Comparing Hybrid and Flipped Modalities in Remote and Face-to-Face Learning in a Japanese University L2 Academic Writing Course

Ranson Paul Lege

Abstract

Teachers throughout the world are interested in the effectiveness of online and flipped class methods of instruction. During the Covid-19 pandemic, these platforms went from cutting edge to becoming the central teaching platform. Online classes in particular can be effective in teaching reading and writing. In 2013, a hybrid online class was introduced into the academic writing program at the Graduate School of Law at Nagoya University as a way to assist Master's students with their writing needs. Between 2012 – 2023, the same writing courses underwent three phases of development: hybrid, flipped, and fully remote. As part of an action research study, the process included stages of planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting on the design of each of the learning platforms. For the planning and implementing phases, the paper compares the quality measures of the instructional designs. Surveys on student perspectives were used to help with the observing and reflecting phases. Student survey results indicated that, even during the peak of the pandemic, learners were satisfied with all three platforms as they developed.

Keywords: *Hybrid, flipped class, remote, L2 academic writing, graduate students*

Introduction

The Graduate School of Law (GSL) at Nagoya University faces numerous problems regarding the intake of students from abroad. At present, approximately 85% of the students come from other countries, primarily Southeast Asia and China. While some of these learners are recent graduates from their respective colleges, others have been in legal practice or worked for various governmental agencies or ministries. Most of these gifted individuals endeavor to study comparative law on either a Japanese or English track program, which means they take classes and write their theses in one or the other targeted languages.

Three serious constraints restrict the design of an effective academic writing program for such students. First, many of these learners are unprepared for the rigors of thesis writing; in fact, most have never written anything in either language. Second, most are on very restrictive two-year scholarship plans, which places stress on both the student and supervisor to complete work in a limited time frame. Third, many content-based faculty members, who use English as a second language (L2), feel overwhelmed by the experience of trying to

communicate writing expectations, especially in advanced degree programs (Suzuki, 2016).

Before 2012, the story of a Master's candidate entering the GSL law program from abroad was a whirlwind of confusion. The L2 student entered the program, met sporadically with a supervisor, had limited instructional writing, wrote as best they could, and then expected to have their work fixed by a foreign "checker" (Matsuda & Hammill, 2014) so that the final judging committee might find some evidence of mutual understanding in their final product. Essentially, the writing skills did not match the high expectations of the degree requirements (Lege, 2022).

In 2012, the suggestion was made that the law faculty negotiate a comprehensive set of writing guidelines that would be integrated into a newly revised set of classes for those on the English track. The aim of the guidelines was two-fold. The first aim was to provide a mutually understood framework as to what was expected in the writing for the student, supervisor, and final examiner. The second aim was to relieve class time of some of the issues related to basic form (grammar, syntax) so that more time could be spent on functional moves needed to write in such a discourse.

The idea to include a hybrid online learning platform *(Pearson, MyLab Writing)* into the program emerged out of two immediate concerns. First, the introduction of a diagnostic for student writing found that student deficiencies were more profound than earlier believed. Second, the department originally allotted only 65 contact hours (22 required) in academic writing that students could take over two years. This was only a fraction of the time compared to the 400 hours of Japanese language instruction that all learners participated in over the same period. To better facilitate this need, the writing courses underwent three phases of development: hybrid classes that mixed online and F2F learning, a blended course that added flipped class methods, and fully remote. The remainder of this paper looks at the quality measures and student perceptions of each of these phases.

Literature Review

Academic Writing and the L2 Student

Research has begun to look at issues that students from abroad face while in the context of experiencing higher education in Japan (Laurence, 2016, Lee 2017). However, such studies primarily focus on the hardships these students encounter rather than meeting and clarifying their learning needs, especially during the recent pandemic. While the field is replete with texts on the problems that L2 students face in trying to express ideas through written text (Nation, 2009; Bailey, 2011; Ferris & Hedgecock, 2014; and Matsuda & Hammill, 2014), such literature addresses the relationship between L2 students attempting to share knowledge with an L1 instructor in an English speaking country (Seloni & Lee, 2020). More is needed to investigate the problems associated with those L2 students struggling to learn and write in English, in a non-English setting such as Japan, where readers or instructors are generally not L1 proficient.

