World Journal of Educational Studies
Print ISSN: 2959-9989
Online ISSN: 2959-9997
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61784/wjes3099

THE DUAL-TEACHER BLENDED TEACHING MODEL FOR MOOC-BASED COLLEGE ENGLISH

Lv Lin, ZhiYing Li*
School of Foreign Studies, South China Agricultural University, Guangzhou 510642, Guangdong, China.
Corresponding Author: ZhiYing Li

Abstract: This study addresses core challenges in College English teaching: insufficient teacher blended teaching competence and limited school-based curriculum adaptability. It constructs a MOOC-based Dual-Teacher Blended Teaching Model, integrating online MOOC instructors and offline teachers into a collaborative community. Implementation involves four approaches: optimizing teaching processes, enhancing information technology application, redefining teacher-student roles, and adopting diversified evaluations. Empirical results show the model significantly improves teachers' competence and curriculum adaptability, stimulates students' learning interest, and boosts their autonomous learning ability. Future development of this model will focus on deepening technology integration, diversifying teaching forms, and refining evaluation systems, expected to provide a new paradigm for College English teaching reform.
Keywords: MOOCs; Dual-teacher blended teaching; College English; Teaching model innovation

1 INTRODUCTION

Massive Open Online Courses, or MOOCs，a term first coined by Dave Cormier and Bryan Alexander, emerged in 2008, and swiftly gained global momentum, spreading across higher education institutions, attracting millions of learners worldwide, and evolving from niche online offerings to a mainstream educational resource. Top universities such as Stanford University, Harvard University, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology took the lead in launching influential MOOC platforms, including Coursera, Udacity, and Edx, providing a wealth of high-quality free or low-cost course resources for learners worldwide. In China, MOOCs have also developed rapidly, with major universities and educational institutions launching their own MOOC platforms such as China University MOOC and Xuetang Online, which have infusing new vitality into college English teaching and advancing the digital transformation of traditional teaching models.

Boasting openness, flexibility, and abundant resources, MOOCs offer notable advantages in college English teaching. For one, they break time and space constraints, enabling students to learn anytime, anywhere while enhancing learning convenience and efficiency. For another, MOOCs provide a vast array of high-quality English teaching resources, such as video lectures, online quizzes, and interactive discussions, which help spark students' learning interest and motivation. Additionally, leveraging technical tools like data analytics, they provide personalized learning path recommendations, thereby supporting the delivery of individualized instruction. However, the effectiveness of MOOCs in enhancing student academic performance and engagement remains a key challenge, compounded by high dropout rates and low retention [1].

2 CURRENT STATUS AND CHALLENGES OF MOOC-BASED BLENDED TEACHING IN COLLEGE ENGLISH

College English Teaching Guidelines (2020 Edition) emphasizes that universities nationwide should fully leverage rapidly advancing digital information technology to deepen reforms of teaching concepts and models. Specifically, they need to incorporate online courses into curriculum design and prioritize developing high-quality offerings—including open online courses, offline courses, and online-offline blended courses. As the integration of information technology with college English teaching enters a new stage, blended teaching reform is gradually shifting from extensive development to refined practice. This shift places higher demands on university teachers' blended teaching competence, with key bottlenecks such as inadequate teacher capabilities and limited school-based adaptability of curriculum resources restricting the reform's further advancement.

2.1 Gaps in Teachers' Blended Teaching Competence

As the primary implementers of blended teaching, teachers confront multiple challenges. Technical difficulties, obstacles in integrating technology with courses, and heavy time and workload pressures have contributed to a slightly negative attitude to conduct blended teaching[2]. Meanwhile, pre-service teacher education curricula often lack training in online and blended teaching, leaving most teachers only equipped with the knowledge and skills for traditional classroom instruction. They lack a solid grasp of the theoretical frameworks and pedagogical principles underlying online and blended teaching, with particular gaps in pedagogical preparation [3]. According to relevant teaching quality

reports, only a small proportion of college English teachers have received systematic blended teaching training, and most report struggling to effectively integrate online resources with offline classroom practices.

2.2 Inadequate Alignment of School-Based Curricula with Current Teaching Requirements

Current college English teaching relies heavily on multimedia courseware, yet most universities use materials uniformly supplied by publishers. While such resources offer universal applicability, they fail to accurately align with the unique institutional characteristics of different universities or the personalized needs of students. For example, an agricultural university still employs general business English courseware for its English classes, disconnected from students' demands for agricultural-specific English proficiency. Similarly, English teaching in art colleges lacks targeted design for cross-cultural artistic communication scenarios, which significantly undermines the practical value of the courses.

2.3 Deficits in the Adaptability of MOOC-Based Blended Teaching to School-Specific Needs

MOOCs have to some extent enabled personalization in both students' learning and teachers' teaching. However, in MOOC-based blended teaching, many educators tend to adopt a modular design by typically alternating between face-to-face instruction and online courses on a weekly basis, which fragments students' learning experiences both spatially and temporally. The absence of "teaching presence" hinders effective learning [4]. Defined as the immersive learning environment fostered by teachers through well-structured instructional activities, active facilitation of interaction, and targeted guidance, teaching presence serves as a key prerequisite for meaningful learning outcomes. This research argues that MOOC learning should not be confined to independent online study; rather, it must be deeply integrated with offline classroom instruction to truly materialize a student-centered, teacher-led pedagogical model.

Therefore, to highlight universities' distinctive characteristics and implement the student-centered educational philosophy, it is essential to encourage offline teachers to creatively utilize high-quality MOOC resources. To this end, this project aims to establish a dual-teacher blended teaching framework, which features collaboration between on-campus offline teachers and MOOC online instructors. Through in-depth cooperation, both parties will jointly design teaching formats tailored to their institution's student profile, thereby identifying the optimal balance and integration model between online MOOC learning and traditional face-to-face instruction.

3 DESIGN OF A DUAL-TEACHER BLENDED TEACHING MODEL FOR COLLEGE ENGLISH BASED ON MOOCS

3.1 Dual-teacher Blended Teaching Model

The dual-teacher teaching model is a type of co-teaching (also known as collaborative teaching or team teaching). Simply put, co-teaching involves two or more teachers working together through the entire teaching process, from designing lesson plans and preparing teaching resources to organizing in-class activities and evaluating learning outcomes [5]. Dual-teacher classrooms are most commonly used in basic education, with a core structure of "remote lecturing teacher + local tutoring teacher". The remote teacher delivers key knowledge via live streaming, while the local teacher handles on-the-ground tasks: maintaining classroom order, answering students' questions and grading assignments. The ultimate goal is to reduce the imbalance in teacher resources across regions and schools, fostering more equitable distribution of educational resources and greater educational equity [6].

The strength of this model lies in its division of labor: online teachers focus on explaining core course content, and offline teachers manage real-time interactions with students. By combining their efforts, the model effectively addresses common drawbacks of online courses, such as lack of meaningful teacher-student engagement [7].

Beyond basic education, the "dual-teacher teaching model" is also widely used in vocational education—full-time vocational college teachers and part-time enterprise teachers co-teach a single course, with their complementary knowledge and skills driving desired teaching outcomes [8]. Dual-teacher model is rarely applied in college English. However, Fudan University's English team has adopted interdisciplinary collaborative teaching for ESP(English for Specific Purposes) courses. They designed an Academic English (Medical) course for basic medical science students and proposed a framework for this co-teaching model [9].

Overall, the dual-teacher teaching model is still in the exploratory phase of application in higher education, with relatively few systematic studies focusing on its use in college English teaching specifically. Drawing on the disciplinary characteristics of college English teaching and the talent training goals of universities, this study proposes a dual-teacher blended teaching model tailored to college English instruction in university settings. The core value of this model lies in fully unlocking the teaching potential of high-quality MOOC resources while leveraging on-campus offline teachers' ability to accurately understand students' learning progress and needs.

Teachers are not isolated teaching individuals but collaborative subjects within a specific educational ecosystem.By sharing knowledge, exchanging experiences, and engaging in joint practice, they can form a teaching community bound by professional cohesion. This community helps break through the limitations of individual teaching capacities, supports teachers' professional growth, and empowers them to enhance teaching competence, expand their knowledge base, broaden their horizons, and boost innovation [10]. The dual-teacher blended teaching model developed in this study fosters a stable teaching community between online and offline teachers through regular collaboration mechanisms. These include periodic teaching and research meetings, joint student learning analysis sessions, and

co-creation workshops for teaching plans. Online teachers can gain insights into students' key learning challenges via offline teachers, allowing them to optimize MOOC content in a targeted way. In turn, offline teachers can draw on online teachers' expertise in technology application and innovative teaching approaches to break free from the constraints of traditional teaching mindsets.

