

The Influence of Differentiated Instruction on Lebanese Students' Motivation, Knowledge, and Engagement

Madoline Massaad, Léa Yahouchi Abi Chaker

Department of Languages and Literatures, Holy Spirit University of Kaslik, Lebanon

Abstract— Students' intrinsic motivation is built to develop students' longing for new understanding and knowledge in order to reach their highest achievement in the classroom and in their workplaces. For the students to be engaged and motivated, students' interests, learning styles, levels, and preferences have to be accounted for. For this to be achieved, approaches, methods, and strategies have to be differentiated to accomplish this essential purpose. The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of differentiated instruction (DI) in a blended learning environment and the traditional method on the motivation, knowledge, and engagement of 180 students (94 in experimental groups and 86 in control groups) in two Lebanese universities having varied experiences and education during a period of three semesters. Mixed methods were utilized to collect and analyze the data. The findings revealed that the implementation of DI in a blended environment enhanced students' intrinsic motivation, knowledge, and engagement.

Keywords— *blended learning, differentiated instruction, intrinsic motivation, PPP.*

I. INTRODUCTION

People in the business world today require effective communication skills from strategic, professional, and adaptable employees who can stand out in the market and collaborate with people from diverse backgrounds and cultures (Thill & Courtland 2016). In the modern age and with the wide spread of globalization, the English language has played an important role in connecting people and serving universal communication for business purposes (Frendo, 2005; Soprana, 2017; Zhang, 2007).

According to El Annan (2012), there is a discrepancy between skills acquired by university students and skills essentially required by employers in the real world. Knowledge of language's vocabulary, grammar, and syntax is important; yet it has to be paired with pragmatic and practical skills, such as communicative skills, teamwork skills, planning and problem-solving skills, self-management and organizational skills, in addition to technological skills to cope with the increasing communication demands in an internationalized environment.

Teaching these core skills, as proven by earlier studies (Al-Annan, 2012; Earnest & Earnest, 2006), necessitates implementing many strategies and procedures, such as

roleplaying, working in groups, and performing written and oral tasks; for example, reports, memos, job interviews and presentations, among others. In addition, other responsibilities necessitate that students know how to research, organize and schedule tasks, manage time, develop plans and strategies, and solve problems in the target language. Thus, it is required from students to be subjected to case studies, authentic work simulations, decision-making tasks, and problem-solving methods pertaining to their field. Moreover, students must know how to plan, organize portfolios, self-assess, and use technological tools in the target language to effectively communicate information and accomplish the assigned tasks and projects. All these skills allow students to adeptly manage their education and work development.

There exists a growing gap between Lebanese universities' curricula and the challenges, demands, and obligations of the business realm (Al-Annan, 2012; Ernest & Ernest, 2006; World Bank, 2008). Students' inadequacy of these fundamental skills is due to the lack of opportunities in target language exposure, social interactions and communication, and exposure to authentic real-life professional situations (Al-Annan, 2012; Land, 2001; World Bank, 2008).

For this reason, human resource (HR) managers in five different Lebanese companies were interviewed regarding their employees who were either soon-to-be graduates or fresh graduates to inquire about those employees' English business communication skills. The HR managers mainly complained about employees' inadequate English level, the absence of English business skills in real-life communications, the lack of effective core skills, and/or the lack of cultural awareness when communicating in national/international business contexts. These shortcomings might cause major confusion, misunderstanding, and failure to appropriately and competently engage with internal and external stakeholders which is a risk for any organization operating in multi-cultural or multi-national contexts.

To remediate to these issues, students have to acquire the needed business communication skills to thrive in the business world, regardless of their major. For this reason, real-life situations have to be presented as much as possible in the classroom through the implementation of student-centered approaches (Tomlinson, 1999; Frendo, 2005; Soprana, 2017). Business English classes need to balance the students' needs and interests which can be accomplished with the use of differentiated instruction as an applicable teaching and learning approach for improving students' learning experience and motivation in a higher education institution (Santangelo & Tomlinson, 2009).

A careful inquiry of the strategies utilized to differentiate instruction acknowledges the use of choice as an essential component of differentiation because when the students are granted the opportunity of choosing materials, activities, and assessments, they feel a sense of empowerment that helps in elevating their interest, intrinsic motivation, and engagement in the course. Therefore, individually, students are able to achieve their highest learning potential as their communicative competences are both valued and recognized in the overall learning process.

The article examines the following research question: *What are the effects of differentiated instruction on the level of students' intrinsic motivation, knowledge, readiness, and engagement in business English?*

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to many observations (Sampath & Zalipour, 2010; Saqlain et al, 2012; Teodorescu, 2013), students of Business English feel that they are alienated when faced with the real business environment and cannot put into application what knowledge they had attained in the classroom. As diversity escalates in higher education, the

one-size-fits all present-practice-produce (PPP) teacher-centered teaching design leads students to failure, not only academically but also professionally. In order to clarify the reasons for this study and to emphasize the need for differentiated learning, students' interests, learning profiles, and readiness levels are examined when suitable. Effective content, process, and product are also differentiated following Tomlinson's (1999, 2005, 2010, 2014) concept of differentiated instruction, Vygotsky's (1978) constructivism and the zone of proximal development (ZPD), and Gardner's (1983, 1993, 2000) multiple intelligences. Effective implementation of the differentiated strategies cannot, however, be thoroughly and successfully acquired due to class time constraints and the application of traditional face-to-face one-fits-all PPP method of teaching and learning. For this reason and because of the prominence and ubiquity of technology nowadays, blended learning is proposed in this study. It provides a chance of integrating the contemporary and technological progress afforded by online learning with the the experience, knowledge, and face-to-face contact of the instructor found in a traditional learning environment (Cleveland-Innes & Wilton, 2018). In addition to face-to-face teaching and learning that takes place in the classroom, Google Classroom and Skype are used as online platforms to ensure students' authentic involvement in their learning experience and improvement of their core employability skills, critical thinking skills, and problem solving abilities needed in their workplace.

2.1 Present-Practice-Produce (PPP)

Teaching Business English entails, as discussed above, the thorough planning and selection of activities and materials to achieve goals and objectives pertaining to the class and to the individual (Ellis & Johnson, 1994; Frendo, 2005; Sims, 2013).

In Lebanon, the majority of higher educational institutions are still applying the traditional PPP teacher-centred approach because of the comprehensive curriculum demands and the compact educational schedule which do not allow opportunities for students to entirely experience the communicative approach (Nehme, 2013; Shaaban, 2018). Nehme (2013) reports that English learning and teaching, especially teaching grammar, follows the traditional teacher-centred approach which is known as the grammar instruction method. Therefore, students are passive and lack chances in communication and interaction. In addition, she argues that rote learning is an elemental technique that does not instigate students' interests, does not enhance their communicative skills, and does not build their self-confidence (Chang, 2011).

Richards & Renandya (2002) explain the main phases of “PPP” as follows:

2.1.1 Presentation

First, the instructor introduces a feature of language in a clear context to clarify the meaning. It could be achieved through different means: a dialogue, a scenario, a text, etc.

2.1.2 Practice

Then, students are requested to perform a controlled practice stage in which specific items have to be repeated by means of matching, filling the gaps, and drilling. This practice assists students to use the language adequately and correctly.

2.1.3 Produce

Finally, the instructor introduces a task or activity to students who are expected to utilize the practiced form(s). The task can be a case for role play, a subject to write, or any assignment that supposedly requires the learned language model to be used.

According to Carless (2009), PPP is effective because the instructor assumes a clear and specific role besides the ability to control the lesson’s pace. Moreover, and according to studies conducted in Hong Kong, educators affirmed that PPP is more productive and efficient when grammatical instructions were being taught which is considered to be a good start when teaching communicative language in the classroom (Dowling, 2017).

Many critics (Ellis & Johnson, 1994; Hyde, 2013) have stated that the PPP method emphasizes instructors’ actions and does not stress on language meaning or student communication or interaction. Here the instructor is the knower, the student is *tabula rasa*, and behaviour adjustment through comprehensive and ample practices is the means to learning. The authors continue their argument by indicating that activities are often given at the last phase, and thus students only have the opportunity to analyse and experiment with language at the production final stage.

This method in its three stages is attacked by several academics. Ellis (1988), Maftoon, Sarem & Hamidi (2012), Scrivener (1996), and Willis (1990) declare that the practice stage is time consuming and controlled by the instructor and accordingly is inflexible, rigid, and incapable of accommodating to the class’ dynamic which is unpredictable and changing. That means that PPP is useless to the process of students’ learning (Lewis, 1993; Maftoon, Sarem & Hamidi, 2012). Willis (1990) emphasizes that what is practiced is not effective communication but conformity.

