

FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND VIETNAMESE

**AN INVESTIGATION OF THE READINESS
TO IMPLEMENT BLENDED LEARNING
IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIETNAM****HOANG NGOC TUE* - LE DUC HANH** -****NGUYEN NGOC QUYNH*** - NGUYEN THI LAN******

ABSTRACT: The 21st century has witnessed an increase in the number of research focusing on improving teaching and learning outcomes when adopting Blended Learning (BL) via the lens of students and teachers. Yet relatively little research investigated institution administrators' readiness to diffuse BL. More research on institutional administrators is needed to provide guidance and direction on how to strategically adopt and implement BL successfully. Accordingly, this study is to identify possible factors that influence higher education (HE) administrators' readiness into diffusing BL. To answer the question, a qualitative research was adopted and data was collected using interviews with 11 administrators/ managers in two universities in Vietnam. The purpose of the interviews was to gain deeper insight into administrators' perspectives while implementing BL. Results showed that institutional structure, resource support, technology infrastructure, management strategies, and ethical considerations would significantly impact administrators' readiness to diffuse BL.

KEY WORDS: blended learning; BL implementation; higher education policies; administration readiness; management strategies.

RECEIVED: APRIL, 16th, 2022.

EDITED: JUNE, 12th, 2022.

1. Introduction

Institutions in tertiary education worldwide have increasingly adopted Blended Learning (BL) for their teaching and learning. Blended learning, a combination of face-to-face and online learning has been the "new normal" in tertiary education courses delivery [Dziuban et al., 2018]. In the last several years, researchers have pointed out that BL can utilize the advantages of both face-to-face and online learning while minimizing the drawbacks of these two delivery modes [Eldeeb, 2019]. To promote BL adoption, it is necessary that institutions are able to provide clear policies and proper support. Without clear policies to guide, teachers and students can inevitably implement BL successfully. Thus, administration involvement plays an important role in successfully implementing BL initiatives. However, studies so far on BL adoption have neglected the institution administrators' perspective [Porter et al., 2016]. This paper explores variables that influence institution administrators' readiness to diffuse BL in universities in Vietnam, where BL has been adopted to improve the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language.

In Vietnam, BL has received better recognition for its numerous benefits toward teaching and learning. The Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) of Vietnam issued policies requiring higher education (HE) institutions to apply information and communication technologies (ICTs) into teaching and learning systems [Hoang, 2015]. HE institutions in Vietnam have positively adopted BL to answer the call by MOET [Hoang, 2015]. Besides, English language has been assigned by MOET as a compulsory course of study for tertiary education students. Thus, adopting the BL approach into teaching and learning English has become more popular in Vietnamese universities. Using BL adoption in teaching and learning English in HE is expected to support traditional learning and improve students' outcomes. Yet only a few studies have explored institutions' administration readiness in Vietnamese institutions. This paper aimed to address the question: *What are the factors that influence administrators' readiness during the implementation of BL in English language*

* Dr; Hanoi University of Industry; Email: hoangngoctue@hau.edu.vn

** Hanoi University of Industry; Email: leduchanh_knn@hau.edu.vn

*** Hanoi University of Industry; Email: ngocquynhnd@gmail.com

**** Hanoi University of Industry; Email: lannt_knn@hau.edu.vn

education in Vietnamese higher institutions?