Online Writing and Student-Centered Learning

A plethora of literature exists on the positive effects of online learning, which includes such things as increases in student engagement and

collaboration, faster feedback time, as well as personalized learning (Crockett, Jukes & McCain, 2010; Twigg, 2013; Pstoka, 2022). Woolner and Clark (2015) studied various forms of web-based or digital courses that have a positive impact on self-directed learning and classroom bonding between student cohorts and instructors. In turn, Al-Jarf (2004) noted a positive relationship between web-based learning and struggling L2 college writers. During the pandemic, many schools were compelled to go to some form of hybrid or direct online learning platform and the results were mixed (Nambiar, 2020; Hen & Sol, 2021).

Meanwhile, critics have contended that many quality issues such as high start-up costs, time, and energy are invested in learning to use digital technologies which deter both students and teachers from such platforms (Lewin, 2013; Straumsheim, 2017). While not critical of such technologies, He (2014) concurred that such costs and the feeling of unpreparedness deter teachers from joining in on such learning environments. Stine (2010) argued that demands of learning technology and academic rules and practices can result in mental stress and overload for students, which were even more serious during the Covid period (Sharin, 2021). In general, while some of these issues were ameliorated before the pandemic, the loss of community remained a problem in designing courses for online platforms (Brown et al. 2023). Many of these issues were true for Japan where educational institutions at all levels were slow to adapt to online learning until Covid hit in 2018 (Wang & Cheng, 2021).

Flipped Class Methods

Instructors can design and employ flipped class methods in either face-to-face (F2F) learning or online platforms. As with online education, the flipped class model has as many advocates (Bergman & Sams, 2014; Talbert, 2017) as detractors (Lewin, 2013; Taylor, 2015). A study conducted by Vanderbilt University found that flipped classes had a positive impact on student learning before COVID-19 (Brame, 2013). Hsiu (2015) stated that flipped learning could increase the active participation of second language learners which in turn affected their language learning. Engin (2014), meanwhile, found that student writing might be enhanced when instructors made their videos rather than using external video sources. Tang et al. (2020) found that an online course designed with flipped class methods saw improved student evaluations compared to those that did not.

Skeptical of the positive use of flipped class methods, Jensen, Krummer, and Godoy (2015) studied classes that used the same type of constructive activities and concluded there were no differences between flipped and non-flipped class settings. Chung and Khe (2017) reviewed various studies and surmised that the efficacy of such a method is affected when students do not understand the rationale for such classes. Korkmaz and Mirici (2021) found that while their students provided a favorable view of online classes that used the flipped method, such learners saw little difference between such an approach and the F2F classes concerning such things as instructional practices and activities. In Japan, the idea of using flipped class methods began to gain some attraction in 2014, Loucky (2017) investigated its application in this country and found that this approach was useful to motivate students in EFL language classes.

Methodology

According to McTaggart (1996), "Action research is not a 'method or procedure' for research but a series of commitments to observe and problematize through practice a series of principles for conducting a social inquiry" (p. 248). Stringer (1999) described the method as a research spiral in which an observer identifies a problem, scours for solutions, plans, takes action, evaluates, revises the original plan, and takes further action. Stringer also explained that an action research study can include a comparative look at either quantitative or qualitative data to help elucidate the different phases. Essentially, the process for this research paper underwent planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting phases for each of the platforms described here.

As such, this paper describes the procedures that I undertook to design writing classes that evolved with the use of three different learning platforms. Each one of these platforms underwent various phases of planning, implementation, observation, and reflection. The first platform combined typical face-to-face learning (F2F) with online educational software to reflect a hybrid approach from 2012 to 2016. In 2017, upon reflection, I decided to experiment with converting the F2F segment into flipped classes while continuing to use elements of the educational software in the previous period (essentially a blended class). In 2019, due to the pandemic, we were forced to switch to a synchronous remote platform; as such, the third platform consisted of moving the blended model from F2F to remote until mid-2023.

For purposes of brevity, the study presents two forms of evaluations for the four phases of planning, implementing, observing, and reflection which occurred in overlapping cycles of effort. The first form of evaluation compares the "usability indicators" of the hybrid and flipped classes. Such a comparison was not done for the remote classes because for this platform it was simply a matter of providing a Zoom link to students in the Learning Management System (LMS). Students already had computers and access to the LMS while working with the hybrid platform so while some adjustments were made these were minor compared to developing the other two phases of instructional design (hybrid and flipped). The second form of evaluation presents data from student evaluations which helped in the observation and reflection phases in developing these classes.