Wong & Van Pattern (2003) present another issue of “PPP” in that it totally depends on the usage of meaningless and decontextualized practices. They point out that language chunks are introduced as models, and students should create them by practice and recurrence. Harmer (2001) states that “PPP” is a teacher-centred method which does not correspond to the humanitarian aspect of student-centred scheme.

In opposition to the one-size-fits all or the PPP style, differentiated strategies regard students’ differences, recognize their strengths, and acclimatize their inhibitions. Business English classes need to balance the students’ needs and interests which can be accomplished with the use of differentiated instruction as an applicable teaching and learning approach for improving students’ learning experience in higher education.

2.2 Differentiated Instruction

Tomlinson (1999) says that “Teachers change because they see the light, or they feel the heat” (p. 114).

Borja, Soto, & Sanchez (2015) affirm that there has been a clear diversification in the educational system around the globe. This means that a classroom might include students from various sociocultural background, students with learning disabilities, and students with high intelligences (Subban, 2006). In addition, other student aspects are being taken into account, such as students’ different intelligences, learning styles, interests, along with their readiness either to study the content being delivered or to proceed to the next concept or idea when examining student’s attributes that constitute or comprise the diversity within the classroom context. For this reason, the one-size-fits all contexts limit students’ chances to benefit from the educational instructions given to them.

Defined by Tomlinson (1999a, 2005), differentiated instruction is an ideology of teaching and learning founded on an argument that students’ learning would be outstanding when instructors attune to students’ various interests, levels, styles, and readiness. The theory explains (1999a) that instructors have to differentiate and adapt content, process, and product in conformity to students’ diversified pedagogical needs for the teaching and learning to be relevant, valid, and effective.

The first key element that the instructor might select to differentiate is a student’s readiness which specifies the student’s connection and proximity to the requested educational results. It depends on prior knowledge, past experiences, skill level, and chances for learning. In Vygotsky’s constructivist theory (1978) related to readiness, he advises that instructors lecture within the student’s zone of proximal development (ZPD), which is

the discrepancy of what a student can accomplish alone with no guidance and what the student can accomplish with support and scaffolding. The students are able to excel in a new skill(s) and know how to be independent learners and problem solvers if they are encouraged by the instructor into their ZPD and instructed with an assignment or task comparatively more difficult than one that students could handle alone (Tomlinson and Imbeau, 2010). For instance, instructors might differentiate a student's readiness by modifying the difficulty levels of the educational materials presented in class. The authors suggest that no improvement will take place if the student is presented with educational materials at or below his/her knowledge level. Likewise, if the educational material is way above the zone, the student will be frustrated and confused. To Anderson (2007) and Tomlinson & Santangelo (2009), the aim of differentiating readiness is to assure that all students are equipped with a suitable learning experience.

As for students' interests, intrinsic motivation is provoked when they are interested in what is being taught (Deci and Ryan, 1985; Sharan & Sharan, 1992; Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006). According to Tomlinson & Imbeau (2010) students' interests interconnect their attention, involvement, and curiosity. As a result, if instructions are differentiated in accordance to the students' interests, they will be motivated to associate the materials taught with the item they previously appreciated and valued. Also, interest differentiation might encourage them to identify new skills or interests (Tomlinson & Santangelo, 2009). To clarify the concept, instructors may differentiate required materials and skills if these are aligned with students' interests in different areas, for instance sports, music, nature, science, and so on. Many studies conducted by Schlechty (1997) and Jensen (2005) have confirmed that interest differentiation has given students incentive and motivation to be engrossed in the task with clear evidence of their productivity and creativity in addition to a surpassing level of intrinsic motivation. The authors affirm that instructors have to acknowledge what item instigates, inspires, and stimulates students and how including this item can be outlined and planned to achieve these different interests.

Students' learning profiles are explained by Tomlinson & Imbeau (2010) as a preference in receiving, examining, or communicating content. Students have usually disparate learning preferences whose essential aspects consist of group orientations, intelligence preferences, learning environments, and cognitive styles.

Furthermore, students are different at learning and processing the acquired data. Dunn and Dunn (1978, 2000) state that students may differ in favoured learning ambiances in the degree of affective support and in the

amount of peer communication and cooperation. The authors continue saying that students vary in their favourite learning processes; some obtain information visually, while others obtain information aurally. Learning environment refers to the means of learning, for instance giving the students the chance to accomplish the task individually, in pair, or in group.

The distinctions regarding cognitive progress or development endorse the implementation of differentiated instructions. Furthermore, Gardner's (1983, 1993, and 2000) theory of multiple intelligences is the most well-known theory for mental and cognitive development. He proposes eight fundamental kinds of intelligences: linguistic, spatial, logical-mathematical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, bodily-kinaesthetic, musical, and naturalist. These kinds of intelligences are disparate ways to measure intelligence that are no longer confined by only the old-traditional linguistic and logical mathematical intelligences.

Although differentiated instruction has its benefits, there are a few challenges in its implementation. Some of the challenges in implementing differentiated instructions are the detachment between instructors' perceptions of differentiated instructions and their own substantial real implementation of the strategy (Whipple, 2012). Many studies have reported impediments of differentiated instructions implementation which might include instructors' unfamiliarity with the accessible means, scarcity of resources, needed time for preparation (Rodriguez, 2012), its predicament to carry out with no aid from fellow workers or assistants, and its nature as being time consuming (Smit and Humpert, 2012). Also Tomlinson et al. (2003) state that some instructors are not enthusiastic and dedicated when handling students' diversity, but all these challenges can be overcome in different ways compared to the extensive learning experience which could be achieved by the students and which should be number one priority for educators.

Angelo & Cross (1993) and Tomlinson & Imbeau (2010) claim that a differentiated inclination happens gradually similar to the progress of every method, strategy, or educational material that already occurred, is occurring now, or will be occurring in the future. The indispensable thing is to begin small and progressively increase and improve one's repertoire. Furthermore, the requirement to cope with diversity found in high education classroom seems imminent (Fox & Hoffman, 2011; Subban, 2006). They argue that the one-size-fits-all teaching and learning style is based on the hypotheses that all students could be regarded and evaluated fairly without any bias.

It is worth mentioning that acquiring the core skills effectively and adequately is unlikely to be attained thoroughly due to the time constraints and the adaptation and implementation of the traditional face-to-face one-fits-all method of teaching and learning. That is why, and through the use of technology, the blended learning model is introduced in this article to engage students in the learning experience and to try to enhance their motivation and critical thinking abilities to deepen their learning process (Morgan, 2014).

2.3 Blended Learning

Blended learning is a new method in education that blends face-to-face classroom teaching with suitable application of technology or online resources. It allows students to explore the learning process critically as a continuation of the face-to-face learning session (Cleveland-Innes and Wilton, 2018; Ginns & Ellis, 2007; Shih, 2010; Northey, Chylinski, & Govind, 2015). Consequently, students have the ability to improve their language learning even after classroom sessions. Blended learning extends teaching and learning beyond the classroom walls, integrating face-to-face and online modes, which can be synchronous or asynchronous to produce an effective learning experience (Cleveland-Innes and Wilton, 2018; Brew, 2008). According to Metcalf (2003), synchronous is “frequently used to describe live training online-real time interaction between instructors and remote students” (p. 20), while the term asynchronous refers to “instruction is just-in-time, when you need it” (p. 21). Asynchronous communication facilitates students’ interaction, collaboration, discussion, knowledge sharing, and construction. In this environment, students can communicate, interact, and post questions to instructors at any time and expect reasonably quick replies. Asynchronous communication provides students with the opportunity to construct knowledge effectively without or with little time constraints. The use of online learning tools in blended learning environment allows students to gain access to the data and information at all times.

A great deal of research has proved that implementing blended learning techniques in classes has succeeded in improving students’ learning results and outcomes (Cleveland-Innes and Wilton, 2018; Garnham & Kaleta, 2002; Twigg, 2003 a; Dziuban et al., 2006; Lim & Morris, 2009; Northey, Chylinski, & Govind, 2015). Thirty students participated in a research study that implemented blended learning in which twenty reported improvement in the learning goals and an increase in grades, knowledge, and awareness of the course objectives. The study showed that blended learning could offer universities the opportunities to endorse technology, stimulate inquiry, and

advocate meaningful and active learning (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004).

Also, research has proved that students enrolled in blended learning courses are more motivated and engaged in learning, with empowered skills of critical thinking compared to those in face-to-face classes (Donnelly, 2010; Owston et al., 2008; Sharpe et al., 2006). The table below adapted from Bull and Garofalo (2005) shows the comparison between traditional and blended learning and is consistent with the benefits stated above.