2. Literature review

2.1. Blended learning in English language higher education

Blended learning has been more popular in tertiary education in the 21st century and has become a major interest of many studies but there is still disagreement in its definition. Graham et al. (2013) defined blended learning as a combination of face-to-face instruction and computer-mediated instruction. Some researchers identified BL as ‘*a combination of traditional face-to-face teaching and online learning*’ [Wright, 2017, p.6414] and ‘*a combination of face-to-face and online instruction to produce effective, efficient, and flexible learning*’ [Zhang & Zou, 2020, p.41]. Various studies demonstrated that using blended learning in teaching and learning helps to improve students’ learning outcomes [Dziuban et al., 20183]. According to Poon (2014), BL implementation in higher education is considered a shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered instruction, which promotes students’ activeness and interactions. While BL adoption has become more imperative for many tertiary institutions, there is still limited research to evaluate the readiness of institutional administrators to apply BL. For instance, Wong et al. (2014) proposed a framework to examine the readiness, intensity of adoption, and impact on BL offerings. The framework is then tested via a case study over a two-year period at Victoria University, Australia. Garrison and Vaughan (2013) conducted two case studies in Canada to examine how institutional change related to BL approaches is predicated based on the committed collaborative leadership of institutions administration. Bokolo et al. developed a model to investigate the variables and factors influencing institutions’ administration readiness to apply BL in Malaysian universities [Bokolo et al., 2020]. The data was collected through an online questionnaire from 223 administrators/managers. The results showed that institutional structure has the most influence on administrators’ readiness toward diffusing BL. However, those prior studies investigated the implementation of BL in general, not specifically BL in English language education.

In the context of English as a foreign language (ESL/EFL), benefits of using BL in teaching and learning has been identified by many research studies. For example, Marsh (2012) stated that the implementation of BL could increase students’ learning autonomy, stimulate collaborative learning, enhance learners’ interaction and engagement, provide more chances to practice language outside classrooms, and improve language skills. Many researchers have investigated how to implement BL effectively in teaching and learning English language [Zhang & Zhu, 2018]. Sharma and Barrett (2007) argued that factors relating to teachers’ attitude toward BL, teachers’ training, students’ proficiency levels, and the accessibility to technology play key role in decisions of implementing BL in ESL/EFL classrooms. Yet there is no research before in Vietnam to examine institutions’ administration readiness. As a result, there is a need for more research to look in-depth at what influences administrators’ perspectives in applying BL in English language teaching and learning.

2.2. Overview of Rogers’ DoI theory

Diffusion of innovation (DoI) theory was introduced by Rogers to investigate the process innovation is diffused or not [Rogers, 2003]. Diffusion is defined as ‘*the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system*’ [Rogers, 2003, p.5]. Rogers grouped innovation adopters into five categories based on similar characteristics and values including innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards. Applying to the context of BL, Porter et al. extended DoI theory and introduced 3 stages of BL adoption in the institution Porter et al. (2016):

Stage 1: exploration/ awareness refers to institutions that have no initiatives to promote BL adoption (Graham et al., 2013) due to limited support to diffuse BL while the institutions are aware of the potential of BL [Porter et al., 2016].

Stage 2: early implementation/ adoption refers to institutions that adopt BL initiatives based on new policies and strategies to implement BL.[Graham et al., 2013; Porter et al., 2016].

Stage 3: growth/ mature implementation refers to institutions with well-established BL strategies, structure, and support [Graham et al., 2013].

In this study, the framework of Graham et al. (2013) for institution adoption and implementation and Rogers' (2003) DoI theory is employed to examine strategy, structure, and support issues that institutions would likely have during the BL implementation [Graham et al., 2013; Rogers, 2003] as follows.

Table 1. *Three stages of BL adoption in the institution (Graham et al., 2013)*

Stage 1 - awareness/exploration	Stage 2 - adoption/early implementation	Stage 3 - mature implementation/growth
As its names in the stage, an institution has not yet adopted a strategy regarding BL; however, administrators are aware of and have limited support for individual faculty who employ BL techniques in their own classes.	As it can be called, in this stage, an institution adopts a BL strategy and experiments with new policies and practices to support its implementation of BL in the institution.	In this stage, an institution has well-established BL strategies, structure and support that are presented clearly in the policies as well as plans.

In this review of the literature, policies related to BL were listed, specifically policies that administrators adopt and implement BL with their perception and categorized them into three key issues of strategy, structure, and support, which are specifically detailed as the following table.