The discussion includes a look at some of the quality measures (such as time and money) that go into the planning and implementing phases of such an instructional design. Such a discussion is important because Taylor (2015) and Jensen, Krummer, and Godoy (2015) criticized that many studies concerning the use of technology in education often do not clarify what it takes to plan and implement such learning platforms. Thus, this paper includes a heuristic comparison of the actual "usability indicators" related to such things as costs, instructor learning time, student learning time, and accessibility. Critics of such new teaching methods often argue that research showing the success of a particular approach does not include the actual expense or inputs in adapting technology to the classroom. In contrast, research showing mixed or negative results is often judged as not having been designed in "the right way." Therefore, a comparison of the "usability indicators" helps to offset such criticism from either side.

For the observing and reflection phases of this action research, this paper will provide results

from descriptive quantitative data from student evaluations of these three different educational delivery approaches. This article includes data culled from general student surveys between 2012 – 2017 on the hybrid classes and surveys conducted between 2017 – 2023 on the flipped classes and the classes that were conducted remotely during COVID-19. The surveys include data in which the students evaluated the main design element (online software and the flipped class materials) and how they rated the overall class delivery relative to other courses they took.

Evaluation of the Three Platforms 2012-2023

This section will describe the GSL academic writing courses with the usability indicators and provide results from student evaluations on the effectiveness of the hybrid, flipped class approaches in the F2F and remote instructional settings. A clear understanding of the usability indicators of the online lab and the flipped class model satisfies the criticism that such data is necessary to gain a full picture of such learning environments. Such a comparison is useful as a matter of transparency and helps those interested in the practical aspects of committing to such learning venues (He, 2014). While seemingly expensive at first, the educational institution or program should consider that such costs represent a long-term investment in students (Twigg, 2013). Moreover, faculty should never underestimate the value of student evaluations in designing both present and future course needs (Hadid et al., 2020).

The Hybrid Class

The designing of an English writing program or curriculum can depend on several key factors such as departmental demands, time constraints, and the pedagogical views of the instructors (Frodesen, 1995). Furthermore, an instructor must consider the needs of the student as well as their skills, habits, and motivation when designing a learning course or program (Dirksen, 2016). As mentioned above, the GSL faculty's demands for improving the form, function, and usage of student writing to satisfy the expectations of an advanced thesis were difficult to meet given the limited class times that students could take writing courses. Students needed time to learn, develop, and apply skills that would help in this endeavor.

In 2012, as a way to stretch that time frame, grant funds were provided to subscribe MyLab Writing, which is a curative software program developed by Pearson Education that is accessed via specially purchased codes. This product is customizable and includes various scaffolding modules, writing exercises, and a class chat room that can be used according to instructional needs. The use of such a tool can be applied either synchronously or asynchronously to a course design as the access codes allow students accessibility from anywhere at any time.

In 2013, the lab was fully integrated into the GSL academic writing courses whereby the instructor could manage, supervise, and assess the learners as they went through the modules. The essential idea was to have students self-manage many of the issues related to form (grammar, syntax) so that the class time could be used to concentrate on more of the functional aspects of writing (organization, meaning) related to a genre-based approach. That is, the courses were designed to focus on the elaborative elements needed to write a thesis or dissertation in comparative law.

As this was integrated into the regular on-campus F2F course, it represented a hybrid

class according to Warnock's (2009) definition whereby any class that was half onsite and half online was deemed a blended learning environment. According to Merriam (2008), such a hybrid class offers remedial students of writing a better learning environment than a direct online course because there is a mix of class community and interaction that develops with the instructor and other members of a class. Essentially, the lab operated as a textbook to meet the needs of L2 graduate students with limited writing experience in English.

Usability Indicators for the Hybrid Course

The data collected for the information in Figure 1 below came partly from student evaluations and personal observations by the instructor over the period 2012-2023. The institution had to pay an initial start-up or licensing fee of $2,500 to Pearson Education. As shown in the figure, students paid nothing for access to the course because the department funded the yearly costs of $32 per student (the cost of a textbook). The students need assistance with access as the steps are not easy. For the instructor, the learning curve can be long because much of it depends upon the personal abilities of each person to manipulate the technology. After feeling comfortable with the lab program, students rated things such as mobility, interaction, and tech support as relatively good.