Table.1: Comparison between the Traditional and Blended Learning Contexts (Bull and Garofalo, 2005)

| Traditional Learning Environment | Blended Learning Environment |
|---|---|
| Instructivist | Shift in focus to the constructivist pedagogical Philosophy |
| Behaviourist | Shift in focus to the cognitivist and constructivist learning theories |
| Teacher-centred instruction | Student-centred learning |
| Single-sense stimulation | Multi-sense stimulation; Access and exchange information in a variety of ways |
| Single-path progression | Multi-path progression |
| Single medium | Multimedia |
| Isolated work | Collaborative work |
| Information delivery | Information exchange |
| Passive learning | Active/exploratory/inquiry-based learning |
| Factual, knowledge-based learning | Critical thinking and informed decision-making |
| Isolated, artificial context | Authentic, real-world context |

According to Senior (2010), the blended learning method emphasizes that instructors have to concentrate on general educational outcomes with the use of technology to extend learning outside the walls of the classroom, and in addition, it concentrates on the students’ requirements, goals, experiences, and interests. This teaching method goes along with the social constructivism theory that advocates the development and collaboration of learning environment where the role of instructors is to address the improvement and advancement of students’ self-reflection and motivation caused by proactive cooperation with the

students all through the course (Baker, 2010; Kuh, 2009; Zimmerman, 2008).

Blended learning shifts the authority of teaching and learning from teacher-centred to learner-centred, improving student's self-efficacy and reducing their anxiety in an EFL learning environment (Bandura, 1977). Richards (2010) and Northey, Chylinski, & Govind (2015) explain that the proactive engagement of students with the content of the course using technological platforms allows instructors to boost face-to-face class in productive communicative activities; it also fosters the production of spoken language as the instructor is a facilitator of the learning experience in which technology is used to aid students (Johnson, 2014).

As previously stated, when students are actively engaged in their learning process, their level of motivation is heightened, especially the intrinsic motivation, which would eventually affect the improvement of their academic achievement.

2.4 Students' Intrinsic Motivation

Researchers (Anderson et al., 2014; Fischer, Malych, and Schafmann, 2019; Liu et al., 2016) assert that motivation is a substantial component in students' knowledge and learning. It is considered as an element of pedagogy that instructors should utilize for their students' development in acquiring knowledge. This kind of motivation is referred to as intrinsic motivation. As a definition, motivation is the "process whereby goal directed activity is instigated and sustained" (Schunk, Pintrich, & Meece, 2002, p.4). Motivation is either extrinsic or intrinsic (Deci and Ryan, 1985, 2008).

On the one hand, Schunk, Pintrich, & Meece (2002) and Williams & Sternberg (2002) state that extrinsic motivation deals with an action or attitude induced by external benefit or reward, such as praise, money, grades, etc. It occurs from outside the person as opposed to intrinsic motivation which emerges from the inside of the person. Although extrinsic motivation is a factor in the classroom, it should be linked with the intrinsic motivation enhancement when associated with the improvement of students' competences (Thomas, 2002). Deci & Ryan (2008) explain that both are compelling factors that form who the individual is and how she/he behaves.

On the other hand, Barry and King (2002) argue that intrinsic motivation involves being engaged in an act or task for its own account, interest, gratification, or innate achievement of curiosity. In their theory of self-determination, Deci & Ryan (1985, 2008) have stated four components that intrinsically motivate an individual: autonomy, competence, relatedness, and progress.

Regarding autonomy, it has been proved by a significant amount of research (Anderson et al., 2014; Deci & Ryan, 2008) that individuals will successfully achieve their life's purposes either in work or academic environment when they feel autonomy in choosing the goals and the means of accomplishing them. An individual intrinsic motivation is ruined when it is controlled. Commanding managers generate demotivated employees who at the end consider that they do not have proprietorship of their own tasks or projects (Amabile and Pratt, 2016). Moreover, controlling instructors diminish students' innate enthusiasm and natural interest to gain knowledge from their learning experience (Anderson et al., 2014).

The second component is competence which comprises challenge, high standards, knowledge, and skill awareness. Individuals' motivation is heightened when they do something they prefer and execute well. The task or project will flow smoothly and naturally without even asking about the motives. That is why tasks or projects have to be designed to present an adequate challenge for the individuals to be energized to use their full capacity.

The third component is relatedness which is deemed as a crucial motivation according to Deci & Ryan (1985, 2008). The sense of belonging to a group is acknowledged and valued especially if there are social and shared goals. In the academic field, instructors have to create an encouraging learning environment in which each student is recognized and appreciated (Scott, 2010).

Finally, the fourth and the last component is progress or the readiness to make consequential contribution. It is the impression of meaningfulness and accomplishment perceived when engaging in projects or activities that contribute to other individual's well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

Many of previous studies have proved that when students are intrinsically motivated, their educational performances were increased (Anderson et al., 2014; Flaherty & Hackler, 2010; Ryan & Deci, 1985, 2008). One of the studies (Flaherty & Hackler, 2010) demonstrated that when differentiated instruction was implemented, students' educational accomplishments were strengthened. The reason for this improvement was that differentiation was relevant to their learning styles and interests, providing opportunities for students which subsequently increased their interest, self-expression, inspiration, and creativity. This contributed to enhancing and developing students' intrinsic motivation in accordance with achieving satisfactory to high grades (extrinsic motivation). Another study (Amabile & Pratt, 2016) stated that students' intrinsic motivation is built through a supportive and

cooperative learning atmosphere. These afforded classroom management and positive atmospheres accentuated fairness and trust which in turn were important factors to improve and enhance confidence and elevate motivation.

It is essential to examine if differentiating content, process, and product to suit students' needs, interests, and styles will increase students' intrinsic motivation. The article investigates if designing diversified lessons and activities, providing individualized strategies and instructions, offering choices appropriate to students' needs, employing cooperative groups, and providing supportive atmosphere would increase students' intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, the study examines if students' intrinsic motivation would extend the academic setting into the realistic personal one as well, that is if students perceive themselves capable of achieving anything not only in the classroom but also in the real world.

As stated previously, education has encountered a considerable shift from teacher-centred to student-centred (Annous & Nicolas, 2014; Coleman, 2006; Gill & Kirkpatrick, 2013; Hwang, Lai, & Wang, 2015). Academic technologies are frequently integrated in the classroom environment for personalized and autonomous learning for students (Graham, 2006; Hwang, Lai, & Wang, 2015) which is essential and critical for developing their participation (Northey, Bucic, Chylinski, & Govind, 2015) and which is crucial to achieve the needed objectives (Bolkan, 2015). The function of blended learning in addition to the implementation of different learning platforms in higher educational institution is among the most important topics examined by academics (Hughes, 2012). For this reason, there is a burgeoning concern in the practice in which the pedagogical methods and online tools/platforms are used to generate higher effective interaction and cooperation among students and between instructors and their students (Hughes, 2012). For this study, Google Classroom and Skype are used as the technological platforms in teaching the Business English course in a blended learning context.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Method

The study is an experimental research in which the researcher manipulates one variable which is the independent variable, controls, and measures the dependent variables in order to establish a cause-effect relationship between them (Creswell, 2011). Therefore, it can be claimed that the independent variables possibly created or caused the dependent variables and had an influence over

them. In this study, the differentiated instruction is considered as the independent variable in which its strategies of differentiating content, process, and product serve students' interest, needs, and learning profiles. The last-mentioned components are considered as the treatment variable conditions manipulated to cause an outcome or dependent variables which are students' intrinsic motivation, knowledge, readiness, and engagement in Business English.

3.2 Research Environment

For this study, 180 students participated in the experiment. They registered for the Business English course which is the last and advanced level of English to be taken. The study was conducted over three semesters with different students in two universities. The first is located in Mount Lebanon, and the second is located in Beirut.

For the control groups, no intervention or experimental treatment was administered, and the traditional one-fits-all PPP teaching method was applied, whereas, the experimental groups were subjected to differentiated instruction teaching strategies. The classrooms were taught by two instructors; the researcher was the main instructor in some sessions and an assistant instructor in other sessions.

In this experiment, cluster sampling was utilized in which the researcher randomly selected two groups (clusters) out of four groups that were registered each semester for this course. There were two classes in the morning and two classes in the evening, and one class was chosen randomly from each shift by the use of an online random picker (miniwebtool.com).

3.3 Procedures of the Study

The table below shows the overall procedures that were implemented for teaching Business English for both groups.

