

Midocean University

College of Management

Department/ Project Management



Title of the Research

The Impact of Face-to-Face and Online Learning Modes on Teaching Quality and Educational Challenges in English Language Institutes in Riyadh: A Comparative Study in Light of Quality Assurance Standards

Prepared by:

Student/ Amal Hamoud Al-Qahtani

Supervised by:

Academic Year

2024-2025

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Dedication

To my beloved mother,
who taught me that true strength lies in perseverance through hardship.
Your resilience and unwavering spirit have been my greatest source of inspiration.

To my dear sister Sarah,
who stood by my side through every step of this journey.
Your support, love, and encouragement meant the world to me.

To my esteemed professors,
whose guidance and dedication have shaped my academic path.

To my dear students and friends,
your kindness, motivation, and participation in this study have added great value to
my work.

Thank you for your trust and generous support.

And to everyone who extended a helping hand and stood by me,
this work is dedicated to you, with heartfelt gratitude and appreciation.

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, all praise and gratitude be to Allah (Alhamdulillah), who granted me the strength, patience, and guidance to complete this research.

My heartfelt thanks go to my beloved mother, whose constant support, encouragement, and heartfelt prayers have been a source of strength and motivation throughout this journey. Her unwavering belief in me kept me going through the most challenging times.

I also extend my deepest gratitude to my dear sister Sarah, who stood by my side every step of the way, offering help, understanding, and emotional support.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my professors for their invaluable support, insights, and encouragement throughout my academic journey.

I am truly thankful to my students and friends for their encouragement and for participating in the questionnaire, which significantly contributed to the completion of this study.

Lastly, I would like to thank everyone who supported, inspired, or assisted me in any way during this project.

Abstract

English language instruction in Saudi Arabia has expanded in response to the increasing global significance of English. This study investigates the challenges and quality of English teaching in both face-to-face and online environments within private language institutes in Riyadh. The aim is to determine which style more effectively improves student engagement, achievement, and satisfaction. The research utilised a descriptive methodology with a structured, closed-ended questionnaire to gather data from a sample of 120 participants, including English language teachers and female students, in Riyadh. Data were analysed utilising SPSS to compute means, standard deviations, and perform hypothesis testing. The findings indicated statistically significant disparities between the two modalities: face-to-face instruction excelled in teacher-student interaction, motivation, learner engagement, and perceived teaching quality, whereas online education demonstrated advantages in flexibility, technological integration, and utilisation of digital tools. Participants in blended learning reported the highest levels of overall pleasure and confidence in utilising English, demonstrating the synergistic advantages of both methodologies. Positive connections were identified between the use of computer-based resources and learner engagement, as well as between instructional quality and the clarity/alignment of learning objectives. The study advocates for the use of a mixed learning model to integrate the advantages of both methodologies. It underscores the necessity for professional development for educators and enhanced digital infrastructure to elevate the overall quality of English language instruction in institutions.

Keywords: English instruction, language institutes, online learning, face-to-face learning, quality assurance.

CONTENTS

No.	Title	Page
	In the name of Allah	2
	Dedication	3
	Aknowledgments	4
	Abstract	5
	Contents	6
	List of Tables	8
	Chapter 1: General Framework of the Study	10
1.1	Introduction	10
1.2	The Study Problem	10
1.3	Importance of the Study	11
1.4	Objective of the Study	11
1.5	The Study Questions	12
1.6	The Study Hypotheses	12
1.7	Theoretical Premises of the Study	13
1.8	Review of Previous Studies	14
1.9	Methodology	20
	Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework of the Study	23
2.1	Section One: Teaching Quality and Challenges in English Language Education	23
2.1.1	Definition of Teaching Quality	23
2.1.2	Dimensions of Teaching Quality	23
2.1.3	Challenges in English Language Teaching	23
2.1.4	The Relationship Between Teaching Quality and Educational Challenges	23
	Section Two: Modes of Learning and Their Impact on Learning Outcomes	24
2.2.1	Face-to-Face vs. Online Learning	24
2.2.2	The Value of Each Learning Mode in EFL Contexts	24
2.2.3	The Impact of Learning Mode on Language Skills	24
2.2.4	The Role of Technology in Enhancing Learning Outcomes	25
2.2.5	Teacher–Student Interaction	25
2.2.6	The Relationship Between Learning Mode and Learning Outcomes	25
	Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing	27
3.1	Introduction	27
3.2	Demographic Variables	27
3.3	Internal Consistency Validity	29
3.4	Reliability of the Study Instrument (Reliability)	31
3.5	Statistical Methods	32
	Chapter 4: Presentation, Analysis, and Discussion of the Study Results	34
4.1	Introduction	34
4.2	Questions	34
4.3	Hypotheses	49

	Chapter 5: Conclusion and Discussion of Results	55
5.1	Findings	55
5.2	Recommendations	56
5.3	Suggestions for Future Research:	56
	Arabic References	57
	Foreign References	57
	Appendix	60
	Questionair	61

Table List

Table List	Page
Table (1): Distribution of the Study Sample According to the Age Variable	27
Table (2): Distribution of the Study Sample According to Role in the Institute	27
Table (3): Distribution of the Study Sample According to English Proficiency Level	28
Table (4): Distribution of the Study Sample According to the Learning Method with the Most Experience	28
Table (5) Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Items of the first axis: Educational Challenges Faced by English Language Students and Teachers in Face-to-Face and Online Learning Environments, Based on the Total Degree of the Dimension.	29
Table (6): Pearson correlation coefficients for the second axis: effective teaching strategies in both physical and online learning environments, based on the Total Degree of the Dimension.	29
Table (7): Pearson correlation coefficients for the third axis: satisfaction related to teaching and learning the English language in both face-to-face and online learning environments based on the Total Degree of the Dimension.	30
Table (8): Pearson correlation coefficients for the fourth axis: teaching quality and learning outcomes in both face-to-face and online learning environments with the total score of the axis	30
Table (9): Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Measuring the Reliability of the Study Instrument	31
Table (10): Means and standard deviations of study sample responses on challenges ranked in descendingly order	34
Table (11): Means and standard deviations of the study sample's responses to classroom-related challenges ranked by mean score	35
Table (12): Means and standard deviations of the sample's responses to online learning challenges, ranked by mean score	36
Table (13): The means and standard deviations of the study sample's responses to the effective teaching strategies were ranked in descending order.	38
Table (14): Means and standard deviations of the study sample's responses to learner engagement strategies in face-to-face, online, and blended learning environments, ranked in descending order according to the mean score.	39
Table (15): Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses to Digital Tools and Resources Across Face-to-Face, Online, and Blended Learning Environments in Descending Order of the Mean	41
Table (16): Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses to Teaching Delivery Methods across Face-to-Face, Online, and Blended Learning Environments, Ordered in Descending Order by Mean Score	42
Table (17): Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses on the Satisfaction Level Related to English Language Teaching and Learning in Descending Order	44

Table (18): Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses to General Satisfaction with Learning in Face-to-Face, Online, and Combined Learning Environments, Ranked in Descending Order Based on the Mean Score.	44
Table (19): Means and standard deviations of participants' responses regarding confidence in using English in the face-to-face environment, ranked in descending order by mean score	45
Table (20): Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses to Teaching Quality and Learning Outcomes in the Face-to-Face, Online, and Combined Learning Environments, Ranked in Descending Order by Mean Score.	47
Table 21: Distribution of study sample participants according to their preferred learning mode	48
Table 22: One-Way ANOVA results for differences in participants' responses based on learning method	49
Table 23: LSD Test Results for Differences between Learning Method Groups	50
Table 24: One-Way ANOVA results for differences in participants' responses based on the learning method	51
Table 25: One-Way ANOVA results for differences in participants' responses based on the learning method	52
Table 26: LSD test results for differences between learning method groups	52
Table 27: One-Way ANOVA results for differences in participants' responses based on the learning method	53
Table 28: Pearson correlation results showing the relationship between the use of computer-based educational materials and students' participation in learning English online	53
Table 29: Pearson correlation results showing the relationship between teaching quality, learning outcome clarity, and alignment of activities in both face-to-face and online learning	54

Chapter 1: General Framework of the Study

1.1 Introduction:

Education around the world has changed a lot in the last few decades. E-learning is now a big part of how teachers teach. In the last ten years, this change happened much faster, especially because of the COVID-19 pandemic. UNESCO says that school closures affected more than 1.6 billion students in more than 190 countries. This led to an unprecedented shift to digital learning platforms. Because of this, technology has changed how teachers and students interact with each other by giving them flexible, interactive tools that can be used anywhere and at any time (Means et al., 2009). The OECD (2018) said that the success of any teaching method depends a lot on how well it fits with the needs of the students and the setting in which it is used, whether that be online or in a traditional classroom.

Saudi Arabia has seen the same kinds of changes happen in the world, with the education sector making quick progress in line with Vision 2030, which focuses on better learning outcomes and higher quality education. The Saudi Ministry of Education set up digital platforms like "Madrasati," "Noor," and "Faris" during the pandemic. These platforms helped more than 6 million students and half a million teachers with remote learning (Ministry of Education, 2021). But this change also showed structural problems, especially in how English is taught.

Alotaibi (2021) said that the platforms were consistent, but they didn't have any interactive features that would have made them more engaging for students. Alqahtani (2022) talked about how online learning environments make it harder for students to practice important language skills, especially speaking. AlFares (2024) recently said that there are still problems with both in-person and online teaching, such as not enough training for teachers, technical issues, and ineffective teaching methods. But these studies usually only look at one type of environment at a time, either online or in person. None of them directly compares the quality of instruction and the problems that come up in both modes, especially in Riyadh's English language institutes, where the private education sector is very important.

To fill this gap, this study looks into and compares the quality of instruction and the difficulties teachers face in face-to-face and online English learning settings. The study uses a focused case study at a private language school in Riyadh to find out things that will help teachers and policymakers make better decisions about education in Saudi Arabia in the future.

1.2 The Study Problem:

Although both face-to-face and online modes of English language instruction are widely used in private language institutes in Riyadh, a clear gap remains between expected educational standards and actual instructional practices. These institutes are tasked with delivering effective language programs that develop communicative competence and align with academic quality benchmarks such as learning outcomes, assessment consistency, and learner satisfaction. However, studies have shown that these modes are not always used in the same way. For example, Rahimi and Ong (2023) noted that the effectiveness of hybrid and online instruction is highly contingent on the adaptability of teaching strategies and the degree to which they meet student needs. Gao and Shi (2023) pointed out that differences in teaching methods and feedback methods across different modalities have a big effect on how satisfied students are and how much they think they are learning. Richards and Rodgers (2014) also said that teaching methods should be in line with the goals of communication and the setting in which the lesson takes place.

Alqahtani (2021) also said that many English teachers in Saudi Arabia still use traditional methods and don't get much support from their schools. This mismatch between teaching methods and what students expect could make it harder for them to learn important language skills and lower the quality of the teaching as a whole.

Therefore, this study seeks to examine: To what extent do face-to-face and online English language instruction modes differ in terms of instructional quality, pedagogical challenges, and learner satisfaction within private language institutes in Riyadh?

1.3 Importance of the Study:

The significance of this study lies in its dual contribution—both theoretical and practical—to the field of English language instruction in Saudi Arabia, particularly within private language institutes in Riyadh.

The study is important because it makes two contributions to the field of English language teaching in Saudi Arabia, especially in private language schools in Riyadh. The study adds to the academic discussion about the quality of instruction by providing real-world data from a Saudi EFL context, where there is still not much research comparing face-to-face and online learning. The results should also help improve and support established educational frameworks like Total Quality Management in Education (TQM) by looking at how well the way lessons are taught matches up with the learning outcomes of the school. The study also looks at the pros and cons of both types of instruction to give us a better understanding of the Blended Learning Theory. It shows how combining different types of teaching can improve student engagement, satisfaction, and success.

The study gives useful information to important people that they can use in their work:

- Teachers will learn more about effective teaching methods in both learning modes, which will help them adapt their teaching methods to get more students involved and improve their results.
- Curriculum developers can use the results to make sure that the way they deliver content meets the needs of the learners. They can do this by using digital tools and engagement techniques that are backed up by research.
- Quality assurance units and institutional decision-makers will get useful feedback that will help them review and improve current policies. This will make sure that both face-to-face and online programs meet national quality standards, learner expectations, and institutional performance indicators.

In the end, the study gives private schools in Riyadh a way to improve the quality and effectiveness of their English language programs. It also gives other schools in Saudi Arabia and around the world a model that they can use.

1.4 Study Objectives:

The main objective of the study is to compare, through a quality assurance lens, the instructional quality, pedagogical challenges, and learner satisfaction between face-to-face and online English language instruction in private language institutes in Riyadh.