In addition, students found the instructional material helpful, the assessment feedback productive, and the general design very good. On average, the learners reported spending about 60 – 90 minutes per week, some longer, as the program offered extra practice. As long as supervision provided substantive feedback and assistance with the tech, students seemed satisfied with the software program. In general, the instructor could expect to spend about 6 –7 hours supervising, discussing, and feedback on written assignments per week. But, over time, the instructor could cut down on some of this time by becoming proficient and knowledgeable with the software program.

Figure 1. *Usability indicators for hybrid class, 2012-2013*

Quality factors	Instructor view	Student view
Costs	Subscription $2,500 Access code fee $32/ student	0
Accessibility	Requires access code, nitial access is not easy	Difficult
ILearning curve	Long	Not easy
Mobile ready	Good	Very good
Interaction	Good	Good
Tech Support	Good	Fair
Instructional Material	Good	Very Good
Assessment	Good	Excellent
Design	Very good	Very good
Time factor/ week	6-7 hours	60–90 minutes

Student Evaluation of the Hybrid Course

Initially, the lab was open to all students in the department and was to be used as a reference source in which learners would have asynchronous participation on demand. This essentially meant that in 2012 all students (n=83) in the department and not

just those in my class (n=24) would have independent access without much oversight or accountability. As Table 1 below shows, both participation (12% of total students) and evaluation in 2012 were low as 74% of students rated the software as low. As a result, I quickly requested that we integrate the software into the course and make it part of the class requirement. In addition, it was available only to those learners taking the course. As the table shows, both participation and evaluation of the lab improved dramatically. From 2012 to 2017, the number of students fully engaging in the software rose to 92% and favorable ratings improved as well. Though not shown, data from 2017 – 2023 would largely maintain a positive approval rating.

Table 1. *Participation and Evaluation of the MYWRITINGLAB, 2012-2017*

Year	# Students	Partici-pat ion	High Rating	Mod. Rating	Low rating
2012	83	12%	1%	25%	74%
2013	22	83%	37%	40%	23%
2014	34	87%	39%	46%	15%
2015	26	90%	40%	48%	12%
2016	26	90%	45%	48%	7%
2017	28	92%	51%	41%	8%

There were several reasons for this change. First, integrating the software into the course content incentivized student interest. Second, by making it part of the course, the instructor had to manage its operation but also hold students accountable for the work. This meant instructor presence was important to ensure that students used the tool. Third, narrowing access to the lab to a limited number of students meant the instructor could direct more attention to those with immediate needs. In general, these results were in line with research that showed that while initial costs in time and money in any digital program can be high (Battaglino, Haldeman, & Laurans, 2012), the investment in the outcomes can pay off in the end (Talbert, 2017).

As shown, the design of the hybrid class underwent several phases of development. The planning phase involved matching the needs of the students with the potential use of an accessible software program. The implementation and observation phases helped to decide how the software should be used within the class context. From the observations and student evaluations, I was able to reflect on additional ways to improve and refine the instructional design of the writing courses. Table 2 below provides collected data on how well the students rated the overall hybrid class approach relative to other courses they took in their program.

Table 2 *Student Comparison of hybrid class to all other courses, 2012-2016*

Year	Students	Comparison with other classes	Difficulty	Improved writing skills	Social Interaction	Instructor Presence
2012	24	Slightly Hi	Higher	Moderate	High	Moderate
2013	22	Slightly Hi	Moderate	Moderate	High	Moderate
2014	34	High	Higher	Moderate	Moderate	High
2015	26	High	Moderate	High	High	High
2016	26	High	Moderate	High	High	High

As Table 2 above shows, students rated the hybrid course higher relative to all the other courses they attended in the program even though it was more difficult. However, as I tweaked the design and improved the course, students felt it was less difficult while also helping them to improve their writing skills. One of the important aspects culled from the data was that students evaluated a higher sense of social interaction in this course relative to what would occur later in the remote classes.

The Flipped Class Method

While outcomes over these same years indicated that student writing was improving on prescriptive things such as grammar and basic organization, there remained issues with the elaborative aspects of their writing, for example, how to write a thesis statement or abstract. In 2016, I decided to consider the use of a flipped class model to possibly boost the opportunities for learners to work on these elaborative moves needed to write their theses and dissertations. This experiment with the flipped class, then, represents the next stage of the action plan.