Table 2. *Key issues of strategy, structure, and support of BL adaptation in the institution (Graham et al., 2013)*

Strategy	Structure	Support
Definition of Blended learning	Scheduling	Professional development
Purpose	Governance	Technical and pedagogical support
Institutional advocacy	Evaluation	Institutional incentives

2.3. Methodology

(i) Settings and participants

The purpose of this study was to investigate in-depth issues influencing institutional administrators' readiness in diffusing BL at higher education. A qualitative study was employed to provide more insight into the research question. Due to the limitation of time and resources, the study was only conducted at two universities in Vietnam. Those universities were chosen as the targeted institutions because they are both at their stage of mature implementation and growth [Graham et al., 2013]. Both institutions experienced implementing BL for a long period of time (five and ten years, respectively) and BL adoption has become a routine aspect in institution operation in terms of strategy, structure, and support. Both institutions failed to implement BL in different ways before officially utilizing one BL curriculum about 5 years ago.

(ii) Data collection and analysis procedures

In early 2020, interviews were conducted with deans and administrative officers of two institutions. Interviews lasted from approximately 30 to 70 minutes. A total of 11 semi-structured interviews were conducted to investigate participants' perspectives. The interviews were adopted by the interview protocol of Graham et al. (2013) and Rogers' DoI theory (2003). The interviews were then recorded, transcribed, and coded and similar themes and patterns were addressed. To be more specific, content analysis was employed as the analysis method for the data. The themes and sub-themes were based on the interviewing data with Administrators and classified with the patterns from three key issues of strategy, structure, and support in Table 2.

Table 3. Themes and Sub-themes based on Interviews with Administrators

Theme	Sub-themes	Theme	Sub-themes
<i>Institutional Structure</i>	-Vision/ Mission -Advocacy -Definition/ Plan	<i>Management Strategies</i>	-Evaluation -Professional Development -Governance
<i>Resource Support</i>	- Technical Support - Pedagogical Support - Incentives (course load reduction) - Financial Support - Tenure/ Promotion	<i>Technology Infrastructure</i>	-Educational Software -Hardware Provision -Network Access
		<i>Ethical Consideration</i>	-Legal Issues -Intellectual Property

2.4. Findings

Findings from the interviews were categorized into 5 themes: instructional structure, resource support, management strategies, technology infrastructure, ethical consideration (see Table 2 & 3).

2.4.1. Instructional structure

(i) Vision

The results showed that all of the interviewees agreed that the alignment of the BL initiative with the institution's mission would be influential to diffuse the BL approach. For instance, in U#2, the vision and mission of the faculty are deployed from the values and mission of their university. The goals to be achieved are to enhance students' communicative skills and confidence to communicate in English, increase pedagogical effectiveness and reduce cost-effectiveness. The Interviewee #2 shared that

"Realizing the advantages and internationalization benefit of blended learning, our university already had a vision and strategy to apply blended courses for more than 30% of the amount of each undergraduate program by 2023. We commenced our blended project with designing and teaching English for non-English major students at three faculties, then, after one year of implementation, we expanded blended courses for all non-English majored students in our institution..."

In terms of U#1, participants shared that the faculty currently use the official document of the institution as their vision. In particular, one interviewee shared that only when the goals of the programs corresponded with the institution's value, would the programs be able to be deployed in the faculty.

(ii) Advocacy

In terms of administration advocacy, the data showed that BL received high support from the faculty administrators and members in both institutions. In U#1, it is revealed that about 78,5% of faculty members advocated the implementation of BL. In U#2, one interviewee noted that *"our top management really advocates BL approach, especially when BL approach is becoming more popular in the world"* (Interviewee #1) According to interviewees, administrator advocacy brings advantages in diffusing BL approach in teaching and learning English such as upgrading infrastructure. It means teachers and students in U#1 and U#2 can receive proper structural resource support when using the BL model.