Sub-objectives:

- To identify the specific pedagogical challenges encountered by instructors and learners in both instructional modes.
- To evaluate instructional quality in each mode based on four indicators: learner engagement, clarity of content delivery, effectiveness of feedback, and alignment with intended learning outcomes.
- To measure learner satisfaction across both instructional settings in terms of perceived effectiveness, engagement, and academic support.
- To assess the role and effectiveness of digital tools and platforms in enhancing English language proficiency in online instruction.
- To analyze how teacher–student interactions influence learner engagement and academic performance in both face-to-face and online environments.
- To provide practical, evidence-based recommendations for enhancing instructional design and quality standards in English language programs at private language institutes.

1.5 The Study Questions:

Main Question:

To what extent do face-to-face and online English language instruction modes differ in terms of instructional quality, pedagogical challenges, and learner satisfaction in private language institutes in Riyadh?

Sub-questions:

1. What are the key pedagogical challenges encountered by teachers and students in face-to-face versus online English instruction?
2. To what extent do effective teaching strategies differ between face-to-face and online learning environments?
3. How does learner satisfaction vary between face-to-face and online modes of English language instruction?
4. To what extent does the quality of teaching and learning outcomes differ across the two instructional formats?

1.6 The Study Hypotheses:

In line with the goals of the study and the study issue, the following hypotheses are hereby posited:

Descriptive Comparative Hypotheses:

1. There is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of perceived pedagogical challenges between face-to-face and online English language instruction, in favor of online learning due to its increased reported limitations.
2. There is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of perceived instructional strategies between face-to-face and online learning environments, with face-to-face learning expected to score higher in engagement and delivery clarity.
3. There is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of learner satisfaction between face-to-face and online instruction, in favor of face-to-face learning.
4. There is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of perceived teaching quality and learning outcomes between the two modes, with face-to-face instruction anticipated to demonstrate higher effectiveness.

Correlational Hypotheses:

5. There is a statistically significant positive correlation between the use of computer-based educational tools and students' participation in online English learning.
6. There is a statistically significant positive correlation between teaching quality and the clarity of learning outcomes and alignment of learning activities in both face-to-face and online learning environments.

1.7 Theoretical Literature of the Study:

This study is based on a multi-theoretical framework that uses important educational and psychological theories to look at the problems, quality, and student satisfaction with face-to-face and online English language instruction in private schools in Riyadh. We chose the theories because they were relevant to language acquisition, instructional design, and getting students interested in learning. Here is a structured presentation of the theories, with the most relevant ones to the research variables listed first:

1. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory: Interaction and Involvement:

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (1978) says that talking to people who know more about language is very important for language development. This study shows how important it is for teachers and students to interact with each other in order to keep students interested and improve their language skills, especially when they are learning in person. This framework is used to explain the lower level of interaction in online settings, especially when looking at results that show pedagogical challenges and engagement gaps between the two modes.

2. Krashen's Input Hypothesis: What you hear and how it affects your learning:

Krashen (1985) says that people learn a language when they get input that is easy to understand but a little bit harder than what they already know. This theory helps us understand how to judge the quality of instruction in both formats, especially when it comes to how clear the content is, how well the scaffolding strategies work, and how helpful the feedback is. It helped create the questionnaire questions about how clear the teaching was and how well the students understood it, as well as how to compare the effectiveness of face-to-face and online delivery. Together, these frameworks provided a multi-dimensional lens through which to design the instrument, structure the comparative analysis, and interpret instructional effectiveness across the two modes.

3. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) – What makes you want to do something, and how happy you are with it:

Deci and Ryan's SDT (2000) looks at both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, which is directly related to learner satisfaction, which is the main variable in this study. The theory helps us look at how different types of learning environments (structured, interactive, and flexible) affect students' feelings of independence, competence, and interest, which helps us understand why satisfaction scores are different for different types of learning.

4. The Community of Inquiry (CoI) Framework for Online Teaching and Interaction:

The CoI model by Garrison et al. (2000) is used to understand the online learning environment, especially in terms of social, cognitive, and teaching presence. This theory helped shape questions in the survey about how digital tools are used, how learners interact online, and how technology is used in the classroom. It is also important for figuring out how well online learning environments support meaningful engagement.

5. The theory of information processing and cognitive engagement:

This theory explains how students take in, think about, and remember language input. It is important for making decisions about how to teach in both modalities and for figuring out how well the way lessons are taught follows the rules of cognitive load. It also has to do with judging how well students learnt, especially when it comes to understanding and using language (Atkinson & Shiffrin, 1968).

2 Total Quality Management (TQM) in Education: Making Sure Everything Is Aligned:

The study's focus on aligning instruction with learning outcomes, consistent assessments, and learner satisfaction is supported by TQM principles as a guiding institutional framework. It makes sense to include quality indicators in the questionnaire and sets up the comparison between the two modes in terms of efficiency, consistency, and continuous improvement (Sallis, 2002).

1.8 Review of Previous Studies:

a. Arabic Studies

1. Exploring the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Achieve Educational Efficiency: A Field Study in Riyadh

Alqahtani, S. H. (2024). By assessing its use in private educational institutions, this study sought to investigate how artificial intelligence might improve the effectiveness and calibre of the educational process in Riyadh. A random sample of 150 teachers and supervisors employed by private schools and institutions was given an electronic questionnaire by the researcher, who used a quantitative approach. The findings showed that AI applications enhanced student satisfaction, enhanced classroom management, and increased the accuracy of performance evaluations.

Although pertinent, the study concentrated more on AI as an administrative tool than on teaching languages or pedagogical approaches. It didn't compare different teaching modalities or discuss English teaching contexts. The current study's emphasis on technology integration and student satisfaction, particularly in online learning

environments, is indirectly supported by its findings on student satisfaction with digital tools.

2. The Impact of the Use of Educational Digital Games on Developing English Language Skills among Intermediate School Students

Al-Mutairi, M., & Alghamdi, A. (2023). The impact of educational digital games on the development of English language proficiency among Saudi intermediate school students was investigated in this quasi-experimental study. The authors suggested incorporating digital games into EFL curricula because the results demonstrated a notable increase in learners' motivation and performance when compared to traditional teaching methods. The study advances our knowledge of motivation and engagement in EFL contexts, but it only looked at public intermediate schools and game-based learning, a particular teaching tool, rather than more general instructional quality or comparative learning approaches. Its emphasis on student engagement, however, supports the notion that interactive strategies can improve learning outcomes, particularly in online environments, and is consistent with the current study's focus on pedagogical challenges.

a. Foreign Studies

1. Every Cloud Has a Silver Lining: The Experience of Online Learning in English Language Classes at Saudi Universities in the Post-COVID-19 Era

Alqahtani, M. H. (2022). This research aimed to examine the experiences of university students in Saudi Arabia with online learning after the onset of COVID-19 and its consequences for English language learning. The author followed a descriptive analytical design by distributing electronic questionnaires to 180 students from other Saudi universities. The results indicated that e-learning offered good flexibility to students, yet there were shortcomings for students, like less interaction and less scope for speaking practice than what is typically provided in face-to-face learning. The study gives us useful information about how students feel about online learning, but it only looked at college students and didn't compare it to face-to-face learning. The fact that it focuses on less interaction and speaking opportunities, on the other hand, directly supports the current study's focus on teaching challenges and fits with its investigation into how learning mode affects language skill development in private institutes. It also backs up worries that sociocultural theory has raised about how interaction affects learning a language.

2. Online Learning as a Bolster for Sustainable Development in the Saudi EFL Context

Alqahtani, F. (2023). The study aimed to explore how online learning contributes to sustainable development, particularly in enhancing learner autonomy, communication willingness, and reducing anxiety among Saudi EFL students. It used both quantitative (through questionnaires) and qualitative (through interviews) methods on 160 students and 23 teachers. The results showed that autonomy, communication, and learning anxiety all got better in a big way. The study suggested using online learning methods to help students become more aware of the environment and achieve long-term educational goals.

The study does not focus on the quality of instruction or comparing different learning environments, even though it does highlight important psychological and behavioural outcomes. It only looked at the internal learner experience in online settings. Still, its focus on learner autonomy and lower anxiety indirectly affects the current study's

variable of student satisfaction, especially when it comes to comfort and how effective students think online learning is.

3. Enhancing EFL Learning in Saudi Arabia: The Academic Contribution of YouTube in EFL Learning and Cultural Awareness

Yassin, B. (2024)

This study found that YouTube could help Saudi students learn English as a foreign language (EFL) and understand other cultures. This study used a mixed-methods approach, using surveys and focus group discussions with a sample of 200 university-level students from different locations in Saudi Arabia. The findings suggested that YouTube highly supported the development of listening and speaking skills, increased students' engagement, and provided a vast number of opportunities for exposure to different cultural contexts of the English language.

The study gives some ideas about how digital platforms can help with language learning, but it only looked at one tool (YouTube) and didn't look at other teaching methods or compare different ways of delivering lessons. But its results on student engagement and oral skill development are similar to what this study is looking into: instructional challenges and learner outcomes, especially in online settings.

4. The Challenges of Effective English Language Teaching in Saudi Schools

Alfares, N. S. (2024)

The main goal of this study was to find out what problems English teachers in Saudi schools face and how these problems affect their teaching. We used a descriptive survey design for the study and got the data from questionnaires. There were 112 English teachers in the sample, and they came from both public and private schools. According to the research, some of the biggest problems with learning English in Saudi Arabia were large class sizes, a lack of professionalism in teacher training, and using old and inappropriate teaching materials.

The study gives a good overview of the general problems teachers face in Saudi Arabia, but it only looked at schools and didn't look at language institutes or compare different types of instruction. Still, its results directly support the current study's focus on teaching problems and show how important it is to look at teacher readiness and resource quality, which are important in both face-to-face and online learning settings.

5. Evaluating Post-Pandemic Undergraduate Student Satisfaction with Online Learning in Saudi Arabia: The Significance of Self-Directed Learning

Shathry, S. & Alojail, M. (2024)

With an emphasis on the function of self-directed learning, this study sought to evaluate students' satisfaction with online education following COVID-19. Using a quantitative methodology and PLS data analysis, the research was conducted on 150 students from King Saud University. It concluded that self-directed learning was the sole significant factor affecting satisfaction. The study recommended designing educational programs that enhance self-directed learning.

This study's focus on student satisfaction and learner independence offers pertinent insight for the current research, despite the fact that it did not examine instructional quality or comparative learning modes. It reaffirms the significance of autonomy as a factor in online learning satisfaction, which is closely tied to the difficulties and results this study looks at.

6. The Effects of Mobile Game-Based Learning on Saudi EFL Foundation Year Students' Vocabulary Acquisition

Alhebbshi, A. A. & Gamlo, N. (2022)

56 Saudi female EFL foundation year students participated in this quasi-experimental study to investigate the effects of mobile game-based learning on vocabulary acquisition. The group that used mobile games performed better than the control group that used conventional techniques, according to the results. To increase vocabulary learning and engagement, the authors suggested incorporating mobile games. The study's findings are pertinent to the current research's emphasis on instructional effectiveness and engagement in digital environments, despite the fact that it only looks at one educational tool and one language skill—vocabulary acquisition. It did not, however, compare in-person and online learning environments or examine more general educational issues. Nevertheless, the study backs up the usefulness of interactive digital tools, which is consistent with the current investigation into the impact of technology on learning outcomes.

7. Comparison of Academic Results during Conventional and Online Modes of Learning: A Case Study of Two Groups of Saudi University Students

Ababneh, I., Al-qdah, M., & Almutairi, A. (2023)

This study looked at the academic performance of two groups of 90 Saudi university students who learnt in both traditional and online settings. The results showed that online learning worked better, especially for theoretical subjects. The study said that Saudi universities should support online learning infrastructure and teaching methods. While this study is directly aligned with the comparative aspect of the current research, it concentrated solely on academic performance and did not explore dimensions such as instructional quality, teaching challenges, or student satisfaction. Nonetheless, it strengthens the rationale for evaluating online versus face-to-face learning, reinforcing the need to assess not just outcomes but also the pedagogical conditions that lead to those outcomes in language instruction contexts.

8. Interactions in Online Versus Face-to-face Classes: Students' and Teachers' Perceptions

Gao & Shi (2023).

The goal of this study was to look into how people feel about interacting in online classes versus in-person classes. It had 124 people fill out a descriptive survey. The results showed that 54% of students liked talking to people in person better. The study said that tools like breakout rooms and polls could make online interactions better. The study mostly looked at people's preferences for interaction, but it didn't go into more general teaching issues like the quality of the instruction or the results of the learning. But its focus on interaction fits with sociocultural theory and backs up the current study's focus on the problems with teaching when there isn't enough interaction in online learning environments, especially in language teaching, where engagement is very important.

