

Darina Dvornichenko,

PhD (Candidate of Political Science),

Department of Maritime Law,

National University "Odesa Maritime Academy",

8, Didrikhson Str., Odesa, Ukraine

Vadym Barskyy,

PhD (Candidate of Law), associate-professor,

Department of the Civil Law Disciplines,

Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University,

2, Dvoryanskaya Str., Odesa, Ukraine

BLENDING LEARNING MODEL IN TEACHING MEDIA LITERACY

This article offers insights into the practices of a blended learning course devoted to media literacy. The present study focuses on correlation of such terms as "blended learning", "hybrid learning", "ubiquitous learning". Special attention is also paid to the studying of benefits and drawbacks of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). The case under investigation is the MOOC "Very Verified: Online Course on Media Literacy" developed by International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX) and EdEra in 2019. Data were collected via pre-test and post-test instruments of assessment with the aim of deriving an understanding of progress made by students, as well as analysing the fluctuations in students' self-assessment of their own media literacy skills. The study also examined quantitative data to determine how many learners completed the course and how useful it was for them. By comparing the data from students who completed the online course combined with face-to-face sessions and those who completed the online course without attending face-to-face sessions, the research examined the benefits of blended learning model. It was found that the

blended learning model turned out to be more effective in comparison with the ubiquitous learning model despite the uniformity of learning content. The findings and analysis offer several insights of blended-learning model and its application in formal and non-formal education.

Keywords: *blended learning, Massive Open Online Course (MOOC), media literacy, ubiquitous learning, critical thinking.*

Introduction and the current state of the research problem

Due to increasingly quick and unpredictable changes in information and technologies, it has become obvious that traditional classroom learning where knowledge is delivered through face-to-face interactions between an educator and learners is no more enough to ensure that students acquired hard and soft skills necessary for their successful life. Traditional classrooms have started to lose their monopoly as the place of learning. In order to cope with the latest changes caused by the spread of the Internet and mobile devices, learning approaches are highly expected to be adjusted and tailored to students' demands as well as their willingness to absorb different information in the most suitable way for them. The approach which tends to pursue this goal is blended learning, a combination of face-to-face and online instruction, which is seen as the most important recent advances in education.

Aim and tasks

The aim of our study is to contribute to research on blended-learning model by comparing the effectiveness of the latter with the online studies. We were particularly interested in studying the effectiveness of "Very Verified: Online Course on Media Literacy" developed by IREX. This course was chosen as the context for the study because blended learning is a key concept of the course, and because research on this model is lacking.

The tasks of our study are addressed through three research questions:

1. What is the difference between the pre-test and post-test results related to students' media literacy skills?
2. What is the difference between the pre-test and post-test results related to students' self-assessment of their media literacy skills?
3. What is the difference between the number of students who completed the online course combined with face-to-face sessions and those who completed the online course without attending face-to-face sessions?

Based on 3 research questions, we intend to test 3 hypotheses:

The first hypothesis states that students' media literacy skills will improve in the post-test period by 25%. The second hypothesis states that students' self-assessment of media literacy skills will increase in the post-test period by 25%. The third hypothesis states that students who completed the online course combined with face-to-face sessions outnumbers those who completed the online course without attending face-to-face sessions.

In the following section, we analyse the difficulties to offer the exact definition of blended learning and discuss the correlation of blended learning with other approaches. This is followed by our research methodology, a description of the project and an outline of how the data are presented. Thereafter, we address the research ques-

tions and describe the findings. Finally, the article ends with our conclusions and demonstrates how this study contributes to the understanding of blended learning.

The current state of the research problem

So far, according to our findings, no similar research has been carried out in Ukraine. Empirical studies that investigate the use of blended learning models can be divided into comparison studies which examine the effectiveness of blended learning by comparing blended learning model with traditional classrooms (Buhaychuk, 2016; Yigit, Koyun, & Cankaya, 2014; Watson, 2008) and non-comparison studies (Asarta & Schmidt, 2007; Krivonos, 2015; Bartolomé, Willem & Aiello, 2007) which examine blended learning program design and implementation, as well as students and teachers' attitudes towards blended learning. While previous studies have looked at various aspects of blended learning by comparing it with the traditional one or examining students' attitudes to it, they have not allowed for a sufficient analysis of its effectiveness. In order to further advance the research in this area, the present study focuses on comparison of data from students who completed the online course combined with face-to-face sessions and those who completed the online course without attending face-to-face sessions, as well as analysing the pre- and post-course results via such assessment instruments as tests.

