (34.3% which is 48 of 73) indicated that during the hybrid learning, they have suffered from disengagement and demotivation during the session as previously stated, teachers' attention portioned into two groups and this led students to take care of themselves during the session. Similarly, numerous respondents (32.9% which is 46 of 73) defined their hybrid experiences as monotonous session. In hybrid learning, the respondents mainly alleged that procedures, technical and educational issues to realize hybrid learning outpaced the learning itself and therefore, the sessions turned out to be tedious and unexciting. Similarly, other respondents emphasized that hybrid was ineffective model (25.7% which is 36 of 73) and they were subjected to unfair assessment (7.1% which is 10 of 73) during the hybrid learning. Jack stressed his point of view as follows; "*... making half of the class online and other half face-to-face will lose its chemistry and focus. It must be either fully online or fully face-to-face...*" *(Jack, Interviewee 1, P. 1)*

Aside from education-related problems in hybrid model, organization-oriented problems can also come about. Lack of awareness, unguided learning management, underdevelopment or unsupportive approach might be regarded as primary grounds for these problems. According to overwhelming majority of respondents (77.3% which is 51 of 73), as one of the most common problems, internet disconnection could be detrimental to the successful implementation of hybrid learning. Precautions that are taken by the relevant institutions or people would create a supportive connection for hybrid setting.

Table 5.2. Organizational Problems Encountered by Respondents (Multiple choice was possible)

Problems	**Number of Responses**	**Percent (%)**
Internet disconnection	51	77.3%
Irregular course schedule	19	28.8%
Technologic equipment shortage	17	25.8%
Technologic equipment illiteracy	16	24.2%
Other	8	12.1%
Total	**111**	**100%**

Valid		**Missing**		**Total**	
Number	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
66	90.4%	7	9.6%	73	100.0%

Furthermore, considerable number of respondents (28.8% which is 19 of 73) affirmed that irregular course schedules made it more demanding. To illustrate, as it was mentioned, convenience became an attractive advantage in hybrid learning, especially for online attendees. In a comparable manner, irregular course schedule benefited online attendees. On the other hand, present students were not able to keep up with the course schedule, which would eventually lead them to attend online. Some respondents (25.8% which is 17 of 73) remarked that technologic equipment shortage also impacted the learning in hybrid setting. As many institutions were caught off guard due to the breakof COVID-19, they were not able to furnish their institutions with appropriate and quality equipment to provide convenient learning environment. Katty uttered her experience as follows.*"...the hybrid teaching went quite easy for me. I had capacity to teach effectively as I had an auditorium, which is equipped with all necessary and applicable technological devices. On the other hand, I had two other auditorium halls for nearly one hundred students and some ten of them were behind the screen and these rooms were not as equipped as advanced one and it was comparably a bit more challenging even to turn off the sound to hear those who were behind the screen..." (Katty, Interviewee 4, P. 1)*. Lastly, a number of respondents restated that technologic equipment illiteracy (24.2% which is 16 of 73) also played crucial role in implementation of hybrid learning. In other terms, the more you are conscious on benefiting the technologic equipment, the more uninterrupted the learning will become. Even though online attendees and teachers would benefit the most, present students may also raise their awareness on the significance of technologic literacy in hybrid learning.

Conclusions

This research mainly focused on the perspectives of university students regarding the hybrid learning model in the context of COVID-19 and hence, sought answers to two research questions. The findings demonstrated that hybrid setting had been seen as a premature learning model but proved a promising model in future according to most of the participants. Technical and education-related issues negatively impacted and decreased the efficient and potential influence of hybrid model. In general, hybrid learning came up with diverse benefits and drawbacks. Flexible, convenient and novel had been featured as the benefits while lack of technical equipment and literacy toward this new model, unequal learning between online and present students, and rising workload and responsibility for students and teacher had been mainly affiliated to the drawbacks. The findings were similar with that of Raes (2022) which indicate that to be able to obtain more precise and generalizable findings and find out the drawbacks in participants' perspectives regarding their experiences in hybrid learning and overcome or improve them into applicable and non-detrimental components, more empirical and comprehensive research was needed.

The literature sources that have been referred to such as Raes (2022), Villareal (2015) and Sanpanich (2021) shared similarities with the results of this research. In other terms, the advantages that were mentioned by the sources cited above were mostly in accordance with the participants' perspectives such as "*convenience, flexibility, technology-oriented learning and autonomous and student-centred learning environmen*t." However, the implementation of hybrid learning fell behind the expectation due to the lack of appropriate guide and setting (classroom). Therefore, the majority of participants confronted many challenges during their hybrid learning times.

To sum up, this study aimed to investigate the perspectives of university students' (also including a university professor and a schoolteacher) regarding the hybrid learning model during the pandemic times. The findings varied but negative aspects comparably outnumbered the positive aspects. The participants made references to several reasons why they were not satisfied with the hybrid learning including unpreparedness to new model, inappropriate learning environment and necessary equipment shortage and technological illiteracy. However, they also added that if existing drawbacks were managed appropriately, the hybrid model would be promising. Overall, it can be deduced from the perspectives of students that hybrid learning proved that it provided some unique advantages rather than fully online or traditional model alone, but drawbacks they experienced in hybrid learning should also be taken into account for better and promising implementation in future.