(iii) Definition/Plan

Furthermore, both universities have official documents which clearly explain policies for the adoption and promotion BL approach. All interviewees indicated that they comprehended thoroughly the concept as well as the policies of using the BL approach. For instance, Interviewee #7 in U#1 reported that *"Blended learning is not a new pedagogical term. It is defined as a teaching method that applies ICT in teaching and learning for all subjects. I have known about the blended learning approach for a long time but since July, 2016, we started implementing BL for our English courses."*

Meanwhile, the Interviewee #3 in U#2 informed that *“Basically, in our institution, at present, blended learning is commonly known as a pedagogical method that blends the maximum benefits of online materials and face-to-face activities in order to create a new learning environment that integrates the full strength of each part in blended courses.”*

“...After two times we failed to adopt BL, in 2015, we started a new plan, a comprehensive plan. First, it is to enable teachers and top managers to acknowledge the theoretical basis of BL approach. Teachers were formally introduced to the benefits of BL, and trained how to design English courses using the BL model, etc. For administrators, we then have clear policies to implement: having strategies to upgrade institutional infrastructure, building regulations of teaching and learning, building resource support for teachers and students...”

Moreover, at both universities, it is reported that all the official documents about blended courses are published on the main websites so teachers and students can have clear goals and objectives of the blended curriculum.

2.4.2. Resource support

(i) Technological support

All deans and administrators participating in the study acknowledge the importance of technical support to diffuse BL. As a result, in both universities, students and teachers can access a free Internet system. There is a specific unit that supports any technological problems when needed for both teachers and students. Teachers and students can receive 24 hours technological support through an online system. One vice-dean in U#1 shared that the technical support in time could save time for lecturers and students: *“students can describe and note down the technical problems they encounter and report to teachers. Teachers will contact the technical unit to solve problems, or students go directly to the technical unit or use a hotline when they need support”*. Meanwhile, five out of six interviewees in U#2 shared the same opinion that students need technological support more than teachers. Another administrator is concerned that *“...according to me, since the time we adopted BL, students need more technical support than lecturers. For example, one day, we have to solve like 40 or 50 requests from students because they forgot their ID passwords, username, etc., while teachers can use the platform easily after one training session”*. (I#5).

(ii) Pedagogical support

Interviewees at both two universities indicated that pedagogical support would be one of the prior concerns that administrators and deans are aware of. For instance, one interviewee at U#2 explained, *“In 2016, when the institution officially switched to BL approach, the faculty organized a training session for all of the lecturers about teaching methodology, assessment, and testing, etc. of the new model.”* (I#4). In addition, six interviewees felt the regular meetings would be extremely useful for teachers to exchange their experience using BL. One interviewee shared that training sections and regular meetings help old teachers who are familiar with traditional teaching methods to make use of the BL approach.

In U#1, training for teachers at the beginning of BL was administered by experts of National Geographic Learning which provides the curriculum for them. The administrators affirm that they do not need any intensive training because they see no big change in their teaching as well as administration. During the course, teachers will support each other by sharing their experiences.

(iii) Financial support

In U#2, interviewees indicated that financial support is essential to adopt effective BL approaches: *“there is financial support for academic staff who teach classes using BL approach to encourage teachers”* (I#5). Academic staff who participated in the designing BL course would receive research grants from the faculty to support their work. Another interviewee commented that *“the institution has the financial potentials for renovating the institution’ infrastructure and support lectures... in redesigning learning program and digitalise learning materials”* (I#6).

In contrast, administrators at U#1 did not feel like financial support is important to diffuse BL. The interviewees shared that teachers did not have financial stipends because implementing BL in

teaching is one of the duties that lecturers have to do. The Interviewee #10 reported that *“As the curriculum materials were required to change to the new ones, so it was our duty and responsibility to update and apply our teaching methods. This seems to be compulsory for lecturers like us...”*.

(iv) *Tenure/ Promotion*

All interviewees made general statements that tenure/ promotion did not have a strong influence to diffuse BL. Interviewees explained that because the BL approach has been adopted into teaching and learning for a long time, it is required that academic staff should be able to use it properly. In U#1, teaching online classes is one of the teachers' duties.

