INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

ISSN(print): 2643-9840, ISSN(online): 2643-9875

Volume 08 Issue 07 July 2025

DOI: 10.47191/ijmra/v8-i07-30, Impact Factor: 8.266

Page No. 3982-3993

# The Impact of Blended Learning Models on Student Achievement and Engagement in Secondary Education: A Systematic Review

**Sustanto[1], Rohmat[2], Atabik[3], Sutrimo Purnomo[4]**

[1,2,3,4]Universitas Islam Negeri Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto, Indonesia.

**ABSTRACT:** This systematic review examines the effectiveness of blended learning approaches in secondary education contexts across diverse global settings. Through a comprehensive analysis of empirical studies published between 2015 and 2024, this research synthesizes findings on the impact of blended learning models on student achievement, engagement, and educational outcomes. Data from 42 peer-reviewed studies representing 15 countries were analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Results indicate that well-implemented blended learning approaches consistently demonstrate moderate to significant positive effects on academic achievement (mean effect size d = 0.38), with particularly strong results in STEM subjects. Additionally, the review identifies four key implementation factors that moderate success: teacher technological pedagogical content knowledge, institutional support systems, technological infrastructure adequacy, and instructional design quality. The findings reveal that blended learning approaches, when properly implemented with attention to contextual factors, can effectively enhance student outcomes while addressing challenges related to educational access and equity. However, significant disparities exist in implementation quality across socioeconomic contexts. This review contributes to educational practice by providing evidence-based guidelines for blended learning implementation in secondary education settings and identifies critical areas for future research including longitudinal impact assessment and implementation science approaches.

**KEYWORDS:** Blended Learning Model, Student Achievement, Secondary Education, Educational Technology, Digital Pedagogy.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The integration of technology in educational contexts has fundamentally transformed teaching and learning processes over the past decade, with blended learning emerging as one of the most significant pedagogical innovations in contemporary education (Singh & Thurman, 2019). Defined as an educational approach that combines traditional face-to-face instruction with computer-mediated activities and online learning experiences (Graham, 2013; Horn & Staker, 2015), blended learning has gained substantial traction in educational systems worldwide. The COVID-19 pandemic further accelerated the adoption of blended learning approaches as educational institutions navigated emergency remote teaching scenarios, prompting renewed scholarly attention to effective implementation models (Hodges et al., 2020; Ferdig et al., 2021).

While significant research has examined blended learning implementation in higher education contexts (Dziuban et al., 2018; Rasheed et al., 2020), considerably less systematic attention has been directed toward understanding its effectiveness specifically within secondary education environments (Pulham & Graham, 2018). Secondary education represents a crucial developmental period for adolescent learners, characterized by increasing academic complexity, heightened metacognitive development, and the cultivation of self-regulated learning skills (Steinberg, 2014). The application of blended learning approaches in this context presents unique challenges and opportunities that warrant dedicated scholarly examination.

Several narrative reviews (e.g., Halverson et al., 2017; Pulham & Graham, 2018) and meta-analyses (Bernard et al., 2014; Means et al., 2013) have explored aspects of blended learning broadly; however, these studies often combine findings across diverse educational levels without specific attention to the unique dynamics of secondary education. This systematic review addresses this gap by focusing exclusively on the implementation and outcomes of blended learning approaches in secondary educational contexts, synthesizing contemporary empirical evidence to inform both practice and policy.

The accelerating global adoption of blended learning approaches in secondary education has generated a substantial body of empirical literature across diverse national and cultural contexts. This provides a timely opportunity to systematically analyze emerging patterns of effectiveness and identify critical success factors that transcend geographic and cultural boundaries.

Additionally, increased attention to educational equity and access in international education discourse necessitates careful examination of how blended learning approaches may either mitigate or exacerbate existing educational disparities (Reich, 2020; UNESCO, 2020).

This systematic review addresses the following research questions: 1) What is the impact of blended learning approaches on academic achievement and engagement among secondary education students across diverse global contexts? 2) What implementation factors moderate the effectiveness of blended learning approaches in secondary education settings? 3) How do contextual factors, including socioeconomic status, technological infrastructure, and cultural context, influence blended learning outcomes in secondary education? 4) What methodological approaches have been employed to study blended learning effectiveness in secondary education, and what are the limitations of the current empirical evidence base?

By synthesizing contemporary empirical evidence on these questions, this review aims to provide educational practitioners, policymakers, and researchers with an evidence-based understanding of the potential benefits, limitations, and implementation considerations associated with blended learning approaches in secondary education. The findings contribute to both theoretical understanding of technology-enhanced learning processes and practical guidance for effective implementation in diverse educational contexts.

## II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The analysis in this systematic review is guided by an integrated theoretical framework that combines three complementary perspectives on technology-enhanced learning: the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework (Garrison et al., 2000; Garrison & Arbaugh, 2007), the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) model (Mishra & Koehler, 2006), and Self-Regulated Learning theory (Zimmerman, 2008). This integrated framework provides a comprehensive lens through which to analyze the multidimensional nature of blended learning processes and outcomes in secondary education contexts.

1. Community of Inquiry Framework

The Community of Inquiry framework conceptualizes effective educational experiences as emerging from the intersection of three critical presences: cognitive presence, teaching presence, and social presence (Garrison et al., 2000). Cognitive presence refers to the extent to which learners can construct and confirm meaning through sustained reflection and discourse. Teaching presence encompasses the design, facilitation, and direction of cognitive and social processes to achieve personally meaningful and educationally worthwhile learning outcomes. Social presence represents the ability of participants to project themselves socially and emotionally in the learning environment. This framework is particularly relevant to blended learning research as it addresses both the online and face-to-face dimensions of the educational experience, providing analytical categories for understanding how different instructional modalities contribute to the overall learning experience (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004). Within secondary education contexts, the CoI framework offers valuable insights into how adolescent learners develop academic discourse communities across physical and virtual learning spaces (Borup et al., 2014; Murphy et al., 2017).

2. Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK)

The TPACK framework conceptualizes teacher knowledge required for effective technology integration as the complex interplay between content knowledge (CK), pedagogical knowledge (PK), and technological knowledge (TK) (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). This framework emphasizes that effective technology integration in educational contexts requires not just technical proficiency but also an understanding of how technology, pedagogy, and content interact. For blended learning research, TPACK provides a conceptual framework for analyzing how teacher knowledge and competencies influence implementation quality and outcomes (Graham et al., 2009). In secondary education contexts, where subject matter specialization increases and pedagogical approaches diversify, the TPACK framework helps illuminate how teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge shapes the design and implementation of blended learning environments across different disciplinary contexts (Harris & Hofer, 2017).

3. Self-Regulated Learning

Theory Self-regulated learning (SRL) theory addresses the cognitive, motivational, and behavioral processes through which learners actively manage their own learning (Zimmerman, 2008). It emphasizes how learners set goals, select strategies, monitor progress, and adapt approaches based on feedback. Self-regulated learning is particularly relevant to blended learning contexts, which typically require greater learner autonomy and self-direction than traditional classroom environments (Broadbent, 2017). In secondary education settings, where adolescents are developing metacognitive capabilities and self-regulation skills, SRL theory provides a framework for understanding how blended learning environments either support or challenge students' may developing capacity for independent learning (Barnard et al., 2009; Tsai & Shen, 2009). This perspective is especially valuable for

analyzing how blended learning approaches can be designed to scaffold students' development of self-regulation skills while providing appropriate support structures (Wong et al., 2019).

4. Integrated Theoretical Perspective

By integrating these three theoretical frameworks, this review adopts a comprehensive analytical approach that addresses the technological, pedagogical, social, and psychological dimensions of blended learning in secondary education. This integrated perspective acknowledges that effective blended learning environments emerge from the complex interaction between technological tools, pedagogical approaches, content representations, social dynamics, and learners' self-regulatory capabilities. This theoretical integration guides our analysis of empirical research, providing conceptual categories for understanding both implementation processes and learning outcomes. Specifically, it focuses attention on how blended learning approaches in secondary education create opportunities for meaningful social and cognitive engagement (CoI), how teachers integrate technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge in designing blended learning experiences (TPACK), and how these environments support students' development of self-regulated learning capabilities (SRL).

## III. RESEARCH METHODS

This systematic review employed a mixed-methods approach to synthesize both quantitative and qualitative evidence regarding blended learning effectiveness in secondary education. The methodological framework was structured according to the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews (Page et al., 2021), supplemented by the methodological guidance for mixed-methods reviews provided by the Joanna Briggs Institute (Lizarondo et al., 2017). This approach enabled the integration of diverse forms of evidence to develop a comprehensive understanding of both implementation processes and outcomes related to blended learning in secondary education contexts.

A comprehensive search strategy was developed in consultation with an education librarian to identify relevant empirical studies across multiple disciplinary databases. The following databases were systematically searched: Education Source, ERIC, Academic Search Complete, PsycINFO, Web of Science, Scopus, and LearnTechLib. Additionally, targeted searches were conducted in Google Scholar to identify potential gray literature and recently published studies not yet indexed in major databases. The search strategy combined three conceptual categories using Boolean operators: (1) educational level terms (e.g., "secondary education," "high school," "middle school"), (2) blended learning concept terms (e.g., "blended learning," "hybrid learning," "mixed-mode instruction"), and (3) outcome and process terms (e.g., "academic achievement," "student engagement," "implementation," "effectiveness"). The full search strategy, including all database-specific search strings, is provided in Appendix A. The search was limited to empirical studies published between January 2015 and March 2024, encompassing a contemporary decade of research that reflects current technological capabilities and pedagogical approaches. This timeframe also captures the significant acceleration in blended learning adoption prompted by the COVID-19 pandemic, enabling analysis of both pre-pandemic and pandemic-era implementation contexts.

Studies were included if they met the following criteria: a. Focused primarily on blended learning approaches in secondary education contexts (grades 6-12 or equivalent international classifications), b. Reportedempirical data (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods) on implementation processes, student outcomes, or both, c. Published in peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, or as evaluated technical reports, d. Published in English or with available English translations e. Published between January 2015 and March 2024 Studies were excluded if they: a. Focused primarily on completely online or completely face-to-face learning without a blended component b. Addressed educational levels outside secondary education (e.g., primary education, higher education) as the primary focus c. Presented theoretical discussions, literature reviews, or program descriptions without empirical data d. Focused solely on teacher professional development in blended learning without examining student-level implementations or outcomes e. Reported solely on emergency remote teaching measures without intentional blended learning design.

The study selection process was conducted in multiple phases. First, all search results were imported into the Covidence systematic review management software for deduplication and screening. Two reviewers independently screened titles and abstracts against the inclusion criteria, with disagreements resolved through discussion to reach consensus. Studies that potentially met the inclusion criteria, or where there was insufficient information in the abstract to make a determination, proceeded to full-text screening. In the full-text screening phase, two reviewers independently assessed each study against the detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria, documenting reasons for exclusion. Disagreements were resolved through discussion, with a third reviewer consulted when consensus could not be reached. The inter-rater reliability for the full-text screening process was calculated using Cohen's kappa, yielding a coefficient of 0.87, indicating strong agreement between reviewers. The PRISMA

flow diagram (Figure 1) illustrates the study selection process, including the number of studies identified, screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the final synthesis.

A standardized data extraction form was developed to systematically capture relevant information from each included study. The form was piloted on a random sample of five studies and refined before full implementation. Data extraction was performed independently by two reviewers for each study, with discrepancies resolved through discussion. The following categories of information were extracted from each study: 1. Study characteristics (authors, year, country, publication type) 2. Context characteristics (school setting, grade levels, subject areas, socioeconomic context) 3. Participant characteristics (sample size, age range, gender distribution, prior academic performance) 4. Blended learning intervention characteristics (technological platforms, ratio of online to face-to-face instruction, pedagogical approaches, duration of implementation) 5. Implementation factors (teacher training, institutional support, technological infrastructure) 6. Methodological characteristics (research design, data collection methods, analytical approaches) 7. Outcome measures (achievement indicators, engagement measures, other reported outcomes) 8. Results (effect sizes where available, key qualitative findings, implementation challenges and facilitators) 9. Quality assessment indicators (methodological rigor, limitations, biases) For quantitative studies reporting comparable outcome measures, effect sizes were either extracted directly or calculated using available statistical information following the procedures outlined by Borenstein et al. (2009). For qualitative studies, key themes related to implementation processes and outcomes were extracted alongside illustrative quotes and contextual information.

The methodological quality of included studies was assessed using appropriate tools based on study design. Quantitative studies were evaluated using the Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies (Thomas et al., 2004), which assesses selection bias, study design, confounders, blinding, data collection methods, withdrawals and dropouts, intervention integrity, and analysis. Qualitative studies were assessed using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative Research Checklist (Critical Appraisal Skills Programme, 2018), which evaluates methodological rigor, credibility, and relevance. For mixed-methods studies, the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (Hong et al., 2018) was applied to assess the quality of both quantitative and qualitative components. Two reviewers independently conducted quality assessments for each study, with disagreements resolved through discussion. Quality assessments were not used to exclude studies but rather to contextualize findings and inform the weight given to different studies in the synthesis process.

Given the heterogeneity of included studies in terms of research designs, outcome measures, and contexts, a mixed-methods synthesis approach was employed. The synthesis process integrated three complementary analytical approaches: 1. Meta-analysis of effect sizes: For quantitative studies reporting comparable outcome measures and providing sufficient statistical information, random-effects meta-analysis models were constructed to estimate pooled effect sizes for key outcomes (achievement, engagement) following the procedures outlined by Borenstein et al. (2009). 2. Thematic synthesis of qualitative findings: Qualitative data and findings were synthesized using the thematic synthesis approach outlined by Thomas and Harden (2008), involving line-by-line coding of findings, organization of codes into descriptive themes, and development of analytical themes that transcend the primary studies. 3. Configurative synthesis: To integrate quantitative and qualitative evidence, a configurative synthesis approach was employed (Gough et al., 2017), mapping patterns of relationships between implementation factors, contextual variables, and outcomes across studies. The synthesis was structured around the research questions, with attention to both convergence and divergence in findings across studies, methodological approaches, and implementation contexts. Subgroup analyses were conducted to explore how effects varied across different subject domains, grade levels, and socioeconomic contexts.

Several methodological limitations merit acknowledgment. First, despite comprehensive database searching, relevant studies may have been missed, particularly those published in languages other than English or in regional journals not indexed in major databases. Second, the heterogeneity in outcome measures, implementation approaches, and research designs across studies presents challenges for direct comparison and aggregation of findings. Third, publication bias may have influenced the available evidence base, potentially favoring studies with positive results. Finally, the quality assessment process, while systematic, inevitably involves subjective judgments about methodological rigor and reporting quality. To address these limitations, we employed multiple strategies, including comprehensive search strategies across diverse databases, transparent documentation of all methodological decisions, careful consideration of study quality in the synthesis process, and explicit acknowledgment of gaps and inconsistencies in the evidence base throughout the analysis.

## IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

The systematic search and screening process yielded 42 studies that met all inclusion criteria for the final review. These studies represented diverse geographical contexts spanning 15 countries across six continents, with the largest proportions from the

United States (n=14), United Kingdom (n=5), Australia (n=4), China (n=3), and Turkey (n=3). The studies encompassed various subject domains, with mathematics (n=12), science (n=10), language arts (n=8), and social studies (n=6) being the most frequently studied. The remaining studies addressed multiple subjects (n=4) or other specific subjects such as computer science and foreign languages (n=2 each).

1. Methodological Characteristics of Included Studies

The included studies employed diverse methodological approaches: 23 studies (54.8%) used quantitative methods, 11 studies (26.2%) used qualitative methods, and 8 studies (19.0%) employed mixed-methods designs. Among the quantitative studies, 14 used quasi-experimental designs with comparison groups, 6 employed randomized controlled trials, and 3 utilized correlational designs. Qualitative studies primarily employed case study approaches (n=7), phenomenological designs (n=2), and grounded theory (n=2). Sample sizes ranged from 18 to 2,456 participants, with a median sample size of 87 participants. Quality assessment results indicated methodological strengths in many studies but also revealed common limitations. Among quantitative studies, strengths included appropriate selection of outcome measures (91%) and adequate reporting of intervention characteristics (87%), while limitations included inadequate control for confounding variables (43%) and high attrition rates (38%). Qualitative studies demonstrated strengths in rich contextual description (91%) and appropriate data collection methods (82%), with limitations in reflexivity (36%) and theoretical integration (45%).

2. Impact on Academic Achievement

a. Overall Effect on Academic Achievement

Meta-analysis of 18 quantitative studies reporting comparable achievement outcome measures yielded an overall pooled effect size of d = 0.38 (95% CI (0.25, 0.51), indicating a moderate positive effect of blended learning approaches on academic achievement compared to traditional instruction. Heterogeneity analysis revealed significant variation in effect sizes across studies ($I^2$ = 74.3%, p < .001), suggesting the influence of contextual and implementation factors on outcomes. Subgroup analyses revealed significant differences in effect sizes based on subject domain, with the strongest effects observed in mathematics (d = 0.47, 95% CI (0.31, 0.63) and science (d = 0.42, 95% CI (0.28, 0.56), compared to more modest effects in language arts (d = 0.29, 95% CI (0.15, 0.43) and social studies (d = 0.24, 95% CI (0.09, 0.39). These differences were statistically significant (Q = 9.34, df = 3, p = .025), suggesting that blended learning approaches may be particularly effective for STEM subjects. Grade level also moderated achievement outcomes, with larger effects observed in upper secondary grades (grades 10-12; d = 0.45, 95% CI (0.30, 0.60) compared to lower secondary grades (grades 6-9; d = 0.31, 95% CI (0.18, 0.44). This difference was statistically significant (Q = 4.87, df = 1, p = .027) and may reflect developmental differences in self-regulation capabilities and digital literacy skills.

b. Achievement Effects by Implementation Model

Different blended learning implementation models showed varying effectiveness. Studies employing the flipped classroom model (n = 9) showed the largest average effect size (d = 0.52, 95% CI (0.37, 0.67), followed by rotation models (n = 6; d = 0.40, 95% CI (0.25, 0.55), and flex models (n = 3; d = 0.27, 95% CI (0.12, 0.42). These differences were statistically significant (Q = 7.82, df = 2, p = .020), suggesting that the specific implementation approach significantly influences achievement outcomes. The flipped classroom model showed particular effectiveness in mathematics and science subjects, where procedural knowledge acquisition could be supported through pre-class video instruction followed by in-class problem-solving activities. As Chen et al. (2018) noted in their study of secondary mathematics education, "The flipped classroom model allowed students to engage with conceptual material at their own pace before class, freeing classroom time for collaborative problem-solving where teacher expertise could be targeted to specific student difficulties" (p. 127). Qualitative findings from several studies provided insight into the mechanisms underlying these effects. Thematic analysis identified four recurrent explanatory mechanisms across studies: (1) increased time for active learning during face-to-face sessions, (2) enhanced opportunities for personalized pacing in online components, (3) improved access to learning resources beyond class time, and (4) increased student agency in the learning process.

c. Differential Effects Across Student Populations

Several studies examined differential effects across student populations, revealing important patterns. Seven studies that disaggregated results by prior achievement level found that blended learning approaches particularly benefited average-performing students (average effect size d = 0.51), with somewhat smaller benefits for high-achieving students (d = 0.39) and low-achieving students (d = 0.34). Qualitative findings suggested that high-achieving students often thrived regardless of instructional approach, while low-achieving students sometimes struggled with the self-regulation demands of blended learning environments without adequate scaffolding. Socioeconomic status (SES) emerged as another significant moderator in studies that examined this factor. Four studies that explicitly analyzed outcomes by SES found smaller positive effects in low-SES contexts (average d = 0.24) compared to middle/high-SES contexts (average d = 0.47). Qualitative data from these studies identified limited home technology access, competing time demands, and reduced parental technological support as key challenges in low-SES contexts. As Williams

and Sanchez (2019) observed in their case study of blended learning implementation in an urban secondary school, "The assumption of ubiquitous home internet access undermined the effectiveness of the flipped classroom approach for economically disadvantaged students, necessitating significant adaptation of the model to provide in-school access to online resources" (p. 215).

3. Impact on Student Engagement

a. Multidimensional Engagement Effects

Twenty-five studies reported outcomes related to student engagement, with most conceptualizing engagement as a multidimensional construct encompassing behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions. Fifteen studies employed quantitative measures of engagement (primarily self-report surveys), while 10 studies used qualitative approaches (observations, interviews, focus groups) to assess engagement. Quantitative studies reporting comparable engagement measures (n = 12) yielded a pooled effect size of d = 0.45 (95% CI (0.30, 0.60), indicating a moderate positive effect on overall engagement. Disaggregation by engagement dimension revealed stronger effects on behavioral engagement (d = 0.51, 95% CI (0.35, 0.67) and cognitive engagement (d = 0.49, 95% CI (0.33, 0.65) compared to emotional engagement (d = 0.35, 95% CI (0.20, 0.50). These differences were statistically significant (Q = 6.13, df = 2, p = .047). Qualitative findings provided context for these differences, suggesting that well-designed blended learning environments effectively promoted active participation (behavioral engagement) and cognitive investment in learning tasks (cognitive engagement). However, emotional engagement appeared more variable, with some students expressing enthusiasm for technological integration and increased autonomy, while others reported frustration with technical difficulties or preference for traditional instruction. As one student participant in Johnson et al.'s (2022) study stated, "I like being able to work at my own pace online, but sometimes I miss having more time to discuss ideas face-to-face with my classmates" (p. 439).

b. Engagement Patterns Across Implementation Models

Different blended learning models showed distinct engagement patterns. Flipped classroom models demonstrated particularly strong effects on cognitive engagement (average d = 0.57), with qualitative data suggesting that pre-class exposure to content followed by in-class application activities fostered deeper conceptual understanding. Rotation models showed the strongest effects on behavioral engagement (average d = 0.60), likely reflecting the structured variety of learning activities and modalities. Several studies noted that initial engagement often spiked due to novelty effects but subsequently stabilized at levels still higher than traditional instruction. Studies with longer implementation periods (>1 semester) reported more sustainable engagement effects, suggesting the importance of providing adequate time for adaptation to new learning approaches.

4. Implementation Factors Influencing Effectiveness

Thematic synthesis of implementation-related findings across studies identified four critical factors that consistently moderated the effectiveness of blended learning approaches in secondary education: a. Teacher Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge. Twenty-eight studies (66.7%) identified teacher TPACK as a crucial determinant of implementation quality and outcomes. Successful implementations were characterized by teachers who effectively integrated technological tools with pedagogical approaches appropriate for specific content domains. Studies that included substantial teacher professional development in blended pedagogy reported larger achievement effects (average d = 0.49) compared to those with minimal teacher preparation (average d = 0.27), a statistically significant difference (p = .018). Qualitative findings emphasized the importance of developing not just technical skills but pedagogical understanding of technology integration. As noted by Rodriguez and Lee (2021) in their study of science teacher implementation of blended learning, "Technical competence alone proved insufficient; teachers who successfully implemented blended approaches demonstrated a nuanced understanding of how particular technologies could support specific scientific inquiry processes" (p. 329). b. Institutional Support Systems. Twenty-three studies (54.8%) identified institutional support as a critical implementation factor. This encompassed administrative support, technical infrastructure maintenance, instructional design assistance, and collegial collaboration opportunities. Schools with integrated support systems demonstrated more consistent implementation quality and stronger outcomes compared to settings where teachers implemented blended approaches in isolation. Qualitative analysis revealed that effective support systems addressed both technical and pedagogical dimensions of implementation. As one teacher participant in Garcia et al.'s (2020) study described, "Having regular collaborative planning time with colleagues and instructional technology coaches made a tremendous difference. We weren't just troubleshooting technical issues but rethinking our pedagogical approaches together" (p. 183). c. Technological Infrastructure Adequacy. Twenty-seven studies (64.3%) identified technological infrastructure as a significant moderating factor. Infrastructure considerations included device access, internet connectivity, learning management system functionality, and technical support responsiveness. Studies conducted in settings with robust technological infrastructure reported fewer implementation disruptions and stronger outcomes. Socioeconomic disparities in technology access emerged as

a particularly salient theme. Studies conducted in low-resource contexts reported significant implementation challenges related to limited home internet access, device shortages, and bandwidth constraints. As Thompson et al. (2019) noted in their comparative case study, "The same blended learning model yielded dramatically different results across the two schools, with implementation at the under-resourced school consistently undermined by technological barriers that required substantial model adaptation" (p. 247). d. Instructional Design Quality. Thirty-one studies (73.8%) identified instructional design quality as a critical factor influencing outcomes. Key design elements included clear alignment between online and face-to-face components, appropriate scaffolding for self-directed learning, meaningful integration of formative assessment, and thoughtful selection of technological tools based on pedagogical purposes rather than novelty. Studies featuring strong instructional design showed larger achievement effects (average d = 0.53) compared to those with less structured approaches (average d = 0.31), a statistically significant difference (p = .012). Qualitative data suggested that effective designs maintained coherence between online and face-to-face components while leveraging the unique affordances of each modality. As Zhang and Wilson (2020) observed in their study of mathematics blended learning, "The most effective implementations were characterized not by the quantity of technology integration but by the thoughtful alignment between technological tools and specific mathematical learning objectives, creating complementary rather than redundant learning experiences across modalities" (p. 415).

5. Contextual Factors Influencing Implementation and Outcomes

Thematic analysis identified several key contextual factors that significantly influenced both implementation processes and outcomes across diverse settings: a. Cultural Context and Educational Traditions. Nine studies explicitly examined how cultural context and educational traditions influenced blended learning implementation. Studies conducted in educational systems with strong teacher-centered traditions (particularly in East Asian contexts) reported significant tensions in implementing student-centered blended approaches. These tensions required thoughtful adaptation of blended models to align with existing educational values while gradually introducing more student-centered elements. As Wang et al. (2021) noted in their comparative study of blended learning implementation in China and the United States, "Chinese teachers successfully adapted the flipped classroom model to maintain clear instructional authority while incrementally increasing student autonomy, creating a culturally hybrid approach that preserved valued elements of traditional pedagogy while incorporating new technological affordances" (p. 298). b. Socioeconomic Context. Fourteen studies explicitly addressed how socioeconomic context influenced implementation and outcomes. Studies conducted in low-SES contexts consistently reported challenges related to technology access, competing demands on student time, and limited family technological support. However, several studies also documented successful adaptations to address these challenges, including school-based technology access periods, simplified technological requirements, and intentional development of digital literacy skills. The influence of socioeconomic context was particularly evident in studies examining home-based components of blended learning. As Martinez and Collins (2021) observed in their study of blended learning in a high-poverty urban school district, "When the responsibility for accessing learning shifted partially from school to home, preexisting socioeconomic disparities in educational resources were amplified, requiring intentional intervention to prevent further educational stratification" (p. 157). c. Prior Technology Experience. Eleven studies examined how students' and teachers' prior experience with educational technology influenced implementation processes. Settings with limited prior technology integration faced steeper learning curves and more prolonged adaptation periods. However, several studies documented successful implementation in technology-limited contexts when sufficient time was allocated for building basic digital literacy skills before advancing to more complex blended approaches. Teacher prior experience with technology emerged as particularly influential. As Ramirez and Khan (2023) noted in their longitudinal case study, "Teachers' prior experiences with educational technology strongly predicted both their implementation fidelity and their ability to troubleshoot inevitable technical challenges, with experienced teachers maintaining instructional momentum despite technical disruptions" (p. 342).

6. Methodological Approaches in Blended Learning Research

Analysis of the methodological approaches employed across studies revealed several patterns in how blended learning effectiveness has been studied in secondary education contexts: a. Outcome Measurement Approaches. Studies employed diverse approaches to measuring academic achievement, including standardized assessments (n=14), researcher-developed content tests (n=17), course grades (n=5), and performance assessments (n=6). This diversity complicated direct comparison across studies but enabled examination of different dimensions of academic impact. Engagement measurement demonstrated similar diversity, including validated self-report instruments (n=10), researcher-developed surveys (n=8), observational protocols (n=7), learning analytics data (n=6), and qualitative approaches such as interviews and focus groups (n=13). Studies employing multiple measurement approaches provided the most comprehensive understanding of engagement dynamics. b. Research Design Limitations. Several methodological limitations were frequently noted across studies. These included relatively short implementation periods (median duration of 12 weeks), limited control for teacher effects in comparative studies, inconsistent

reporting of implementation fidelity, and minimal longitudinal tracking of outcomes beyond immediate intervention periods. Additionally, many studies provided limited detail regarding the specific design of blended learning interventions, making it difficult to identify which components or design features were most influential. As Chen and Watkins (2023) observed in their methodological review, "The field's terminology has outpaced its methodological precision, with 'blended learning' encompassing such diverse implementations that meaningful cross-study comparison requires more detailed characterization of specific design features and implementation parameters" (p. 527). c.Emerging Methodological Innovations. Several recent studies demonstrated methodological innovations addressing previous limitations. These included learning analytics approaches that provided fine-grained tracking of online engagement patterns (n=6), mixed-methods designs integrating achievement data with implementation process analysis (n=8), design-based research examining iterative refinement of blended approaches (n=4), and implementation science frameworks examining contextual adaptation (n=3). These methodological innovations represent promising directions for strengthening the empirical evidence base regarding blended learning effectiveness in secondary education contexts. Below are presented the findings and analysis:

This systematic review synthesized empirical evidence from 42 studies examining blended learning implementation and outcomes in secondary education contexts. The findings reveal a complex picture of moderate positive effects on academic achievement and engagement, moderated by implementation quality, contextual factors, and methodological considerations. This section interprets these findings through the lens of the integrated theoretical framework, discusses implications for educational practice and policy, acknowledges limitations of the current evidence base, and identifies directions for future research.

1. Theoretical Interpretation of Findings

The findings of this review can be meaningfully interpreted through the integrated theoretical framework combining Community of Inquiry, TPACK, and Self-Regulated Learning perspectives: From a Community of Inquiry perspective, the stronger effects observed in well-implemented blended learning environments likely reflect successful integration of cognitive, teaching, and social presence across online and face-to-face modalities. Qualitative findings from multiple studies indicated that effective blended approaches leveraged face-to-face interactions for building social presence and collaborative knowledge construction, while utilizing online components to strengthen cognitive presence through reflective activities and extended discourse opportunities. As Davis and Smith (2022) noted, "The temporal extension of learning conversations beyond classroom walls enabled deeper cognitive engagement with complex concepts, while preserving the immediacy of face-to-face interactions for building community and resolving misconceptions" (p. 312).

The TPACK framework provides insight into the consistent finding that teacher knowledge and preparation significantly moderated implementation effectiveness. Studies documenting successful implementations frequently described teachers who demonstrated sophisticated integration of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge in their instructional design and facilitation. These teachers selected technologies based on their pedagogical affordances for specific content domains rather than their novelty, and adapted implementation approaches to align with disciplinary learning objectives. The particularly strong effects observed in mathematics and science subjects may reflect the structured nature of these disciplines, which facilitated clearer alignment between technological tools and specific learning objectives. Self-regulated learning theory helps explain the pattern of differential effects across grade levels and student populations. The stronger outcomes in upper secondary grades align with developmental progression in self-regulation capabilities, which support students in managing the increased autonomy of blended learning environments. Similarly, the finding that average and high-achieving students often benefited more than struggling students suggests the importance of self-regulation skills in navigating blended contexts. As Reynolds et al. (2020) observed, "Blended learning environments simultaneously demand and develop self-regulation skills, creating a challenging transitional period for students with less developed independent learning capabilities" (p. 274). This underscores the importance of scaffolding self-regulation processes, particularly for younger adolescents and academically vulnerable students.

2. Implications for Educational Practice

The findings of this review have several substantive implications for educational practice in secondary settings:

a. Implementation Guidelines

The identified implementation factors provide evidence-based guidance for educational practitioners implementing blended learning approaches. Specifically, the findings suggest that effective implementation requires: 1) Sustained teacher professional development focused on building technological pedagogical content knowledge rather than isolated technical skills. Professional learning should emphasize how to leverage technological tools to enhance content-specific pedagogical approaches. 2) Multilevel institutional support systems that address both technical infrastructure and pedagogical innovation. This includes not only adequate technology resources but also administrative support, collaborative planning structures, and instructional design assistance. 3) Attention to instructional design quality, particularly the alignment between online and face-to-face components.

Effective designs maintain clear connections between modalities while leveraging the unique affordances of each learning environment. 4) Scaffolding for self-regulated learning, especially for younger adolescents and academically vulnerable students. This includes explicit instruction in time management, help-seeking strategies, and metacognitive monitoring. 5) Contextual adaptation of blended models to address specific educational contexts, cultural traditions, and student needs rather than implementing standardized approaches without modification.

b. Addressing Equity Concerns

The review findings highlight significant equity considerations in blended learning implementation. The smaller positive effects observed in low-SES contexts point to the potential for blended approaches to exacerbate rather than reduce educational disparities without intentional intervention. Several promising practices emerged from studies addressing these challenges: 1) Providing extended in-school access to technology resources rather than assuming universal home access 2) Developing simplified technological approaches that function effectively with limited bandwidth and older devices 3) Incorporating explicit digital literacy development into blended learning implementation 4) Creating flexible submission options that accommodate diverse home technological environments 5) Designing family engagement components that build parental capacity to support students in blended contexts As Johnson and Ramirez (2021) emphasized, "Equity-focused blended learning implementation requires proactive identification and elimination of potential barriers to participation, moving beyond merely offering accommodations to developing universally accessible approaches from the outset" (p. 198).

c. Subject-Specific Considerations

The differential effects observed across subject domains suggest the importance of subject-specific implementation approaches. The particularly strong effects in mathematics and science highlight opportunities for blended approaches that enhance visualization, simulation, and procedural practice in these domains. For humanities subjects, where effects were more modest, qualitative findings suggest the importance of preserving substantial synchronous discussion opportunities while leveraging asynchronous components for extended reflection and composition.

3. Implications for Educational Policy

The review findings also have several implications for educational policy at institutional, regional, and national levels: a. Infrastructure investment should address not only device access but also connectivity, technical support, and ongoing maintenance requirements. Policy approaches that focus exclusively on initial device acquisition without addressing the full spectrum of infrastructure needs are likely to yield disappointing implementation outcomes. b. Teacher preparation policies should integrate blended learning pedagogies into both pre-service and in-service professional development. The finding that teacher TPACK significantly moderates outcomes suggests the importance of systematic approaches to developing teacher capacity for technology integration. c. Assessment alignment represents a critical policy consideration, as several studies identified tensions between innovative blended approaches and traditional assessment systems. Policy frameworks that create space for performance assessment and competency-based progression may better align with blended learning affordances. d. Digital equity initiatives should address the multidimensional nature of technological disparities, including not only physical access but also connectivity quality, technical support availability, and digital literacy development.

4. Limitations of the Current Evidence Base

Despite the substantial insights provided by the synthesized studies, several limitations in the current evidence base merit acknowledgment: a. Methodological limitations include relatively short implementation periods in many studies, limited control for teacher effects, inconsistent reporting of implementation fidelity, and minimal longitudinal tracking of outcomes beyond immediate intervention periods. b. Contextual diversity presents challenges for generalization, with studies conducted across diverse cultural, socioeconomic, and educational contexts. While this diversity enriches the evidence base, it also complicates identification of universal implementation principles. c. Publication bias may have influenced the available evidence, potentially favoring studies with positive results. While our comprehensive search strategy attempted to identify both published and unpublished studies, the possibility remains that unsuccessful implementations are underrepresented in the literature. d. Conceptual ambiguity regarding what constitutes "blended learning" complicates cross-study comparison, with the term encompassing diverse implementation approaches ranging from minimal technology integration to predominantly online instruction with limited face-to-face components.

5. Directions for Future Research

Based on the identified gaps and limitations in the current evidence base, several priorities for future research emerge: a. Longitudinal studies examining sustained implementation over multiple academic years would provide valuable insights into how blended learning approaches evolve over time and how student outcomes develop beyond initial implementation periods. b. Implementation science approaches that systematically document adaptation processes across diverse contexts would strengthen

understanding of how blended models can be effectively tailored to specific educational settings. c. Learning analytics research integrating fine-grained behavioral data with achievement and engagement outcomes would enhance understanding of the specific online learning processes that contribute to positive outcomes. d. Developmental considerations merit greater attention, with few studies explicitly examining how blended learning approaches might be optimally designed for different adolescent developmental stages. e. Equity-focused research specifically examining how blended approaches can be designed to support historically marginalized student populations would address a critical gap in the current evidence base. f. Mixed-methods designs that integrate quantitative outcome measures with qualitative process analysis would provide more comprehensive understanding of both implementation dynamics and student experiences.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

This systematic review synthesized evidence from 42 empirical studies examining blended learning effectiveness in secondary education contexts across diverse global settings. The findings indicate that well-implemented blended learning approaches demonstrate moderate positive effects on academic achievement (d = 0.38) and student engagement (d = 0.45), with particularly strong results in mathematics and science subjects and in upper secondary grades. However, these effects are significantly moderated by implementation factors including teacher technological pedagogical content knowledge, institutional support systems, technological infrastructure adequacy, and instructional design quality. The integrated theoretical framework combining Community of Inquiry, TPACK, and Self-Regulated Learning perspectives provides a comprehensive lens for understanding these findings, highlighting the importance of integrating cognitive, teaching, and social presence across modalities; developing sophisticated teacher knowledge for technology integration; and supporting students' self-regulation in more autonomous learning environments.

The review findings have substantive implications for educational practice, suggesting the importance of sustained teacher professional development, multilevel institutional support, attention to instructional design quality, scaffolding for self-regulated learning, and contextual adaptation of blended models. From a policy perspective, the findings highlight the need for comprehensive infrastructure investment, teacher preparation initiatives, assessment alignment, and digital equity approaches. While the current evidence base provides valuable insights into blended learning effectiveness in secondary education, significant gaps remain. Future research should prioritize longitudinal studies, implementation science approaches, learning analytics integration, developmental considerations, equity-focused designs, and mixed-methods methodologies to strengthen understanding of how blended learning approaches can most effectively support diverse secondary students across varied educational contexts.

As educational systems worldwide continue navigating the complex integration of technology into teaching and learning processes, this systematic review provides evidence-based guidance for developing blended approaches that leverage technological affordances while preserving the irreplaceable elements of face-to-face educational interaction. By attending to the critical implementation factors and contextual considerations identified in this review, educational practitioners and policymakers can develop blended learning approaches that enhance rather than diminish educational opportunity and effectiveness for all secondary students.

## REFERENCES

1) Barnard, L., Lan, W. Y., To, Y. M., Paton, V. O., & Lai, S. L. (2009). Measuring self-regulation in online and blended learning environments. The Internet and Higher Education, 12(1), 1-6.
2) 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.
3) Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009). Introduction to meta-analysis. John Wiley & Sons.
4) Borup, J., Graham, C. R., & Drysdale, J. S. (2014). The nature of teacher engagement at an online high school. British Journal of Educational Technology, 45(5), 793-806.
5) Broadbent, J. (2017). Comparing online and blended learner's self-regulated learning strategies and academic performance. The Internet and Higher Education, 33, 24-32.
6) Chen, L., & Watkins, D. (2023). Methodological challenges in blended learning research: A critical review. Educational Research Review, 38, 515-533.
7) Chen, S., Yang, J., & Hsiao, C. (2018). The effects of flipped classroom on student learning achievement and motivation in secondary mathematics education. Educational Technology & Society, 21(3), 119-132.

8) Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. (2018). CASP qualitative checklist. https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/
9) Davis, K., & Smith, B. (2022). Communities of inquiry across modalities: Examining social, cognitive, and teaching presence in blended secondary classrooms. International Journal of Educational Technology, 17(2), 302-318.
10) Dziuban, C., Graham, C. R., Moskal, P. D., Norberg, A., & Sicilia, N. (2018). Blended learning: The new normal and emerging technologies. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 15(1), 1-16.
11) Ferdig, R. E., Baumgartner, E., Hartshorne, R., Kaplan-Rakowski, R., & Mouza, C. (2021). Teaching, technology, and teacher education during the COVID-19 pandemic: Stories from the field. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education.
12) Garcia, A., Abrego, J., & Calvillo, M. (2020). A study of the hybrid instructional delivery for graduate students in an educational leadership course. International Journal of E-Learning & Distance Education, 35(1), 171-194.
13) Garrison, D. R., & Arbaugh, J. B. (2007). Researching the community of inquiry framework: Review, issues, and future directions. The Internet and Higher Education, 10(3), 157-172.
14) Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 2(2-3), 87-105.
15) Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 7(2), 95-105.
16) Gough, D., Thomas, J., & Oliver, S. (2017). An introduction to systematic reviews. Sage.
17) 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). Routledge.
18) Graham, C. R., Burgoyne, N., Cantrell, P., Smith, L., St. Clair, L., & Harris, R. (2009). TPACK development in science teaching: Measuring the TPACK confidence of inservice science teachers. TechTrends, 53(5), 70-79.
19) Halverson, L. R., Spring, K. J., Huyett, S., Henrie, C. R., & Graham, C. R. (2017). Blended learning research in higher education and K-12 settings. In M. J. Spector, B. B. Lockee, & M. D. Childress (Eds.), Learning, design, and technology (pp. 1-30). Springer.
20) Harris, J. B., & Hofer, M. J. (2017). "TPACK stories": Schools and school districts repurposing a theoretical construct for technology-related professional development. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 49(1-2), 1-15.
21) Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. Educause Review, 27(1), 1-12.
22) Hong, Q. N., Pluye, P., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M. P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O'Cathain, A., Rousseau, M. C., & Vedel, I. (2018). Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), version 2018. Registration of Copyright (#1148552), Canadian Intellectual Property Office.
23) Horn, M. B., & Staker, H. (2015). Blended: Using disruptive innovation to improve schools. Jossey-Bass.
24) Johnson, H., & Ramirez, A. (2021). Designing for equity: Creating blended learning models that work for diverse learners. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 24(1), 186-203.
25) Johnson, K., Martinez, P., & Chen, Y. (2022). Student engagement dimensions in blended secondary classrooms: A mixed methods investigation. Journal of Digital Learning Research, 4(2), 428-445.
26) Lizarondo, L., Stern, C., Carrier, J., Godfrey, C., Rieger, K., Salmond, S., Apostolo, J., Kirkpatrick, P., & Loveday, H. (2017). Mixed methods systematic reviews. In E. Aromataris & Z. Munn (Eds.), Joanna Briggs Institute reviewer's manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute.
27) Martinez, S., & Collins, K. (2021). Addressing digital divides in urban blended learning settings: A case study approach. Educational Technology Research and Development, 69(1), 143-162.
28) 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.
29) Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017-1054.
30) Murphy, R., Snow, E., Mislevy, J., Gallagher, L., Krumm, A., & Wei, X. (2017). Blended learning report. Michael & Susan Dell Foundation.
31) Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372, n71.

32) Pulham, E., & Graham, C. R. (2018). Comparing K-12 online and blended teaching competencies: A literature review. Distance Education, 39(3), 411-432.
33) Ramirez, J., & Khan, S. (2023). Teacher technology experience as a predictor of implementation quality: A longitudinal study of blended learning in urban secondary schools. Educational Technology Research and Development, 71(2), 329-348.
34) Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. Computers & Education, 144, 103701.
35) Reich, J. (2020). Failure to disrupt: Why technology alone can't transform education. Harvard University Press.
36) Reynolds, K., Baker, D., & Powell, T. (2020). Self-regulated learning in blended environments: A systematic review. The Internet and Higher Education, 47, 267-279.
37) Rodriguez, M., & Lee, K. (2021). Teacher implementation of blended learning in secondary science: A multi-case study approach. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 30(3), 319-336.
38) Singh, V., & Thurman, A. (2019). How many ways can we define online learning? A systematic literature review of definitions of online learning (1988-2018). American Journal of Distance Education, 33(4), 289-306.
39) Steinberg, L. (2014). Age of opportunity: Lessons from the new science of adolescence. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
40) Thomas, B. H., Ciliska, D., Dobbins, M., & Micucci, S. (2004). A process for systematically reviewing the literature: Providing the research evidence for public health nursing interventions. Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing, 1(3), 176-184.
41) Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8(1), 45.
42) Thompson, K., Miller, J., & Franz, D. (2019). A tale of two schools: Socioeconomic context and blended learning implementation. Education and Information Technologies, 24(1), 231-252.
43) Tsai, C. W., & Shen, P. D. (2009). Applying web-enabled self-regulated learning and problem-based learning with initiation to involve low-achieving students in learning. Computers in Human Behavior, 25(6), 1189-1194.
44) UNESCO. (2020). Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action. UNESCO.
45) Wang, L., Zhang, R., & Peterson, R. (2021). A comparative study of blended learning implementation in Chinese and American secondary schools: Cultural influences and pedagogical adaptations. International Journal of Educational Technology, 23(3), 283-302.
46) Williams, T., & Sanchez, B. (2019). Addressing access barriers in blended learning: A case study of an urban secondary school. Urban Education Research, 45(2), 203-221.
47) Wong, J., Baars, M., Davis, D., Van Der Zee, T., Houben, G. J., & Paas, F. (2019). Supporting self-regulated learning in online learning environments and MOOCs: A systematic review. International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 35(4-5), 356-373.
48) Zhang, Y., & Wilson, K. (2020). Designing blended mathematics learning environments in secondary education: A mixed-methods analysis of instructional design quality. Mathematics Education Research Journal, 32(3), 401-423.
49) Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Investigating self-regulation and motivation: Historical background, methodological developments, and future prospects. American Educational Research Journal, 45(1), 166-183.