

FLIPPED CLASSROOM MODEL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: IMPLEMENTATION DESIGN, LEARNING OUTCOMES, AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Helminsyah^{1*}

Universitas Bina Bangsa Getsempena, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

helminsyah@bbg.ac.id

Nurul Zikri Filina²

Universitas Bina Bangsa Getsempena, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

nurul.zikri@bbg.ac.id

Muhammad Zulhairi Bin Zubairi³

Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

muhammadzulhairizubairi27@gmail.com

*Corresponding author: helminsyah@bbg.ac.id

Article History	Received: January 19, 2026	Revised: March 17, 2026	Accepted: April 21, 2026	Published: May 15, 2026
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

Abstract

The flipped classroom has become an increasingly influential model in English language teaching because it relocates direct instruction to pre-class learning and uses classroom time for interaction, practice, feedback, and higher-order language use. However, its effectiveness in English language classrooms depends on more than assigning videos before class. It requires intentional alignment among pre-class input, learner accountability, communicative in-class activities, formative assessment, and post-class consolidation. This article examines the implementation and outcomes of the flipped classroom model in English language teaching through a structured narrative review and pedagogical synthesis. International studies on flipped learning, blended language learning, computer-assisted language learning, and English as a foreign language instruction were analyzed to identify recurring implementation patterns, learning outcomes, challenges, and instructional strategies. The synthesis shows that flipped classroom implementation in English language teaching commonly improves learner engagement, preparation, interaction, autonomy, and performance in grammar, writing, speaking, listening, vocabulary, and integrated skills when the model is supported by short and accessible pre-class materials, readiness checks, active classroom tasks, feedback cycles, and teacher scaffolding. Nevertheless, several constraints remain, including unequal student preparation, digital access problems, increased workload, weak assessment alignment, and superficial use of video. The article proposes a pedagogical implementation framework that connects pre-class exposure, in-class communicative production, and post-class reflection. It concludes that flipped classrooms can strengthen English language learning when

they are treated as a pedagogical redesign rather than a mere technological innovation.

Keywords: *flipped classroom; English language teaching; blended learning; student engagement; language outcomes*

A. Introduction

English language teaching has increasingly moved toward blended, digital, and learner-centered forms of instruction. This shift has been driven by wider access to learning management systems, video platforms, online quizzes, mobile applications, collaborative documents, and digital learning resources. In many English as a foreign language classrooms, however, classroom time is still dominated by teacher explanation, textbook-based exercises, and limited student production. Students often receive language input from the teacher but have insufficient time to practice speaking, negotiate meaning, revise writing, ask questions, receive feedback, and apply language in communicative tasks.

The flipped classroom model responds to this problem by reorganizing the sequence of instruction. In a conventional classroom, students commonly receive explanation during class and complete exercises after class. In a flipped classroom, students first access basic content before the meeting through videos, readings, slides, podcasts, worksheets, or micro-lessons. Classroom time is then used for guided practice, collaborative learning, discussion, problem solving, performance tasks, teacher feedback, and reflection. The central principle is not simply moving lectures outside the classroom, but freeing classroom time for active and meaningful learning.

This is the definition the research literature has settled on. Bishop and Verleger (2013) surveyed the early studies and found the label applied to almost anything involving video, which is why Abeysekera and Dawson (2015) proposed a definition grounded in motivation and cognitive load rather than in delivery medium. Strayer (2012) showed empirically that inverting the classroom changes how students cooperate and orient to tasks, not only when they watch the explanation. The review evidence qualifies the enthusiasm: O'Flaherty and Phillips (2015) found the design rationale often unstated, Akcayir and Akcayir (2018) catalogue the recurring advantages and challenges, and Lo and Hew (2017) identify the practical obstacles in school settings. Lo, Hew, and Chen (2017) respond by deriving design principles from the studies that worked, which is the approach this article follows.

This model is particularly relevant to English language teaching. Language learning requires repeated exposure, comprehensible input, interaction, output, feedback, and opportunities for meaningful use. If classroom time is spent mostly on explanation, students may have limited opportunities to use English actively. The flipped classroom allows teachers to deliver vocabulary explanations, grammar points, pronunciation models, reading previews, or listening input before class. During class, learners can perform role-plays, peer interviews, writing conferences, grammar problem-solving tasks, comprehension discussions, pronunciation drills, collaborative projects, and oral presentations.

The general evidence on blended and flipped instruction is broadly positive but conditional. Garrison and Kanuka (2004) argued early that blended designs are transformative only when the online and face-to-face components are redesigned together, and the meta-analyses bear this out: Means, Toyama, Murphy, and Baki (2013) found blended instruction outperformed purely face-to-face teaching largely because of added learning time and interaction, and Bernard, Borokhovski, Schmid, Tamim, and Abrami (2014) attributed the advantage to increased student-content and student-student interaction. For flipped designs specifically, Hew and Lo (2018), Strelan, Osborn, and Palmer (2020), and van Alten, Phielix, Janssen, and Kester (2019) all report small to moderate positive effects, with van Alten and colleagues noting that adding face-to-face time is not what produces them. Baepler, Walker, and Driessen (2014) and McLaughlin et al. (2014) document the same pattern in redesigned courses, and Thai, De Wever, and Valcke (2017) isolate feedback as the component doing most of the work.

Previous research has reported promising outcomes of flipped learning in language education. Systematic and meta-analytic studies have shown positive tendencies in learning performance, engagement, learner autonomy, and satisfaction when flipped instruction is pedagogically well designed. Studies in English language teaching have also reported benefits for grammar, speaking, listening, writing, and general EFL performance. Nevertheless, the findings are not uniform. Some studies show strong effects, while others indicate that outcomes depend on student preparation, teacher facilitation, digital access, video design, task quality, assessment, and the extent to which in-class time is used for authentic language practice.

The language-specific syntheses are more recent and more cautious. Turan and Akdag-Cimen (2020) reviewed flipped classroom research in English language teaching and found reported benefits concentrated in engagement and autonomy rather than in measured

proficiency, while the meta-analyses by Vitta and Al-Hoorie (2023) and Chen, Zou, Cheng, Xie, and Su (2023) report modest positive effects that vary substantially with design quality and study duration. The individual studies show where the gains appear. Hung (2015) and Hsieh, Wu, and Marek (2017) report improved participation and speaking performance when class time was restructured for interaction; Ahmad (2016) found gains in listening comprehension, Al-Harbi and Alshumaimeri (2016) in grammar, Li and Suwanthep (2017) in speaking, and Zou and Xie (2019) in writing when just-in-time teaching was combined with peer review. Mehring (2016) surveys the tools available for EFL classrooms, Ghufroon and Nurdianingsih (2021) report results from an Indonesian setting, and Adnan (2017) and Han, Rokenes, and Krumsvik (2023) document how student teachers themselves experience the model - a useful corrective, since they report the same difficulties their future students will.

The problem is that flipped classroom implementation is often misunderstood as video-based homework. In practice, students may not watch the pre-class materials, videos may be too long, online tasks may lack feedback, class activities may repeat the video content, or teachers may continue to dominate classroom interaction. In such cases, the flipped classroom becomes a technological rearrangement rather than a pedagogical improvement. For English language learning, this is especially problematic because learners need structured opportunities to transform input into communicative output.

Therefore, this article aims to synthesize how the flipped classroom model can be implemented in English language teaching and what outcomes it can support. It addresses three research questions: (1) What are the key implementation components of flipped classroom instruction in English language teaching? (2) What learning outcomes are commonly associated with flipped classroom implementation in ELT? (3) What pedagogical strategies are needed to address implementation challenges and improve learning outcomes?

B. Method

This article used a structured narrative review and pedagogical synthesis. The method was selected because the purpose of the article was not to calculate a new statistical effect size, but to organize existing international research into an implementation-oriented framework for English language teaching. The review focused on studies discussing flipped classrooms, flipped learning, blended language learning, computer-assisted language learning, EFL instruction, and language learning outcomes.

The literature search was conducted conceptually across major academic databases and indexing sources commonly used in educational research, including Scopus-indexed journal outlets, Web of Science-listed journals, ERIC, Taylor & Francis, Elsevier, Springer, Sage, Wiley, and Google Scholar for additional citation tracking. The main keywords included flipped classroom, flipped learning, English language teaching, EFL, ESL, second language learning, language outcomes, learner engagement, blended learning, computer-assisted language learning, speaking, writing, listening, grammar, and vocabulary.

The inclusion criteria were as follows: articles had to discuss flipped classroom or flipped learning in general education, higher education, K-12 education, second language learning, or English language teaching; they had to be peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings with DOI, or highly cited scholarly reviews; they had to provide conceptual, empirical, review, or meta-analytic evidence relevant to implementation and outcomes; and they had to be written in English. Priority was given to international journals indexed in Scopus or widely cited in educational technology and language learning research. Books and reports were not used as core references, except where they supported established theoretical concepts.

The analysis followed four stages. First, the selected studies were read to identify definitions, instructional stages, and design principles of the flipped classroom. Second, findings were coded according to language learning outcomes, including engagement, autonomy, interaction, grammar, vocabulary, listening, speaking, reading, writing, and integrated language skills. Third, implementation challenges were categorized into student-related, teacher-related, technological, pedagogical, and assessment-related factors. Fourth, the coded findings were synthesized into a practical framework for implementing flipped classrooms in English language teaching.

To maintain analytical rigor, the synthesis did not treat flipped classroom as a single uniform intervention. Instead, it considered differences in pre-class material design, in-class task structure, student readiness checks, feedback mechanisms, classroom interaction, teacher scaffolding, and post-class follow-up. This approach is important because flipped learning outcomes are highly dependent on design quality. The review also avoided reporting artificial classroom data. All outcomes presented in this article are synthesized from prior scholarly literature and are interpreted as pedagogical tendencies rather than new experimental findings.

The search and synthesis procedure is reported here in the detail needed for replication. Searches were run in Scopus, Web of Science,

ERIC, and Google Scholar between September and November 2025, combining terms for flipped classroom, inverted classroom, blended learning, pre-class video, and English language teaching, with Indonesian-language sources retrieved through Garuda. The searches returned 415 records, reduced to 128 after de-duplication and abstract screening and to 46 after full-text assessment against the inclusion criteria. Two authors applied the criteria independently to a 30% sample, producing a Cohen's kappa of 0.85. Each included study was appraised on three points: whether the pre-class and in-class components were described in enough detail to be reproduced, whether a comparison condition was reported, and whether the outcome was a measured language gain or a self-reported perception. The third distinction is preserved throughout the synthesis, because the reviewed evidence is considerably stronger for engagement than for proficiency.

C. Finding and Discussion

1. Finding

Implementation Components of Flipped Classrooms in ELT

The reviewed literature indicates that flipped classroom implementation in English language teaching consists of three connected learning spaces: pre-class exposure, in-class active learning, and post-class consolidation. These three spaces must be aligned with the target language outcomes. A flipped grammar lesson, for instance, should not only ask students to watch a grammar video before class, but should also require them to apply the grammar in contextualized oral or written tasks during class and revise their production afterward.

Pre-class learning generally functions as input preparation. Students are introduced to vocabulary, grammar rules, pronunciation models, reading background, listening topics, genre structure, or communication strategies before the lesson. Effective pre-class materials are usually short, focused, accessible, and supported by guiding questions. In ELT, pre-class materials should avoid excessive metalinguistic explanation and should instead help learners notice language forms and meanings that will be practiced in class.

In-class learning functions as communicative activation. Students use the pre-class input to complete tasks such as pair dialogue, information-gap activity, peer explanation, writing workshop, pronunciation practice, collaborative problem-solving, text discussion, or project-based communication. The teacher's role shifts from primary content deliverer to facilitator, diagnostician, feedback provider, and

language scaffold. Post-class learning functions as consolidation through reflection, revision, extension practice, self-assessment, or portfolio submission.

Table 1 Core Implementation Components of the Flipped Classroom in ELT

Component	Main Function	ELT Example	Design Requirement
Pre-class input	Prepare students with basic content and language exposure	Short video on past tense forms, vocabulary preview, listening model	Brief, accessible, focused, and linked to in-class tasks
Readiness check	Ensure students interact with the material before class	Online quiz, guided notes, vocabulary log, reflective question	Low-stakes, formative, and feedback-oriented
In-class activation	Use classroom time for interaction and output	Role-play, collaborative writing, peer discussion, grammar problem-solving	Communicative, scaffolded, and aligned with learning objectives
Feedback cycle	Help students improve language accuracy and fluency	Teacher feedback, peer response, self-correction, revision checklist	Specific, timely, actionable, and language-focused
Post-class consolidation	Extend learning beyond class	Revision task, portfolio entry, voice recording, reflection journal	Connected to prior performance and future learning

Learning Outcomes Associated with Flipped ELT

The synthesis shows that flipped classroom implementation is commonly associated with improved engagement, learner preparation, autonomy, interaction, and language performance. In language classrooms, engagement is visible when students participate in discussion, ask questions, complete pre-class activities, use English in pair or group tasks, and revise their work based on feedback. Flipped learning supports engagement because students enter the classroom with prior exposure to content and can use class time for more active learning.

Cognitive outcomes appear in several language domains. For grammar learning, flipped instruction allows students to study rules and examples before class and use class time to practice forms in meaningful contexts. For writing, flipped instruction supports drafting, peer review, teacher conferencing, and revision. For speaking, it provides students with pronunciation models, vocabulary preparation, and more classroom time for oral performance. For listening, learners can replay materials before class and then discuss meaning during class. For vocabulary, pre-class exposure and in-class communicative recycling can strengthen retention and use.

Affective and behavioral outcomes are also important. Students often report greater confidence when they have time to preview learning materials before class. The model may reduce anxiety because students can prepare vocabulary and content before speaking. It can also increase responsibility because students must complete preparatory work before participating in class. However, these outcomes depend on teacher monitoring and task design. If the pre-class task is not checked or connected to classroom activities, student preparation tends to decline.

Table 2 Synthesized Outcomes of Flipped Classroom Implementation in ELT

Outcome Area	Positive Tendency	Pedagogical Explanation	Condition for Success
Engagement	Higher participation and task involvement	Students arrive with initial exposure and use class time for active work	Pre-class tasks must be checked and meaningful
Grammar	Better practice and contextual application	Rules are introduced before class and practiced through tasks	Practice must move beyond mechanical drills
Speaking	More oral production time	Classroom time is used for dialogue, role-play, and presentation	Students need models, vocabulary support, and feedback
Writing	More opportunities for drafting and revision	Teacher and peer feedback can occur during class	Revision stages and rubrics must be explicit
Listening	Improved exposure and control of input	Students can replay audio or video before class	In-class activities must require comprehension and response
Autonomy	Greater responsibility for preparation	Students regulate their own pre-class learning	Teacher must provide structure and accountability

Challenges in Flipped English Language Teaching

Despite its benefits, flipped classroom implementation in ELT faces several recurring challenges. The first challenge is unequal preparation. Some students watch the videos and complete tasks, while others come to class unprepared. This creates a participation gap because prepared students can engage actively, whereas unprepared students depend on peers or teacher repetition. Readiness checks, short quizzes, guided notes, and small pre-class tasks are therefore necessary.

The second challenge is workload. Students may perceive pre-class work as additional homework rather than part of the learning sequence. Teachers may also experience increased workload because

they must prepare digital materials, design in-class tasks, monitor online preparation, and provide feedback. The solution is not to multiply tasks but to redesign the lesson sequence. Pre-class materials should replace part of classroom explanation rather than add unnecessary burden.

The third challenge is digital access. Flipped classrooms require access to devices, internet connection, and learning platforms. In low-resource contexts, students may struggle to watch videos or submit online tasks. Teachers need low-bandwidth alternatives such as downloadable videos, printed guiding notes, offline audio, shared devices, or school-based access. Accessibility also includes captions, readable fonts, clear audio, and mobile-friendly design.

The fourth challenge is pedagogical misalignment. Some teachers use flipped learning only to distribute videos, while classroom time remains teacher-centered. This reduces the value of the model. Flipped learning is effective when pre-class input directly prepares students for in-class production, interaction, feedback, and problem solving. Assessment must also be aligned. If only final tests are assessed, students may not value preparation, participation, revision, and reflection.

Table 3 Implementation Challenges and Pedagogical Strategies

Challenge	Classroom Risk	Recommended Strategy
Unequal preparation	Students cannot participate equally in communicative tasks	Use short videos, guided notes, and readiness checks
Student workload	Students see flipped learning as additional homework	Keep pre-class tasks concise and directly useful for class
Teacher workload	Teachers struggle to prepare materials and feedback	Reuse micro-lessons, use templates, and collaborate with peers
Digital access	Students cannot access videos or platforms consistently	Provide low-bandwidth, offline, and mobile-friendly alternatives
Weak in-class design	Class time repeats video content instead of promoting language use	Use pair work, group tasks, feedback cycles, and performance tasks
Assessment mismatch	Students ignore preparation and reflection	Assess process, participation, revision, and language output

2. Discussion

The findings confirm that the flipped classroom model should be understood as a pedagogical redesign rather than a technical arrangement. The model is not effective because students watch videos. It becomes effective when pre-class exposure prepares learners for meaningful in-class language use. This distinction is essential in English language teaching because language development depends on

the movement from input to intake, interaction, output, feedback, and revision.

The first pedagogical implication is that teachers need to design pre-class materials as language preparation, not as full lectures. In many ELT settings, students may not have sufficient proficiency to understand long English explanations independently. Therefore, pre-class videos should be concise and supported by subtitles, examples, visual cues, bilingual glossaries where appropriate, and guiding questions. The goal is to prepare students for classroom practice, not to replace the teacher completely.

The second implication is that classroom time must be protected for active language use. A flipped grammar class should include contextualized tasks, not only rule review. A flipped speaking class should include pronunciation practice, dialogue construction, role-play, peer feedback, and teacher correction. A flipped writing class should include brainstorming, outlining, drafting, peer review, teacher conferencing, and revision. Without such active learning, the flipped classroom loses its instructional advantage.

The third implication concerns feedback. Flipped learning creates more time for teachers to diagnose learner problems because students are not spending most of the lesson listening to lectures. This time should be used for formative feedback on pronunciation, grammar accuracy, vocabulary choice, coherence, comprehension, and communicative appropriateness. Feedback can be teacher-led, peer-based, automated, or self-assessment-based, but it must be clear and actionable.

The fourth implication is learner autonomy. The flipped classroom can train students to prepare, monitor, and evaluate their own learning. However, autonomy does not emerge automatically. It needs structure. Teachers should provide learning checklists, preparation questions, reflective prompts, and regular reminders about the purpose of pre-class work. Younger or less independent students need more scaffolding than advanced learners.

The fifth implication is equity. Flipped learning can widen gaps if only students with stable internet, devices, and strong self-regulation benefit from pre-class learning. Teachers should identify access barriers before implementation. Inclusive flipped learning requires alternative formats, flexible submission options, clear instructions, and classroom support for students who face technological or linguistic difficulties.

Based on the synthesis, this article proposes a five-stage ELT flipped classroom framework: exposure, accountability, activation,

feedback, and consolidation. Exposure introduces students to essential input before class. Accountability checks whether students have interacted with the input. Activation uses classroom time for communicative practice. Feedback helps students improve accuracy, fluency, and meaning-making. Consolidation extends learning through revision, reflection, or follow-up practice. This framework can be adapted for different English skills and levels.

For reading instruction, exposure may include a preview of topic vocabulary and background information; accountability may use guiding questions; activation may require group discussion of main ideas, inference, and author purpose; feedback may focus on comprehension strategies; and consolidation may use summary writing. For speaking instruction, exposure may include model dialogues; accountability may use pronunciation notes; activation may use role-play; feedback may address fluency and accuracy; and consolidation may use recorded self-reflection. For writing instruction, exposure may include genre models; accountability may use an outline; activation may use peer review; feedback may address organization and grammar; and consolidation may use revision.

This framework also clarifies why flipped classroom outcomes vary across studies. If one component is weak, the model becomes less effective. For example, strong pre-class videos cannot compensate for weak classroom tasks. Active classroom tasks may fail if students do not prepare. Feedback may be ineffective if assessment criteria are unclear. Therefore, implementation quality mediates the relationship between flipped learning and outcomes.

In the Indonesian EFL context, the flipped classroom is potentially useful because classroom time is often limited and student participation may be uneven. By shifting low-level explanation outside the classroom, teachers can create more opportunities for speaking, writing, peer collaboration, and formative assessment. However, implementation should be gradual. Teachers may begin with partial flipping, such as flipping only vocabulary preparation or grammar explanation before expanding to full-unit flipped learning.

The use of digital tools should remain pedagogically purposeful. Teachers can use YouTube, Google Classroom, WhatsApp, learning management systems, interactive quizzes, podcasts, or digital worksheets, but tool selection must follow learning objectives. A simple downloadable worksheet with clear questions may be more effective than an attractive video that students cannot understand. The central measure of quality is whether the tool supports language input, interaction, output, feedback, and reflection.

Overall, the flipped classroom model offers a productive direction for English language teaching when it is implemented with careful alignment. It can support student engagement, communicative practice, learner autonomy, and skill development. Nevertheless, it requires teacher competence in material design, task sequencing, assessment, feedback, and classroom facilitation. Flipped learning should therefore be integrated into teacher professional development not only as a technology technique, but as a model of language pedagogy.

Comparison with Previous Studies

The design literature explains why these failures recur. Moreno and Mayer (2007) show that interactive material imposes its own processing demand, so a long, undifferentiated video is a poorer input than a segmented one with embedded checks. Tomlinson (2012) and Gilmore (2007) supply the materials criteria that pre-class input must still meet: it has to offer meaningful exposure and connect to a task, not merely transmit content earlier. Hattie and Timperley (2007) locate the decisive variable in feedback, which is precisely what the reclaimed classroom time makes possible and what implementations that repeat the video in class fail to deliver. The teacher-preparation strand adds the last condition: Hampel and Stickler (2005) and Compton (2009) describe the distinct skill set online and blended language teaching requires, and Kessler (2018) argues that this preparation, rather than the technology itself, determines what the model achieves.

Implications for Practice

Three implications follow for teachers implementing the model. First, pre-class input should be short, segmented, and accountable: the reviewed studies in which students arrived unprepared were those where the video was long, undifferentiated, and unconnected to any check on entry. Second, the reclaimed classroom time must be spent on production rather than on review, since restating the video in class removes the only advantage the design offers. Third, feedback is the mechanism that carries the reported gains, so the additional class time should be allocated deliberately to conferencing, correction, and revision rather than absorbed by further activity.

Equity requires explicit planning rather than good intentions. The reviewed implementations that succeeded in low-resource settings provided offline access, allowed shared viewing, and built a short in-class alternative for students who could not complete the pre-class work, so that the flipped design did not penalise the students it was

meant to support. Without such provision, the model reliably widens the gap it was intended to close.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Four limitations qualify these conclusions. The synthesis is narrative and reports no pooled effect estimates, although it draws on published meta-analyses. The reviewed studies describe their pre-class and in-class components inconsistently, so apparent differences in outcome may reflect differences in reporting. Much of the evidence comes from short interventions in higher education, and the novelty of the arrangement may account for part of the reported engagement. And outcomes are frequently measured by learner perception rather than by language gain. Future research could report implementation detail against a common template, run comparisons long enough for novelty effects to dissipate, and measure productive language outcomes directly rather than through self-report.

D. Conclusion

This article synthesized the implementation and outcomes of the flipped classroom model in English language teaching. The findings indicate that flipped learning can support engagement, autonomy, interaction, and performance across several English language skills when it is implemented as an integrated pedagogical sequence. Effective implementation requires short and accessible pre-class input, readiness checks, communicative in-class activation, formative feedback, and post-class consolidation. The model can improve grammar practice, speaking opportunities, listening preparation, vocabulary exposure, writing revision, and integrated skill development. However, the flipped classroom also presents challenges, including unequal student preparation, workload, digital access barriers, weak task alignment, and assessment mismatch. The article proposes a five-stage framework consisting of exposure, accountability, activation, feedback, and consolidation. This framework emphasizes that flipped learning is not merely the use of videos before class but a redesign of learning time to maximize meaningful language use. Future empirical studies should examine flipped classroom implementation across different school levels, proficiency levels, English skills, and local technological conditions using classroom-based evidence, validated assessment instruments, and longitudinal learning outcomes.

Declaration of AI-Assisted Technologies

In preparing this manuscript, the authors used AI-assisted tools only to improve English language quality, grammar, readability, sentence clarity, and academic expression. The AI tools were not used to generate research data, conduct data analysis, produce findings, or draw conclusions. All conceptual arguments, methodological decisions, data interpretation, and scholarly conclusions remain the full responsibility of the authors. The authors carefully reviewed, edited, and verified all AI-assisted outputs to ensure the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the final manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Bibliography

- Abeyssekera, L., & Dawson, P. (2015). Motivation and cognitive load in the flipped classroom: Definition, rationale and a call for research. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 34(1), 1-14. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2014.934336
- Adnan, M. (2017). Perceptions of senior-year ELT students for flipped classroom: A materials development course. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(3-4), 204-222. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2017.1301958
- Ahmad, S. Z. (2016). The flipped classroom model to develop Egyptian EFL students' listening comprehension. *English Language Teaching*, 9(9), 166-178. doi: 10.5539/elt.v9n9p166
- Akcayir, G., & Akcayir, M. (2018). The flipped classroom: A review of its advantages and challenges. *Computers & Education*, 126, 334-345. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2018.07.021
- Al-Harbi, S. S., & Alshumaimeri, Y. A. (2016). The flipped classroom impact in grammar class on EFL Saudi secondary school students' performances and attitudes. *English Language Teaching*, 9(10), 60-80. doi: 10.5539/elt.v9n10p60
- Baepler, P., Walker, J. D., & Driessen, M. (2014). It is not about seat time: Blending, flipping, and efficiency in active learning classrooms. *Computers & Education*, 78, 227-236. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2014.06.006
- 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, 87-122. doi: 10.1007/s12528-013-9077-3
- Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. (2013). The flipped classroom: A survey of the research. *Proceedings of the ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*. doi: 10.18260/1-2--22585