The actual implementation of the flipped class occurred in conjunction with the continued use of the My Writing Lab. The flipped class simply reduced the amount of "lecturing" that occurred in the previous F2F hybrid class. The main point of experimenting with the flipped class approach was to help find ways to extend the amount of "writing" time or practice that students might need to improve their skills. Since actual contact time was limited, a flipped class approach would allow students to have a library of information that they could access before they came to class so that we could practice the skills in class. To properly use this approach, some costs and learning time were essential to ensuring its success because it requires developing a high delivery of lessons.

Usability Indicators for the Flipped Class

As with the online lab, the students paid no direct costs for flipped class learning; however, the initial costs on the program side were rather pricey because it involved teacher training as well as the purchasing of equipment and software to develop videos. Our budget allowed me to attend a few conferences and online courses to better prepare and deal with some of the micro issues related to developing a flipped class. However, as Figure 2 below shows, a person could easily spend $250 – $3,000 on learning how to be proficient with such a delivery system. There are ways around some of these costs but some investment in professional development may still be necessary to learn how to use technology effectively; for example, we initially purchased Camtasia to help with editing of videos when GoogleForm can be used at no cost. The initial step of producing a video can take 3-5 hours (preparing, shooting, editing), but after completion, the lesson is set for future use and thus a library of lessons can quickly accumulate.

While the learning for the instructor can be very steep, students pay nothing as long as the program has a solid Learning Management System (LMS) in which they can access the instructional videos. Access can be complicated by distance, and unlike the pre-packaged lab, the instructor is responsible for the tech issues. Thus, an instructor that is well-trained in making their videos will most likely provide quality and manageable content that students will find appealing. In general, Students rated all other quality aspects as good to excellent and found that they only needed about 20 minutes to watch and complete the quizzes on the video. Inserting small quizzes into such videos is optional, but important for instructors concerned with student accountability.

Figure 2. *Usability Indicators for the flipped classes, 2017*

Quality factors	Instructor view	Student view
Costs	Training ($250-3,000) Lightboard ($100-$700) Software, camera, lighting ($150-$1,000) Our investment; $5,000	0
Accessibility	Shared via URL	Good
Learning curve	Can be very long	(depends on link)
Mobile ready	Excellent	Excellent
Interaction	Good	Good
Tech Support	Depends on instructor	Good
Instructional Material	Good	Very Good
Assessment	Good	Excellent
Design	Very good	Very good
Time factor/ week	3-5 hrs making a lesson. 1 hr assessment	20 minutes

Student Evaluations between 2017 – 2023

In general, students in the GSL program had become accustomed to and satisfied with both the hybrid and flipped class methods relative to many of their other courses up to 2017. From 2017 to 2019, the classes were conducted F2F using the flipped class as the primary mode of delivery, but after the onset of Covid, all classes shifted to remote access only. With improvements in the flipped class method, the students would come to evaluate the approach more highly as it was integrated more regularly into the remote writing courses. Thus, Table 3 below presents data from surveys collected between 2017 – 2023 that asked about student perceptions regarding the combination of the flipped class methods in these writing courses compared to other courses they took in their program.

Table 3. *Comparison of the flipped class AW course with all other courses, 2017-2023*

Year	Students	Comparison with other classes	Difficulty	Improved writing skills	Social Interaction	Instructor Presence
2017 (F2F)	27	Slightly Hi	Higher	Moderate	Low	Moderate
2018 (F2F)	25	Slightly Hi	Moderate	Moderate	Low	High
2019 (F2F)	21	High	Higher	Moderate	Same	High
2020 (R)	20	High	Moderate	High	Low	Moderate
2021 (R)	19	High	Moderate	High	Same	High
2022 (R)	19	High	Higher	High	Moderate	High
2023 (R)	17	High	Moderate	High	Moderate	High

The table above reflects the perceptions of students in the third stage of the action plan, which would eventually include full integration of both and flipped class methods first into F2F (2017-2019) and then remote (R) writing courses (2020-2023). In addition, elements of the educational software were still required for use because the material covered much of the form of writing (grammar and punctuation), while the flipped lessons guided students on the elaborative aspects of writing a thesis (such as how to write an abstract). Because students were already set up with an LMS, the instructor only needed to send out a Zoom link to conduct the remote class, there was no need to evaluate the "usability indicators" for this latter phase of the study.

As the data above indicates, in the period between 2017 and 2023 the number of students participating in the GSL academic writing classes declined. This was primarily the result of the pandemic which impacted an assortment of issues related to recruitment, scholarships, and even things such as acquiring visas. As the table shows, students evaluated the combined approach in the AW class as higher relative to their other graduate courses, especially during the COVID-19 period in which all classes were conducted remotely (2020 – 2023).