9. Teaching English Speaking Online versus Face-to-Face: Saudi Students' Experience

Alzamil (2021).

The purpose of this study was to compare the development of speaking skills among Saudi students in-person and online. Forty interviews were conducted using a qualitative approach. The findings showed that although students valued flexibility, they preferred face-to-face communication for speaking confidence. A blended methodology was suggested by the study.

This research was restricted to speaking development and did not look at more general factors like teaching quality, student satisfaction, or instructional challenges, even though it directly relates to the comparative scope of the current study and focuses on a fundamental language skill. However, its findings support the current study's goal of determining how modality influences language instruction outcomes and emphasise the necessity of comparing learning environments.

10. Learning Motivation of Vietnamese EFL Learners in Fully Online Classes during COVID-19: A Mixed Methods Study

Phuong, T. T. H. (2022)

During the COVID-19 pandemic, this mixed-methods study investigated the learning motivation of 183 Vietnamese EFL students enrolled in fully online courses. The results highlighted the importance of supportive online environments and learner autonomy. One of the recommendations was to encourage communication and participation in online EFL classes.

This study's findings support the significance of learner autonomy and interaction factors relevant to the current study's interest in student satisfaction and instructional challenges in online settings, despite the fact that it was conducted in a non-Saudi context and primarily focused on motivation. It did not, however, discuss instructional quality or comparative teaching modalities.

11. Technology and Classroom Practices: An International Study

Kozma, R. B. (2003).

This study examined how educators from different nations use technology in the classroom and how it relates to their teaching methods. Teachers in 28 different countries provided both qualitative and quantitative data for the study, which used a comparative international survey-based methodology. The results showed that more constructivist and student-centered teaching approaches were linked to creative technological applications. Using technology also encourages group learning and the growth of higher-order thinking abilities. The study suggested improving teacher preparation programs to encourage pedagogical innovation as well as efficient technology use.

The study's conclusions provide pertinent theoretical support for the ongoing research, despite the fact that it is not specifically focused on language instruction or the Saudi context. The focus on digital tool integration and constructivist pedagogy bolsters the current study's interest in technology use and instructional quality in online versus in-person settings. Nevertheless, learner satisfaction and language-specific outcomes—two important aspects of the current study—were not examined.

12. Exploring expert teachers' cognitions and practices of teaching English speaking and their students' experiences and engagement.

Rahimi, M., & Ong, K. K. W. (2023)

The study sought to investigate students' experiences and involvement in those classes, as well as the attitudes and methods of proficient English-speaking instructors. Using a qualitative approach, the researchers conducted student focus groups, teacher interviews, and classroom observations. A sample of proficient English language instructors and their secondary school pupils participated in the study. The study's main conclusions included the following: teacher scaffolding, creating a safe environment for

oral communication, and striking a balance between fluency and accuracy are all essential components of effective speaking instruction. When the activities were contextually relevant and interactive, students reported being more engaged. According to the study, teacher preparation programs ought to promote reflective practices, highlight useful speaking instruction techniques, and aid in the advancement of context-based teaching methodologies.

The study did not compare instructional modes or look at learner satisfaction, despite its specific focus on teaching speaking in secondary schools. Nonetheless, the current study's focus on instructional quality and challenges in EFL contexts, particularly with regard to student engagement in both face-to-face and online environments, is in line with its emphasis on engagement, scaffolding, and contextual interaction.

13. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014)

This foundational work aimed to present a comprehensive theoretical underpinning for considering different linguistic approaches and methods used to teach a language. The authors reviewed an array of teaching methodologies and examined the principles, procedures, and use, for example, of methods like the communicative approach, grammar-translation, and task-based learning. The book provides educators and researchers with valuable support so that they can explore and choose methods that meet their instructional aims and the needs of learners.

This reference is not an empirical study, but it gives the current research important theoretical support. Its thorough breakdown of teaching methods backs up the current study's look at the quality of teaching in both face-to-face and online settings. In particular, the talk about learner-centered and communicative approaches fits with the study's focus on how well teaching works and how engaged students are in different modes.

C. Synthesis and Identified Gaps:

The Arabic and international literature that was looked at gives a wide range of ideas about EFL teaching, from digital tools and improving speaking skills to letting students work on their own and being happy in online settings. These studies add a lot to the field, but most of them only looked at one thing at a time, like specific language skills, individual tools (like YouTube or mobile games), or general perceptions, usually in a school or university setting.

But not many people have directly compared face-to-face and online teaching in private language schools in Riyadh. Most of them also didn't look at the quality of instruction, student engagement, and student satisfaction as variables that are all connected. The current study fills this gap by combining these dimensions into a single framework, which allows for a comparative, context-specific analysis that has been mostly missing from previous research.

1.9 Methodology:

Study Design

The descriptive-analytical methodology used in this study was appropriate for analysing variations, connections, and recurrent trends among variables in both in-person and online English language training. This method was selected because it:

- Made it possible to compare the two teaching modalities directly using quantifiable indicators.
- Made it possible to examine the connections between factors like learner satisfaction and the quality of instruction.
- Presented a thorough overview of the actual state of English language instruction in Riyadh's private institutions.

Population Sample:

The intended target population

English language instructors and learners at a private language school in Riyadh who had prior experience with both in-person and online learning environments made up the target population.

The Actual Sample

Participants who satisfied the requirements for meaningful participation and were able to give thoughtful answers to the questionnaire were chosen using a purposive sampling technique.

- There were 92 participants in all (teachers and students).
- Justification: To guarantee a 95% confidence level and lower the margin of error, the sample size was established under guidelines for descriptive-analytical research.

The Pilot Sample

Thirty participants participated in a pilot study to assess the reliability and clarity of the questionnaire items.

Instrument of Study

A structured, closed-ended questionnaire was used as the main research tool to gather quantitative data on the following topics:

- Demographics.
- Pedagogical difficulties in both online and in-person learning settings.
- The quality of instruction as measured by the objectives' clarity, the methods' efficacy, the calibre of the feedback, and the alignment with the ILOs.
- Learners' contentment with the classroom setting.

Justification for Selecting the Instrument

- Worked well for gathering numerical data that could be examined statistically.
- Was effective at quickly reaching a large number of participants.

The Development of the Instrument

Based on the literature review, the questionnaire was created and modified for the Riyadh English language learning environment. The items were modified to fit the local context and were taken from well-known, validated assessment instruments in the field of teaching English.

Reliability and Validity:

- Content Validity: To make sure the questionnaire accurately measured the desired research variables, it was examined by specialists in English language instruction.
- Reliability: Cronbach's Alpha was used to evaluate internal consistency in the 30-person pilot sample. Every value was higher than 0.70, which was deemed appropriate for studies in education.

Methods for Data Collection Procedures

- The chosen participants received the questionnaire only online through Google Forms.
- To guarantee accurate responses, clear instructions were given.
- To guarantee that responses were completed on time, a set period was established for data collection.

The Statistical Analysis Methods

Data were analyzed using SPSS according to the following plan:

1. Descriptive Statistical Analysis
 - Mean scores.
 - Standard deviations.
 - Percentages and frequency distributions.
2. Comparative Analysis (for difference-related questions)
 - Independent Samples t-test.
 - One-Way ANOVA.
3. Correlational Analysis (for relationship-related questions)
 - Pearson's Correlation Coefficient to measure the strength and direction of relationships between variables such as teaching quality, learning outcomes, and learner satisfaction.
4. Reliability Testing
 - Cronbach's Alpha to verify internal consistency.

Significance Level:

The statistical significance threshold was set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Data Analysis Plan:

1. Incomplete or inconsistent responses were eliminated from the data through screening and cleaning.
2. To find general trends, descriptive analysis was done.
3. To find meaningful differences between groups, a comparative analysis was done.
4. To investigate the connections between important variables, correlational analysis was done.

Study limitations

- Subject Scope: Learner satisfaction, pedagogical challenges, and quality of instruction.
- Geographic Scope: Restricted to one Riyadh-based private language school.
- Time Range: 2024–2025 academic year.
- Participants: Students and instructors of English at the chosen institution.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework of the Study

Section One: Teaching Quality and Challenges in English Language Education

2.1.1 Definition of Teaching Quality

Richards and Rodgers (2014) assert that the quality of language education is contingent upon the teacher's capacity to effectively present and organise content, utilise diverse instructional strategies, actively engage students, and align assessments with learning objectives. They also emphasized that the effectiveness of language instruction is assessed by its ability to engage learners and enhance their understanding. Darling-Hammond (2000) and Stronge (2018), on the other hand, highlighted that teaching quality significantly influences student achievement, incorporating elements such as instructional clarity, adaptability, and learner-centred practices.

2.1.2 Dimensions of Teaching Quality

The quality of teaching in the English language education includes the following elements:

1. Clear and organised presentation of information.
2. Use of interactive pedagogical approaches.
3. Delivery of ongoing feedback.
4. Efficient classroom administration.
5. Incorporation of technology to facilitate learning objectives.

Stronge (2018) highlighted that teaching quality relies on key dimensions, including clarity of instruction, implementation of learner-centred interactive methods, provision of constructive feedback, effective classroom management, and the pedagogical application of technology to improve learning outcomes.

2.1.3 Challenges in English Language Instruction

Face-to-face and online learning environments encounter several challenges, including overcrowded classrooms, variability in students' proficiency levels, and insufficient technical resources in face-to-face settings. On the other side, online learning presents challenges such as limited interaction, difficulties in tracking progress, reduced motivation among certain students, and insufficient teacher proficiency in educational technologies.

Alshahrani and Al-Shehri (2012) identified significant challenges faced by students and teachers in Saudi EFL contexts within online environments, including low student motivation, limited interaction, and insufficient teacher preparedness in effectively utilising educational technologies. Traditional classrooms often experience overcrowding and restricted access to technological resources, which impedes differentiated instruction.

2.1.4 The Relationship Between Teaching Quality and Educational Challenges

The more a teacher's ability to tackle obstacles inherent to the educational mode, whether it's in-person or online, the superior the quality of teaching is likely to be. Alshathry and Alojail (2024) stated that students' satisfaction with online learning is affected by the instructor's proficiency in managing digital tools and maintaining engagement, highlighting

the critical link between addressing instructional challenges and attaining teaching effectiveness. Therefore, this study aims to identify the principal problems in each mode and analyze their correlation with the perceived quality of education from the viewpoints of both teachers and students.

Section Two: Modes of Learning and Their Impact on Learning Outcomes

2.2.1 Face-to-Face vs. Online Learning

Face-to-face learning depends on direct interaction and is regarded as an optimal setting for cultivating speaking and communication abilities. Online education, on the other hand, provides flexibility and convenient access to materials; nevertheless, it may be deficient in social contact and motivation if not properly structured.

Online learning, as articulated by Singh and Thurman (2019), refers to learning experiences in synchronous or asynchronous environments utilising various devices with internet connectivity. Conversely, face-to-face learning occurs in conventional classroom environments when students and educators are physically co-located, facilitating direct connection (Means et al., 2009).

The Value of Each Learning Mode in EFL Contexts

Both in-person and online learning modalities provide unique benefits that are essential for the enhancement of English language proficiency. In-person education, for instance, facilitates quick engagement, immediate feedback, and enhanced social presence, all of which bolster learners' confidence and enhance their speaking and listening skills.

Research by Gao and Shi (2023) highlighted the significance of classroom contact in enhancing oral communication, whereas Alzamil (2021) observed that many Saudi learners exhibit greater ease in articulating themselves within conventional classroom environments, hence facilitating more profound language engagement.

In contrast, online education offers flexibility, self-directed study, and gives an access to a lot of digital resources, and is flexible. Well-designed online environments can enhance reading and writing ability while supporting learners who require visual assistance and interactive information. Means et al. (2010) indicate that students in blended or fully online formats frequently get comparable or superior learning outcomes relative to conventional learners, particularly when instruction is enhanced by active engagement tools. Alqahtani (2025) asserts that online learning augments students' motivation and autonomy, which are crucial for continuous advancement in language acquisition.

Understanding the complementary capabilities of both instructional styles is crucial for comprehending their contributions to learning outcomes. This study seeks to evaluate the efficacy of face-to-face versus online learning environments in English language training, specifically inside language institutions in Riyadh. The research aims to discover which elements of instructional quality are most improved or impeded by each mode, to inform best practices for EFL teaching in varied learning environments and offer insights into optimising instructional methods to address learners' needs.

2.2.3 The Impact of Learning Mode on Language Skills

Previous studies suggest that instructional that the way language is taught can affect how well certain language abilities develop. Many people think that learning in person is better for improving speaking and listening skills since professors and students can engage and give feedback right away (Gao & Shi, 2023). On the other hand, online learning

environments have shown promise in helping students improve their reading and writing skills, especially when they include digital materials and allow students to work at their own pace (Phuong, 2022). These differences show how important it is to make sure that the way you teach matches the language goals you want to achieve.

