

A Blended Learning Model for Teaching English Based on An LMS (Moodle/Google Classroom)

Ismatullayeva Robiyabonu

Master's student at Webster University, Uzbekistan

Received: 31 December 2025; **Accepted:** 23 January 2026; **Published:** 28 February 2026

Abstract: The rapid growth of digital learning infrastructures has made blended learning a mainstream organizational form for language education. Yet many blended implementations remain technologically driven rather than pedagogically designed, resulting in fragmented activities, inconsistent feedback cycles, and limited gains in communicative competence. This article proposes and justifies a blended learning model for teaching English that is structurally anchored in a Learning Management System (LMS), with Moodle and Google Classroom considered as two widely used implementation environments. The results of the study are presented as a coherent model specification, including its pedagogical logic, learning sequence, content structuring principles, and indicators for evaluating effectiveness. The discussion emphasizes that the added value of an LMS-centered blended format emerges when the LMS functions as a single “learning spine” that unifies content, interaction, feedback, and evidence of progress, while classroom time is reserved for communicative practice and higher-order tasks. The article concludes with implications for course design, teacher professional development, and scalable quality assurance in English language education.

Keywords: Blended learning, LMS, Moodle, Google Classroom, English language teaching, formative assessment, learning analytics, communicative competence, instructional design.

Introduction: Blended learning has moved from an experimental innovation to a dominant organizational approach in many educational systems, including language programs that aim to balance communicative interaction with flexible self-paced study. In English language teaching, the pedagogical attractiveness of blended learning is often explained by its promise to expand exposure to language input, increase opportunities for practice, diversify assessment, and personalize learning pathways. At the same time, the shift toward blended formats has revealed a persistent design problem: many courses adopt digital tools without a coherent instructional architecture, leading to “two parallel courses” where online and face-to-face components are weakly connected. Students then experience the online part as homework storage or content delivery, while classroom time continues to follow traditional patterns that do not fully exploit the

affordances of digital environments.

A Learning Management System can address this fragmentation when it is used not merely as a repository but as a structured environment for sequencing tasks, guiding interaction, and capturing evidence of learning. Moodle and Google Classroom represent two common LMS-related ecosystems. Moodle is typically implemented as a feature-rich institutional platform supporting complex course structures, quizzes, rubrics, and learning analytics. Google Classroom is often adopted for its simplicity, integration with Google Workspace tools, and low entry barriers for teachers and students. Although these environments differ in configuration and depth, both can support a blended language course if the course logic is designed around learning outcomes and if the LMS becomes the stable hub that integrates content, communication, and feedback.

The central argument of this article is that an effective blended learning model for English should be built around an LMS-centered weekly cycle that explicitly distributes functions across modalities. The online component should be used for exposure, rehearsal, and formative checking, while face-to-face sessions should prioritize interaction, negotiation of meaning, and performance tasks that require teacher facilitation and peer collaboration. The research questions guiding this work are as follows: What principles should guide LMS-based blended design in English language teaching to avoid fragmentation and ensure outcome alignment? What course structure and learning cycle can operationalize these principles in Moodle or Google Classroom? Which evaluation indicators can capture both learning outcomes and learning processes within an LMS-centered blended format?

This study adopts a design-oriented, research-synthesis methodology suitable for instructional model development. Rather than reporting a single empirical intervention, it integrates established findings from blended learning research, computer-assisted language learning, and assessment theory to construct a coherent model that can be implemented and empirically validated in future studies. The methodological procedure includes three stages.

First, a conceptual synthesis identifies mechanisms through which blended learning improves language outcomes, including increased time on task, diversified input and output opportunities, iterative feedback, and learner self-regulation. Foundational work in blended learning is used to clarify definitions and design dimensions, while language education research informs how tasks should be distributed to support communicative competence and balanced skill development.

Second, the model is constructed as a set of design specifications organized around the course “spine” inside an LMS. This involves defining learning outcomes, mapping outcomes to task types, sequencing tasks into a stable weekly cycle, and specifying the evidence to be collected for formative and summative assessment. Moodle and Google Classroom are treated as implementation environments rather than the model itself; the design is expressed in functional terms so it can be adapted to other platforms with similar capabilities.

Third, an evaluation framework is derived, including outcome indicators (achievement, performance quality, skill development) and process indicators (engagement, completion patterns, revision behavior, feedback uptake, and interaction density). These indicators are selected to be compatible with typical LMS data and with rubric-based language assessment. The model’s internal coherence is assessed by alignment among outcomes, activities, assessment evidence, and feedback loops, consistent with principles of constructive alignment and backward design.

The primary result of this study is an LMS-centered blended learning model for teaching English that integrates online and face-to-face modalities within a single instructional architecture. The model is organized around four interdependent components: outcome-aligned modality distribution, a weekly learning cycle, an assessment-and-feedback system, and analytics-informed orchestration.

The first component specifies how learning functions are distributed across modalities to maximize pedagogical value. The online component is designed for structured exposure to input, guided practice, and low-stakes formative checks. In language terms, this includes lexical and grammatical noticing, controlled practice that stabilizes form-meaning connections, listening and reading tasks with comprehension checks, and preparatory writing or speaking drafts. The face-to-face component is designed for communicative performance and interaction, including task-based speaking, collaborative problem solving, role-play, debates, peer review, and teacher-guided feedback on common difficulties identified online. This distribution is not simply a time split; it is a functional split where online work prepares learners for richer in-class communication, while class interaction creates a purpose for online practice and generates needs that are addressed through targeted online reinforcement.

The second component defines a stable weekly learning cycle that students can internalize, thereby reducing cognitive load and increasing predictability. Each week begins with a diagnostic micro-activity inside the LMS that activates prior knowledge and identifies areas of difficulty. Learners then complete input-focused work, such as short readings, videos, or listening segments, followed by comprehension and noticing tasks. Next, learners engage in guided practice through auto-graded

exercises or structured assignments that require production, such as short forum responses or brief writing drafts. Before the face-to-face session, learners submit a “readiness artifact” that demonstrates preparation, for example a vocabulary set, a short outline, a voice recording, or a response to a prompt. The teacher uses these artifacts to adapt the in-class plan and to select representative errors or misconceptions. The face-to-face meeting then emphasizes interaction and performance tasks designed to elicit target language use in meaningful contexts. After class, learners complete a consolidation task online that includes reflection, a revision step, and an exit check that contributes to the learning record. The weekly cycle ends with feedback release and a progress view so that learners can monitor their development and plan the next week’s study.

The third component is the assessment-and-feedback system. The model distinguishes between evidence for learning and evidence of learning, ensuring that formative assessment is not reduced to occasional quizzes. The LMS hosts frequent low-stakes checks that provide immediate feedback and help learners regulate study. Higher-stakes assignments are assessed through analytic rubrics aligned with communicative competence dimensions such as task achievement, coherence, vocabulary range, grammatical accuracy, and interactional effectiveness. Crucially, the model embeds revision as a required step for selected tasks. Learners submit drafts, receive feedback, and resubmit improved versions, enabling assessment to serve learning rather than merely classification. In Moodle, this can be operationalized through assignment workflows, rubric tools, and quiz banks; in Google Classroom, it can be implemented through assignment iterations, comment-based feedback, and rubric attachments integrated with Docs. The model also specifies peer feedback moments, but only when learners are trained to use criteria-based comments and when the teacher monitors quality to prevent superficial evaluation.

The fourth component describes analytics-informed orchestration. Because an LMS records engagement and performance traces, teachers can identify patterns such as low completion rates, repeated misconceptions, or uneven participation. The model does not treat analytics as surveillance; it treats them as instructional

signals supporting timely intervention. Teachers review completion data and item-level difficulty, then modify the next face-to-face lesson to address the most consequential barriers. Over time, teachers refine content sequences and task designs based on recurring analytics patterns, creating an iterative improvement cycle at the course level.

Taken together, these components constitute a model where the LMS is the organizational and evidentiary backbone, while face-to-face time is reserved for interactional work that benefits from live facilitation. The result is not an “online add-on,” but a single integrated learning process with clear modality functions and continuous feedback.

The proposed model responds to a central tension in blended learning: the desire for flexibility often competes with the need for coherence. In language education, coherence is especially important because skill development depends on repeated cycles of exposure, practice, feedback, and reuse in communicative contexts. When online tasks are disconnected from classroom interaction, learners may complete digital activities mechanically, without transferring gains to real communication. Conversely, when classroom interaction is not prepared by online work, the face-to-face session can become inefficient, with large amounts of time spent on content that could have been accessed independently. The model addresses this tension by embedding a predictable cycle where online work prepares for interaction and where class interaction produces meaningful feedback targets for subsequent online consolidation.

A key pedagogical implication concerns the nature of “blending.” Blended learning is often mistaken for a proportional combination of hours. The evidence base suggests that outcomes depend less on the ratio and more on how modalities are used to serve distinct learning functions. In the proposed design, online work extends exposure and distributed practice, which supports retention and automatization, while the classroom becomes a site for negotiation of meaning, interactional repair, and pragmatic use of language. This differentiation aligns with communicative and task-based perspectives that emphasize language as action in social contexts, not only as rule mastery.

The model also highlights assessment as a major driver

of learning behavior. If online tasks do not contribute to meaningful feedback and if revision is not valued, learners may treat the LMS as a compliance tool rather than a learning environment. By contrast, a rubric-based system with iterative drafts creates an incentive structure where effort and improvement matter. This is consistent with research on formative assessment and feedback, which indicates that feedback is most effective when it is timely, specific, and connected to opportunities for improvement. The model therefore integrates feedback cycles into the weekly rhythm, rather than leaving them to irregular teacher discretion. Teacher workload is an important practical concern. One reason blended learning is inconsistently implemented is that teachers face increased demands: they must create online materials, monitor submissions, and provide feedback while continuing face-to-face instruction. The model mitigates workload by emphasizing a stable weekly template and a limited set of evidence-rich tasks. Auto-graded checks are used strategically for immediate feedback, while teacher grading is reserved for tasks that reveal communicative performance and that benefit from qualitative comments. Peer feedback is included selectively and supported through clear criteria. Over time, the model encourages reuse and improvement of task banks, especially in Moodle, where quizzes and item banks can be iteratively refined. In Google Classroom, sustainability depends on template reuse and consistent workflow routines.

Equity and access must be considered in any LMS-based design. A blended model can widen gaps when learners have unequal access to devices, connectivity, or supportive learning spaces. The model assumes that course designers provide offline-friendly resources where possible, avoid excessively heavy media files, and ensure that essential tasks can be completed using mobile devices when necessary. In addition, teachers should monitor participation patterns to identify learners at risk of disengagement and provide alternative pathways or additional support. The LMS can help by making gaps visible early; however, visibility must be paired with supportive interventions rather than punitive responses.

The model is intentionally platform-agnostic in its core logic, yet it recognizes practical differences between Moodle and Google Classroom. Moodle's strength lies

in structured course organization, integrated assessment tools, and analytics options, which support complex blended designs and scalable quality assurance. Google Classroom's strength lies in simplicity and tight integration with collaborative document tools, which can be advantageous for writing and peer review workflows. The model can be implemented in either environment if the course maintains a single coherent structure, uses consistent naming conventions and deadlines, and ensures that feedback is predictable and actionable.

The limitations of this work are inherent to design synthesis. The article proposes a model grounded in literature and instructional logic, but it does not report an empirical trial with measured learning gains. Future studies should validate the model through quasi-experimental or mixed-method designs, comparing integrated LMS-centered blending with less structured implementations, and examining both outcomes and processes. Particularly valuable would be research that links LMS trace data with performance rubrics and qualitative evidence of learner experience, thereby explaining not only whether the model works, but how and for whom it works.

An effective blended learning model for teaching English requires more than combining online resources with face-to-face lessons. The core requirement is a coherent instructional architecture where modalities have distinct functions, assessment is evidence-rich and improvement-oriented, and the LMS serves as the organizing backbone that unifies content, interaction, feedback, and progress monitoring. The model proposed in this article operationalizes these requirements through outcome-aligned modality distribution, a stable weekly learning cycle, an iterative assessment-and-feedback system, and analytics-informed orchestration. Implemented in Moodle or Google Classroom, this approach can increase instructional coherence, support learner self-regulation, and strengthen communicative competence by reserving classroom time for interaction while using online time for preparation and consolidation. The model offers a practical basis for course design and a research-ready framework for future empirical validation in diverse educational contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Graham C. R. Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions // Bonk C. J., Graham C. R. (eds.) *The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer, 2006. P. 3–21.
2. Garrison D. R., Kanuka H. Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education // *The Internet and Higher Education*. 2004. Vol. 7, No. 2. P. 95–105.
3. Horn M. B., Staker H. *Blended: Using Disruptive Innovation to Improve Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2015. 272 p.
4. Picciano A. G. Blended learning: Implications for growth and access // *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*. 2009. Vol. 13, No. 1. P. 95–102.
5. Means B., Toyama Y., Murphy R., Bakia M., Jones K. *Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2010. 93 p.
6. Allen I. E., Seaman J., Garrett R. *Blending In: The Extent and Promise of Blended Education in the United States*. Needham, MA: Sloan Consortium, 2007. 45 p.
7. Laurillard D. *Teaching as a Design Science: Building Pedagogical Patterns for Learning and Technology*. New York: Routledge, 2012. 272 p.
8. Biggs J., Tang C. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. 4th ed. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2011. 389 p.
9. Nicol D. J., Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice // *Studies in Higher Education*. 2006. Vol. 31, No. 2. P. 199–218.
10. Hattie J., Timperley H. The power of feedback // *Review of Educational Research*. 2007. Vol. 77, No. 1. P. 81–112.
11. Dörnyei Z. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005. 270 p.
12. Ellis R. *Task-Based Language Teaching and Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. 387 p.
13. Richards J. C. *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 47 p.
14. Nation I. S. P., Macalister J. *Language Curriculum Design*. New York: Routledge, 2010. 232 p.
15. Mayer R. E. *Multimedia Learning*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 304 p.
16. Zimmerman B. J. Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview // *Theory Into Practice*. 2002. Vol. 41, No. 2. P. 64–70.
17. Mishra P., Koehler M. J. Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge // *Teachers College Record*. 2006. Vol. 108, No. 6. P. 1017–1054.
18. Council of Europe. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 260 p.
19. Stockwell G. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Diversity in Research and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 244 p.
20. Chapelle C. A. *Computer Applications in Second Language Acquisition: Foundations for Teaching, Testing and Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 262 p.