Table.2: Procedures of the Study

| Control Group One-Fits-All Model in the Classroom | Differentiated Instruction In Blended Learning Environment |
|--|---|
| Present: The instructor presented the theme or concept, read the text and found the concept embedded in the text, in addition to providing examples using different techniques. | Differentiation of content: Introducing the topic and tasks, thus preparing students for the task. Linking various texts and resources (according to interests, levels and learning profiles) and uploading them in Google Classroom to be later |

| | |
|---|---|
| | checked online. |
| Practice: The instructor described a situation in which students were to practice the emphasized pattern and checked students' work for accuracy. | Differentiation of process: Using of tiered activities, using of independent learning strategies (cooperative or problem-based), with the implementation of appropriate grouping of students depending on the tasks, levels or interests, providing various levels of scaffolding to students, and engaging students in writing business correspondence (emails depending on their grouping) and in oral communication (interviews, phone conversations, and presentations). |
| Production: The instructor presented a task to students in which they were expected to utilize the form(s) just practiced (role play, writing task, or any task that used the language pattern or vocabulary learned). | Differentiation of product: Delivering of the presentation either online, by Skype, or in the classroom and providing students with a variety of assessment choices, for example preparing formal or informal presentations either in groups or as individuals |

The mixed method was utilized by analysing the collected data quantitatively and qualitatively to strengthen and validate the findings. Quantitative tool such as questionnaires was used in addition to the qualitative focus group discussions and the open-ended questions to investigate and answer the research question: *What are the effects of differentiated instructions in a blended environment on the level of students' intrinsic motivation, knowledge, readiness, and engagement in Business English?*

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

4.1.1.1 Questionnaires

For this purpose, questions in Questionnaire 1 (submitted to the control groups) and Questionnaire 2 (submitted to the experimental groups) regarding students' intrinsic motivation, readiness, and engagement were analysed using the Frequency in SPSS. The questionnaires were designed following Likert scale of five-points, ranging from number 5 for 'strongly agree' to number 1 for 'strongly disagree'.

Students' intrinsic motivation as previously discussed in the literature review is built to develop students' longing for new understanding and knowledge in order to reach their highest achievement in the classroom and in their workplaces. For the students to be engaged and motivated, students' interests, learning styles, levels, and preferences have to be accounted for. For this to be achieved, approaches, methods, and strategies have to be differentiated. Students' prior knowledge should be tested. Then it has to be assimilated with the new knowledge, taking into account its relevance to students' needs (majors, styles, levels, etc.).

In regards to the aforementioned elements, the students' responses in the experimental groups were highly positive as disclosed in Table 3. The majority of the students replied positively towards the effectiveness and suitability of the method/strategy applied while teaching Business English (87.9%, Spring 2018; 91.4%, Fall 2019; and 88.5%, Spring 2019). This resulted in their elevated interest and motivation in acquiring the taught materials compared to the control groups' responses.

Table.3: Effectiveness of Differentiated Instructions in Blended Learning

The teaching method was appropriate, effective, and interesting.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 4 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| Agree | 16 | 48.5 | 48.5 | 60.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 13 | 39.4 | 39.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method was appropriate, effective, and interesting.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 8.6 |
| Agree | 18 | 51.4 | 51.4 | 60.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 14 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method was appropriate, effective, and interesting.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Agree | 12 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 57.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 11 | 42.3 | 42.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Furthermore, Table 4 shows the significant affirmative responses concerning the diversified materials found either in the course book or in the Google Classroom. It is worth

mentioning that these materials were diversified or differentiated according to students' interests, majors, and English levels. With respect to English levels, there were many scaffold and tiered exercises for the lower achievers to practice with in order to reach the expected English level required for this course.

Table.4: Differentiated Activities

Spring 2018

The materials in the book and Google Classroom were interesting and diversified.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Agree | 10 | 30.3 | 30.3 | 36.4 |
| Strongly Agree | 21 | 63.6 | 63.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The lessons and the materials in the book and Google Classroom were not useful because they were irrelevant to my field of study.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 21 | 63.6 | 63.6 | 63.6 |
| Disagree | 7 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 84.8 |
| Uncertain | 4 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 97.0 |
| Agree | 1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Fall 2019

The materials in the book and Google Classroom were interesting and diversified.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Uncertain | 2 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 8.6 |
| Agree | 10 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 37.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 22 | 62.9 | 62.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The lessons and the materials in the book and Google Classroom were not useful because they were irrelevant to my field of study.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 18 | 51.4 | 51.4 | 51.4 |
| Disagree | 13 | 37.1 | 37.1 | 88.6 |
| Uncertain | 3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 97.1 |
| Agree | 1 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Spring 2019

The materials in the book and Google Classroom were interesting and diversified.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 7.7 |
| Agree | 7 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 34.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 17 | 65.4 | 65.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The lessons and the materials in the book and Google Classroom were not useful because they were irrelevant to my field of study.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 16 | 61.5 | 61.5 | 61.5 |
| Disagree | 6 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 84.6 |
| Uncertain | 4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Students in the experimental groups affirmed that the method/strategy used (Differentiated instructions in blended environment) had a constructive effect on acquiring knowledge because the instructors anticipated

and took into account their interests, learning styles, and English levels (Table 5).

Table.5: Students' Needs

Spring 2018

Students' interests were taken into consideration when learning the course.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Agree | 24 | 72.7 | 72.7 | 72.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 9 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Different learning styles and English levels were taken into consideration when teaching the course.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Agree | 19 | 57.6 | 57.6 | 63.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 12 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Fall 2019

Students' interests were taken into consideration when learning the course.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Agree | 27 | 77.1 | 77.1 | 77.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 8 | 22.9 | 22.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Different learning styles and English levels were taken into consideration when teaching the course.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 2 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| Agree | 20 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 62.9 |
| Strongly Agree | 12 | 34.3 | 34.3 | 97.1 |
| 45 | 1 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Spring 2019

Students' interests were taken into consideration when learning the course.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Agree | 19 | 73.1 | 73.1 | 73.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 7 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Different learning styles and English levels were taken into consideration when teaching the course.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 7.7 |
| Agree | 14 | 53.8 | 53.8 | 61.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 10 | 38.5 | 38.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Moreover, students who were subjected to differentiation were positively engaged in the tasks given either in class or/and in Google Classroom. Most of these students confirmed that students' groupings were effective in the learning experience (78.8%, Spring 2018; 77.2%, Fall 2019; and 80.8%, Spring 2019), while the other few students were uncertain of its effectiveness with no disagreeing responses to note (Table 6).

Table.6: Students' Grouping

Spring2018

Students' groupings were effective in the learning experience.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 7 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.2 |
| Agree | 14 | 42.4 | 42.4 | 63.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 12 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Fall2019

Students' groupings were effective in the learning experience.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 8 | 22.9 | 22.9 | 22.9 |
| Agree | 17 | 48.6 | 48.6 | 71.4 |
| Strongly Agree | 10 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Spring2019

Students' groupings were effective in the learning experience.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 5 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 19.2 |
| Agree | 13 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 69.2 |
| Strongly Agree | 8 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Besides students' groupings, students were highly engaged in synchronous (real-time communication via Skype) and asynchronous communications (not real-time communication but communication through written posts or recorded speech posted on the platform) both among each other and between them and the instructors. Their positive responses found in Table 7 below acknowledged the strategies' effectiveness regarding the learning experience.

Table.7: Synchronous/Asynchronous Discussions

Spring 2018

The synchronous and asynchronous discussions among students employed in Google Classroom were effective in the learning experience.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 4 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| Agree | 20 | 60.6 | 60.6 | 72.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 9 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The synchronous and asynchronous discussions between students and instructors employed in Google Classroom were effective in the learning experience.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Agree | 21 | 63.6 | 63.6 | 69.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 10 | 30.3 | 30.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Fall 2019

The synchronous and asynchronous discussions among students employed in Google Classroom were effective in the learning experience.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 4 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 11.4 |
| Agree | 22 | 62.9 | 62.9 | 74.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 9 | 25.7 | 25.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The synchronous and asynchronous discussions between students and instructors employed in Google Classroom were effective in the learning experience.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 2 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| Agree | 22 | 62.9 | 62.9 | 68.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 11 | 31.4 | 31.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Spring 2019

The synchronous and asynchronous discussions among students employed in Google Classroom were effective in the learning experience.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Agree | 16 | 61.5 | 61.5 | 73.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 7 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The synchronous and asynchronous discussions between students and instructors employed in Google Classroom were effective in the learning experience.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Agree | 17 | 65.4 | 65.4 | 69.2 |
| Strongly Agree | 8 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

All of this led to their considerable participation inside and outside the classroom as illustrated in Table 8.

Table.8: Students' Participation Inside and Outside Classroom

Spring 2018

There was a chance to participate inside and outside the classroom.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Agree | 15 | 45.5 | 45.5 | 45.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 18 | 54.5 | 54.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Fall 2019

There was a chance to participate inside and outside the classroom.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Agree | 15 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 42.9 |
| Strongly Agree | 20 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Spring 2019

There was a chance to participate inside and outside the classroom.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Agree | 11 | 42.3 | 42.3 | 42.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 15 | 57.7 | 57.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Their engagement in Business English inside and outside the classroom resulted in their motivation to acquire the knowledge needed. They were not passive learners but active ones who had opportunities to analyse and reflect on the acquired materials inside and outside the classroom (Table 9).