2.2.4 The Role of Technology in Enhancing Learning Outcomes

Technological tools, including educational platforms, virtual classrooms, interactive assessments, and artificial intelligence, have demonstrated promise for advancing the quality of English language learning experiences. Nonetheless, technology will not advance language learning experiences without the teacher using it in a meaningful way and the learners choosing to engage meaningfully with technology.

Koehler and Mishra's (2009) research shows that instructors' Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), which is a mix of knowledge about content, teaching, and digital technologies, is what makes technology integration work. In the same way, Alzahrani and Saleh (2025) said that teachers' digital literacy and students' willingness to use language learning technology are two important things that make them work well in Saudi EFL settings. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) also said that AI tools can improve personalisation and involvement, but their usefulness depends on how well they fit with the aims of the teacher and the needs of the students.

2.2.5 Teacher–Student Interaction

According to Vygotsky's Social Development Theory, interaction with a more experienced individual (the teacher) enhances the learning process. This interaction is sometimes limited in online learning, which negatively affects students' motivation.

This view is supported by several studies. For example, Borup et al. (2014) noted that a common shortcoming of online learning environments is that limited teacher-student interaction does not orient the learner, and is often associated with decreased participation and isolation, both of which decrease positive learner engagement. Martin and Bolliger (2018) were able to show that consistent interactions with teachers are the most important aspect of maintaining student motivation and satisfaction in a virtual classroom. Moore (1989), however, described three types of interaction: learner-content, learner-instructor, and learner-learner. Moore pointed out that when instructor interaction is weak, student understanding and active engagement typically suffer.

2.2.6 The Relationship Between Learning Mode and Learning Outcomes

The quality of learning outcomes depends a lot on how well important instructional factors, like how well teachers and students interact, how content is delivered, and how well technology is used, are incorporated into the chosen learning mode. As Means et al. (2010) have emphasized that it is only when effectively designed and delivered that online instruction provides better learning results than traditional student learning (Means et al., 2010). This indicates the importance of instructional quality in defining modes of learning over the design or teaching format (online or face-to-face). Moreover, Ababneh et al. (2023) found that academic achievement has a greater relationship with the quality of instruction and instructional management and is independent of a learning format. In terms of English language teaching in Saudi Arabia, Al-Fares (2024) also noted that specifying the particular types of teaching approaches required for each type of learning mode design was key in achieving effective educational outcomes.

Theoretical Framework Summary

This study relies on central concepts such as teaching quality, learning outcomes, interaction, and technology. It is also grounded in theories such as Vygotsky's Social Development Theory, cognitive theory, and the Community of Inquiry framework to explain the differences between face-to-face and online learning. This framework enables the researcher to interpret the study's results and connect them to the academic and professional context of English language institutes in Riyadh.

Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

3.1 Introduction:

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis conducted on the study data. The aim of this chapter is to provide a clear and objective summary of the findings based on the participants' responses to the questionnaire. The results are organized according to the main axes of the study, reflecting the challenges, instructional strategies, satisfaction, teaching quality, and correlations addressed in the research hypotheses. Each section includes tables displaying the frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, followed by a descriptive summary of the key outcomes. These findings serve as the foundation for the discussion and interpretation in the following chapter.

3.2 Demographic Variables:

The primary data related to the study sample includes the independent variables of the study, which are the personal characteristics of the sample individuals (e.g., gender, age, nationality, occupation).

Table (1)

Distribution of the Study Sample According to the Age Variable

Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Under 18	8	8.7
18 to 25	28	30.4
26 to 35	43	46.7
Above 35	13	14.1
Total	92	100%

It is evident from Table (1) that 43 participants, representing 46.7% of the total study sample, are aged between 26 and 35 years, making them the largest age group in the study. Meanwhile, 28 participants (30.4%) are aged between 18 and 25 years, 13 participants (14.1%) are above 35 years old, and 8 participants (8.7%) are below 18 years of age.

Table (2)

Distribution of the Study Sample According to Role in the Institute

Role in the Institute	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Student	83	90.2
Teacher	9	9.8
Total	92	100%

Table (2) shows that 83 participants in the study sample represent 90.2% of the total sample and are students, making them the majority. Meanwhile, 9 participants represent 9.8% of the total sample and are teachers.

Table (3)

Distribution of the Study Sample According to English Proficiency Level

English Proficiency Level	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Beginner	14	15.2
Intermediate	60	65.2
Advanced	18	19.7
Total	92	100%

Table (3) shows that 60 participants in the study sample, representing 65.2% of the total sample, have an intermediate level of English proficiency, making them the majority. Meanwhile, 18 participants (representing 19.6%) have an advanced level of proficiency, while 14 participants (representing 15.2%) have a beginner level of English proficiency.

Table (4)

Distribution of the Study Sample According to the Learning Method with the Most Experience

Learning Method	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Face-to-face	35	38.0
Online	21	22.8
Both	36	39.1
Total	92	100%

Table (4) shows that 36 participants in the study sample, representing 39.1% of the total sample, have experience with both methods (face-to-face and online learning), making them the majority. Meanwhile, 35 participants (representing 38%) have experience with face-to-face learning, while 21 participants (representing 22.8%) have experience with online learning only.

3.3 Internal Consistency Validity:

After confirming the face validity of the study instrument, the researcher applied it in the field initially to a pilot sample of (30) individuals. The internal consistency validity was then verified through the calculation of Pearson's Correlation Coefficient for each item with the total degree of the axis to which it belongs. The following tables clarify this:

Table (5)

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Items of the first axis: Educational Challenges Faced by English Language Students and Teachers in Face-to-Face and Online Learning Environments, Based on the Total Degree of the Dimension.

Challenges Related to Classroom Experience		Challenges of Online Learning	
Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension	Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension
1	**0.889	1	**0.793
2	**0.983	2	**0.681
3	**0.922	3	**0.797
4	**0.895	4	**0.788
		5	**0.808

** Significant at the statistical level (0.01) or less.

Table (6)

Pearson correlation coefficients for the second axis: effective teaching strategies in both physical and online learning environments, based on the Total Degree of the Dimension.

Strategies for Engaging Learner Interaction		Digital Tools and Resources		Teaching Presentation Methods	
Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension	Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension	Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension
1	**0.894	1	**0.768	1	**0.743
2	**0.904	2	**0.960	2	**0.844
3	**0.970	3	**0.910	3	**0.917

Strategies for Engaging Learner Interaction		Digital Tools and Resources		Teaching Presentation Methods	
Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension	Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension	Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension
4	**0.597			4	**0.929

**Significant at the statistical level (0.01) or less.

Table (7)

Pearson correlation coefficients for the third axis: satisfaction related to teaching and learning the English language in both face-to-face and online learning environments based on the Total Degree of the Dimension.

General satisfaction with learning		Confidence in using the English language	
Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension	Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Dimension
1	**0.924	1	**0.980
2	**0.935	2	**0.981

** Significant at the statistical level (0.01) or less.

Table (8)

Pearson correlation coefficients for the fourth axis: teaching quality and learning outcomes in both face-to-face and online learning environments with the total score of the axis

Item No.	Correlation Coefficient with the Axis
1	0.779
2	0.838
3	0.858
4	0.953
5	0.839
6	0.877
7	0.845

** Significant at the statistical level (0.01) or less.

It is evident from Tables (5-8) that: the correlation coefficient value of each item with its axis or dimension is positive and statistically significant at the level of significance (0.01), which indicates the validity of its consistency with the axis or dimension to which it belongs.

3.4 Reliability of the Study Instrument (Reliability):

The researcher calculated the reliability of the study instrument using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (α), as shown in Table (9) to measure internal consistency reliability by calculating the reliability score of each dimension and its items, as well as the total reliability value for the study instrument.

Table (9)

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Measuring the Reliability of the Study Instrument

Axis of the Questionnaire	Number of Items	Reliability Coefficient
First: Challenges related to face-to-face classroom learning	4	0.940
Second: Challenges of online learning	5	0.829
Section (A): Challenges	9	0.897
First: Strategies related to teacher-student interaction	4	0.814
Second: Tools and digital resources	3	0.855
Third: Teaching style and teacher's role	4	0.874
Section (B): Teaching Strategies	11	0.878
First: General satisfaction with learning	2	0.842
Second: Confidence in using the English language	2	0.959
Section (C): General Satisfaction	4	0.902
Section (D): Teaching Quality and Learning Outcomes	7	0.937
Total Reliability	31	0.936

It is evident from Table (9) that the reliability coefficients of the study's dimensions ranged between (0.81 – 0.96), and that the overall reliability coefficient reached (0.94), indicating that the questionnaire enjoys a high degree of reliability and can be depended upon for field application in the study.

3.5 Statistical Methods:

To achieve the objectives of the study and analyze the data collected by the researcher, the researcher used several appropriate statistical methods using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), which is abbreviated as (SPSS). This was done after coding the data and inputting it into the software, and then the researcher extracted the results according to the following statistical methods:

1. **Percentage & Frequencies:**

To identify the personal and occupational characteristics of the study sample individuals and to determine the direction of their responses toward the main dimensions represented in the study tool statements.

2. **Weighted Mean:**

To determine the degree of increase or decrease in the responses of the study sample individuals to each statement of the basic study dimensions. This statistical method helps to rank the statements based on the highest weighted arithmetic mean.

3. **Arithmetic Mean (Mean):**

To determine the level of increase or decrease in the responses of the study sample individuals to the main dimensions (based on the average of statement means). It is known that the higher the mean, the more it indicates the importance of that dimension according to a mathematical average.

4. **Standard Deviation:**

To identify the level of variability in the responses of the study sample individuals to each of the study variable statements, and for each axis of the main dimensions of the study tool. This statistical method was adopted because the standard deviation indicates the extent of the dispersion of study sample responses for each main dimension. The closer the standard deviation is to zero, the lower the dispersion of responses among the study sample individuals.

5. **Pearson Correlation Coefficient:**

To measure the internal consistency validity between the items of the instrument (the questionnaire), and each dimension it belongs to. It is also used to measure the relationship between some variables in the responses related to certain hypotheses of the study.

6. **Cronbach's Alpha (α) Coefficient:**

To calculate the reliability coefficient of the study instrument.

7. **One-Way ANOVA Analysis:**

To show the significance of differences in the responses of the study sample individuals according to the variation of their variables when divided into more than two groups.

8. **LSD Test (Least Significant Difference):**

To show the significance of differences in the responses of the study sample individuals among categories of personal and occupational variables that are divided into more than

two groups, in case the ANOVA test shows the existence of statistically significant differences between these variable categories.

Chapter 4: Presentation, Analysis, and Discussion of the Study Results

4.1 Introduction:

This chapter addresses the analysis of the study results by presenting the responses of the study sample to the research questions and discussing them according to the scientific methodology. The analysis is based on statistical readings of means, standard deviations, and test results. The study findings are then interpreted and discussed.

4.2 Questions:

Results Related to the First Question:

"What are the educational challenges faced by English language students and teachers in face-to-face and online environments?"

To identify the educational challenges faced by students and teachers of English across different learning modalities (face-to-face, online, and both), means and standard deviations were calculated. The study sample responses were analyzed and ranked according to the teaching challenges scale. The results are presented in Table (10) below.

Table (10)

Means and standard deviations of study sample responses on challenges ranked in descendingly order

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face			Online			Both			Rank
#	Challenges	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	
1	Challenges related to classroom experience	4.78	0.342	Strongly Agree	3.82	0.867	Agree	4.20	0.797	Agree	1
2	E-learning challenges	3.69	0.510	Agree	3.04	0.602	Neutral	3.50	0.516	Agree	2
Overall Mean		4.24	0.348	Strongly Agree	3.43	0.641	Agree	3.85	0.506	Agree	

It is evident from Table (10) that English language students and teachers face educational challenges across three different learning environments: face-to-face, online, and blended (those who experienced both). The overall mean scores for the perceived challenges were (4.24 out of 5) for the face-to-face group, (3.43 out of 5) for the online group, and (3.85 out of 5) for the blended group. Across all three groups, challenges related to the classroom experience consistently ranked first. The highest mean was recorded by the face-to-face group (4.78 out of 5), followed by the blended group (4.20 out of 5) and the online group (3.82 out of 5). As for the second challenge, the face-to-face group reported having trouble learning online, with an average score of 3.69 out of 5. The online and blended groups, on the other hand, said they had trouble learning online, with ratings of 3.04 and 3.50 out of 5, respectively.