However, there is still recognition toward academic staff who took part in designing BL courses in U#2. Those experienced academic staff are assigned to observe and help the implementation of BL for other faculties.

“At the first time of launching the blended courses, all the lecturers who participated in designing the BL materials were prioritized to teach these BL classes so that they can revise and review their designing materials. We know that their teaching workload appears to be much more than other teachers, then, we provided them with some support and promotion....”, said the Interviewee #5.

2.4.3. *Management strategies*

(i) *Evaluation*

Both U#1 and U#2 developed their plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the BL approach. Both institutions integrate questionnaires of students' satisfaction with the online courses. In U#1, a large-scale survey was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of BL institution-wide student impact of blended courses. The data showed that the academic record of students in the BL approach was improved compared to the traditional one. Approximately 75% of students felt satisfactory about the subjects. Higher recognition of teachers' performance was recorded. U#2 does not have a formal survey implementation by students. The effectiveness of students' results is evaluated based on positive feedback from recruiters and companies when students do their internships. Students finishing BL courses have received positive feedback in having better working capacity, and more confidence.

Regarding evaluation from academic staff, there are formal meetings for lecturers to evaluate the process at the beginning of the semesters, and when the semester finishes. Informal meetings are also organized regularly either face-to-face or online to collect feedback from teachers to make further improvement. Interviewee #3, 5 commented that *“evaluation like whether to adjust this content or modify that material in teaching.., yes, we have that in regular meetings”*; *“we invited experienced teachers with BL to present how they use techniques, tips in teaching and other teachers would discuss and give comments. And reports at the end of those meetings will be shared to all teachers in the faculty...”*. The evaluation of implementing BL is reported annually and shared with deans and other administrators. Strategic decision-making will be based on the feedback of students and lecturers to improve the effectiveness in the next semesters.

(ii) *Professional development*

U#1 and U#2 also often organize regular meetings during the implementation of BL in English courses among teachers in faculties. Teachers then discuss and make adjustments for their teaching. At the beginning of the semesters, there are workshops and seminars where specialists and experienced teachers are invited to guide and share their experience on BL:

“In 2016 when we first implemented BL, we organized training and guidance sessions for all teachers of the language faculty. The training covered from pedagogical knowledge to technological knowledge on installing software, etc.”, (I#4 at U#2)

“We have 8 academic office staff and 2 technical staff, so I think that is a totally an advantage to provide professional development” (I#8 at U#1).

Technological knowledge is also provided and promoted during regular meetings. However, administrators in both institutions stated that their teachers did not have many troubles with

technology while teaching. Therefore, professional development on pedagogical knowledge is more prioritized.

In terms of students, at both institutions they are equipped with proper technical skills and learning skills toward the BL approach via many sources such as: the catalog of their studies and the main websites of the institutions, and guidance from their teachers during the whole semester.

(iii) *Governance*

Both U#1 and U#2 have developed their BL governance structures. To be more specific, a council involving deans, department chairs, and group leaders was established to oversee the BL implementation. At U#2, annual plan for the development of BL is reported by group leaders then sent to the faculty and institution. A detailed plan for designing and teaching BL courses has been issued by faculty administrators. The course schedule is made clearly 55% for the seat time and 45% for online study (40 and 35 periods respectively). At U#1, 45 face-to-face periods are mandatory for students in classes and students do the homework online. It was reported the plan receives relatively positive support from faculty teachers.

2.4.4. *Technology infrastructure*

(i) *Educational software*

In both institutions, applications for online learning are provided so that students and teachers can access it via either computers or smartphones. That brings enormous advantages to diffuse BL in teaching and learning. Especially at U#2, some interviewees shared that: *"We have our own technical unit taking the main responsibility in designing the educational software. The IT (Information Technology) personnel based on other learning software like MOODLE and the requirements of the English faculty to build our own software. In general, the software we are using can respond to up to 70% of our teachers' and students' expectations."* (I#1). The Interviewee #11 at U#1 shared how the educational software and tools eased the workload of teachers in preparing and teaching *"teachers of non-majored English have an advantage while using the software. They can use the Itool to create Powerpoint easily, and the Platform of the software can aid their teaching in class..."*.