Table.9: Students' Reflection Inside and Outside the Classroom

Spring 2018

There was a chance to analyze and reflect the acquired materials inside and outside the classroom.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 4 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| Agree | 23 | 69.7 | 69.7 | 81.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 6 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Fall 2019

There was a chance to analyze and reflect the acquired materials inside and outside the classroom.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 8.6 |
| Agree | 25 | 71.4 | 71.4 | 80.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 7 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Spring 2019

There was a chance to analyze and reflect the acquired materials inside and outside the classroom.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Agree | 19 | 73.1 | 73.1 | 84.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Furthermore, students found what they were learning compatible, applicable, and relevant to real-life experiences or/and their fields of study as shown in Table 10.

Tables.10: Learning Relevance to Real-Life Experience

Spring 2018

The lessons and the materials in the book and Google Classroom were not useful because they were irrelevant to my field of study.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 21 | 63.6 | 63.6 | 63.6 |
| Disagree | 7 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 84.8 |
| Uncertain | 4 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 97.0 |
| Agree | 1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The course's tasks and real-life situations were related.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 4 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| Agree | 6 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 30.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 23 | 69.7 | 69.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Fall 2019

The lessons and the materials in the book and Google Classroom were not useful because they were irrelevant to my field of study.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 18 | 51.4 | 51.4 | 51.4 |
| Disagree | 13 | 37.1 | 37.1 | 88.6 |
| Uncertain | 3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 97.1 |
| Agree | 1 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The course's tasks and real-life situations were related.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 8.6 |
| Agree | 9 | 25.7 | 25.7 | 34.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 23 | 65.7 | 65.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Spring 2019

The lessons and the materials in the book and Google Classroom were not useful because they were irrelevant to my field of study.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 16 | 61.5 | 61.5 | 61.5 |
| Disagree | 6 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 84.6 |
| Uncertain | 4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The course's tasks and real-life situations were related.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Agree | 5 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 30.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 18 | 69.2 | 69.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Moreover, the responses showed that differentiated instructions in blended environment improved students' problem-solving skills (87.8%, Spring 2018; 91.4%, Fall 2019; and 88.5%, Spring 2019), enhanced their learning autonomy (87.8%, Spring 2018; 88.6%, Fall 2019; and 88.5%, Spring 2019), and developed their self-confidence (90.9%, Spring 2018; 88.6%, Fall 2019; and 88.5%, Spring 2019). All their responses were compared to the highly negative responses of the students in the control groups who were subjected to the one-fits-all PPP method (Appendix A).

As analysed above, when differentiated instructions in blended environment was implemented, the relationship of student-student and student-instructor were well established and strengthened. In doing so, students' intrinsic motivation improved, especially when their needs (interests, styles, and majors) were taken into consideration. When students had absolute interest in their personal learning, they would not only progress academically, but they would exhibit a higher awareness and perception of long-term accomplishment and self-worth. That eventually would positively be achieved and extended outside the classroom.

4.1.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative tools were employed to assert and strengthen the quantitative analysis achieved by examining specific questions of the questionnaires for the purpose of examining the research question: Data obtained from focus group discussions and the open-ended questions in Questionnaire 2 presented to students in the experimental groups were investigated.

4.1.2.1 Focus Group Discussions

Two focus group sessions per semester were conducted for the experimental groups: one after the Midterm exam and the second at the end of the semester. Each focus group consisted of six students chosen randomly from the different six majors available in both universities. Specific questions were discussed in this section pertaining to students' intrinsic motivation, knowledge, readiness, and engagement in Business English.

The questions are as follows:

- To what extent was this course intellectually stimulating when it was given in a differentiated blended mode?
- Was Business English relevant to your field of study and/or employment and how?
- In what way(s) do you think the course has improved your knowledge and level of confidence?

After analysing the data several times, the specific themes related to research questions were coded/tagged and included knowledge, intrinsic motivation, engagement, and readiness.

The replies received from answering the first question in the focus group were positive and decisive that the course was intellectually stimulating and interesting. Most students throughout the semester agreed that how the materials were presented had impacted their learning in the course. They preferred this kind of teaching and learning strategy in comparison to somehow memorized and dry materials and a teacher-centred approach executed in the acquisition of the English language in previous levels.

They asserted that this strategy was fundamental to knowledge integration as it took into account their learning styles and preferences. In their opinion, the principal element that had a significant impact was how the materials were presented. A student said that *"Classes were not boring. Every time there was something new and challenging to be learned or done, and the important thing is that the instructors were not the only one talking like in other courses I am taking in Business"* (Spring 2018).

Another student confessed that *"At the beginning I found it difficult because I had to participate and get out of my comfort zone, but the materials were given in an interesting and appealing way which made it impossible for me to stay passive"* (Fall 2019).

Moreover, a student from the graphic design department explained that she *"thought that Business English was only for business students, and I only had to take the course because it is the last English level that I had to be registered in... I thought that I will only memorize business words and definitions and write what I memorized. But I*

was actually surprised because I was fully engaged in the content and actively interacting with my classmates and instructors" (Fall 2019).

In Spring 2019, one of the students who was interviewed stated that *"How we studied English before was useless and boring. We only had to memorize grammar rules and vocabulary. The way that we are learning the course is unique and special as if we were in an actual company, and we were employees asked to fulfil the responsibilities related to our department"* (Spring 2019).

To summarize, many students admitted to being motivated to learn when their needs, majors, and preferences were accommodated and regarded. The majority of students' comments highlighted the stress-free and relaxed environment, the caring instructors, the interesting and beneficial materials, and the interesting engaging instructions.

As to answering the second question in the focus group discussion *"Was Business English relevant to your field of study and/or employment?"* Many students admitted that the innovative learning education, the customized texts and assignments, and a variety of quality materials and resources had substantially influenced the students' commitment. It also helped them feel connected to the course content and to its extension to their real life. They further commented that the given tasks and knowledge were parallel, relevant, and applicable to their majors and their current work's responsibilities. In other words, they felt a link with the materials and tasks given in their learning and life. Many students proclaimed that what happened within the classroom and in Google Classroom mirrored what was happening in the workplace. They agreed that the assignments and the discussions that followed were designed according to students' life experiences and their concerns, and thus consequentially corresponded to students. Furthermore, the majority of students asserted that classroom interaction and classroom/Google Classroom groupings satisfied social needs and improved learning. The course's groups sometimes reflected what happens in a company whether the grouping was heterogeneous or homogenous.

Some of the students' responses are given below:

"When we were in class discussing the task given, I felt as if I were in the company deliberating with my colleagues to present our final project to our manager."

"I have acquired the knowledge of how to manage business communication both orally and in written."

"My English and interaction skills had been improved, and I think my chances for employment have increased"

because I know how to write a CV and cover letter and how to manage a job interview if called to one."

"What was happening in the course reflected the real-life communication in the business world. The class was as a business enterprise where all of us were like colleagues working with each other either in different departments or in the same department depending on the task. Other times we were divided into employees and clients or managers who were asked to do something depending on the job given to us; we had to figure out how to work and communicate with each other to create a productive and constructive working relationship."

The data collected in regard to students' responses to the third question: *In what way(s) do you think the course has improved your knowledge and level of confidence?* in both focus groups per semester were also analysed. They held positive attitude towards how the class was taught, and how the materials were given. From the responses of a few students, it was revealed that at the beginning especially the reserved and timid students apprehended and dreaded participating. But later on and because of the supportive teaching and learning classroom ambiance where constructive feedback was implemented, they started to eagerly participate, even more than in other previous English levels. Many students declared that they overcame their fear of expressing their ideas in English whether in written or orally because of the effective and productive classroom community. They agreed that the continuous encouragement and reinforcement of high classroom behaviour and academic expectations contributed to raising their confidence levels. Thus, it made students believe in themselves and fulfil the requirements of the task/assignment.

A student in Spring 2018 said that *"Because of role-playing, stimulation, grouping, the objective feedback, and continuous follow-up, my level of confidence has been raised"*. Another argued, *"The different materials given, and the discussions made in class and online had strengthened my self-confidence and instilled in me a sense of belonging both in class and at work"* (Fall 2019). Moreover, one of the students in Fall 2019 expressed his opinion saying, *"Because of the fairness, trust, positive feedback, relevant materials, and assessment in this supporting environment, my self-esteem and confidence have been rebuilt. I'm no longer terrified of presenting or speaking in English"*

In addition to the focus group discussions held twice a semester, there was also a qualitative tool used to acquire the information required to answer the third research

question which was the open-ended questions in Questionnaire 3 (submitted to experimental groups).

4.1.2.2 Open-Ended Questions

The open-ended questions found in the semi-structured questionnaire given to the experimental groups were analysed to generate further explanations of their answers to the closed-ended questions in regard to specific examined elements.

The open-ended questions found in Questionnaire 2 are as follows:

- In your opinion, what are the benefits of taking Business English using the differentiated instructions and blended learning?
- In what way(s) was the course given in the differentiated blended way relevant to your further education or employment?