These results support hypothesis 1, which says that there would be a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of perceived pedagogical obstacles between face-to-face and online English classes. The high challenge scores in the face-to-face mode suggest that although this mode benefits from richer in-person engagement, it may place greater demands on teachers in terms of classroom management, real-time feedback, and active learning facilitation. Conversely, online learning's lower challenge scores may indicate fewer immediate demands but also reflect known barriers such as reduced interaction and sustained motivation. From an educational standpoint, these findings highlight the need for targeted professional development: for

face-to-face instructors, on managing high-intensity interactive classes; and for online instructors, on designing strategies that increase learner participation and engagement.

What follows is a detailed presentation of the specific educational challenges faced by English language students and teachers across three learning environments: face-to-face, online, and blended (both face-to-face and online).

1. Challenges Related to Classroom Experience

Table (11) below illustrates the challenges related to classroom experience faced by English language students and teachers across face-to-face, online, and blended learning environments:

Table (11)

Means and standard deviations of the study sample's responses to classroom-related challenges ranked by mean score

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
1	Face-to-face learning helps me understand English grammar better.	4.74	0.561	Strongly Agree	4	3.81	0.928	Agree	2	4.19	1.009	Agree	2
2	There is greater motivation to learn in face-to-face classrooms compared to online classes.	4.74	0.443	Strongly Agree	3	3.62	1.071	Agree	4	4.11	1.008	Agree	4
3	I feel more connected with the teacher in face-to-face classes compared to online ones.	4.86	0.355	Strongly Agree	1	3.76	1.221	Agree	3	4.14	1.046	Agree	3

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
4	I find it difficult to improve my English speaking skills through online classes	4.77	0.547	Strongly Agree	2	4.10	1.091	Agree	1	4.36	0.961	Strongly Agree	1
Overall Mean		4.78	0.342	Strongly Agree		3.82	0.867	Agree		4.20	0.797	Agree	

It is evident from Table (11) that the respondents acknowledged the presence of classroom experience challenges across three learning environments: face to face, online, and blended (students who experienced both). The mean scores for these challenges were 4.78 out of 5 for the face to face group, 3.82 out of 5 for the online group, and 4.20 out of 5 for the blended group.

In all three settings, the most significant challenge was the same: “I find it difficult to improve my English speaking skills through online classes.” This statement ranked first for the online group (4.10) and the blended group (4.36) and was among the top for the face to face group. The least agreed upon challenge varied slightly: for both the online and blended groups, it was “There is more motivation to learn in face to face classes compared to online ones” with mean scores of 3.62 and 4.11, respectively. For the face to face group, the lowest ranked challenge was “Face to face learning helps me understand English grammar better” with a mean of 4.74 out of 5.

These results are consistent with Hypothesis 1, which anticipates significant differences in perceived pedagogical challenges between face to face and online learning, with online learning reporting more limitations. The notably higher challenge scores in online contexts underscore the persistent difficulties students face in building speaking skills without the immediacy and interactivity of in person communication.

From an educational implications standpoint, this indicates that online English learning ought to emphasize speaking-oriented activities, including planned conversation practice, real-time oral feedback, and interactive peer-to-peer talks, to alleviate these issues. Incorporating specialised speaking modules into the online component for blended learners may mitigate the performance disparity between in-person and virtual formats.

2. E-Learning Challenges:

Table (12) presents the online learning challenges faced by English language students and teachers across face-to-face, online, and blended learning environments, as follows:

Table (12)

Means and standard deviations of the sample's responses to online learning challenges, ranked by mean score

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#	Statments	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
1	I find it difficult to improve my English speaking skills through online classes.	3.54	0.95	Agree	4	2.33	1.354	Disagree	5	2.72	1.137	Neutral	5
2	Online classes provide me with greater flexibility in learning.	3.31	1.207	Neutral	5	4.24	0.995	Strongly Agree	1	3.86	0.833	Agree	2
3	Online classes make it difficult to interact with others.	3.74	1.039	Agree	2	2.57	1.028	Disagree	4	3.36	1.046	Neutral	4
4	Internet connectivity issues affect my ability to participate in online classes.	3.69	0.993	Agree	3	3.10	0.889	Neutral	2	3.58	1.025	Agree	3
5	Technical problems (such as platform errors or device issues) reduce the effectiveness of my online learning.	4.17	0.785	Agree	1	2.95	0.805	Neutral	3	3.97	0.971	Agree	1
Overall Mean		3.69	0.510	Agree		3.04	0.602	Neutral		3.50	0.516	Agree	

It is evident from Table (12) that English language students and teachers encounter e learning challenges across three different learning environments: face to face, online, and blended (those who experienced both). The overall mean scores for perceived e learning challenges were 3.69 out of 5 for the face to face group, 3.04 out of 5 for the online group, and 3.50 out of 5 for the blended group.

Across all three groups, technical issues were consistently ranked highest. The face to face group reported the highest score (4.17 out of 5), followed by the blended group (3.97 out of 5). Technical difficulties were also recognized by the online group as a major factor, though to a slightly lesser extent.

The lowest rated challenges differed among the groups. For the blended and online groups, the lowest rated challenge was “The difficulty of enhancing speaking abilities through online classes”, with mean scores of 2.33

and 2.72, respectively. For the face to face group, the least endorsed statement was “Online courses offer more flexibility”, with a mean of 3.31 out of 5.

These findings related to Hypothesis 1, which anticipates notable disparities in perceived pedagogical obstacles across the two primary educational modes. The somewhat lower ratings in the online group indicate the ongoing challenges learners encounter in surmounting technological obstacles and enhancing speaking skills in virtual environments.

From an educational implications standpoint, these findings indicate that for online and blended learning to be more effective, institutions must enhance technical support systems, invest in robust digital infrastructure, and create interactive speaking-focused activities to alleviate the adverse effects of technical limitations. Educators must also be trained in the management and resolution of digital tools, ensuring that technological difficulties do not impede learning engagement and success.

Results Related to Research Second Question:

"To what extent do effective teaching strategies differ between face-to-face and online learning environments?"

To identify the effective teaching strategies in face-to-face, online, and blended learning environments, the means, standard deviations, and ranks of the participants' responses to the effective teaching strategies axis were calculated. The results are shown in Table (13) below.

Table (13)

The means and standard deviations of the study sample's responses to the effective teaching strategies were ranked in descending order.

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face			Online			Both			Rank
#.	Effective Teaching Strategies	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	
1	Learner engagement strategies	3.68	0.617	Agree	3.64	0.785	Agree	3.60	0.740	Agree	3
2	Digital tools and resources	4.19	0.601	Agree	4.02	0.785	Agree	4.27	0.568	Strongly Agree	1
3	Teaching delivery methods	3.86	0.501	Agree	3.81	0.493	Agree	3.80	0.527	Agree	2
Overall Mean		3.91	0.428	Agree	3.82	0.454	Agree	3.89	0.408	Agree	

It is evident from Table (13) that the study sample agreed on the overall effectiveness of teaching strategies across the three learning environments: face-to-face, online, and blended (those who experienced both). The overall mean scores were 3.91 out of 5 for the face-to-face group, 3.82 out of 5 for the online group, and 3.89 out of 5 for the blended group.

In all three situations, digital tools and resources proved to be the most effective pedagogical approach. The blended group had the highest score (4.27 out of 5), followed by the face-to-face group (4.19 out of 5) and the online group (4.02 out of 5). Teaching delivery methods were consistently ranked second, with mean scores of 3.86, 3.81, and 3.80 for the in-person, online, and blended groups, respectively. Learner engagement strategies came in third place, with mean scores of 3.68, 3.64, and 3.60 across the three environments.

These results are directly associated with Hypothesis 2, which posits that face-to-face learning will get superior scores in engagement and clarity of delivery. The findings indicate that face-to-face instruction maintains a marginal advantage in some strategic aspects, while the blended group's consistently elevated scores for digital tools imply that the amalgamation of technology with in-person methods may produce superior outcomes.

The findings underscore the necessity of utilizing technology-enhanced resources across all instructional modalities, not exclusively in online formats. In traditional classrooms, the integration of digital resources can enhance content accessibility, facilitate differentiated learning, and maintain student interest. The comparatively lower scores for learner engagement tactics suggest a necessity for more participatory, student-centered methodologies in both online and mixed environments. This may entail employing active learning methodologies, real-time feedback mechanisms, and collaborative assignments to guarantee student engagement irrespective of the channel of delivery.

Here is the detailed presentation of the effective teaching strategies across the three learning environments: face-to-face, online, and blended.

1. Learner Engagement Strategies

Table (14) presents the learner engagement strategies across face-to-face, online, and blended learning environments, as follows:

Table (14)

Means and standard deviations of the study sample's responses to learner engagement strategies in face-to-face, online, and blended learning environments, ranked in descending order according to the mean score.

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
1	Interactive tasks (such as group work) help me learn better in face-to-face classes.	4.14	1.141	Agree	2	3.71	1.102	Agree	2	3.89	1.237	Agree	2
2	Interactive tasks (such as group work) help me learn better in online classes.	3.31	1.345	Neutral	3	3.90	0.944	Agree	1	3.39	1.293	Neutral	3
3	Face-to-face learning makes me more engaged than online lessons.	4.60	0.651	Strongly Agree	1	3.52	1.289	Agree	3	4.17	1.028	Agree	1

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
4	Online lessons make me more engaged than face-to-face learning.	2.66	1.056	Neutral	4	3.43	1.028	Agree	4	2.97	1.082	Neutral	4
Overall Mean		3.68	0.617	Agree		3.64	0.785	Agree		3.60	0.74	Agree	

It is evident from Table (14) that English language students and teachers expressed general agreement on the effectiveness of learner engagement strategies across the three learning environments: face to face, online, and blended. The mean scores were 3.68 out of 5 for the face to face group, 3.64 out of 5 for the online group, and 3.60 out of 5 for the blended group.

In all three settings, the highest rated items emphasized the value of interaction and in person engagement. The face to face and blended groups both ranked the statement “Face to face learning makes me more engaged than online lessons” first, with mean scores of 4.60 and 4.17, respectively. The top rated statement for the online group was “Interactive tasks (such as group work) help me learn better in online classes,” with a mean score of 3.90, suggesting that organised, collaborative activities can improve engagement in virtual environments.

The statement "Online lessons make me more engaged than face-to-face learning" received the lowest ratings across all groups, with mean scores of 2.66 for face-to-face, 3.43 for online, and 2.97 for blended learning. This continuous pattern underscores the notion that in-person connection is a more potent catalyst for engagement than online activities for the majority of learners.

These findings are directly associated with Hypothesis 2, which posits that face-to-face learning will yield greater engagement scores. The data supports this assumption, as in person settings consistently achieved higher engagement scores. However, the relatively moderate results for the online group also show that online engagement can be improved through the deliberate use of interactive methods, such as collaborative problem solving, peer discussion forums, and breakout room activities.

From an educational consequences standpoint, institutions must prioritise active learning practices across all environments, especially in online and blended formats, where sustaining engagement can be more difficult. Teacher training programs must prioritise strategies for creating interaction-rich virtual classrooms to bridge the engagement disparity between online and in-person learning.

2. Digital Tools and Resources

Table (15) presents the digital tools and resources across face-to-face, online, and blended learning environments, as follows:

Table (15)

Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses to Digital Tools and Resources Across Face-to-Face, Online, and Blended Learning Environments in Descending Order of the Mean

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
1	Digital tools such as videos, quizzes, and platforms enhance my English learning.	4.11	0.932	Agree	3	4.62	0.59	Strongly Agree	1	4.44	0.877	Strongly Agree	1
2	The quality of digital tools significantly affects my English learning outcomes.	4.14	0.810	Agree	2	3.86	1.014	Agree	2	4.11	0.667	Agree	3
3	The quality of platforms significantly affects my English learning outcomes.	4.31	0.718	Strongly agree	1	3.57	1.287	Agree	3	4.25	0.770	Strongly Agree	2
Overall Mean		4.19	0.601	Agree	—	4.02	0.785	Agree		3.89	0.568	Agree	

Table 15 clearly indicates that respondents concurred on the significance of digital tools and resources in all three learning environments: face-to-face, online, and hybrid. The average scores were 4.19 out of 5 for the face-to-face setting, 4.02 out of 5 for the online environment, and 4.27 out of 5 for the hybrid environment, demonstrating a consistently high perceived value in utilising technology to enhance English language acquisition.

In both the online and blended environments, the statement “Digital tools like videos, quizzes, and platforms improve my English learning” received the highest ratings, with mean scores of 4.62 and 4.44, respectively. This shows a strong belief that well selected digital tools can enhance language acquisition, particularly in virtual or partially virtual contexts. In contrast, within the face-to-face group, the highest-rated item was "The quality of platforms significantly affects my English learning outcomes," with a mean score of 4.31, indicating that even in conventional environments, the perceived quality of digital resources continues to have influence.