Bibliography

Abrami, P. C., Bernard, R. M., Bures, E. M., Borokhovski, E., & Tamim, R. M. (2011). Interaction in distance education and online learning: using evidence and theory to improve practice. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 23*, 82-103. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-011-9043-x

Alodwan, T. (2021). Online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic from the perspectives of English as foreign language students. *Academic Journals*, 279-288.

Ayuwanti, I., M, & Siswoyo, D. (2021). Teacher-student interaction in mathematics learning. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), 10*(2), 660–667. doi: 10.11591/ijere.v10i2.21184

Bärenfänger, O. (2005). Learning management: A new approach to structuring hybrid learning arrangements. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 14–35.

DuPage, C. O. (n. d.). An Introduction to Hybrid Teaching: Learning Technologies. 1–17. https://www.codlearningtech.org/PDF/hybridteachingworkbook.pdf

Hall, S., & Villareal, D. (2015). The Hybrid Advantage: Graduate Student Perspectives of Hybrid Education Courses. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 27*(1), 69–80.

Holley, D., & Oliver, M. (2010). Student engagement and blended learning: Portraits of risk. *Computers & Education*, 693–700.

Karabulut-Ilgu, A., & Jahren, C. (2016). Evaluation of Hybrid Learning in a Construction Engineering Context: A Mixed-Model Approach. *Advances in Engineering Education*, 1–26.

Karakose, T. (2021). The impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on higher education: Opportunities and implications for policy and practice. *Educational Process: International Journal, 10*(1), 7–12. http://dx.doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2021.101.1

Martyn, M. (2003). The Hybrid Online Model: Good Practice. *Educause Quarterly*, 18-23.

Masalimova, A. R., Ryazanova, E. L., Tatarina, L. I., Sokolova, E. G., Ikrennikova, Y. B., Efimushkina, S. V., & Shulga, T. I. (2021). Distance learning hybrid format for university students in post-pandemic perspective: Collaborative technologies aspect. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, *16*(1), 389–395. https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i1.5536

McElrath, E., & McDowell, K. (2008). Pedagogical Strategies for Building Community in Graduate Level Distance Education Courses. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 4*(1), 117–127.

Mohammed, G. S., & Mudhsh, B. D. (2021, April). The Effects of COVID-19 on EFL Learners' Anxiety at the University of Bisha. *Arab World English Journal* (Special Issue on Covid-19 challenges), 209–221. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid.16

Moreno, N. P., Garay, D. V., Harris, K. A., Newell, A. D., Perez-Sweeney, B., Camacho-Lopez, E., & Shargey, B. A. (2021, July). What the Pandemic Experience Taught Us About STEM Higher Education-School Partnerships. *Journal of Stem Outreach, 4*(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.15695/jstem/v4i2.11

Parker, A., & Parker, S. (2013). Interaction: The Vital Conversation in Online Instruction. 1–29.

Prior, D. D., Mazanov, J., Meacheam, D., Heaslip, G., & Hanson, J. (2016). Attitude, digital literacy and self-efficacy: Flow-on effects for online learning behavior. *Internet and Higher Education, 29*, 91–97. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2016.01.001

Raes, A. (2022). Exploring Student and Teacher Experiences in Hybrid Learning Environments: Does Presence Matter? *Postdigital Science and Education, 4*, 138–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-021-00274-0

Raes, A., Detienne, L., Windey, I., & Depaepe, F. (2019). A systematic literature review on synchronous hybrid learning: gaps identified. *Learning Environments Research, 23*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-019-09303-z

Sanpanich, N. (2021, May-August). Investigating Factors Affecting Students' Attitudes toward Hybrid Learning. *rEFLections, 28*, 208–227.

Singh, J., Steele, K., & Singh, L. (2021). Combining the Best of Online and Face-to-Face Learning: Hybrid and Blended Learning Approach for COVID-19, Post Vaccine, & Post Pandemic World. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 140–171.

Wisdom, J., & Creswell, J. W. (2013, February). Mixed Models: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis While Studying Patient-Centered Medical Home Models. 1–8. https://pcmh.ahrq.gov/sites/def

Yang, Z., & Spitzer, L. (2020). A Case for Hybrid Learning: Using a Hybrid Model to Teach *Advanced Academic Reading. ORTESOL Journal, 37*, 11–22.

Zein, M., Nuh, Z. M., Dardiri, Jasril, Candra, R. M., Hanafi, I., & Thahir, M. (2019, October). Hybrid Learning in Mathematics Learning: Experimental Study in SMA Negeri 1 Pekanbaru. *Malikussaleh Journal of Mathematics Learning (MJML), 2*(2), 56–60.