To analyse the qualitative open-ended questions, content analysis was employed, and coding techniques were utilized. In general, the qualitative responses of the 94 students in the experimental groups were collected and carefully examined. Afterwards, the repeated themes were identified and categorized. Subsequently these repeated themes were coded to render them researchable. At the end, and after grouping and breaking down the codes, a collection of themes and the perception of their frequency were completed.

Regarding the first question, the recurring themes were different learning styles, English skills, engagement (which was subcategorized into student's grouping and students' discussions with other students and instructors), self-confidence, and useful knowledge through learning and using technology.

Mostly, all the students had an affirmative decisive perspective about differentiated instruction in blended environment. They expressed that it was beneficial in their learning and realized that their different styles were attended to. The materials and tasks were presented in different ways: visual, oral, aural, social, etc. Some of the materials and tasks referred to the various amounts of content with different exercises presented in Google Classroom to suit their majors. These exercises were also appropriate to their English levels which were gradually improving through the different tasks that were carefully designed to enhance their English writing and oral skills.

In addition, positive remarks were disclosed regarding the engagement in the classroom and in Google Classroom. As mentioned previously, the engagement was subdivided into students' groupings and the discussions and communication that took place first among the students

and second among the students and instructors. For both subcategories, many students identified them as useful, valuable, and constructive. This theme was also linked to the themes of acquired knowledge and the development of students' self-confidence.

Regarding the acquired knowledge, the majority of students said that the knowledge acquired in Business English was appropriate and sufficient for them to communicate both in and out the workplace with accuracy and fluency in written and oral settings.

As for the theme of self-confidence, most students stated that they enjoyed the class. They expressed that they were more confident about their success in their current or future jobs. They conveyed being comfortable with the class' load and environment (in class and in Google Classroom). Furthermore, some students stated that working with high-achieved classmates had helped them understand the concept or task better than when explained by the instructors.

Though no negative responses were given concerning the first open-ended question, eight students out of 94 stated their indifference about the method's benefits applied in class. They explained their attitude by claiming that they were already familiar with the materials especially the ones pertaining to writing business correspondences and oral business communication. They had gained the knowledge through their work experience. In addition, three of them stated that their companies had previously enrolled them in a program to improve their English communication skills.

Moving to the second open-ended question, the majority of the 94 students expressed that the course helped them with their oral skills in other academic major courses. The reason was that the vast oral practices done in Business English had rendered oral presentations in other courses easy and natural. Sixty students emphasized the importance of the words and phrases given and practiced in different situations either in their learning or at their workplace. Some of the students elaborated that what they learned and practiced mirrored real-life situations in the workplace. Others added that they now understood how to interact orally or/and through writing in the different contexts they had encountered. Because of these facts, their engagement in the course heightened.

Fourteen students out of the whole related that they do not work, but because of the course, their Business English skills had been improved, and they felt that they had higher opportunities to land a job when interviewed.

Others confessed that though they have good English skills at the workplace, the rich materials given, and the way the course was conducted, made them acknowledge its

increased benefits in their workplace, as they acquired added information regarding the appropriate style to use in different contexts and with different participants.

Out of the 94, six students said that though the materials and the teaching and learning method were useful and applicable in their workplace, they already knew how to effectively communicate in English; they added that they had the competent knowledge about the specific terms to be used in specific situations both in written and oral contexts.

4.2 Discussion

The collection and interpretation of the required data served to comprehensively clarify and answer the research question pertaining to students' intrinsic motivation, readiness, knowledge, and engagement in English for business purposes.

Because of the implementation of the differentiated instructions which respected the students' different needs, varying English level, styles, and majors, students were highly motivated and engaged and actually practiced what they learned. They felt a sense of belonging to the course, and appreciated how it mirrored the social situations they were facing in the workplace. In addition, and because of limited class time, blended learning was utilized via Google Classroom and Skype to give ample opportunities for the students to effectively practice what they were learning. They were not confined within the wall of the classroom, and they were learning and practicing language knowledge outside it as well. At the end, after examining and analysing the quantitative and qualitative collected data, it can be inferred that differentiating the content, process, and product promoted students' intrinsic motivation, knowledge, and readiness and engagement in Business English. The data acknowledged that students were engaged and devoted to learn, understand, and apply the given materials because of the gratification and fulfilment the acquired knowledge had contributed.

By implementing the differentiated instructions and blended learning, students' aims surpassed the extrinsic motivation, as it went further to achieving intrinsic motivation as well. They felt a belonging to the community whether in class or at their workplace. Moreover, the intervention done through heterogeneous or/and homogeneous grouping played a crucial role in them taking outstanding responsibility in their learning individually and as group(s).

Furthermore, interacting with other classmates and not being confined in individual tasks reduced negative competition. It also increased the realization of teambuilding and leadership importance during learning.

Consistently and because of the associated discussed elements, self-esteem and confidence developed and/or increased in this environment which accentuated trust, routine, practice, structure, and fairness. This kind of environment is the preferred milieu for acquiring and practicing the needed knowledge.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As proven by earlier studies, teaching these core skills necessitates implementing many strategies and procedures, such as roleplaying, working in groups, and performing written and oral tasks; for example, reports, memos, job interviews, presentations, etc.

The study highlighted and clarified the major components of differentiated instruction which improved students' academic learning, accomplishment, and satisfaction inside and outside the classroom. The findings of this study might be considered of importance to other instructors in higher education because it presented how differentiation of content, process, and product is fundamental to suit students' diversity.

The results collected from questionnaires, focus groups, and open-ended questions concerning the research question indicated that the level of students' intrinsic motivation, knowledge, readiness, and engagement was heightened when differentiated instruction in a blended environment was administered in Business English for the experimental groups. It was proved that the disparate and numerous strategies, practices, and authentic activities such as role-playing, simulation, and students' groupings had a great impact on students' accomplishments. Students' learning autonomy, problem-solving skills, confidence, motivation, and communicative skills were developed and strengthened.

Also, through the analysis of the questionnaires' results regarding students' engagement and motivation, high positive percentages obtained from the experimental groups were juxtaposed with the negative responses of the control groups in which one-fits-all PPP method was implemented. The negative responses highlighted the problems of having limited time and practice for participation, discussion, analysis, and reflection on the acquired knowledge. Moreover, there were limited opportunities for self and peer evaluations. All of these limitations resulted in the students' slight and insignificant accomplishment of acquiring problem-solving skills, increasing their learning autonomy, and developing their self-confidence and motivation in the course given.

Furthermore, there was progress in the other core skills: analysing, critical thinking, solving problems, planning, sharing and constructing knowledge. In addition, this approach improved self-confidence, lowered anxiety in the process, and increased intrinsic motivation. The findings of this study are consistent with the findings obtained from Ernest and Ernest (2005) and Tomlinson (1999, 2003) which concluded in obtaining positive reactions of students who were subjected to differentiated instructions, especially when students' different styles and intelligences (Gardner, 1983), learning interests, and needs were taken into consideration when differentiating.

These results conform to the findings of Whyte (2011) who asserted that students appreciated the opportunities given to them to shift from silent participants into active ones through the different modes of interactions: student-content, student-students, and student-instructors either face-to-face or online, and in this case Google Classroom and Skype. By experiencing this kind of pedagogical mode, they took responsibility for their own learning. They were aware of the importance of English language in today's life and of the significant place it holds in the educational field and in the workplace. They gained interest in learning, acquiring, and improving their communicative competences as shown by the results of the collected data. Through the different contents, tasks, participations, as well as peers' and instructors' assistance, the students' productive skills, pragmatic awareness, and general performances developed throughout the semester. These findings also parallel Vygotsky's theory of constructivism (1978) in which the zone of proximal development (ZPD) is an essential attribute. This theory emphasizes the cultural and social aspects in the teaching and learning process. The theory argues that knowledge is established and built up, and that learners learn from each other. The student must be involved in the process of learning with the cooperation and help of other learners and a qualified teacher.

For this reason, Lebanese universities ought to regularly appraise their pedagogical methods and strategies to cope with the diverse students' needs, technological advancements, and the Lebanese and international business markets. Businesses are struggling with students/graduates who are saturated with theoretical knowledge but lack communicative, technological, and social skills. Extensive exposure to authentic materials and real-life practices in using the target language must be included in Lebanese universities' language curricula for the purpose of fulfilling the students' various needs and expectations. To achieve this, it is recommended that universities in Lebanon

cooperate with the Ministry of Higher Education to reconsider universities' curricula and implement pedagogical methods and procedures that adhere and conform to the demands of the workplace environment with English as an international language. It is necessary to mention that modifying the curricula is not sufficient if it is not coordinated with the theoretical and practical awareness of differentiated instruction. To accomplish this, seminars and workshops ought to be organized for the instructors to gain the required knowledge for implementation. First, they must understand the strategy and its components while observing the implementation of differentiated instruction during the training, and then perform it during the workshop activities and later in teaching their students. Instructors need to apply differentiated instruction to accommodate students' various learning styles (Tomlinson, 2001). Instructors have to be trained to design appropriate lessons, tasks, activities, learning materials and resources, and adopt cooperative, supportive, and interactive teaching techniques.