The items with the lowest ratings in all three categories pertained to the quality of digital tools or the platforms themselves. The online group exhibited the lowest mean score (3.57) for platform quality, indicating that technological constraints or inconsistencies may detract from the learning experience in entirely online environments.

These findings corroborate Hypothesis 2, which posited that instructional tactics, including the incorporation of digital resources, would be regarded as more effective in specific modalities, especially face-to-face and blended learning. They also support Hypothesis 5, which posits a positive association between the utilisation of computer-based educational resources and students' engagement in online English learning. The consistently high ratings for digital tools in both online and blended settings indicate that such resources play a crucial role in sustaining learner engagement and participation, especially in virtual contexts. The findings indicate that blended environments provide an ideal equilibrium by integrating interactive, real-time learning with extensive digital resources, whereas exclusively online learning is more susceptible to technological quality concerns.

From an educational ramifications standpoint, schools must invest in dependable, user-friendly systems and ensure that educators are educated to use digital resources strategically rather than as mere extra additions. In online environments, platform reliability and content quality are essential for maintaining learner interest and attaining desired learning outcomes.

3. Teaching Delivery Methods

Table (16) presents the teaching delivery methods across face-to-face, online, and blended learning environments, as follows:

Table (16)

Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses to Teaching Delivery Methods across Face-to-Face, Online, and Blended Learning Environments, Ordered in Descending Order by Mean Score

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
1	I benefit more from recorded lessons compared to live sessions.	2.89	1.255	Neutral	4	3.19	1.209	Neutral	4	3.00	1.219	Neutral	4
2	I benefit more from live sessions compared to recorded lessons.	4.34	0.873	Strongly agree	2	3.71	0.845	Agree	3	4.14	0.931	Agree	2
3	Teachers adapt their methods well in	3.69	0.932	Agree	3	4.38	0.669	Strongly Agree	1	3.89	0.820	Agree	3

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
	online classes.												
	Teachers adapt their methods well in face-to-face classes.	4.51	0.658	Strongly agree	1	3.95	0.74	Agree	2	4.17	0.878	Agree	1
	Overall Mean	3.86	0.501	Agree		3.81	0.493	Agree		3.80	0.527	Agree	

It is evident from Table (16) that respondents agreed on the effectiveness of teaching delivery methods across all three learning environments—face to face, online, and blended—indicating a consistently positive perception of instructional quality. The mean scores were 3.86 out of 5 for face to face learning, 3.81 out of 5 for online learning, and 3.81 out of 5 for blended learning.

In all settings, the top-rated factor demonstrated teachers' capacity to modify their instructional approaches:

- In-person: “Educators effectively modify their techniques in face-to-face instruction” (mean 4.51).
- Online: “Educators effectively modify their techniques in virtual classrooms” (mean 4.38).
- Blended: “Educators effectively modify their techniques in in-person classes” (mean 4.38).

The question with the lowest rating was consistent across all groups: “I benefit more from recorded lessons than live sessions,” with mean ratings of 2.89, 3.19, and 3.00 for face-to-face, online, and blended groups, respectively.

The findings corroborate Hypothesis 2, which anticipated that face-to-face learning would achieve superior scores in delivery clarity and adaptability. Although both forms exhibited considerable effectiveness, the marginally superior scores for face-to-face education indicate that instant engagement and adaptation in live teaching are regarded as more valuable than asynchronous recorded formats.

The findings underscore the significance of preserving interactive, real-time components across all instructional modalities. In online courses, possibilities for live engagement—such as virtual classrooms, interactive Q&A sessions, and adaptive feedback—are essential for sustaining student motivation and achieving high-quality learning results. Institutions should refrain from excessive dependence on recorded information without additional live contact, as this may diminish learner engagement and perceived instructional efficacy.

Results Related to the Third Question:

“How does learner satisfaction vary between face-to-face and online modes of English language instruction?”

To identify the satisfaction level related to teaching and learning English in face-to-face, online, and combined learning environments, the means, standard deviations, and ranks of the participants’ responses on the satisfaction axis were calculated. The results are presented in Table (17) below.

Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses on the Satisfaction Level Related to English Language Teaching and Learning in Descending Order

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face			Online			Both			Rank
#.	Satisfaction Level	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	
1	Overall satisfaction with learning	3.87	0.622	Agree	4.02	0.602	Agree	4.25	0.592	Strongly Agree	1
2	Confidence in using English	3.91	0.722	Agree	3.93	0.455	Agree	4.17	0.644	Agree	2
Overall Mean		3.89	0.625	Agree	3.98	0.480	Agree	4.21	0.546	Strongly Agree	

Table (17) clearly indicates that respondents expressed elevated levels of satisfaction with English language instruction and acquisition in all contexts. In the in-person context, the average score was 3.89 out of 5, with confidence in utilising English rated highest at 3.91, and overall satisfaction with learning closely following at 3.87. In the digital context, satisfaction persisted at an elevated level, with an average score of 3.98. The highest scored item was overall pleasure with learning (4.02), followed by confidence in utilising English (3.93). The blended group—individuals who encountered both modalities—exhibited the highest overall satisfaction, with a mean score of 4.21. Overall happiness with learning was rated highest (4.25), followed by confidence in utilising English (4.17).

These findings are consistent with Hypothesis 3, which predicted higher satisfaction in face to face learning, but they also reveal an interesting trend: blended learning participants reported the highest satisfaction scores overall. This suggests that exposure to both modalities may offer learners the combined benefits of interactive in person engagement and the flexibility of online learning.

From an educational standpoint, the results imply that learner satisfaction is not solely tied to a single delivery mode. Satisfaction seems to rise when learners experience a combination of synchronous engagement and adaptable digital resources. This underscores the potential of blended learning models for language institutes as a strategic method to maintain high satisfaction while addressing varied student needs.

The following presents the detailed results of the level of satisfaction related to English language teaching and learning in the face-to-face, online, and blended learning environments.

1. Overall Satisfaction with Learning

Table (18) presents the general satisfaction with learning across the three learning environments as follows:

Table (18)

Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses to General Satisfaction with Learning in Face-to-Face, Online, and Combined Learning Environments, Ranked in Descending Order Based on the Mean Score.

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
1	Overall, I am satisfied with the face-to-	4.63	0.646	Strongly Agree	1	3.57	0.87	Agree	2	4.33	0.894	Strongly Agree	1

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
	face English learning experience.												
2	Overall, I am satisfied with the online English learning experience.	3.11	0.993	Neutral	2	4.48	0.873	Strongly Agree	1	4.17	0.737	Agree	2
Overall Mean		3.87	0.622	Agree		4.02	0.602	Agree		4.25	0.592	Strongly Agree	

Table (18) clearly indicates that respondents demonstrated significant pleasure with learning across all three contexts, while the degree of preference differed by mode. In the in-person context, the overall mean score was 3.87 out of 5. The highest level of agreement was with the statement “Overall, I am satisfied with the face-to-face English learning experience” (4.63), whereas satisfaction with the online learning experience was significantly lower (3.11), demonstrating a distinct preference for in-person instruction.

The total mean score went up to 4.02 in the online learning environment. The highest rating was for "Overall, I am satisfied with the online English learning experience" (4.48). People in this group were still happy with face-to-face learning, but their satisfaction level was significantly lower (3.57). This shows that even online-focused learners saw the benefits of learning in person, just not as strongly.

The integrated learning group had an overall mean score of 4.25, the highest of all groups. Satisfaction levels were robust for both modalities, with face-to-face interactions rated slightly higher (4.33) than online interactions (4.17), indicating that blended learners appreciate both formats and perceive them as complementary.

These findings partially corroborate Hypothesis 3, which anticipated increased pleasure in face-to-face learning; however, they also indicate that learners with experience in both modalities report the highest overall satisfaction. This indicates that blended models can merge the engagement and interaction of in-person learning with the flexibility and convenience of online delivery, potentially providing an optimal learning experience for English language learners at private institutions

2. Confidence in Using English

Table (19) presents the results related to confidence in using English across the three learning environments, as follows:

Table 19

Means and standard deviations of participants' responses regarding confidence in using English in the face-to-face environment, ranked in descending order by mean score

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
1	I feel confident using English after taking face-to-face classes.	4.40	0.881	Strongly Agree	1	3.52	0.873	Agree	2	4.25	0.906	Strongly Agree	1
2	I feel confident using English after taking online classes.	3.43	0.979	Agree	2	4.33	0.73	Strongly Agree	1	4.08	0.874	Agree	2
Overall Mean		3.91	0.722	Agree		3.93	0.455	Agree		4.17	0.644	Agree	

It is evident from Table (19) that learners in all three environments—face to face, online, and blended—reported high confidence in using English, with the blended group showing the highest overall mean (4.17 out of 5).

In the face to face environment, the mean score was 3.91, with the strongest agreement for “I feel confident using English after taking face to face classes” (4.40). The lowest score (3.43) was for confidence after taking online classes, which shows that this group thinks that in-person seminars are better at building confidence.

The overall average for the online group was 3.93, while the highest score was 4.33 for "I feel confident using English after taking online classes." The lowest rating (3.52) pertained to confidence following in-person lessons, indicating a context effect—learners typically assign the highest ratings to the mode in which they are presently involved.

The mixed group had the most consistency, with mean scores fluctuating narrowly between 4.08 and 4.25. Confidence was moderately elevated following in-person classes (4.25) compared to online sessions (4.08), maintaining the trend that face-to-face learning is perceived more favourably regarding confidence.

The findings partially validate Hypothesis 3, indicating that in-person learning is predominantly regarded as more beneficial for enhancing confidence in English usage. However, the blended mode achieved the highest overall confidence ratings, implying that combining both environments may maximize learners’ self assurance in using English. This finding suggests that integrated instructional models could be particularly valuable for English language programs in Riyadh’s private institutes.

Results Related to the Fourth Question:

"To what extent does the quality of teaching and learning outcomes differ across the two instructional formats?"

To identify the quality of teaching and learning outcomes in face-to-face, online, and combined learning environments, the means, standard deviations, and ranks of the participants’ responses on the “Teaching Quality and Learning Outcomes” domain were calculated. The results are presented in Table (20) below:

Table (20)

Means and Standard Deviations of Participants' Responses to Teaching Quality and Learning Outcomes in the Face-to-Face, Online, and Combined Learning Environments, Ranked in Descending Order by Mean Score.

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
1	The learning outcomes of the English course were clear from the start.	4.40	0.695	Strongly Agree	5	4.43	0.676	Strongly Agree	5	4.17	0.775	Agree	7
2	The assessments matched what I was taught during the course.	4.49	0.658	Strongly Agree	3	4.57	0.598	Strongly Agree	1	4.31	0.749	Strongly Agree	5
3	I believe I achieved the intended learning outcomes of the course.	4.34	0.725	Strongly Agree	7	4.43	0.598	Strongly Agree	4	4.25	0.732	Strongly Agree	6
4	The content was aligned with the learning objectives.	4.43	0.739	Strongly Agree	4	4.57	0.676	Strongly Agree	2	4.33	0.676	Strongly Agree	3
5	The activities were aligned with the learning objectives.	4.51	0.658	Strongly Agree	1	4.52	0.602	Strongly Agree	3	4.36	0.723	Strongly Agree	2
6	I saw noticeable improvement in my English skills through this course.	4.40	0.736	Strongly Agree	6	4.43	0.598	Strongly Agree	4	4.50	0.655	Strongly Agree	1
7	The course provided a high level of instructional quality.	4.49	0.612	Strongly Agree	2	4.33	0.73	Strongly Agree	6	4.31	0.710	Strongly Agree	4

Learning Modalities		Face-to-Face				Online				Both			
#.	Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Level	Rank
	Overall Mean	4.44	0.579	Strongly Agree		4.47	0.537	Strongly Agree		4.32	0.597	Strongly Agree	

It is evident from Table (20) that respondents expressed very high agreement with the quality of teaching and achievement of learning outcomes in all three instructional settings—face to face, online, and blended.

In the face to face environment, the overall mean was 4.44 out of 5, with the highest score for “Activities were aligned with the learning objectives” (4.51). This highlights the efficacy of organised, goal-oriented classroom activities in facilitating learning. The minimum score (4.34) for “I believe I have achieved the intended learning outcomes” indicates a robust perception of accomplishment, albeit marginally lower than that for activity alignment.

The average score in the online environment was 4.47, with the highest rating for “Assessments matched what was taught” at 4.57. This signifies that students appreciate the coherence and clarity between teaching and evaluation in online environments. The minimum score (4.33) for “The course provided a high level of instructional quality” indicates that although online education is perceived as effective, there may be slight apprehensions regarding delivery quality in relation to its robust evaluation alignment.

In the hybrid setting, the overall mean was 4.32, with the highest score for “I observed significant improvement in my English skills” being 4.50. This underscores the value of skill development through the integration of two modalities. The minimal score (4.17) for “Learning outcomes were clear from the start” indicates that the communication of objectives in blended courses may require enhancement.