However, the results indicated both positive and negative attitudes toward the flipped class approach, especially during the period when classes went remote. On the positive side, students found that this combined approach helped to improve their writing, which was related to the importance of feedback (Teng & Zheng, 2020). In addition, students evaluated the instructor's presence in this specific course as more favorable compared to their other courses. Instructor presence is a critical element that can make or break the effectiveness of a remote course (Stewart, 2021). Ways to improve instructor presence include activities that build rapport with students and make videos on how the tech works as well as on the substantive material of a course.

Meanwhile, on the negative side, students found the AW courses moderately more difficult relative to their other classes and bemoaned the lack of social interaction in such a class setting. The reasons they found the writing classes more difficult, however, was that it required them to take more responsibility for their learning compared to typical F2F classes, and included overcoming anxieties related to using technology. Again, developing friendly user videos that explain the technology can help alleviate some of the concerns students have about an online course.

In terms of social interaction, the students found it lower compared to some of their other F2F classes, but nearly the same or slightly better compared to other online classes that were mandatory during the Covid period. Improving the sense of community in a remote class continues to be a problem for online courses (Kebritchi et al., 2017; Rasheed et al.2020). But, as Table 3 suggests, strong instructor presence may have had a positive effect on social interaction (Rapanta, 2020), though more study in this area is needed. However, during this period, the instructor was able to reflect and adjust to this problem by building more of a rapport with the students and finding ways to encourage social interaction.

Discussion: Comparing the Two Approaches in the Two Different Settings

Usability indicators are a major concern for any online design scheme (Hewett, 2015). Teachers with few resources in time and

money could find it difficult to undertake either of these modalities. But, with recent developments with platforms such as Google Classrooms, instructors can reduce some of the costs. For the flipped class approach, the instructor will need more initial time to learn and develop lessons and videos as well as manage technological issues, but this could pay off with less time needed in lesson planning and grading later. For the hybrid class that uses a subscribed software (ie paid license), the instructor will have less of a learning curve, and fewer technological worries but may invest more time in supervising and grading.

Overall, the students in our program perceived the online lab as better than the flipped class but mainly because they had become accustomed to the structure and design of the lab and because of the lack of social interaction when going remote. Following Chung and Khe's (2017) research, the rationale of the flipped classes for the GSL may not have been fully understood at first but would change over time. Some of the students felt more pressure to perform at higher levels with the flipped classes (Stine 2010), while the online lab gave them more time to revise their work. In addition, the feedback and discussion that occurred with the instructor online afforded more direct and private interaction than with flipped classes in only the F2F platform, which matched the research by Merriam (2008). Unlike Taylor (2015), tech issues were not seen as a major stumbling block to using either of these modalities, and students preferred both of these methods over traditional classroom lecturing.

In general, if both modalities are well designed and instructor presence is strong, then student attitudes toward either modalities (hybrid or flipped) in F2F or remote platforms should be fairly equal. However, the loss of a sense of community or student social interaction that occurs with remote learning tends to decrease the appeal of such learning approaches. During the Covid period, the instructor was able to observe and reflect on this issue and make some adjustments to improve learner satisfaction especially compared to the other classes that students took at this time (see Table 2).

Conclusion

As part of action research, this paper aimed to provide data and analysis of an academic writing course that underwent various phases of development between 2012 – 2023. The design of these courses aimed at meeting the needs of L2 students in the Graduate School of Law at Nagoya University who required additional time to learn the skills and habits to write a satisfactory thesis or dissertation. The instructional design for the academic writing classes evolved with the use of the three learning platforms: a hybrid class that met F2F (2012-2017), a F2F class that used both hybrid and flipped class modalities (2017-2019), and a remote class that employed both of the same modalities (2019-2023). The action plan for each of the platforms included a planning, implementing, observation, and reflection phase. The paper provided data on "usability indicators" and student surveys to help describe the process of the development of these writing classes.