Based on the promising findings and results achieved from this study regarding students' improvement in learning autonomy, knowledge, intrinsic motivation, and engagement inside and outside the classroom, it is prudent and recommended to implement the strategies of differentiated instruction in a blended learning environment. Most importantly, differentiated instruction must communicate and consider an innovative pedagogy which could encourage and advocate transformation of knowledge and practical integration. It is not only essential for students' performance in a specific class and/or course, but it could have everlasting effects on motivation, self-efficacy, and achievement. Conceding that differentiated instruction is thoroughly implemented, it can exhibit systematic and structured effectiveness and encourage students who have diverse and distinctive learning backgrounds and experiences to respond to the heightened challenges of the global society.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 157-183.
- [2] Anderson, K.M. (2007). Tips for teaching differentiating instruction to include all students. *Preventing School Failure*, 51(3), 49-53.
- [3] Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). Minute paper. *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers*, 148-153.
- [4] Annous, S., & Nicolas, M. O. D. (2014). Journal of Business.
- [5] Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2): 191–215.
- [6] Baker, C. (2010). The impact of instructor immediacy and presence for online student affective learning, cognition, and motivation. *The Journal of Educators Online*, 7(1): 1-30. Retrieved from <http://www.thejeo.com/>
- [7] Barry, K., & King, L. (2002). Beginning teaching and beyond. Tuggerah.
- [8] Bolkan, J. (2015). Students taking online courses jumps 96 percent over 5 years. Retrieved from <https://campustechnology.com/articles/2013/06/24/report-students-taking-onlinecourses-jumps-96-percent-over-5-years.aspx>
- [9] Borja, L. A., Soto, S. T., & Sanchez, T. X. (2015). Differentiating instruction for EFL learners. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(8), 30-36.
- [10] Brew, L.S. (2008). The role of student feedback in evaluating and revising a blended learning course. *Internet and Higher Education*, 11, 98-105.
- [11] Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (Vol. 4). New York: Longman.
- [12] Bull, G., & Garofalo, J. (2005). Internet access: The last mile. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 32(1): 16-18.
- [13] Perfect, T. J., & Schwartz, B. L. (Eds.) (2002). Applied metacognition Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/read/107598848>
- [14] Carless, D. R. (2009). Revisiting the TBLT versus PPP debate: Voices from Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*.
- [15] Chang, M. (2011). EFL teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college. *Asian EFL Journal*, 53(1), 17-34.
- [16] Chesley, G. M., & Jordan, J. (2012). What's missing from teacher prep. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 41-45.
- [17] Cleveland-Innes, M., & Wilton, D. (2018). Guide to blended learning.
- [18] Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language teaching*, 39(1), 1-14.
- [19] Creswell, J. (2011). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.
- [20] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Self-determination and intrinsic motivation in human behavior. *EL Deci, RM Ryan.*–1985.
- [21] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 49(3), 182.
- [22] Donnelly, R. (2010). Harmonizing technology with interaction in blended problem-based learning. *Computers & Education*, 54(2), 350-359.
- [23] Dowling, T. (2017). Presentation, Practice and Production (PPP) and Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT): A Defence and a Critique. *Language and Culture: The Journal of the Institute for Language and Culture*, (21), 139-154.

- [24] Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1978). Teaching students through their individual learning styles. Reston, VA: Reston.
- [25] Dziuban, C.D., Hartman, J.L., & Moskal, P.D. (2004). Blended learning. *Educational Center for Applied Research Bulletin*, 7, 12(1): 41-49.
- [26] EL-Annan, S. H. (2012). Mismanaging Knowledge and Education and their Effects on Employment in Lebanon and the Middle East. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 3(1), pp. 9-16. <https://doi.org/10.22610/jevr.v3i1.44>.
- [27] Ellis, M., & Johnson, C. (1994). *Teaching business English* (pp. 25-38). Oxford.
- [28] Ernst, H. R., & Ernst, T. L. (2005). The promise and pitfalls of differentiated instruction for undergraduate political science courses: Student and instructor impressions of an unconventional teaching strategy. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 1(1), 39-59.
- [29] Fischer, C., Malycha, C., and Schafmann, E. (2019). The Influence of Intrinsic Motivation and Synergistic Extrinsic Motivators on Creativity and Innovation. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
- [30] Flaherty, S., & Hackler, R. (2010). Exploring the Effects of Differentiated Instruction and Cooperative Learning on the Intrinsic Motivational Behaviors of Elementary Reading Students. *Online Submission*.
- [31] Fox, J., & Hoffman, W. (2011). *The differentiated instruction book of lists* (Vol. 6). John Wiley & Sons.
- [32] Frendo, E. (2005). *How to teach business English*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- [33] Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- [34] Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- [35] Gardner, H. E. (2000). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. Hachette UK.
- [36] Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95-105.
- [37] Gill, S. K., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English in Asian and European higher education. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*.
- [38] Ginns, P. & Ellis, R. (2007). Quality in blended learning: Exploring the relationships between on-line and face-to-face teaching and learning. *Internet and Higher Education*, 10, 53-64.
- [39] Graham, C.R. (2006). Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In *Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs: 3-21*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer Publishing.
- [40] Harmer, J. (2001). The practice of language teaching. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Longman, 164-188.
- [41] Hughes, J. N. (2012). Teacher-student relationships and school adjustment: Progress and remaining challenges. *Attachment & Human Development*, 14(3), 319-327.
- [42] Hyde, C. (2013). *Task-based language teaching in the business English classroom* (Doctoral dissertation).
- [43] Hwang, G. J., Lai, C. L., & Wang, S. Y. (2015). Seamless flipped learning: a mobile technology-enhanced flipped classroom with effective learning strategies. *Journal of computers in education*, 2(4), 449-473.
- [44] Jensen, E. (2005). *Teaching with the brain in mind*. ASCD.
- [45] Kuh, G. D. (2009). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 141:5-20.
- [46] Land, R. (2001). Agency, context and change in academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 6(1).
- [47] Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach* (Vol. 1, p. 993). Hove: Language teaching publications.
- [48] Liu, D., Jiang, K., Shalley, C. E., Keem, S., & Zhou, J. (2016). Motivational mechanisms of employee creativity: A meta-analytic examination and theoretical extension of the creativity literature. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 137, 236-263.
- [49] Maftoon, P., Sarem, S. N., & Hamidi, H. (2012). A Closer Look at Different Aspects of Language Teaching/Learning and Learner Identity. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2(6).
- [50] Metcalf, L. B. (2003). *Blended eLearning: Integrating Knowledge, Performance Support and Online Learning*. Massachusetts: HRD Press Inc.
- [51] Morgan, D. (2014). Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. *Portland State University, OR, USA*, 20(8): 1045-1053. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413513733>
- [52] Nehme, N. F. (2013). Is the Grammar-Instruction Approach an Old-Fashioned Method in Comparison to the Communicative Approach in Non-Native Contexts? A Case Study of Students and Teachers' Perceptions.
- [53] Northey, G., Bucic, T., Chylinski, M., & Govind, R. (2015). Increasing student engagement using asynchronous learning. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 37(3), 171-180.
- [54] Owston, R., Wideman, H., Murphy, J., & Lupshenyuk, D. (2008). Blended teacher professional development: A synthesis of three program evaluations. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 11(3-4), 201-210.
- [55] Richards, J. C. (2010). Competence and performance in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, 41(2): 101-122. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688210372953>
- [56] Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.
- [57] Rodriguez, A. (2012). An analysis of elementary school teachers' knowledge and use of differentiated instruction.
- [58] Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2011). Temperament as an Indicator of Language Achievement. *Online Submission*, 5(4), 33-52.
- [59] Sampath, D., & Zalipour, A. (2010). Effective teaching strategies for learners of business communication: A case

