

# Lecturers' Attitude towards the Implementation of Blended-Learning Model at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak-Papua

Tenri Ugi Irianto<sup>a,b\*</sup> & Firman<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Yapis Papua University, Jl. Dr. Sam Ratulangi No.11, Trikora, Kec. Jayapura Utara, Kota Jayapura, Papua, 99113, Indonesia*

<sup>b</sup>*Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua, Brambaken, Samofa, Biak Numfor Regency, Papua, 98111, Indonesia*

<sup>c</sup>*Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, Jl. Sultan Alauddin No.259, Gn. Sari, Kota Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan 90221, Indonesia*

---

## Abstract

The objective of this study is to investigate the lecturers' attitudes towards the Implementation of Blended-Learning Model at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua. In this study, researchers used qualitative methods. The researcher applied the case study design. The subjects of this study were selected purposively and three lecturers were selected who ever taught English at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua. The instrument used in this study was an interview (depth-interview). The data analysis technique used is thematic analysis. The result of this study confirms that there are three categories of how the lecturers' attitudes towards the Implementation of Blended-Learning Model at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua. These categories are Highly Supportive on Blended Learning (HSBL), Moderately Supportive on Blended Learning (MSBL), and Lowly Supportive on Blended Learning (LSBL).

*Keywords:* lecturers' attitude; blended-learning model; lowly supportive.

---

## 1. Introduction

The field of education and learning is dynamic. The physical presence of schools, classrooms, test rooms, teachers, textbooks, and exams has always been linked to it in earlier decades (Eddy et al., 2014). Technology advancements have, however, led to new learning environment trends and the introduction of more contemporary ideas on how to study in this day and age. Technology has favourably changed our education from traditional face-to-face instruction and introduced us to the idea of e-learning (i.e., learning that is provided digitally). E-learning and web-based programs first concentrated on transferring classroom-based training to the Internet (Ma'arop & Embi, 2016; Maatuk, Elberkawi, Aljawarneh, Rashaideh, & Alharbi, 2022; Winter, Russell, Ugalde, White, & Livingston, 2022). However, lengthy sections of "page-turner" content and point-and-click tests present a difficulty for learners (Amin, Sibuea, & Mustaqim, 2022; Mastan et al., 2022).

Blended Learning combines the advantages of online learning and conventional classroom. However, merely combining online learning and conventional classroom might not fulfil students' need, and could lead to unexpected failure. The concept of blended learning is derived from two words, blend and learning. The word blend means combining things and learning denotes an assimilation of new knowledge as explained by (Choy & Quek, 2022; Olivier, 2011; Rakoczi, 2022). Blended learning allows students to engage in learning outside the confines of the classroom; with synchronous tools, such as web conferencing, Skype and group chats, and asynchronous tools that include discussion boards, blogs and social networking sites (Pomykalski, 2022; Yao, 2022). There is no single commonly accepted definition of blended learning, but practitioners "negotiate their own meaning" according to the needs of their contexts of practice (Heinze, 2008). The absence of a universal definition for blended learning allows HEIs to contextualise the concept according to their respective environments. Hence, this study adopted the definition of blended learning used by the university involved in the case study concerned, which is, "the mixture of traditional delivery including: lectures, group discussions, apprenticeships and experiential learning, together with e-learning methods, which accommodate various

---

\*Corresponding author.

*E-mail address:* tenriugiirianto@uniyap.ac.id

learning needs of a diverse audience in a variety of subjects”. There are, however, opposing views about delineating the concept of blended learning. For instance, Oliver & Trigwell (2005) caution against the use of the term blended learning primarily because it does not incorporate the perspective of the learner, and because it considers blending from a lecturer’s point of view. Another common objection to blending, cited by Jackson (2011) is that aiming for a coherent blend of learning provided through a variety of delivery mediums and instructional techniques is hard, he reckons that it will take some careful thought and planning to achieve this. Moreover, only a handful of learners fully engage with all the elements of blended learning, so it is not worth the effort (Jackson, 2011).