(ii) *Hardware provision*

At U#2 along with changing facilities and classes, the interviewees indicated that interactive TVs would be installed to replace old projectors. The sound systems will be upgraded. There are two fully equipped computer laboratories with high-speed internet connection which allows students to learn BL from 7 a.m to 9 p.m. About U#1, there used to be computer laboratories where students could study for only two hours per day. However, due to the low internet connection, those computer rooms were closed down. Administrators in U#1 also shared that: *"the majority of students now have their own smartphones or laptops. So, the role of computer labs is not necessary anymore."* (I#10).

(iii) *Network access*

In U#1, interviewees shared that *"network access in our institution is a change, a big change. Only when students access to the Internet, they can do online activities"*, *"in the past, the internet connection is secured, but now students can access to free Wifi..."* students can bring their own laptops or mobile phones to study in the library, everywhere in the campus". Teachers and administrators are provided with passwords to access a faster Internet connection. A Free Wifi system is also provided for students and teachers at U#2 with passwords and ID so that all of the students can access the Internet to complete the online exercises anytime and anywhere in the university campus.

(iv) *Ethical consideration*

Both 2 institutions in the study acknowledged this important issue. At U#1, the ownership of course materials belongs to National Geographic Learning, which provides the curriculum for them *"we exploit the content of materials and the result extracted from that content, not the ownership of course materials"*, *"students have the authorised books, and we, the technical unit created our own platform... coordinate with the National Graphic to make our own platform to administrate students' accounts, etc."*.

At that time, at U#2, the ownership of course materials belongs to the institution because their academic staff is directly involved in the designing of teaching and learning materials. Some interviewees reported the ownership of the program belongs to their university department of training.

3. Discussion and implication

Accordingly, we concluded that in the ESL/EFL context like Vietnam there are five factors influencing HE administrators' readiness in diffusing BL in English courses: instructional structure, resource support, management strategies, technology infrastructure, and ethical consideration.

First and foremost, it appears that institutional structure has the most significant effect on the readiness of administrators to diffuse BL. The finding affirmed the results from Yeop et al. (2016) in which argued that institution administration plays the key role in determining the readiness to implement BL because it helps govern staff and learners. The vision/ mission of implementing BL into teaching and learning English needs to be aligned with objectives of the educational program required by the faculties and the institutions. It needs to serve the purpose of improving students' English skills and correspond with the program outcome standards. The vision/mission should be shared and be well-aware of among lecturers, administrators and academic staffs. Besides, advocacy among administrators and staff is important to diffuse BL successfully. Administration advocacy can help to provide needed resources and fundings [Bokolo et al., 2020]. For definition and plan, the finding points out that when the administrators are able to have a clear definition and plan of BL approach, it brings advantages to make strategic decisions and policies to promote BL [Graham et al., 2013].

The effectiveness of resource support also influences administration readiness to diffuse BL. More specifically, it can be noted that technological support and the facilitation of BL show an influential relationship. The result corresponds with findings from Ahmed in which efficient technical and pedagogy support bring significant influence to enhance students' and teachers' acceptance of the BL approach. In terms of pedagogy support, it can be inferred that administrators are well aware of providing lectures proper pedagogy training and guidance. The finding is aligned with Ahmed's study which confirmed that efficient pedagogy support has a positive effect on increasing acceptance of BL implementation by lectures. Based on the interview data, it indicated that technological support and pedagogical support would be the most influential variables in resource support for diffusing BL from administrators' perspective. We found it quite interesting that financial support and tenure/ promotion were not as necessary as we anticipated. The result is in contrast to the work of Porter et al., (2016) which indicated that financial support is essential toward the development of BL implementation.