These data partially validate Hypothesis 4, indicating that although all modes receive excellent ratings for teaching quality and outcomes, each possesses unique capabilities.

• In-person instruction excels in structured learning activities. • Online formats lead in assessment alignment. • Blended approaches optimise skills enhancement.

In educational practice, utilising the advantages of each modality—explicit objectives and organisation from face-to-face instruction, comprehensive assessment frameworks from online learning, and skill enhancement from blended approaches—could yield optimal results for English language programs in private institutions in Riyadh.

These data corroborate Hypothesis 6, which asserts a favourable link between teaching quality and the clarity and congruence of learning outcomes and activities in both face-to-face and online settings. The consistently elevated evaluations across all modalities underscore that explicit objectives and well aligned assessments are essential determinants of perceived instructional quality.

Table 21

Distribution of study sample participants according to their preferred learning mode

Preferred Learning Mode	Frequency	Percentage
Face-to-face learning	56	60.9%
Online learning	11	12.0%
No significant difference	25	27.2%
Total	92	100%

It is evident from Table (21) that a clear majority of respondents (56 participants; 60.9%) perceived face to face learning as the most effective mode for improving their English skills. This strong preference supports Hypothesis 4 in favor of in person instruction for higher instructional quality and better learning outcomes.

A minority (25 participants; 27.2%) reported no significant difference between the two modalities, indicating that for certain learners, instructional efficacy is more contingent upon teaching quality than the manner of delivery.

This corresponds with previous results in Tables (17–20), which demonstrate consistently elevated satisfaction and quality ratings for both modalities.

Only 11 participants (12%) favored online learning as the more effective approach, reinforcing the idea that while online instruction offers flexibility and strong assessment alignment (as noted in Table 20), it may not fully match the interaction and confidence building benefits of face to face environments.

From an educational point of view, these results suggest that English language programs in Riyadh's private schools should keep a strong face-to-face component while carefully adding useful online practices, especially for testing and extra skill building, to meet the needs of students who value both types of learning.

4.2 Hypotheses:

First Hypothesis: “There are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the means of the participants’ responses regarding the challenges, attributed to the method of learning.”

To determine whether statistically significant differences exist in the participants’ responses based on the learning method variable, the researcher applied One-Way ANOVA to indicate the significance of differences in responses due to different learning methods. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 22

One-Way ANOVA results for differences in participants’ responses based on learning method

Axis	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance Level
Challenges related to classroom experience	Between Groups	13.068	2	6.534	14.109	**0.000
	Within Groups	41.217	89	0.463		
	Total	54.285	91			
E-learning challenges	Between Groups	5.665	2	2.833	9.926	**0.000
	Within Groups	25.397	89	0.285		
	Total	31.062	91			
Overall challenges	Between Groups	8.659	2	4.329	18.097	**0.000
	Within Groups	21.292	89	0.239		
	Total	29.951	91			

It is evident from Table 22 that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (0.01 or less) in the participants’ responses regarding:

- Classroom experience challenges
- E-learning challenges
- Overall challenges

These differences vary according to the learning method variable.

To identify the direction of differences between each pair of learning method categories on these axes, the researcher used the LSD test, as shown in the next table:

Table 23*LSD Test Results for Differences between Learning Method Groups*

Axis	Learning Method	n	Mean	Face-to-Face	E-learning	Both Methods
Classroom experience challenges	Face-to-Face	35	4.78	—	**	**
	E-learning	21	3.82		—	
	Both	36	4.20		**	—
E-learning challenges	Face-to-Face	35	3.69	—	**	
	E-learning	21	3.04		—	
	Both	36	3.50		**	—
Overall challenges	Face-to-Face	35	4.24	—	**	**
	E-learning	21	3.43		—	
	Both	36	3.85		**	—

**Statistically significant differences at the 0.01 level or less

*Statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level or less

From Table 23, we conclude:

- There are statistically significant differences at the 0.01 level or less between participants with face-to-face learning experience and those with e-learning experience or both methods regarding:

- Classroom experience challenges
- Overall challenges

In favor of participants with face-to-face learning experience.

- Statistically significant differences at the 0.01 level or less exist between participants with face-to-face learning experience and those with e-learning experience regarding:

- E-learning challenges

In favor of participants with face-to-face learning experience.

- Statistically significant differences at the 0.01 level or less were found between participants with both types of learning experience and those with e-learning experience only in relation to:

- Classroom experience challenges
- E-learning challenges
- Overall challenges

In favor of participants with experience in both learning methods.

Second Hypothesis: "There are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean responses of the study sample regarding instructional strategies attributed to the method of learning."

To determine whether there are statistically significant differences in the responses of the study sample based on the learning method variable, the researcher used One-Way ANOVA to indicate the significance of differences in the responses. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 24

One-Way ANOVA results for differences in participants' responses based on the learning method

Axis	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance Level
Strategies to engage learners	Between groups	0.098	2	0.049	0.098	0.906
	Within groups	44.440	89	0.499		
	Total	44.538	91			
Digital tools and resources	Between groups	0.851	2	0.426	1.055	0.352
	Within groups	35.907	89	0.403		
	Total	36.758	91			
Teaching delivery methods	Between groups	0.066	2	0.033	0.127	0.881
	Within groups	23.126	89	0.260		
	Total	23.192	91			
Instructional strategies overall	Between groups	0.101	2	0.051	0.279	0.757
	Within groups	16.150	89	0.181		
	Total	16.251	91			

It is evident from Table 24 that:

There are no statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05 or less) in the participants' responses regarding:

- Strategies to engage learners
- Digital tools and resources
- Teaching delivery methods
- Instructional strategies overall

based on the learning method variable.

Third Hypothesis: "There are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean responses of the study sample regarding satisfaction with English language teaching and learning attributed to the method of learning."

To determine whether there are statistically significant differences in the responses of the study sample based on the learning method variable, the researcher used One-Way ANOVA to explain the significance of the differences. The results are shown in the following table:

Table 25

One-Way ANOVA results for differences in participants' responses based on the learning method

Axis	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance Level
General satisfaction with learning	Between groups	2.569	2	1.284	3.500	*0.034
	Within groups	32.660	89	0.367		
	Total	35.228	91			
Confidence in using English	Between groups	1.340	2	0.670	1.639	0.200
	Within groups	36.386	89	0.409		
	Total	37.726	91			
Overall satisfaction	Between groups	1.861	2	0.931	2.923	0.059
	Within groups	28.336	89	0.318		
	Total	30.198	91			

It is evident from Table 25 that:

- There are no statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05 or less) in the participants' responses regarding:

- Confidence in using English*
- Overall satisfaction*

based on the learning method variable.

- There are statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05 or less) in participants' responses regarding:

- General satisfaction with learning*, based on the learning method.

To identify which groups contributed to this difference, the researcher conducted an LSD test, and the results are presented in the following table:

Table 26

LSD test results for differences between learning method groups

Axis	Learning Method	N	Mean	Face-to-face	Online	Both
Overall satisfaction with learning	Face-to-face learning	35	3.87	—		
	Online learning	21	4.02		—	
	Both	36	4.25	**		—

**Statistically significant difference at (0.01) or less

*Statistically significant difference at (0.05) or less

It is evident from Table 26 that:

There is a statistically significant difference at the level of (0.01 or less) between the responses of participants

who experienced both learning methods and those who only experienced face-to-face learning, regarding overall satisfaction with learning, in favor of participants who experienced both face-to-face and online learning.

Fourth Hypothesis: "There are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean responses of the study sample regarding the quality of teaching and learning outcomes attributed to the learning method."

To determine whether there are statistically significant differences in the participants' responses based on the learning method variable, the researcher used One-Way ANOVA. The results are shown in the following table:

Table 27

One-Way ANOVA results for differences in participants' responses based on the learning method

Axis	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance Level
Quality of teaching and learning outcomes	Between groups	0.393	2	0.197	0.590	0.556
	Within groups	29.641	89	0.333		
	Total	30.034	91			

It is evident from Table 27 that:

There are no statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level or less in the participants' responses regarding the quality of teaching and learning outcomes based on the learning method.

Fifth Hypothesis: "There is a statistically significant correlation at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the use of computer-based educational materials and students' participation in learning English online."

To test this hypothesis, Pearson's correlation was used to measure the relationship between the use of computer-based educational materials and students' participation in learning English online. The results are as follows:

Table 28

Pearson correlation results showing the relationship between the use of computer-based educational materials and students' participation in learning English online

Axis	Tools & Resources Use	Significance Level
Overall satisfaction with learning	0.146	0.164
Confidence in using English	0.225	*0.031
Overall satisfaction	0.205	*0.050

**Significant at the 0.01 level or less

*Significant at the 0.05 level or less

It is evident from Table 28 that:

There is a significant positive correlation at the 0.05 level between the use of computer-based educational materials and students' participation in learning English online. This indicates that the more computer-based materials are used, the greater the student participation.

There is a statistically significant positive correlation at the 0.05 level between the use of computer-based instructional materials and confidence in using the English language. This indicates that the more computer-based instructional materials are used, the greater the confidence in using English. There is no statistically significant correlation at the 0.05 level between the use of computer-based instructional materials and overall satisfaction with learning.

Sixth Hypothesis: "There is a statistically significant correlation at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between teaching quality and the clarity of learning outcomes and alignment of learning activities in both face-to-face and online learning."

To test this hypothesis, the **Pearson correlation** was used to measure the relationship between teaching quality, learning outcome clarity, and alignment of educational activities. The results are as follows:

Table 29

Pearson correlation results showing the relationship between teaching quality, learning outcome clarity, and alignment of activities in both face-to-face and online learning

Axis	Tools & Resources Use	Significance Level
Overall satisfaction with learning	0.537	**0.000

**Significant at the 0.01 level or less

*Significant at the 0.05 level or less

It is evident from Table 29 that:

The clarity of learning objectives and the alignment of educational activities in both in-person and online learning modes are significantly positively correlated with teaching quality at the 0.01 level.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Discussion of Results

5.1 Findings:

This study explored instructional challenges and teaching quality in face-to-face and online English learning at a private language institute in Riyadh. The findings not only reflect observed trends in the literature but also add context-specific insights that help interpret these patterns more meaningfully.

- **Instructional Challenges:** Both modalities presented difficulties, with online learning showing more challenges in student engagement and communication. This finding aligns with Alqahtani (2022), who highlighted reduced speaking opportunities in virtual contexts. These challenges may stem from limited non-verbal cues and reduced immediacy in online interaction—issues particularly impactful in the Saudi EFL context, where oral participation is often culturally sensitive and teacher-centered methods are still dominant.
- **Teaching Quality & Learning Outcomes:** A strong positive correlation was found between teaching quality and the clarity of learning outcomes and activity alignment. This supports the principles outlined in Richards & Rodgers (2014), who emphasized that coherent instructional design enhances effectiveness. It also aligns with Alqahtani (2023), whose findings confirmed that well-structured activities and clear learning objectives lead to better student outcomes in Saudi EFL settings. Within the local context, this underscores the importance of designing lesson plans that explicitly link learning goals, assessment, and teaching methods, particularly in private institutes where standardization is often lacking.
- **Mode Comparison:** While face-to-face learning scored slightly higher in terms of perceived effectiveness and interaction, online learning was favored for its flexibility, mirroring findings from Means et al. (2010). However, in the current study, the slight preference for traditional learning may reflect the sample's familiarity bias and limited access to advanced digital tools in some Saudi institutions.
- **Interaction & Engagement:** The stronger interaction reported in face-to-face environments echoes Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, which emphasizes the role of social interaction in learning. In the Saudi context, where authority-based classroom dynamics are common, physical presence likely fosters more guided participation and accountability.
- **Technology's Role:** While technology was seen as a useful aid, its impact varied depending on teacher competence and pedagogical integration. This supports Kozma (2003), who found that technology alone does not enhance learning unless embedded within constructivist, student-centered practices. In this study, the gap in digital preparedness among teachers affected the perceived quality of online instruction.
- **In summary,** the study emphasizes the importance of aligning instructional strategies with clearly defined outcomes, leveraging interactive techniques, and ensuring teachers are trained to integrate technology effectively. These findings contribute to both practice and theory by applying established frameworks (e.g., Vygotsky, Community of Inquiry) to a specific Saudi EFL context, offering a grounded understanding of how modality affects learning dynamics in private institutes.

5.2 Recommendations

In light of the study's findings, the following recommendations are proposed to enhance the quality of English language instruction in both face-to-face and online contexts:

1. Enhance Instructional Alignment:

Ensure a stronger alignment between instructional methods, learning outcomes, and classroom activities across both learning modes. Clear alignment improves coherence and directly contributes to more effective teaching and learning experiences.