There is an obvious debate in the literature over the terms and their interpretation which are widely used in the present article. The core notion of our research – blended learning – still does not have a commonly accepted definition. First, the term "*blended learning*" appeared in the literature around 2000s (Guzer & Caner, 2014: 4597). One of the first studies that used the term "*blended learning*" was "Blurring the lines of play and work to create blended classroom learning experiences" by M. Cooney et. al. (2000). Though this study is far from the general use of blended learning as it focuses mainly on the combination of play and work in prekindergarten learning, it is still helpful in tracking the first usage of this term.

Nowadays the term "*blended learning*" is widely used in corporate training, secondary and higher education. However it is not easy to define it as there is still no consensus of what is meant by "*blended learning*" (Oliver & Trigwell, 2005; Sharma & Barrett, 2007). In secondary education, blended learning is understood as the teaching practice that combines teaching methods from both face-to-face and online learning, that is proving highly effective in helping schools address the challenges of student achievement, limited resources and the expectations of 21st century learners (Ma, Li, & Liang, 2019). In higher education blended learning is defined as a combination of technology and classroom instruction in flexible approach to learning that recognizes the benefits of delivering of some training and assessment online but also

uses other modes to make up a complete training program which can improve the effectiveness of learning and/or save costs (Banados, 2006). In the field of corporate training, blended learning is defined as a learning program where more than one delivery mode is being used with the objective of optimizing the learning outcome and cost of program delivery (Singh & Reed, 2001).

Kim (2007) has defined blended learning as a combination of two or more of all possible learning types among three key dimensions: physical class based versus virtual, formal versus informal, and scheduled versus self-paced. He has given one important qualifier to this definition. To make sure that blended learning is a combination of traditional learning and online learning, at least one of the learning types must be a physical class based type and another should be based on online learning type. Elsenheimer (2006) stated blended learning should not only refer to mixing of training and delivery methods but also to the application of instruction, tools, practice, and evaluation to create a unified learning and performance environment. According to Veliathan (2002), blended learning is used to describe learning that mixes various event based activities, including face-to-face classrooms, live e-learning, and self-paced learning. As the emphasis during blended learning is on the maximizing students' abilities within different learning environments, inter alia, digital and traditional, it can be also called "*hybrid learning*" (Bryan & Volchenkova, 2016; Nguyen, 2015). Mentoring or the support of an expert or a facilitator also matters a lot in this type of learning (Reid-Young, 2003).

As the exact definition of blended learning, beyond some combination of online and face to-face learning, may not matter, for the purposes of this article it is defined as a combination of online learning via *Massive Open Online Course* (MOOC) and face-to-face interaction.

MOOCs have become one of the most prominent trends in education since their development in 2008 (Olazabalaga, Garrida & Ruiz, 2016). MOOCs are pedagogical innovations that have changed traditional learning idea and provided a new way for acquiring knowledge to meet the competency demands of a digital and knowledge driven society.

As one of the popular innovative and viable pedagogical tools, MOOCs are closely linked to the concept of *ubiquitous learning* which focuses on the learners' opportunities to connect to spaces of information, communication, learning and education with the help of information and communication (Cope & Kalantzis, 2010).

Simply, "ubiquitous learning" means "anywhere and anytime learning": the internet or learning content follows people around (Weiser, 1991: 97). Thus ubiquitous learning refers to any environment that allows any mobile learning devices to access the learning and teaching content via wireless networks in any location at any time. Despite the obvious benefits of ubiquitous learning, it is emphasized that those students who learn via this approach tend to develop bad studying habits (Hsieh & others, 2011: 1200). In order to mitigate such negative ef-

fects students' access to online information needs to be controlled.

Zakaria et. al. (2019) also focuses on some negative effect of ubiquitous learning in general and MOOCs in particular. Among the greatest drawbacks is the lack of social interactions among people. As the interaction is essential to develop soft skills necessary for building deeper connections with people and communicate successfully, the combination of MOOCs and a traditional classroom in a blended learning approach will give the best of these two pedagogical approaches. It is hoped that students will be much better prepared for the future through learning via combination of MOOCs and traditional environment. The similar view was expressed by Yu et. al. (2008) who supported the idea of the combination of MOOCs and a traditional classroom in a blended learning approach which does not have any negative effect on communication skills of learners but vice versa increases the contact hours students can have with each other. As a result through interaction they enhance their learning compared to classical classes where the interaction is quite limited and controlled.

Research Methods

A case study approach was utilized in this research. Eisenhardt defines case study as "a research strategy which focuses on understanding the dynamics present within single settings" (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). The case under investigation here is a blended learning course based on the MOOC "Very Verified: Online Course on Media Literacy" (English language version) developed by International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX) and EdEra. The MOOC was launched in 2019 in the English and Ukrainian languages. For the purpose of the present research 55 students were selected to do the course in English within the framework of blended learning. The course included 5 units which were open to students step by step so that to keep participants motivated. Each unit formed the focus of the face-to-face session which was based on the online content in one of the units and lasted 1 hour 30 minutes. The online content was designed with the purpose to replace the use of a textbook for the course. It can be divided into 4 learning formats:

- short, concise reads and informative visuals;
- detailed videos and articles;
- in-depth longreads and interviews;
- quizzes, games, tests, and additional materials.

The videos were presented by two different speakers – a female Ukrainian native speaker and a male English native speaker, which made the course gender-balanced. The course also contains several interviews with the Ukrainian journalists that allowed students to think more deeply about the topic and realize that there is always more than one view. Each unit was accompanied by a short test which most students found helpful. Even though some students had difficulty with a few of the questions, the most complicated questions which aroused discussion among students were revisited during the face-to-face session leading to a better understanding of the most challenging concepts. The last module also included a final

test to measure how well the students absorbed the material. The threshold for passing it was 60 %.

Based on the literature review the research aims to test three hypotheses. The first hypothesis states that students' media literacy skills will improve in the post-test period by 25%. The second hypothesis states that students' self-assessment of media literacy skills will increase in the post-test period by 25%. The third hypothesis states that students who completed the online course combined with face-to-face sessions outnumbers those who completed the online course without attending face-to-face sessions.

For the purposes of this study, pre-test and post-test were the instruments which were used to confirm or disconfirm the first and second hypotheses. Both pre-test and post-test which consisted of 5 pages and 32 questions, were conducted offline with 55 students aged 18-35. The test can be divided into two parts: questions that allow to assess the students' media literacy skills and questions

that allow the students to self-assess their own media literacy skills. The test is based on 29 closed-ended questions which were used to conduct quantitative research. Besides, the test also included 3 semi-structured questions allowed to conduct qualitative research to assess such respondents' abilities as critical thinking. Both pre-test and post-test were identical.

Research results

The first hypothesis states that students' media literacy skills will improve in the post-test period by 25%. For this purpose the students completed the pre-test and post-test which required from them to choose the correct answer or give a full answer to the question posed. The topics which were covered in the course – Media Analysis, News Media Knowledge, Facts vs. Opinions Skill, and Media Locus of Control – were in the focus to assess students' performance. Table 1 depicts the progress in students' skills and knowledge in comparison with the pre-test.

Table 1

<i>Change in students' media literacy skills</i>	
Students' media literacy skills	
31% individual change of	Media Analysis Skills which include the ability to identify: different points of view, omitted information, the purpose of the article
69% individual change of	News Media Knowledge on ownership of major media outlets, information bubble, Dzhynsa (advertiser), journalistic standards, how to check the background of an expert)
24 % individual change of	Facts vs. Opinions Skill
14% individual change of	Locus of Control (sense of responsibility and control over own media consumption)

The results of the tests supported hypothesis # 1 which indicated that there was a significant effect on the students' media literacy skills. The post-test demonstrated much higher results in students' ability to differentiate between facts and opinion, identify omitted information, detect hate speech and propaganda, as well as students' knowledge on ownership of major media outlets, filter bubble and personalized algorithms. The average indicator how students' media literacy skills have changed amounts to 34,5 % which does not only confirm our hypothesis but exceeds our expectations.

The second hypothesis states that students' self-assessment of media literacy skills will increase in the post-test period by 25%. For this purpose the students completed the pre-test and post-test which required from them to critically assess their media literacy skills from 1 (the lowest) to 11 (the highest mark). Then we compared the answers in 55 pre-test and 55 post-test forms and calculated an average indicator by adding all the numbers and then dividing them by the number of students (55). Table 2 depicts the results we received.

Table 2

<i>Change in students' self-assessment of media literacy skills</i>	
Students' self-assessment of media literacy skills	
pre-test	post-test
4	8

The results of the tests supported hypothesis # 2 which indicated that there was a significant effect on the students' self-assessment of own media literacy skills.

The post-test demonstrated higher eagerness of students to more critically assess any information as well as their intention to crosscheck the news in different sources and

not to rely on their intuition while reading the news.

The third hypothesis states that students who completed the online course combined with face-to-face sessions outnumbers those who completed the online course without attending face-to-face sessions. For this purpose the number of people who have done the course solely online and received certificates since the MOOC was released was turned into percentage and compared with the number of people who have received certificates via blended approach. In order to get the certificates via

blended learning the students were required to attend minimum 4 sessions out of 5 and pass a final test. As obviously there was no requirement to attend classes for those who did the course solely online, for the successful completion of the course students only had to pass a final test. Table 3 depicts the percentage of students who completed the online course combined with face-to-face sessions and those who completed the online course without attending face-to-face sessions.

Table 3

<i>The number of students who completed the MOOC</i>	
Students who completed the MOOC within blended learning approach	Students who completed the MOOC without participating in face-to-face sessions
90,4%	20,14 %

The results of the tests supported hypothesis # 3 which indicated that the blended learning approach made a considerable effect on the students' willingness to complete the course.

Discussion

The pedagogy of blended learning course "Very Verified: Online Course on Media Literacy" is based on the assumption that there are clear advantages in face-to-face interaction as well as the understanding that there are benefits in using online methods. The course pursues the objective to provide an effective learning environment which will stimulate students' progress in media literacy and improvement of English speaking, listening and reading skills. The results of our research demonstrate that the objective of the course has been achieved successfully.

The intention of the course designers was to turn passive recipients of knowledge into active learners, to move from a teacher-centred approach to student-centred one and make learning more meaningful. This intention was met with the help of the problem-based learning, which is an inquiry-based instructional approach in which students work in small groups to solve problems which have no clear solution or solution path (Jonassen, 2003). This approach which was actively used during all 5 offline sessions, is well suited in helping students become active learners as it makes students responsible for their learning and puts a learner in real-world problems. This explains a high level of motivation among those students who completed the MOOC in the blended mode which helped them complete the course successfully. However, as the problem-based learning based on group work with other students was not provided for online participants of the course who did not attend offline sessions, the level of their motivation to complete the final test was much lower which resulted in only 20,14 % who completed the MOOC.

To avoid the lack of interactivity with a facilitator and group work with other participant the chatbot was integrated into the course. Its aim was to create an informal bond between the course developers and participants as well as ubiquity learning. Unlike other virtual assis-

tants which can propose personalized questions to the students or respond to the learner inquiries, the chatbot within the MOOC "Very Verified: Online Course on Media Literacy" was designed as a testing tool to engage more students in the subject. The chatbot did not need any installation and operated via Facebook Messenger. However, the research results show that such tool could not replace a facilitator and thus did not contribute to online participants' performance within the course.

During the course the students were required to give feedback and make reflections on their learning which helped participants to evaluate changes in their thinking and their own progress over a period of time. The research results demonstrate that the completion of the MOOC in blended learning mode contributed significantly to the change of students' self-assessment which also led to their increased confidence. In terms of knowledge acquisition, the course helped students to learn in depth various techniques to become more media literate and improve their level of English. However, what is more valuable is that students gained an opportunity to develop their critical thinking skills. The content of the course stimulated students to leave their comfort zone in an effort to try different perspectives using different points of view.

Conclusion

As a conclusion, this paper is not aimed at achieving generalization. Instead, it serves as a particularisation which can further aggregate for generalization. This study, first, contributes to the literature by providing a review of the current state of the research problem and, second, points out significant insights about students' attitude toward blended learning by analysing their achievements, personal development and outcomes of learning as well as comparing the performance of students who completed the online course combined with face-to-face sessions and those who completed the online course without attending face-to-face sessions. The methods used in this research made possible to collect multiple data which strengthen the reliability of the findings of the study.

It was found that the blended learning model turned out to be more effective in comparison with the ubiquitous learning model despite the uniformity of learning content. The higher performance of students who attended face-to-face sessions in addition to learning via the MOOC also was achieved through facilitator's monitoring of student progress during the meetings as well as deeper connections with other learners.

Given the growth of blended teaching and learning in Ukraine and internationally and the complexity of educational change as a result of Information and Communication Technologies, there is a clear need for further re-

search on the use of blended approaches based not only on MOOCs but also other modes. In Ukraine in particular, further research is needed at a time when the traditional learning has been disrupted by the quarantine measures introduced by the government with the purpose to prevent the further spread of COVID-19 virus, and the need to increase flexible learning opportunities has become more and more important.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank IREX for their valuable support in preparation of the present research.

References

1. Asarta, C., Schmidt, J. (2007). Comparing student performance in blended and traditional courses: Does prior academic achievement matter? *The Internet and Higher Education*, 32, 29–38, 2007. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1096751616300525> [in English].
2. Banados, E. (2006). A blended learning pedagogical model for teaching and learning EFL successfully through an online interactive multimedia environment: *CALICO Journal*, 23 (3), 533–550. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228625193_A_Blended-learning_Pedagogical_Model_for_Teaching_and_Learning_EFL_Successfully_Through_an_Online_Interactive_Multimedia_Environment [in English].
3. Bartolomé, A., Willem, C., Aiello, M. (2007). Blended Learning and New Literacies: *The International Journal of Technology, Knowledge and Society*, 4, 3–9. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255936686_Blended_Learning_and_New_Literacies [in English].
5. Bryan, A., Volchenkova K. (2016). Blended Learning: Definition, Models, Implications for Higher Education: *Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Ser. Education. Educational Sciences*, 8(2), 24–30. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303815166_BLENDED_LEARNING_DEFINITION_MODELS_IMPLICATIONS_FOR_HIGHER_EDUCATION [in English].
6. Buhaychuk, K. (2016). Changing Learning: A Theoretical Analysis and Strategy Made in Higher Education: *Information technology and means of learning*, 17(4), 1–18. Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/u/jrn/itzn_2016_54_4_3 [in English].
7. Cooney, M., Gupton, P., O'Laughlin, M. (2000). Blurring the lines of play and work to create blended classroom learning experiences: *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 27(3), 165–171. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225167051_Blurring_the_lines_of_play_and_work_to_create_blended_classroom_learning_experiences [in English].
8. Cope, B., Kalantzis, M. (2010). Ubiquitous learning: An agenda for educational transformation: *6th Inter. Conf. on Networked Learning*, 576–582. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2632/61edce369e56860fa16a56f43bc6547110e0.pdf?ga=2.268881841.1308687999.1585395173-763566223.1585395173> [in English].
9. Eisenhardt K., Graebner, M. (2007). Theory Building from Cases: Opportunities and Challenges: *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50, (1), 25–32. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/258557?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents [in English].
10. Elsenheimer, J. (2006). Got Tools? The blended learning analysis and design expediter: *Performance Improvement*, 45, 8, 26–30. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pfi.4930450806> [in English].
11. Guzer, B., Caner, H. (2014). The Past, Present and Future of Blended Learning: An in Depth Analysis of Literature: *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 4596–4603. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275543451_The_Past_Present_and_Future_of_Blended_Learning_An_in_Depth_Analysis_of_Literature [in English].
12. Hsieh, S.W., Jang, Y.R., Hwang, G.J., Chen, N.S. (2011). Effects of teaching and learning styles on students' reflection levels for ubiquitous learning", *Computers & Education*, 57 (1), 1194–1201. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.01.004> [in English].
13. Jonassen, D. H. (2003). Using cognitive tools to represent problems: *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 35(3), 362–381. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15391523.2003.10782391> [in English].
14. Kim, W. (2007). Towards a definition and methodology for blended learning: *Workshop on Blended Learning*, pp. 1–8. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/1357530/Blended_Learning_Towards_a_Mix_for_SMEs-Stakeholders_and_their_Priorities [in English].
15. Krivonos, O. (2015). Blended learning as a basis for the formation of teacher's ICT-competence: *Problems of Methods of Physical-Mathematical and Technological Education*, 8 (2), 19–23. Retrieved from [http://nbuv.gov.ua/u/jrn/nz_pmfm_2015_8\(2\)_6](http://nbuv.gov.ua/u/jrn/nz_pmfm_2015_8(2)_6) [in English].

16. Ma, J., Li, C., Liang, H.. (2019). Enhancing Students' Blended Learning Experience through Embedding Metaliteracy: *Education Research International*. 1–8. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/6791058> [in English].
17. Nguyen, T. (2015). The effectiveness of online learning; Beyond no significant difference and future horizons: *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 11 (2), 309–319. Retrieved from https://jolt.merlot.org/Vol11no2/Nguyen_0615.pdf. [in English].
18. Olazabalaga, I., Garrida, C., Ruiz U. (2016). Research on MOOCs: Trends and Methodologies. *Mano-grafica*, 9, 87–98. Retrieved from https://www.ugr.es/~portal/articulos/PL_monograph1_2_016/art_7.pdf [in English].
19. Oliver, M., Trigwell K. (2005). Can "blended learning" be redeemed?", *E-Learning*, 2(1), 17–26. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250151886_Can_'Blended_Learning'_Be_Redeemed [in English].
20. Reid-Young, A. (2003). The key to e-learning is b-learning: *HCI Journal of International Development*. Retrieved from <https://www.hci.com.au/b-learning> [in English].
21. Sharma, P., Barrett, B. (2007). *Blended learning: Using technology in and beyond the language classroom*. Oxford, England: Macmillan Publishers Limited [in English].
22. Singh, H., Reed, R. (2001). A white paper: achieving success with blended learning: *Centra Software*, Retrieved from <https://maken.wikiwijs.nl/userfiles/f7d0e4f0bd466199841ede3eea221261.pdf> [in English].
23. Valiathan, P. (2002). Blended learning models. American Society for Training and Development. Retrieved from <https://www.purnima-valiathan.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Blended-Learning-Models-2002-ASTD.pdf> [in English].
24. Watson, J. (2008). Blended learning: The convergence of online and face-to-face education: *Vienna, VA: North American Council for Online Learning*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED509636.pdf> [in English].
25. Weiser, M. (1991). The Computer for the 21st Century. *Scientific Americans*, 265(3), 66–75. [in English].
26. Yigit, T., Koyun, A., Cankaya, I. (2014). Evaluation of Blended Learning Approach in Computer Engineering Education: *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 807–812. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266208637_Evaluation_of_Blended_Learning_Approach_in_Computer_Engineering_Education [in English].
27. Yu, Y. T., Choy, M.E., Chan, Y. K., Lo, Y. T. (2008). A hybrid learning course on software development: Requirements validation of tool support, *First International Conference*, 316–327. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-85170-7_28 [in English].
28. Zakaria, M., Awang, S., Rahman, A. (2019). Are MOOCs in Blended Learning More Effective than Traditional Classrooms for Undergraduate Learners?", *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7 (11), 2417–2424. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2019.071119> [in English].

Дарина Дворніченко,

кандидат політичних наук,
кафедра морського права,

Національний університет «Одеська морська академія»,
вул. Дідріхсона, 8, Одеса, Україна,

Вадим Барський,

доцент, кандидат юридичних наук,
кафедра цивільно-правових дисциплін,

Одеський національний університет ім. І. І. Мечникова,
вул. Дворянська, 2, Одеса, Україна

МОДЕЛЬ ЗМІШАНОГО НАВЧАННЯ У ВИКЛАДАННІ МЕДІАГРАМОТНОСТІ

У статті досліджено особливості змішаного навчання на прикладі курсу, присвяченого медіаграмотності. Дослідження зосереджується на виявленні співвідношення між такими поняттями, як «змішане навчання», «гібридне навчання», «повсюдне навчання». Особлива увага приділяється вивченню переваг та недоліків масових відкритих онлайн-курсів (МВОК), для аналізу яких було відібрано МВОК «Very Verified: Онлайн-курс з медіаграмотності», розроблений Радою міжнародних наукових досліджень та обмінів (IREX) спільно з EdEra у 2019 році. Кількісні дані для дослідження було зібрано за допомогою таких інструментів, як тестування на початку та в кінці курсу з метою зрозуміння прогресу студентів, а також аналізу коливань у самооцінці власних навичок медіаграмотності. В дослідженні також порівнюються дані щодо кількості учнів, які пройшли курс в форматі змішаного навчання та тих, хто закінчив МВОК суто онлайн. На підставі зіставлення цих даних, автори доводять перевагу моделі змішаного навчання. Було виявлено, що змішана модель навчання виявилася більш ефективною в порівнянні з моделлю повсюдного навчання, незважаючи на відсутність різниці у змі-

сті курсу. Результати дослідження зосереджуються на окремих особливостях моделі змішаного навчання та її застосування у формальній та неформальній освіті.

Ключові слова: *змішане навчання, масовий відкритий онлайн-курс (МВОК), медіаграмотність, повсюдна модель навчання, критичне мислення.*

Подано до редакції 18.01.2021