Furthermore, in terms of management strategies, the result aligned with previous studies which indicated the positive impact of having proper directions and policies to the readiness of diffusing BL approach [Graham et al., 2013; Porter et al., 2016]. Research points out that evaluation of students' perceptions toward lecturers teaching, annual reports, and regular meetings among teachers could be useful channels to identify weaknesses to be improved in the future. Likewise, the provision of professional development for teachers and students is another important factor to successful BL implementation. It is then suggested that providers could make information and resources available online, so faculty members and students could access it on their own schedule and progress at their own rate. In this way, it can also reduce time and cost-effectiveness for the faculty. In addition, having a clear road-map of the ratio between face-to-face classes and online learning makes it easier to oversee the running of BL approach.

The next factor that influences administration readiness in diffusing BL is technology infrastructure. The result is consistent with previous research which confirmed the direct effect of technology infrastructure for effective BL adoption [Porter et al., 2016]. As a result, institutions that are seeking ways to adopt BL must have necessary technology infrastructure to be able to implement BL effectively. In detail, software infrastructure and high-speed networks should be taken into consideration and be upgraded often to meet students and lecturers' requirements.

Last but not least, ethical issues are also needed to be considered because it is one of the factors predicting administration readiness. It can be explained that rules and regulations initiated in BL policies about ownership of course materials, editing and rights privileges of materials created by teachers can influence how materials are used and utilized [Bokolo et al., 2020]. Thus, providing clear policies about ethical issues is necessary to motivate academic staff to design and improve course materials (Graham, 2013) [6], which foster the dissemination via the internet during BL courses. It can also help to save teachers' original ideas and prevent the institution from legal issues in the future [Bokolo et al., 2020].

4. Conclusion

Currently, the number of studies examining the involvement of institutional managers and administrators to assess the readiness in their institutions to diffuse BL is still limited. Besides, prior research focused mainly on the perspectives of students and academic staff to improve teaching and learning, and only a few studies investigated institutions' readiness and diffusion issues. This study then aims to shed some light into that question by identifying factors influencing institutions' administration readiness to investigate the growth or mature BL adoption in English courses in universities in Vietnam. Overall, the results suggested that institutional structure, management strategies, resource support, technology infrastructure, and ethical consideration can affect administration readiness to diffuse BL. We noted that the diffusion of BL in English classrooms has a close relationship with the sufficient investment of technical, pedagogical support for not only teachers but also students, who may lack the necessary skills to learn English online. Realizing and understanding these factors can help administrators to have better guidance in order to institutionalize BL adoption. The study provides some insight into administrators' perspectives on their readiness to diffuse BL of institutions on the stage of growth/ mature implementation. It is expected that other institutions who are at the stage of exploration/ awareness or early implementation/ adoption can retrieve results from this study to organize policies to embrace BL in the future.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, H. M. S. (2010), Hybrid E-Learning acceptance model: Learner perceptions. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 8(2), 313-346.
2. Bokolo Jr, A., Kamaludin, A., Romli, A., Mat Raffei, A. F., A/L Eh Phon, D. N., Abdullah, A., & Baba, S. (2020), A managerial perspective on institutions' administration readiness to diffuse blended learning in higher education: Concept and evidence. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 52(1), 37-64.
3. Dziuban, C., Graham, C. R., Moskal, P. D., Norberg, A., & Sicilia, N. (2018), Blended learning: the new normal and emerging technologies. *International journal of educational technology in Higher education*, 15(1), 1-16.
4. Eldeeb, S. (2019), An investigation into students' views on blended learning at the English Language Institute in King Abdulaziz University. *Arab World English Journal: Special Issue: Application of Global ELT Practices in Saudi Arabia September*.
5. Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2013), Institutional change and leadership associated with blended learning innovation: Two case studies. *The internet and higher education*, 18, 24-28.
6. Graham, C. R., Woodfield, W., & Harrison, J. B. (2013), A framework for institutional adoption and implementation of blended learning in higher education. *The internet and higher education*, 18, 4-14.
7. Hoang, N. T. (2015), EFL teachers' perceptions and experiences of blended learning in a Vietnamese university (Doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology).
8. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/8394/5/1/Ngoc%20Tue_Hoang_Thesis.pdf.
9. Marsh, D. (2012), *Blended learning: Creating learning opportunities for language learners*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