- study from INTI university college, Malaysia. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 19(3), 256-266.
- [60] Schlechty, P. (1997). *Inventing better schools: An action plan for education reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [61] Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Goals and goal orientations. *Motivation in Education: Theory, Research, and Applications*, 170-209.
- [62] Senior, R. (2010). Connectivity: A framework for understanding effective language.
- [63] Shaaban, K. (2018). Challenges of Teaching English in Tertiary Education in the Arab World.
- [64] Sharan, Y., & Sharan, S. (1992). *Expanding cooperative learning through group investigation* (Vol. 1234). New York: Teachers College Press.
- [65] Sharpe, R. et al. (2006). The undergraduate experience of blended e-learning: *A review of UK literature and practice undertaken for the Higher Education Academy*. Retrieved from: <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/research.htm>
- [66] Shih, R.C. (2010). Blended learning using video-based blogs: Public speaking for English as a second language students. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26(6):883-897.
- [67] Sim, M. (2013). Ups and downs of teaching Business English terminology. *University of Oradea*.
- [68] Smit, R., & Humpert, W. (2012). Differentiated instruction in small schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(8), 1152-1162.
- [69] Soprana, V. (2017). A theoretical outline of the importance of cross-cultural and pragmatic awareness in the business scenario. *BERT: Porto Alegre*, 8(1): 101-121. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/2178-3640.2017.1.27462>.
- [70] Subban, P. (2006). Differentiated instruction: a research basis. *International Education Journal*, 7(7), 935-947.
- [71] Teodorescu, A. (2013). Traditional vs. modern approaches in business English teaching in the economic field. *Knowledge Horizons-Economics*, 5(2), 153-156.
- [72] Tett, L., Crowther, J., & O'Hara, P. (2003). Collaborative partnerships in community education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(1), 37-51.
- [73] Tomlinson, C. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: responding to the needs of all learners*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- [74] Tomlinson, S. (2005). *Education in a post welfare society*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- [75] Tomlinson, C. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- [76] Tomlinson, C. & Imbeau, M. (2010). *Leading and managing a differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. *USF Information Technology*. (2009). Retrieved from University of South Florida: <https://www.usf.edu/it/about-us/it-news/skype-for-business.aspx>.
- [77] Tomlinson, C. & Santangelo, T. (2009). The application of differentiated instruction in postsecondary environments: Benefits, challenges and future directions. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(3), 307-323.
- [78] Twigg, C. A. (2003a). Improving learning and reducing costs: Lessons learned from Round 1 of the Pew grant program in course redesign. Troy, NY: Center for Academic Transformation. Retrieved from <http://www.thencat.org/PCR/R1Lessons.html>
- [79] Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Intrinsic versus extrinsic goal contents in self-determination theory: Another look at the quality of academic motivation. *Educational psychologist*, 41(1), 19-31.
- [80] Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [81] Whipple, K. A. (2012). *Differentiated instruction: A survey study of teacher understanding and implementation in a southeast Massachusetts school district* (Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University).
- [82] Whyte, S. (2011). Developing and integrating teacher competences in language acquisition, pedagogy and technology. *Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis*: 220-232.
- [83] Williams, W. M., & Sternberg, R. J. (2002). How parents can maximize children's cognitive abilities. *Handbook of Parenting Volume 5 Practical Issues in Parenting*, 168.
- [84] Willis, P. E. (1990). *Common culture* (p. 85). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- [85] World Bank. (2008). The road not travelled, education reform in the Middle East and North Africa. World Bank, Washington DC.
- [86] Wong, W., & Van Patten, B. (2003). The evidence is IN: Drills are OUT. *Foreign language annals*, 36(3), 403-423.
- [87] Zhang, Z. (2007). Towards an integrated approach to teaching business English: a Chinese experience. *English for Specific Purpose*, 26: 399-410.
- [88] Zhang, L., & Atkin, C. (2010). Conceptualizing Humanistic Competence in the Language Classroom by TJP--A Chinese Case. *International Education Studies*, 3(4), 121-127.
- [89] Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Investigating self-regulation and motivation: Historical background, methodological developments, and future prospects. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1): 166-183.

Appendix A

Students' Motivation and Learning Autonomy
 Spring 2018
 Experimental Group

Study habits and problem-solving skills were improved.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 4 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 12.1 |
| Agree | 11 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 45.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 18 | 54.5 | 54.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Student motivation in approaching the academic tasks was increased.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Uncertain | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 12.1 |
| Agree | 13 | 39.4 | 39.4 | 51.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 16 | 48.5 | 48.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving my learning autonomy.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Uncertain | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 12.1 |
| Agree | 21 | 63.6 | 63.6 | 75.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 8 | 24.2 | 24.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving and developing my self-confidence.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Uncertain | 1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 9.1 |
| Agree | 16 | 48.5 | 48.5 | 57.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 14 | 42.4 | 42.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Fall 2019

Experimental Group

Study habits and problem-solving skills were improved.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 8.6 |
| Agree | 12 | 34.3 | 34.3 | 42.9 |
| Strongly Agree | 20 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Student motivation in approaching the academic tasks was increased.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 1 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Uncertain | 4 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 14.3 |
| Agree | 13 | 37.1 | 37.1 | 51.4 |
| Strongly Agree | 17 | 48.6 | 48.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving my learning autonomy.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 1 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Uncertain | 3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 11.4 |
| Agree | 21 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 71.4 |
| Strongly Agree | 10 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving and developing my self-confidence.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 1 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Uncertain | 3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 11.4 |
| Agree | 17 | 48.6 | 48.6 | 60.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 14 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 35 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Spring 2019

Experimental Group

Study habits and problem-solving skills were improved.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Uncertain | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Agree | 8 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 42.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 15 | 57.7 | 57.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Student motivation in approaching the academic tasks was increased.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Uncertain | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 11.5 |
| Agree | 10 | 38.5 | 38.5 | 50.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 13 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving my learning autonomy.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Uncertain | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 11.5 |
| Agree | 17 | 65.4 | 65.4 | 76.9 |
| Strongly Agree | 6 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving and developing my self-confidence.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Uncertain | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 11.5 |
| Agree | 12 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 57.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 11 | 42.3 | 42.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Control Group

Spring 2018

The course's tasks and real-life situations were related.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 1 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| Disagree | 14 | 48.3 | 48.3 | 51.7 |
| Uncertain | 8 | 27.6 | 27.6 | 79.3 |
| Agree | 6 | 20.7 | 20.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 29 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Study habits and problem-solving skills were improved.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 6 | 20.7 | 20.7 | 20.7 |
| Uncertain | 17 | 58.6 | 58.6 | 79.3 |
| Agree | 6 | 20.7 | 20.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 29 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Student motivation in approaching the academic tasks was increased.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 11 | 37.9 | 37.9 | 37.9 |
| Disagree | 14 | 48.3 | 48.3 | 86.2 |
| Uncertain | 4 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 29 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving my learning autonomy.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Strongly Disagree | 2 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 6.9 |
| Disagree | 18 | 62.1 | 62.1 | 69.0 |
| Uncertain | 8 | 27.6 | 27.6 | 96.6 |
| Agree | 1 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 29 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving and developing my self-confidence.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Disagree | 13 | 44.8 | 44.8 | 44.8 |
| Uncertain | 11 | 37.9 | 37.9 | 82.8 |
| Agree | 5 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 29 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Control Group

Fall 2019

The course's tasks and real-life situations were related.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| | Disagree | 16 | 48.5 | 48.5 | 54.5 |
| | Uncertain | 9 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 81.8 |
| | Agree | 6 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Study habits and problem-solving skills were improved.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Disagree | 9 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 27.3 |
| | Uncertain | 18 | 54.5 | 54.5 | 81.8 |
| | Agree | 6 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Student motivation in approaching the academic tasks was increased.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 15 | 45.5 | 45.5 | 45.5 |
| | Disagree | 14 | 42.4 | 42.4 | 87.9 |
| | Uncertain | 4 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving my learning autonomy.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| | Disagree | 18 | 54.5 | 54.5 | 60.6 |
| | Uncertain' | 12 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 97.0 |
| | Agree | 1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving and developing my self-confidence.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Disagree | 17 | 51.5 | 51.5 | 51.5 |
| | Uncertain | 11 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 84.8 |
| | Agree | 5 | 15.2 | 15.2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Control Group

Spring 2019

The course's tasks and real-life situations were related.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| | Disagree | 13 | 54.2 | 54.2 | 58.3 |
| | Uncertain | 5 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 79.2 |
| | Agree | 5 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Study habits and problem-solving skills were improved.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Disagree | 6 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| | Uncertain | 13 | 54.2 | 54.2 | 79.2 |
| | Agree | 5 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Student motivation in approaching the academic tasks was increased.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 41.7 | 41.7 | 41.7 |
| | Disagree | 11 | 45.8 | 45.8 | 87.5 |
| | Uncertain | 3 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Student motivation in approaching the academic tasks was increased.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 41.7 | 41.7 | 41.7 |
| | Disagree | 11 | 45.8 | 45.8 | 87.5 |
| | Uncertain | 3 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving my learning autonomy.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| | Disagree | 13 | 54.2 | 54.2 | 58.3 |
| | Uncertain' | 9 | 37.5 | 37.5 | 95.8 |
| | Agree | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The teaching method helped in improving and developing my self-confidence.

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Disagree | 12 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| | Uncertain | 8 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 83.3 |
| | Agree | 4 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |