TEACHING MIXED EDUCATION IN ACADEMIC LYCEUMS: CHALLENGES AND POSSIBILITIES

Khadjibayeva Shakhzoda

Head English teacher Institution: Academic Lyceum named after M.S. Vosiqova under TSUL,

Tashkent, Uzbekistan Corresponding email: [shaggy.english@gmail.com]

Glossary

• Academic Lyceum: A type of secondary institution in Uzbekistan and some other contexts, typically affiliated with universities, that prepares students for higher education.

• Action Research: A participatory process where practitioners plan, act, observe, and reflect to improve their own practice in cycles.

• Asynchronous Learning: Learning activities completed at different times by students, often using recorded videos, online platforms, or written assignments.

• Blended Learning / Mixed Education: The intentional integration of face-to-face instruction with online learning experiences.

• CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages): A widely used international standard for measuring language proficiency.

• Cognitive Overload: A state where the amount of information presented exceeds a learner's processing capacity, reducing learning effectiveness.

• Formative Assessment: Assessment for learning that provides feedback during the learning process rather than at the end.

• LMS (Learning Management System): A software platform that organizes and tracks online learning materials, activities, and student progress.

• Low-Bandwidth Engagement Protocol (LBEP): A set of strategies designed to ensure student access to learning materials even with weak internet connectivity.

• Mastery Ladder: An assessment framework that uses multiple forms of evidence to determine student proficiency at different levels.

• Mixed-Mode Instruction: Teaching that combines online and offline (in-person) learning formats.

• Oral Defense: A form of assessment in which students verbally justify their work or reasoning, often in front of teachers or peers.

• Studio Friday: A lyceum-specific innovation where students work on interdisciplinary projects in collaborative groups.

• Synchronous Learning: Real-time learning where students and teachers interact simultaneously, either in person or online.

• Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD): A concept by Vygotsky describing the difference between what a learner can do independently and what they can achieve with guidance.

Abstract

This article examines the design, implementation, and evaluation of mixed education (blended learning) in academic lyceums, with a focus on the Uzbek context where lyceums

bridge lower secondary and higher education. Drawing on seminal scholarship—Garrison and Kanuka's (2004) "blended learning" framework and Graham's (2006, 2013) delineation of models—we analyze the pedagogical and organizational affordances of combining face-to-face and online learning. The study reports findings from a year-long action research project conducted at an academic lyceum (N = 146 students, 12 teachers) across English, law, mathematics, and ICT courses. Data sources included classroom observations, learning analytics from a learning management system (LMS), student/teacher surveys, semi-structured interviews, and achievement results. The analysis identifies key challenges (digital inequity, instructional design load, assessment integrity, cognitive overload, and teacher role redefinition) and possibilities (personalization, data-informed feedback, inclusive participation, time-on-task gains, and interdisciplinary projects). The article presents four practical novelties piloted and refined through iterative action cycles: (1) a "3×3" micro-cycle lesson architecture; (2) a mastery-based assessment ladder with triangulated evidence; (3) a low-bandwidth engagement protocol; and (4) a "studio Friday" model for interdisciplinary capstones. Results indicate statistically and educationally significant gains in course completion rates (+11.8%), reading/listening proficiency in English (+0.5 CEFR bands median), and reduced non-completion due to absence (−37%). The article concludes with an implementation roadmap for lyceums, limitations, and recommendations for policy and teacher professional development.

Keywords: blended learning, mixed education, academic lyceum, Uzbekistan, action research, instructional design, assessment, inclusive pedagogy

Introduction

Academic lyceums serve as selective, pre-tertiary institutions designed to accelerate academic preparation and cultivate disciplinary depth. In many post-Soviet and Central Asian contexts, lyceums also carry a nation-building mission: preparing youth for globalized higher education and knowledge economies while maintaining cultural and linguistic identity. Amid this mandate, "mixed education"—a purposeful blend of face-to-face instruction with synchronous/asynchronous online learning—has moved from emergency practice to strategic design.

The promise of mixed education is not merely logistical flexibility. Rather, it is the opportunity to redistribute time and cognitive labor toward higher-order thinking, apprenticeships in academic discourse, and differentiated pathways. Yet lyceums face structural constraints: limited budgets, uneven connectivity, assessment regimes emphasizing high-stakes examinations, and teachers whose preparation focused primarily on traditional classroom pedagogy. This article addresses the central question: How can academic lyceums implement mixed education to maximize learning while minimizing friction for teachers and students?

We pursue this question through a literature-informed action research study in one academic lyceum during the 2024–2025 academic year. The study surfaces context-specific challenges and generates design novelties grounded in evidence and teacher inquiry.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Defining Mixed (Blended) Education

Garrison and Kanuka (2004) define blended learning as the "thoughtful integration of classroom face-to-face learning experiences with online learning experiences," emphasizing not the ratio but the synergy of modes. Graham (2006, 2013) clarifies this integration by describing three principal dimensions: (a) space/time (synchronous vs. asynchronous), (b) human–technology roles (teacher-centered to learner-centered), and (c) fidelity of tasks (from replication to transformation).

The consensus across reviews is that blended environments can outperform purely online or purely face-to-face formats when the blend is intentional and when assessment, feedback, and student support are redesigned rather than merely digitized (Means et al., 2013; Graham, 2013).

2.2. Mechanisms of Impact

Hattie's (2009, 2012) synthesis underscores feedback (d = 0.70), formative evaluation (d = 0.90), and teacher clarity (d = 0.75) as high-impact influences on student achievement. Mixed education can amplify these mechanisms by: (1) creating more frequent, low-stakes checkpoints; (2) visualizing progress through LMS analytics; and (3) freeing synchronous time for feedback-rich seminars and rehearsals. Vygotskian perspectives on the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) support the use of scaffolds and peer mediation via structured online forums and collaborative documents, enabling learners to operate just beyond independent capacity while maintaining psychological safety.

2.3. Challenges Identified in Prior Research

Commonly reported challenges include digital inequity, time costs for instructional design, and academic integrity concerns in remote assessments (Graham, 2013). Teachers require new pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) to blend modalities coherently (Mishra & Koehler, 2006), while students must develop self-regulation and media literacy. Institutional policies and infrastructure shape feasibility: bandwidth constraints, device access, and technical support are decisive (Horn & Staker, 2015).

2.4. Relevance to Academic Lyceums

Lyceums tend to be exam-oriented and schedule-driven. Mixed education in such settings must align with curricular standards (e.g., CEFR for English, national competency frameworks in mathematics and law), while offering space for inquiry and project-based work. Research suggests blended designs are particularly effective when they: (a) map online tasks to higher-order objectives; (b) retain in-person sessions for discourse and application; and (c) maintain transparent routines to reduce cognitive load (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Graham, 2013).

3. Context and Methodology

3.1. Setting and Participants

The study took place in an academic lyceum affiliated with a public university in a major Uzbek city. Participants included 146 students (aged 15–18) across four subject strands—English (N=58), law (N=36), mathematics (N=32), and ICT (N=20)—and 12 teachers with 3–22 years of experience. Approximately 21% of students reported intermittent home internet access; 12% shared a device with siblings.

3.2. Action Research Design

We employed a participatory action research (PAR) framework across two semesters (September–December; February–May). Each cycle followed the classic plan–act–observe–reflect stages. Design meetings produced shared lesson templates, assessment rubrics, and technology protocols. Teachers implemented the plans and collected data; a research team facilitated observations and reflection workshops.

3.3. Mixed-Education Model

The lyceum adopted a hybrid-block schedule with two 45-minute face-to-face sessions weekly per course and one 60-minute online synchronous seminar, plus asynchronous tasks (2–3 hours). Core tools included an open-source LMS, video-conferencing, and collaborative documents. To address access disparity, all materials were made mobile-first, compressed under 20 MB per week, and mirrored on USB drives for offline access.

3.4. Data Sources and Analysis

Quantitative data included: attendance records, LMS log-ins and task completion, assessment scores, and CEFR-aligned English benchmarks (diagnostic, midterm, final). Qualitative data derived from student surveys (Likert + open-ended), teacher interviews, and observation notes (structured protocol). We applied descriptive statistics, pre-post comparisons (paired t-tests where appropriate), and thematic coding. In reporting, we emphasize effect sizes and practical significance, not only p-values.

3.5. Ethics

Participation was voluntary with opt-out alternatives. Student data were de-identified for analysis. The study followed institutional guidelines for ethical practice in educational research.

4. Findings: Challenges in Mixed Education

4.1. Digital Inequity and Fragile Access

Despite mobile-first design, 18–22% of students experienced connectivity dropouts during synchronous sessions. Students with shared devices logged in less often and submitted fewer multimedia tasks. Teachers reported repeatedly re-teaching content due to uneven access.

Implication: Equity requires redundant pathways (synchronous + asynchronous + offline) and low-bandwidth content norms.

4.2. Instructional Design Load

Teachers reported an initial +4–6 hours/week of preparation to convert lessons into blended format: creating short videos, interactive quizzes, and discussion prompts. The cognitive demand of aligning objectives across modes was the primary source of stress.

Implication: Shared repositories, templates, and "design sprints" reduce solo workload.

4.3. Assessment Integrity and Validity

Proctored online tests faced identity and collaboration concerns. Teachers adopted larger banks of items and open-book designs, but alignment with high-stakes external exams remained a tension.

Implication: Shift from single high-stakes tests to triangulated evidence and task-authenticity reduces incentives for misconduct while preserving rigor.

4.4. Cognitive Overload and Fragmentation

Students reported that navigating multiple platforms and deadlines was exhausting. When asynchronous tasks lacked clear time estimates and exemplars, completion quality declined.

4.5. Teacher Role Reconfiguration

Facilitation overtook lecturing. Some teachers felt their expertise was "invisible" in online forums; others embraced coaching roles. Professional identity work was required to see facilitation as advanced pedagogy rather than a reduction of expertise.

5. Findings: Possibilities Unlocked by Mixed Education

5.1. Personalization and Mastery Paths

Asynchronous modules enabled self-pacing and targeted practice. Findings: Challenges in Mixed Education

- Digital inequity: Many students lack reliable internet or devices.
- High teacher workload: Lesson preparation doubled due to dual-mode delivery.
- Assessment integrity: Cheating and unreliable online tests emerged.
- Cognitive overload: Too many platforms and tasks confused students.
- Teacher role redefinition: Teachers shifted from "knowledge givers" to "facilitators."

Possibilities of Mixed Education

- Personalized learning: Students could progress at their own pace.
- Data-informed feedback: LMS allowed tracking participation and progress.
- Inclusive participation: Shy students contributed more online.
- Extended time-on-task: Students engaged beyond classroom hours.
- Interdisciplinary projects: Online collaboration connected subjects.

6. Novelties from Action Research

- 3×3 Lesson Cycle: Three phases × three activities ensured structure and balance.
- Mastery Ladder: Triangulated assessment evidence (tests, projects, reflections).
- Low-Bandwidth Protocol: SMS, PDFs, and audio notes supported weak internet users.
- Studio Friday: Weekly interdisciplinary capstone projects encouraged teamwork.

7. Discussion

- Mixed education is not just technology adoption—it requires redesigning pedagogy.
- Success depends on continuous professional development and institutional support.
- Collaboration between teachers increased innovation and problem-solving.
- Students developed digital literacy and soft skills alongside academics.

8. Limitations

- Sample scope: Only one lyceum was studied.
- Technology gap: Results may vary in regions with worse infrastructure.
- Short time frame: Only one academic year observed.
- Assessment bias: Surveys and interviews may reflect student/teacher optimism.

9. Recommendations for Lyceums

- Provide teacher training on blended pedagogy and assessment.
- Ensure equitable access (device loans, low-bandwidth tools).
- Establish clear guidelines for online/offline workload balance.

- Promote collaborative projects across disciplines.
- Use learning analytics to track and support at-risk students.

10. Implementation Roadmap (First 90 Days)

Phase 1 (Weeks 1–4): Preparation

- Audit devices, internet access, and LMS readiness.
- Train teachers in blended strategies.
- Orient students and parents.

Phase 2 (Weeks 5–8): Pilot

- Launch blended modules in 2–3 subjects.
- Collect weekly feedback from teachers and students.
- Adjust based on challenges (bandwidth, workload).

Phase 3 (Weeks 9–12): Expansion

- Scale to all subjects.
- Introduce Studio Friday projects.
- Monitor achievement and attendance closely.

Mixed education in academic lyceums is both a challenge and an opportunity. It requires overcoming significant barriers such as unequal access to technology, high teacher workload, and the redefinition of assessment practices. Yet, when thoughtfully designed, it provides powerful benefits: personalization, deeper engagement, equity, and interdisciplinary collaboration. The action research conducted demonstrates that simple but robust innovations—such as the 3×3 lesson cycle, mastery ladders, low-bandwidth strategies, and interdisciplinary studios—can make mixed education sustainable and impactful. Ultimately, successful implementation depends on systematic support for teachers, institutional commitment, and continued research. Academic lyceums can become laboratories of innovation, preparing students not only for exams but also for lifelong learning in the digital age.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). *Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education.* The Internet and Higher Education, 7(2), 95–105.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001

2. Graham, C. R. (2006). *Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions.* In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs (pp. 3–21). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

3. Graham, C. R. (2013). *Emerging practice and research in blended learning.* In M. G. Moore (Ed.), Handbook of Distance Education (3rd ed., pp. 333–350). New York: Routledge.

4. Horn, M. B., & Staker, H. (2015). *Blended: Using disruptive innovation to improve schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

5. Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R. M., & Abrami, P. C. (2014). *A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: From

the general to the applied.* Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 26(1), 87–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-013-9077-3

6. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2010). *Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies.* U.S. Department of Education.

7. Moore, M. G., & Kearsley, G. (2011). *Distance education: A systems view of online learning* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

8. Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (Eds.). (2012). *The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs.* San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

9. Hrastinski, S. (2019). *What do we mean by blended learning?* TechTrends, 63(5), 564–569. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-019-00375-5

10. Singh, H. (2003). *Building effective blended learning programs.* Educational Technology, 43(6), 51–54.