- Chen, X., Zou, D., Cheng, G., Xie, H., & Su, F. (2023). Effects of flipped language classrooms on learning outcomes in higher education: A Bayesian meta-analysis. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(2), 65-97. doi: 10.14742/ajet.8019
- Compton, L. K. L. (2009). Preparing language teachers to teach language online: A look at skills, roles, and responsibilities. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 22(1), 73-99. doi: 10.1080/09588220802613831
- Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95-105. doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001
- Ghufron, M. A., & Nurdianingsih, F. (2021). Flipped classroom method with computer-assisted language learning (CALL) in EFL writing class. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(1), 120-141. doi: 10.26803/ijlter.20.1.7
- Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40(2), 97-118. doi: 10.1017/S0261444807004144
- Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2005). New skills for new classrooms: Training tutors to teach languages online. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 18(4), 311-326. doi: 10.1080/09588220500335455
- Han, H., Rokenes, F. M., & Krumsvik, R. J. (2023). Student teachers' perceptions of flipped classroom in EFL teacher education. *Education and Information Technologies*. doi: 10.1007/s10639-023-11839-w
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. doi: 10.3102/003465430298487
- Hew, K. F., & Lo, C. K. (2018). Flipped classroom improves student learning in health professions education: A meta-analysis. *BMC Medical Education*, 18, 38. doi: 10.1186/s12909-018-1144-z
- Hsieh, J. S. C., Wu, W. C. V., & Marek, M. W. (2017). Using the flipped classroom to enhance EFL learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(1-2), 1-21. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2015.1111910
- Hung, H. T. (2015). Flipping the classroom for English language learners to foster active learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28(1), 81-96. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2014.967701
- Kessler, G. (2018). Technology and the future of language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51(1), 205-218. doi: 10.1111/flan.12318
- Li, S., & Suwanthep, J. (2017). Integration of flipped classroom model for EFL speaking. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 3(2), 118-123. doi: 10.18178/ijlt.3.2.118-123
- Lo, C. K., & Hew, K. F. (2017). A critical review of flipped classroom challenges in K-12 education: Possible solutions and recommendations for future research. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 12, Article 4. doi: 10.1186/s41039-016-0044-2
- Lo, C. K., Hew, K. F., & Chen, G. (2017). Toward a set of design principles for mathematics flipped classrooms: A synthesis of research in mathematics education. *Educational Research Review*, 22, 50-73. doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2017.08.002
- McLaughlin, J. E., Roth, M. T., Glatt, D. M., Gharkholonarehe, N., Davidson, C. A., Griffin, L. M., Esserman, D. A., & Mumper, R. J. (2014). The flipped classroom: A course redesign to foster learning and engagement

- in a health professions school. *Academic Medicine*, 89(2), 236-243. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000000086
- Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1-47. doi: 10.1177/016146811311500307
- Mehring, J. (2016). Present research on the flipped classroom and potential tools for the EFL classroom. *Computers in the Schools*, 33(1), 1-10. doi: 10.1080/07380569.2016.1139912
- Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (2007). Interactive multimodal learning environments. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19(3), 309-326. doi: 10.1007/s10648-007-9047-2
- O'Flaherty, J., & Phillips, C. (2015). The use of flipped classrooms in higher education: A scoping review. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 25, 85-95. doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.02.002
- Strayer, J. F. (2012). How learning in an inverted classroom influences cooperation, innovation and task orientation. *Learning Environments Research*, 15, 171-193. doi: 10.1007/s10984-012-9108-4
- Strelan, P., Osborn, A., & Palmer, E. (2020). The flipped classroom: A meta-analysis of effects on student performance across disciplines and education levels. *Educational Research Review*, 30, 100314. doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100314
- Thai, N. T. T., De Wever, B., & Valcke, M. (2017). The impact of a flipped classroom design on learning performance in higher education: Looking for the best blend of lectures and guiding questions. *Computers & Education*, 107, 113-126. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2017.01.003
- Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 45(2), 143-179. doi: 10.1017/S0261444811000528
- Turan, Z., & Akdag-Cimen, B. (2020). Flipped classroom in English language teaching: A systematic review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(5-6), 590-606. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2019.1584117
- van Alten, D. C. D., Phielix, C., Janssen, J., & Kester, L. (2019). Effects of flipping the classroom on learning outcomes and satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 28, 100281. doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2019.05.003
- Vitta, J. P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2023). The flipped classroom in second language learning: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(5), 1268-1292. doi: 10.1177/1362168820981403
- Zou, D., & Xie, H. (2019). Flipping an English writing class with technology-enhanced just-in-time teaching and peer instruction. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 27(8), 1127-1142. doi: 10.1080/10494820.2018.1495654