2. Strengthen Teacher–Student Interaction:

Encourage regular and varied forms of communication between teachers and students, especially in online environments where spontaneous interaction is often limited. Strategies could include scheduled check-ins, informal discussion threads, and feedback mechanisms.

3. Adopt Blended Learning Models:

Leverage the advantages of both online and traditional instruction to implement blended learning frameworks that offer flexibility, personalized learning paths, and improved instructional quality, particularly in English language teaching programs.

5.3 Suggestions for Future Research:

- Study instructional effectiveness in multiple institutes or cities to have more generalizable research findings.

- Include qualitative procedures (for example, interviews or open-ended survey questions) to obtain a deeper understanding of learners' and teachers' experiences.

1. Examine the impact of balancing instructional formats relative to learners engaging in long-term behaviours (i.e., skill, retention, and performance).

4. Foster Student Engagement in Online Learning:

Incorporate interactive digital tools—such as breakout rooms, live polls, and discussion forums—to promote active participation and social presence in virtual classrooms, thereby mitigating common engagement challenges.

5. Invest in Targeted Professional Development:

Provide structured training programs for teachers focused on integrating technology meaningfully and applying adaptive pedagogical strategies tailored to both online and in-person settings. This would enhance learner engagement and academic outcomes.

References list

تميز علا ج ملأ:

1. القحطاني، س. ح. (2024). استكشاف استخدام الذكاء الاصطناعي لتحقيق الكفاءة التعليمية: دراسة ميدانية بالرياض. *مجلة العلوم التربوية والنفسية*، 8(6)، 107-121.
<https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.S250324>
2. الشريف، ف. م. ف.، وفلاته، أ. ب. م. (2022). أثر استخدام الألعاب الرقمية التعليمية في تنمية قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية لدى طالبات الصف الأول المتوسط بمدينة مكة المكرمة. *المجلة العربية للتربية النوعية*، 6(23)، 433-470.
<https://doi.org/10.21608/ejev.2022.248806433>
3. علي، ر. أ. ع. (2024). درجة توظيف المستحدثات التكنولوجية لتنمية مهارات اللغة الإنجليزية لدى طالبات المرحلة المتوسطة من وجهة نظر المعلمات. *Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities and Social Sciences*، 183(108)، 212-212.
<https://doi.org/10.33193/JALHSS.108.2024.1159>

Foreign References

1. Ababneh, I., Al-qdah, M., & Almutairi, A. (2023). Comparison of academic results during conventional and online modes of learning: A case study of two groups of Saudi university students. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 5799. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15075799>
2. AlFares, N. S. (2024). The challenges of effective English language teaching in Saudi schools. *English Language Teaching*, 17(10), 1–96.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v17n10p96>
3. Alhebshi, A. A., & Gamlo, N. (2022). The effects of mobile game-based learning on Saudi EFL foundation year students' vocabulary acquisition. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(1), 408–425. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no1.27>
4. Alotaibi, R. (2021). The adoption of digital transformation in the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia. *International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies*, 12(8), 1–12.
<https://TuEngr.com/V12/12A8L.pdf>
5. Alqahtani, A. (2021). The lack of qualified EFL teachers in Saudi schools: A qualitative interview study. *English Language Teaching*, 14(11), 24–24.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n11p24>
6. Alqahtani, F. (2025). Online learning as a bolster for sustainable development in the Saudi EFL context. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(6), 123.
<https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n6p123>
7. Alqahtani, M. H. (2022, November). Every cloud has a silver lining: The experience of online learning in English language classes at Saudi universities in the post-COVID-19 era. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 7, p. 1027121). Frontiers Media SA. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1027121>
8. Alshahrani, K., & Al-Shehri, S. (2012). Conceptions and responses to e-learning: The case of EFL teachers and students in a Saudi Arabian university. *Monash University Linguistics Papers*, 8(1), 21-31.
9. Alshathry, S., & Alojail, M. (2024). Evaluating post-pandemic undergraduate student satisfaction with online learning in Saudi Arabia: The significance of

self-directed learning. *Applied Sciences*, 14(19), 8889.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/app14198889>

10. Alzahrani, A., & Saleh, A. M. (2025). The role of language learning technologies: Insights from the Saudi context. In A. H. Al-Hoorie, C. Mitchell, & T. Elyas (Eds.), *Language Education in Saudi Arabia: Integrating Technology in the Classroom* (pp. 129–145). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-84278-8_8

11. Alzamil, A. (2021). Teaching English speaking online versus face-to-face: Saudi students' experience during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Arab World English Journal*, 12(1), 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol12no1.2>

12. Atkinson, R. C., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1968). *The psychology of learning and motivation: Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes* (Vol. 2, pp. 89–195). Academic Press.

13. Borup, J., West, R. E., Graham, C. R., & Davies, R. S. (2014). The adolescent community of engagement framework: A lens for research on K–12 online learning. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 22(1), 107–129.

<https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/112371/>

14. Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000>

15. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.

https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

16. Gao, X., & Shi, L. (2023). Interactions in online versus face-to-face classes: Students' and teachers' perceptions. *International Journal of Chinese Language Teaching*, 4(3), 76–93. <https://doi.org/10.46451/ijclt.20230305>

17. Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2–3), 87–105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516\(00\)00016-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6)

18. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.

19. Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (2009). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)? *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 60–70.

20. Kozma, R. B. (2003). Technology and classroom practices: An international study. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 36(1), 1–14.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2003.10782399>

21. Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. *Online Learning*, 22(1), 205–222. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i1.1092>

22. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2009). *Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf>

23. Moore, M. G. (1989). Three types of interaction. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 3(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923648909526659>

24. National eLearning Center. (2021). *Saudi Arabia's National eLearning Platform Madrasati: K–12 phase 2 report*. Ministry of Education. Retrieved from <https://olc-wordpress-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2021/05/NELC-Phase-2-K-12-Report-Final-1.pdf>

25. OECD. (2018). *Teaching for the future: Effective classroom practices to transform education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264293243-en>

26. Phuong, T. T. H. (2022). Learning motivation of Vietnamese EFL learners in fully online classes during COVID-19: A mixed methods study. *Issues in Educational Research*, 32(2), 681–700. Retrieved from <http://www.iier.org.au/iier32/phuong.pdf>
27. Rahimi, M., & Ong, K. K. W. (2023). Exploring expert teachers' cognitions and practices of teaching English speaking and their students' experiences and engagement. *System*, 115, Article 103064. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103064>
28. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
29. Sallis, E. (2002). *Total quality management in education* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
30. Sekaran, U. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
31. **Singh, V., & Thurman, A.** (2019). How many ways can we define online learning? A systematic literature review of definitions of online learning (1988–2018). *American Journal of Distance Education*, 33(4), 289–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2019.1663082>
32. Stronge, J. H. (2018). *Qualities of effective teachers* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
33. UNESCO. (2021). *Education: From disruption to recovery*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>
34. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
35. Yassin, B. (2024, October). Enhancing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning in Saudi Arabia: The academic contribution of YouTube in EFL learning and cultural awareness. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1451504. Frontiers Media SA. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1451504>
36. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>

Appendix

University of Midocean

RESEARCH ON

A Comparative Study of Instructional Quality and Pedagogical Challenges in English Language Institutes in Riyadh: Face-to-Face vs. Online Learning

QUESTIONNAIRE BOOKLET

MPM Student

Amal Hamoud Alqahtani

Introduction

Dear Participant,

You are invited to take part in a research study entitled:

“Challenges of Teaching and Learning English in Face-to-Face and Online Environments in Riyadh.”

This questionnaire is being conducted as part of the requirements for the Master’s degree in Project Management at Midocean University. The study aims to explore and compare the challenges faced in both learning modes. This questionnaire gathers data that will contribute to the completion of this research.

Your responses are completely confidential and will be used only for academic purposes. The survey takes approximately 7-10 minutes to complete. Your participation is highly appreciated.

Thank you for your time and valuable contribution.

Supervisor
Associate Professor
Faculty of
[@gmail.com](mailto:.....@gmail.com)
Phone :

Amal Hamoud Alqahtani
Master Candidate
Faculty of
Management
Midocean University

Amal.h.alqahtani@outlook.s
a
Phone # 0501620789

Section A:

Demographic Characteristics

- Please tick (✓) the appropriate choice

1. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Teacher
2. Age: ☐ Under 18 ☐ 18–25 ☐ 26–35 ☐ Above 35
3. Role in the institute: ☐ Student
4. English proficiency level: ☐ Beginner ☐ Intermediate ☐ Advanced
5. Mode of learning experienced the most: ☐ Face-to-face ☐ Online ☐ Both equally

Section B:

Instructions: Please answer all questions honestly. For each statement, put (v) to choose the response that best reflects your opinion.

The following set of statements explores the challenges, strategies, and satisfaction related to English language teaching and learning in both face-to-face and online environments.

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by ticking the appropriate box.

Section A: Challenges

Main Question: What are the main challenges in teaching English in face-to-face and online environments?

Item No		1	2	3	4	5
	I. Classroom Experience	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Natural	Agree	Strongly Agree
ACEI1	Face-to-face learning helps me better understand English grammar.					
ACEI2	Face-to-face learning helps me better understand English vocabulary.					

ACEI3	It is easier to stay motivated in face-to-face classes than in online ones.					
ACEI4	I feel more connected to my teacher in face-to-face classes than online.					
Item No	II. Online Learning Challenges	1	2	3	4	5
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Natural	Agree	Strongly Agree

AOLCII1	I find it difficult to improve my English speaking skills through online classes.					
AOLCII2	Online classes give me more flexibility in learning.					
AOLCII3	Online classes make it harder to interact with others.					
AOLCII4	Internet connectivity problems affect my ability to participate in online classes.					
AOLCII5	Technical issues (such as platform errors or device problems) reduce the effectiveness of my online learning.					

Section B: Teaching Strategies

Main Question: What teaching strategies are effective in both face-to-face and online environments?

Item No	I. Learner Engagement Strategies	1	2	3	4	5
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Natural	Agree	Strongly Agree
BLESI1	Interactive tasks (like group work) help me learn better in face-to-face classes.					
BLESI2	Interactive tasks (like group work) help me learn better in online classes.					
BLESI3	Face-to-face instruction keeps me more engaged than online lessons.					
BLESI4	Online lessons keep me more engaged than Face-to-face instruction.					
Item No	II. Digital Tools and Resources	1	2	3	4	5
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Natural	Agree	Strongly Agree
BDTRII1	Online tools like videos, quizzes, and platforms improve my English learning.					
BDTRII2	The quality of online tools strongly influences my English learning outcomes.					
BDTRII3	The quality of platforms strongly influences my English learning outcomes.					
Item No	III. Teaching Delivery Methods	1	2	3	4	5
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Natural	Agree	Strongly Agree
BTDMIII1	I benefit more from recorded video lessons than live sessions.					
BTDMIII2	I benefit more from live sessions than recorded video lessons.					
BTDMIII3	Teachers adjust their methods well in online classes.					
BTDMIII4	Teachers adjust their methods well in in-person classes.					

Section C: General Satisfaction

Main Question: How satisfied are learners with English language instruction in both learning modes?

Item No	I.	Overall Learning Satisfaction	1	2	3	4	5
---------	----	-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Natural	Agree	Strongly Agree
COLSI1	Overall, I am satisfied with the face-to-face English learning experience.					
COLSI2	Overall, I am satisfied with the online English learning experience.					
Item No	II. Confidence in English Use	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Natural	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
CCEUII1	I feel confident using English after taking face-to-face classes.					
CCEUII2	I feel confident using English after taking online classes.					
Section D: Instructional Quality & Learning Outcomes Main Question: To what extent does the English language instruction meet quality standards and support the achievement of learning outcomes?						
Item No	I. Instructional Quality & Learning Outcomes	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Natural	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
DIQLOI1	The learning outcomes of the English course were clear from the start.					
DIQLOI2	The assessments matched what I was taught during the course.					
DIQLOI3	I believe I achieved the intended learning outcomes of the course.					
DIQLOI4	The content was aligned with the learning objectives.					
DIQLOI5	The activities were aligned with the learning objectives.					
DIQLOI6	I saw noticeable improvement in my English skills through this course.					
DIQLOI7	The course provided a high level of instructional quality.					

Section C:

Preferred Mode of Learning

Which mode of learning do you believe is more effective for improving your English skills?

- ☐ Face-to-face learning
- ☐ Online learning
- ☐ No significant difference

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my sincere thanks to all the participants who took their time to complete this questionnaire. Your responses are highly appreciated and will greatly contribute to the success of this academic research.

Sincerely,

Amal Hamoud Alqahtani
MPM Candidate
Midocean University Cell
0501620789