While developing and using licensed software or learning to make personal videos for flipped class perhaps can be expensive and time-consuming, this does not have to be the case. With the help of grant money, our program was able to make the expenditure to ensure that we could optimize the chances of success. However, as the evaluations in each phase indicate, the students found that

the investment in designing these approaches was relatively effective compared to a typical F2F and more importantly in helping them to improve their writing skills. While students initially evaluated the flipped class as moderately effective in the F2F phase, their attitudes were increasingly positive as adjustments were made when classes went remote. Since students became accustomed to working online (phase 1) and in the use of flipped classes (phase 2), it may have affected more positive feelings about such a remote class (phase 3) relative to many of their other remote courses in the program. While concerns about social interaction continue to be a problem for all remote classes, a strong instructor presence that can deal with the tech needs of students while delivering interactive lessons can reduce some of these concerns.

The Author

Ranson Paul Lege, PhD, has lived and taught in Japan for over thirty years. While his interests are in the Humanities and Information Science, he has been teaching academic writing in Japanese colleges for nearly 25 years. In 2012, he helped to design a new academic writing program for the Graduate School of Law at Nagoya University that included advances in distance, online and remote learning. In addition, he enjoys walking, reading, traveling, antiques, and counselling his students.

References

Al-Jarf, R. S. (2004). The effects of web-based learning on struggling EFL college writers. *Foreign Language Annals, 37*(1), 49-57.

Bailey, A. (2011). *Academic writing: A handbook for international students, 3rd ed.* Routledge.

Battaglino, T. B., Haldeman, M., & Laurans, E. (2012). Creating sound policy for digital learning. *Thomas B. Fordham Institute.* Retrieved May 4, 2023 from http://www.edexcellencemedia.net/publications/2012/20120110

Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2014). Flipping For mastery. *Educational Leadership, 71*(4), 24-29.

Brame, Cythnia J. (2013). Flipping the classroom. *Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching.* Retrieved April 21, 2023, http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/flipping-the-classroom/

Brown, M., Hoon, A.E., Edwards, M., Shabu, S., Okoronkwo, I., Newton, P.M. (2023). A pragmatic evaluation of university student experience of remote digital learning during the COVID-19 pandemic, focusing on lessons learned for future practice. *PLoS ONE 18*(5). Retrieved May 16, 2023 from https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0283742

Chung, K. L., & Khe, F. W. (2017) A critical review of flipped classroom challenges in K-12 education: Possible solutions and recommendation for future research. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 12*(4), 1-22. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from http://dx.doi.10.1186/s41039-016-0044-2

Crockett, L., Jukes I., & McCain, T. (2010). Understanding the digital generation teaching and learning in the new digital landscape. Sage.

Dirksen, J. (2016). Design for how people learn. Pearson Education.

Engin, M. (2014). Extending the flipped

classroom model: developing second language writing skills through student-created digital videos. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 14*(5), 12–26.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgecock, J. S. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice.* Routledge.

Frodeson, J. (1995). Negotiating the syllabus: A learning-centered, interactive approach to ESL graduate writing course design. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research & pedagogy,* Ablex Publishing.

Hadid, Y., Keren, B. & Naveh, G. (2020). The relative importance of teaching evaluation criteria from the points of view of students and faculty. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(2), 447-459. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1665623

He, Y. (2014). Universal design for learning in an online teacher education course: Enhancing learners' confidence to teach online. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 10*(2), 283-297. https://jolt.merlot.org/vol10no2/he_0614.pdf

Heng, K. & Sol, K. (2021). Online learning during COVID-19: Key challenges and suggestions to enhance effectiveness. *Cambodian Journal of Educational Research, 1*(1), 3–16. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346719308_Online_learning_during_COVID-19_Key_challenges_and_suggestions_to_enhance_effectiveness

Hewett, B. L. (2015). Reading to learn and writing to teach: Literacy strategies for online writing instruction. Bedford/St. Martin's.

Hsiu, T. H. (2015). Flipping the classroom for English language learners to foster active learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Language Learners, 28*(1), 81-96.

Kebritchi, M., Lipschuetz, A., & Santiague, L. (2017). Issues and Challenges for Teaching Successful Online Courses in Higher Education: A Literature Review. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 46*(1), 4-29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239516661713

Kormaz, S. & Mirici, H.I., (2021). Converting a conventional flipped class into a synchronous online flipped class during COVID-19: university students' self-regulation skills and anxiety. *Interactive Learning Environments,* 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.2018615

Laurence, D. (2016). Trend in access to higher education in Japan. *Oncue Journal, 9*(3), 261-272.

Lee, J. S. (2017). Challenges of international students in a Japanese university: Ethnographic perspectives, *Journal of International Students, 7*(1), 73-93.