11. Poon, J. (2014), A cross-country comparison on the use of blended learning in property education. *Property management*, 32, 154-175.
12. Porter, W. W., Graham, C. R., Bodily, R. G., & Sandberg, D. S. (2016), A qualitative analysis of institutional drivers and barriers to blended learning adoption in higher education. *The internet and Higher education*, 28, 17-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.08.003>.
13. Rogers, E. M. (2003), *Diffusion of Innovation*. The Free Press.
14. Sharma, P., & Barrett, B. (2007), *Blended learning: Using technology in and beyond the language classroom*. Oxford, UK: Macmillan education.
15. Wong, L., Tatnall, A., & Burgess, S. (2014), A framework for investigating blended learning effectiveness. *Education+ Training*, 56, 233-251. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-04-2013-0049>
16. Wright, B. M. (2017), Blended learning: Student perception of face-to-face and online EFL lessons. *Indonesian journal of applied linguistics*, 7(1), 64-71.
17. Yeop, M. A., Wong, K. T., & Noh, N. M. (2016), *Blended learning in selected journals: A content analysis using the complex adaptive blended learning systems*. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 13 (10), 47-58.
18. Zhang, D., & Zou, Y. (2020), Fostering multiliteracies through blended EFL learning. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT)*.
19. Zhang, W., & Zhu, C. (2018), Comparing learning outcomes of blended learning and traditional face-to-face learning of university students in ESL courses. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 17(2), 251-273.

**Nghiên cứu khảo sát về mức độ sẵn sàng thực hiện mô hình học kết hợp
tại trường đại học ở Việt Nam**

Tóm tắt: Trong thế kỉ 21, ngày càng nhiều các công trình nghiên cứu khoa học tập trung vào việc cải thiện kết quả giảng dạy và học tập khi áp dụng học kết hợp qua lăng kính của học sinh và giáo viên. Tuy nhiên, số lượng các nghiên cứu khảo sát sự sẵn sàng của các nhà quản lí trong việc triển khai thực hiện giảng dạy học kết hợp vẫn còn rất ít. Do đó, để có thể áp dụng được học kết hợp trong giảng dạy thành công đối với các cơ sở giáo dục thì cần có nhiều nghiên cứu về hướng dẫn, cách áp dụng, chiến lược và thực hiện học kết hợp thành công từ các trường đã thực hiện. Vì vậy, nghiên cứu này nhằm xác định các yếu tố có thể ảnh hưởng đến sự sẵn sàng của các nhà quản lí giáo dục đối với việc tổ chức thực hiện học kết hợp ở môi trường đại học. Nghiên cứu này được thực hiện theo phương pháp định tính với dữ liệu được thu thập bằng cách phỏng vấn 11 nhà quản lí ở hai trường đại học ở Việt Nam. Mục đích của các cuộc phỏng vấn là để hiểu sâu hơn về quan điểm của các nhà quản lí khi thực hiện học kết hợp. Kết quả cho thấy các yếu tố về cấu trúc đào tạo, nguồn hỗ trợ, cơ sở hạ tầng, chiến lược quản lí và vấn đề bản quyền có tác động đáng kể đến mức độ sẵn sàng triển khai thực hiện học kết hợp của các nhà quản lí.

Từ khoá: học kết hợp; triển khai học kết hợp; chính sách giáo dục đại học; sự sẵn sàng của nhà quản lí; chiến lược quản trị.