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are striving to provide effective, flexible, convenient and accessible learning experiences to address the needs of a new generation of students entering these institutions (Thomas, 2008). This generation of students has a keen interest in using technology and demand to use technology in teaching and learning, in and out of the classroom (George - Walker & Keeffe, 2010). These students display technology-influenced aptitude, attitudes, beliefs and sensitivities (Tshabalala et al., 2014). They define technology broadly, beyond the computer and the internet, to include the ability to adapt technology to meet individual needs (Roberts, Liu, & Hazard, 2005). They thus challenge academic staff members to utilise innovation in their delivery approaches. This has led to various institutions adopting blended learning as one of the approaches used for teaching and learning (Tshabalala et al., 2014). The blended learning approach also offers several advantages to academic staff, such as accessibility of information, universal connectivity, which enables the formation of communities of inquiry, and innovative teaching strategies. However, negative perceptions held by members of academic staff could affect the adoption of blended learning (Tshabalala et al., 2013). Such perceptions relate to attitudes towards innovation and change, time required for implementation, workload, and level of institutional support, available technology infrastructure, instructional delivery methods and quality assurance.

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua, as a Higher Education in Indonesia also implemented a blended learning model as a transition from the full online learning process during the last COVID-19 pandemic. Of course, many changes and adaptations were made, especially for lecturers who were in charge of teaching in the classroom. This can be seen in the preparation and development of the Semester Learning Plan. In learning planning, one of the things that is very crucial is the implementation of the learning model. Perceptions from lecturers are important as material for evaluating the development of study programs even for institutions in the academic field. Institutions are required to prepare up-to-date applications for the implementation of lectures so that they can run optimally and achieve learning objectives. Based on this background, the researcher intends to study the “Lecturers’ Attitude towards the implementation of Blended-Learning Model at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua.

## **2. Research Method**

In this study, researchers used qualitative methods (Creswell, 2014). To achieve the goal of how is the lecturers' attitude towards the implementation of Blended-Learning Model at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak – Papua, the researcher applied the case study design (Mason, 1996). The subjects of this study were selected purposively (Creswell, 2012) and three lecturers were selected who ever taught English at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua. The first lecturer was Brigita (pseudonym). She is 42 years old, has served for 15 years in the institution, the subject she teaches is General English, and settled in Papua. The second lecturer was Jonathan (pseudonym). He is 45 years old, served in the institution for 19 years, and the course he teaches is General English. The third lecturer is Amber (pseudonym). He is 35 years old, has served the institution for 10 years, and teaches General English. The instrument used in this study was an interview (depth-interview) (Kvale, 1996; Potter, 1996). The data analysis technique used is thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis is a poorly demarcated and rarely acknowledged, yet widely used qualitative analytic method. Thematic analysis involves a number of choices which are often not made explicit (or are certainly typically not discussed in the method section of papers), but which need explicitly to be considered and discussed. In practice, these questions should be considered before analysis (and sometimes even collection) of the data begins, and there needs to be an ongoing reflexive dialogue on the part of the researcher or researchers with regards to these issues, throughout the analytic process.

## **3. Results and Discussion**

This section will explain the exploration of the data of lecturers' attitudes towards the Implementation of Blended-Learning Model at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua. The data are based on the results of interviews with the subject of the study. Categorization is based on the definition, dimensions, and significance of blended learning. Here is the description of the data:

**Table 1.** Thematic Matrix on lecturers' attitudes towards the Implementation of Blended-Learning Model at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak – Papua

Group	Classification	Characteristics
A	Highly Supportive on Blended Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Class combines online and face-to-face learning. The substantial proportion of the material is delivered online. Usually the class provides online discussion, but there is also several times face-to-face learning.</li> <li>- Apply student-centred learning.</li> <li>- Comfortable to use website technology to share knowledge</li> <li>- Teaching in direct collaboration/face-to-face and online model is more effective.</li> </ul>
B	Moderately Supportive on Blended Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Class combines online and face-to-face learning. The substantial proportion of the material and assignment are delivered mainly face-to-face.</li> <li>- Learning approach turn from student-centred to teacher centred learning.</li> <li>- Unease to adapt with direct collaboration/face-to-face and online model.</li> </ul>
C	Lowly Supportive on Blended Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Class without the use of online technology. The learning material is delivered in oral and written.</li> <li>- Lack of technological skills</li> <li>- Reading oriented learning.</li> </ul>

### 3.1. Lecturer who is highly supportive on Blended Learning (HSBL)

Lecturers with the HSBL classification implement blended learning effectively. He combines a face-to-face model with online learning with a presentation of 50% online learning and 50% face-to-face learning model. As he said as follows:

*“Yes, according to the rules, I implement blended learning with a proportion of 50:50. Half face-to-face, and the rest online learning”*

He is also very competitive in using the Learning Management System as a support for blended learning models. Various platforms become supportive systems, namely zoom, YouTube, and WAG. This makes him very comfortable and feels facilitated with the BL learning model. As he stated as follows:

*“Honestly, yes, I am very comfortable and feel much facilitated with the blended learning model. In addition, training is carried out by the campus to use the LMS. In its implementation, I use social media such as YouTube, Zoom, and WAG as additional learning media outside of the LMS prepared by the campus”*

From the aspect of the approach used, lecturers with the HSBL classification implement a collaborative learning model. Of course, this model is more student-centered. Lecturers are not the only source of knowledge. According to him, lecturers should be facilitators, companions, guides, and direct students in learning. As he stated as follows:

*“I trust the cooperative learning model more. Lecturers should only be facilitators, companions, directors, guides for students in the learning process. However, it is also important to continue learning throughout life so that when students face learning problems, lecturers can provide solutions”.*

### 3.2. Lecturer who is moderately supportive on Blended Learning (MSBL)

Lecturers with the MSBL category are almost the same as lecturers with the HSBL category in implementing BL but technically different. The main problem is the preparation, adaptation and management between face-to-face and online learning. As he said as follows:

*“I still use blended learning but the preparation is a bit complicated. It is necessary to describe in detail the learning scenario including the device used. Class adaptations and arrangements are also apparently not as easy as classroom classes”*

In addition, lecturers with the MSBL category are inconsistent in applying the learning approach. She swings from student to teacher centred learning. According to her, she is more confident when taking part also in learning. In a sense, she likes to give lectures after class discussions. As he expressed as follows:

*“I believe that lecturers need to give advice even though the class discussion is not over yet. The lecturer needs to direct every difficulty of the student. Thus, my habit is to give a lecturing in the middle of a class discussion”*

### 3.3. Lecturer who is lowly supportive on Blended Learning (LSBL)

Lecturers with the LSBL category in total teach using a face-to-face model. According to her, technology cannot replace lecturers in learning. On the other hands he admits that she has limitations regarding accessing and using technology in learning. This is clearly stated as follows:

*“What I know and believe is that no matter how great technology is, it will not be able to replace lecturers in learning. The attitudes of today's students are difficult to control so they must continue to be observed directly. After the pandemic, it's okay to face-to-face. I have difficulty using technology during online learning like during the COVID pandemic previously.”*

Regarding the approach used, lecturers with the LSBL category are more oriented towards reading models. Giving reading materials then he explained the material and ended with the task. According to her, this approach is more effective because it can really force students to read more material and learn new knowledge. She also had the same study habits when he was in college. So she applied it to her students from the past to the present. As she puts it as follows:

*“Yes, my learning model at the time of college yes read the material as often as possible. I love reading. So that this kind of learning style I think is the best and I apply it to students. i haven't changed my teaching style like this since I served on this campus”.*

Based on the data mentioned above, there are three categories of how the lecturers' attitudes towards the Implementation of Blended-Learning Model at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua. These categories are Highly Supportive on Blended Learning (HSBL), Moderately Supportive on Blended Learning (MSBL), and Lowly Supportive on Blended Learning (LSBL). The characteristics of lecturer who is Highly Supportive on Blended Learning (HSBL) are Class combines online and face-to-face learning. The substantial proportion of the material is delivered online. Usually the class provides online discussion, but there is also several times face-to-cafe learning. Apply student-centred learning. Comfortable to use website technology to share knowledge. Teaching in direct collaboration/face-to-face and online model is more effective. Meanwhile, lecturer who is Moderately Supportive on Blended Learning (MSBL) characterised as Class combines online and face-to-face learning. The substantial proportion of the material and assignment are delivered mainly face-to-face. Learning approach turn from student-centred to teacher centred learning. Unease to adapt with direct collaboration/face-to-face and online model. Furthermore, lecturer who is Lowly Supportive on Blended Learning (LSBL) characterised as Class without the use of online technology. The learning material is delivered in oral and written. Lack of technological skills. Reading oriented learning.

Things are different in categorizing the attitude of lecturers in using blended learning. Ma'arop and Embi (2016) revealed that among the challenges faced by the instructors are increased workload and time devotion, lack of pedagogical and technical skills to conduct the program and difficulty in finding the right blend between face-to-face and online learning. The review also discovered the importance of staff training, support and networking as strategies to help instructors deal with such issues. Yulia (2017) showed that the students were very ready for the implementation of Blended Learning. It can be seen from students' positive attitude toward online aspects (learning flexibility, online learning, online interaction, and study management), as much as 83%, higher that the score of their attitude toward conventional classroom learning which is 77%. The students' readiness is a foundation for the successful implementation of Blended Learning, which should be supported by both lecturers and organization. Tshabalala et al. (2014) found that it was a result of a failure to plan properly for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of blended learning. Furthermore, it seems that the LMS (Moodle) is not assisting students, who are supposed to be the primary beneficiaries, probably due to uncoordinated efforts to implement blended learning in the Faculty of Education.

#### 4. Conclusion

Based on the result of this study, it can be concluded that the lecturers' attitudes towards the Implementation of Blended-Learning Model at the Law Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Biak - Papua categorised into three namely Highly Supportive on Blended Learning (HSBL), Moderately Supportive on Blended Learning (MSBL), and Lowly Supportive on Blended Learning (LSBL).

#### References

- Amin, M., Sibuea, A. M., & Mustaqim, B. (2022). The Effectiveness of Online Learning Using E-Learning During Pandemic Covid-19. *Journal of Education Technology*, 6(2).
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Choy, T. K., & Quek, C. L. (2022). 'Does Blended Learning Support Self-Regulated Learning?': A Literature Review. *EdMedia+ Innovate Learning*, 597-600.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eddy, L., Nor-Aziah, A., Jasmine, J., & Mohamed-Amin, E. (2014). Blended learning: Examining concepts and practices. *Blended & Flipped Learning: Case Studies in Malaysian HEIs*. Bangi: Pusat Pengajaran & Teknologi Pembelajaran, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- George-Walker, L. D., & Keeffe, M. (2010). Self-determined blended learning: a case study of blended learning design. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(1), 1-13.
- Heinze, A. (2008). *Blended learning: An interpretive action research study*: University of Salford (United Kingdom).
- Jackson, A. (2011). *A blended learning didactic model for ergonomics instruction based on students preferred learning styles*. Paper presented at the INTED2011 Proceedings.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interview views: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ma'arop, A. H., & Embi, M. A. (2016). Implementation of blended learning in higher learning institutions: A review of the literature. *International Education Studies*, 9(3), 41-52.
- Maatuk, A. M., Elberkawi, E. K., Aljawarneh, S., Rashaideh, H., & Alharbi, H. (2022). The COVID-19 pandemic and E-learning: challenges and opportunities from the perspective of students and instructors. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 34(1), 21-38.
- Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching*. London: Sage.
- Mastan, I. A., Sensuse, D. I., Suryono, R. R., & Kautsarina, K. (2022). Evaluation of distance learning system (e-learning): a systematic literature review. *Jurnal Teknoinfo*, 16(1), 132-137.
- Oliver, M., & Trigwell, K. (2005). Can 'blended learning' be redeemed? *E-learning and Digital Media*, 2(1), 17-26.
- Olivier, J. (2011). *Accommodating and promoting multilingualism through blended learning*. North-West University.
- Pomykalski, J. J. (2022). *Using LinkedIn Learning as a Component of Blended Learning in Two Separate Analytics Courses—Early Results*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the EDSIG Conference ISSN.
- Potter, J. (1996). Discourse analysis and constructionist approaches: theoretical background. In J. Richardson, T.E. (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences* (pp. 1-30). Loughborough: Loughborough University.
- Rakoczi, G. (2022). *Changing from blended learning to fully online learning: Does the change influence the learners' experiences and perception of a 360 lecture?* Paper presented at the EdMedia+ Innovate Learning.

- Roberts, M. L., Liu, R. R., & Hazard, K. (2005). Strategy, technology and organisational alignment: Key components of CRM success. *Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management*, 12(4), 315-326.
- Thomas, J. C. (2008). Administrative, faculty, and staff perceptions of organizational climate and commitment in Christian higher education. *Christian Higher Education*, 7(3), 226-252.
- Tshabalala, M., Ndeya-Ndereya, C., & Van der Merwe, T. (2013). *Academic staff's challenges in adopting blended learning: Reality at a developing university*. Paper presented at the International Conference on e-Learning.
- Tshabalala, M., Ndeya-Ndereya, C., & van der Merwe, T. (2014). Implementing Blended Learning at a Developing University: Obstacles in the Way. *Electronic Journal of E-learning*, 12(1), 101-110.
- Winter, N., Russell, L., Ugalde, A., White, V., & Livingston, P. (2022). Engagement strategies to improve adherence and retention in web-based mindfulness programs: systematic review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 24(1), e30026.
- Yao, M. (2022). The antecedents to perceived individual learning among Chinese high school students post COVID-19: A Blended learning perspective. *Asian Bulletin of Online Education and E-Learning*, 2(1), 42-53.
- Yulia, H. (2017). Readiness for Blended Learning viewed from the Students Attitude towards Learning Aspects. *International Journal of Active Learning*, 2(1), 15-26.