Lege, R. P. (2022). Online and Remote Learning in the Graduate School of Law, Nagoya University: The importance of Design, Accessibility, Reliability, and Need (DARN), *Journal of the International Education & Exchange Center 9*, 35-47.

Lewin, T. (2013). Professors at San Jose State criticize online courses. *The New York Times,* http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/03/education

Loucky, J. P. (2017) Motivating and empowering students' language learning in flipped integrated English classes. In J. P. Loucky & J. L. Ware (eds) Flipped Instruction Methods and Digital Technologies in the Language Learning Classroom. Scopus.

Matsuda, P. K., & Hammill, M. J. (2014). Second language writing. In G. Tate et al (eds) *A guide to composition pedagogies*. Oxford University Press.

Merriam, S. B. (2008). Third update on adult learning: New directions for adult and continuing education. Jossey-Bass.

McTaggart R. (1996). Issues for participatory action researchers. In O. Zuber-Skerritt (ed.). *New directions in action research,* Falmer Press.

Nambiar, D. (2020). The impact of online learning during COVID-19: students' and teachers' perspective. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 8*(2), 783-793. https://doi:10.25215/0802.094

Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing.* Routledge.

Pearson Education. (n.d.). MyLab Writing. https://mlm.pearson.com/global/mywritinglab/

Psotka. J. (2022) Exemplary online education: for whom online learning can work better. *Interactive Learning Environments, 30*(2), 199-201.

Rapanta, C., Botturi, L., Goodyear, P., Guàrdia, L. & Koole, M. (2020). Online university teaching during and after the Covid-19 crisis: Refocusing teacher presence and learning Activity. *Postdigit Science Education 2,* 923–945. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00155-y

Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A. & Nor, A.A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. *Computers & Education,144,* 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103701

Seloni, L & Lee, S. H. (2020). Second language writing instruction in global contexts: English language teacher preparation and development. Multilingual Matters.

Schmidt, K. (2002). Classroom action research: A case study assessing students' perceptions and learning outcomes of classroom teaching versus on-line teaching. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 40*(1). http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTTE

Sharin, A.N. (2021). E-Learning during Covid-19: A review of literature. *Malaysian Journal of Media Studies, 23*(1), 15-28. https://doi.org/10.22452/jpmm.vol23no1.2

Straumsheim, C. (2017). Online education, costs more not less. *Inside Higher Education.* https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/02/17

Stewart, M.K. (2021). Social presence in online writing instruction: Distinguishing between presence, comfort, attitudes, and learning. *Computers and Composition, 68,* 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2021.102669

Stine, L. (2010). Basically unheard: Developmental writers and the conversation on online learning. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 38*(2), 132-48.

Stringer, E. T. (1999). *Action Research.* Sage.

Suzuki, S. T. (2016) Formal Academic Writing Instruction to Advanced English Learner Groups in Science and Engineering. *OnCue Journal, 8*(2), 189-197.

Talbert, R. (2017). Flipped learning: A guide for higher education faculty. Stylus Publishing.

Teng, S. H. & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Empowering learners in the second/foreign language classroom: Can self-regulated learning strategies-based writing instruction make a difference? *Journal of Second Language, 48,* 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100701

Tang, T., Abuhmaid, AM., Olaimat, M., Oudat, D.M., Hadhramout, M.A., & Bamanger E. (2020). Efficiency of flipped classroom with online-based teaching under COVID-19. *Interactive Learning Environments, 31*(2), 1077-1088. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1817761

Taylor, Aaron. (2015). Flipping Great or Flipping Useless? A review of the flipped classroom experiment at Coventry University London Campus. *Journal of Pedagogic Development, 5*(3). https://journals.beds.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/jpd/article/view/230

Twigg, C. (2013). Improving learning and reducing costs: New models for online learning. *The National Center for Academic Transformation.* http://www.thencat.org./Articles/NewModels.html

Wang, S., Chen, A. (2021). Cultural factors in urgent transition to online learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic – Case studies from Japan and China. In: Li, R., Cheung, S.K.S., Iwasaki, C., Kwok, LF., Kageto, M. (eds) Blended Learning: Re-thinking and Re-defining the Learning Process. ICBL 2021. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science,* vol 12830. Springer.

Warnock, S. (2009). *Teaching writing online: How and why.* NCTE.

Woolner, P., & Clark, A. (2015). *Developing shared understandings of learning environments: interactions with students, teachers, and other professionals.* Routledge.