3.2 MOOC-based Dual-teacher Blended Teaching Model

MOOCs, defined as large-scale, open online academic courses featuring flexibility, efficiency, high quality, and advanced technology, have become an imperative driver for teaching reform. Both online courses and offline face-to-face instruction rely on the flexible application of information technology, and the dual-teacher blended teaching model further integrates three core approaches: MOOC-based online learning, offline instruction, and mobile learning. As a student centred model, it prioritizes improving learning completion rates, tracking individual learning progress, and fostering effective interaction and communication among peers.

The core feature of this model is its collaborative teaching mechanism: online MOOC instructors deliver knowledge and demonstrations virtually, with the key responsibility of providing standardized, high-quality resources. On-campus offline teachers take charge of classroom organization, interaction facilitation, and personalized guidance, leading the adaptation to students' learning needs and the implementation of teaching activities. Through full-cycle collaboration, including pre-class teaching research, in-class coordination, and post-class feedback, the two parties jointly design teaching plans, forming a closed-loop system. The specific division of labor is shown in the table 1 below.

Table 1 Division of Responsibilities for Dual-Teacher Roles

Teaching Stages	Responsibilities of Online MOOC Instructors	Responsibilities of On-Campus Offline Teachers
Pre-class	Provide MOOC resource lists, set basic teaching objectives, and design pre-test questions	Conduct student learning situation surveys, analyze students' deficiency
In-class (40 minutes)	Present microlectures, assign real-time tests, and provide feedback on learning data	Organize interactive activities, answer personalized questions, and adjust teaching pace
Post-class	Assign personalized exercises, update MOOC resources, and participate in teaching effect evaluation	Grade assignments, conduct one-on-one tutoring, and collect student feedback

4 IMPLEMENTATION APPROACHES AND EFFECT ANALYSIS

4.1 Implementation Approaches

The implementation approaches of the MOOC-based dual-teacher blended teaching model for college English mainly include the following aspects.

4.1.1 Optimize classroom processes and emphasize teacher collaboration

In the pre-class stage, online and offline teachers complete the school-based integration of MOOC resources and the collaborative design of teaching plans through regular research meetings. They screen and reorganize MOOC content based on the needs of students from different majors, and supplement school-specific modules. For example, a special topic on "Agricultural English Terminology" is added for students of agricultural majors, while cases on "Cross-cultural Art Communication" are designed for art students.

During the class, a blended process is adopted. In the first 20 minutes, online teachers present microlectures through the MOOC system, assign real-time quizzes, and provide feedback on learning data. In the subsequent 20 minutes, offline teachers organize interactive activities such as group discussions, and presentations. They deliver collective clarifications on students' common questions and individualized guidance tailored to their specific learning needs. Concurrently, real-time access to students' MOOC learning trajectories via the smart classroom system enables dynamic adjustments to the teaching rhythm.

After the class, based on learning data analysis, online instructors provide students with personalized review resources and extended exercises. Offline instructors grade assignments, and answer questions via the learning platform. To drive continuous improvement, two parties hold regular debrief sessions to identify teaching challenges and refine subsequent plans.

4.1.2 Innovate teaching concepts and upgrade IT application in classrooms

Technology empowerment is the core backbone of the dual-teacher model. By integrating computers, smartphones, tablets and other devices, we build a multi-dimensional interactive system: teachers use instant feedback systems for real-time in-class quiz statistics, student submission features to gather classroom presentation materials, and online collaboration tools to facilitate interactive group learning. Additionally, AI speech assessment technology is integrated to provide real-time scoring and targeted error correction for students' oral expressions, boosting language output accuracy.

To foster critical thinking abilities, we design activities following the "problem-driven – inquiry-based collaboration – outcome innovation" framework. First, open-ended questions are posed (e.g., "How to effectively conduct cross-cultural business negotiations in English"). Students then collaborate on solutions via online research and offline group

discussions, before showcasing results through English reports, situational simulations, and other formats. This process comprehensively enhances their critical thinking and innovation capabilities.

4.1.3 Reposition teacher-student relationship and enhance teaching quality

In the dual-teacher blended teaching model, the teacher-student relationship has undergone a fundamental restructuring: MOOC teachers act as knowledge providers, delivering a systematic knowledge framework; offline teachers serve as learning guides, overseeing the learning process and offering personalized support; students take on the role of active learners in the classroom, steering their own learning journey.

In the dual-teacher blended teaching model, offline teachers play a central role in academic guidance. On the one hand, they dynamically monitor students' learning status, identify learning challenges through regular interactive communication, and promptly optimize teaching strategies. On the other hand, they prioritize students' psychological support: specifically, to alleviate anxiety potentially stemming from online learning, they organize targeted activities, such as group ice-breaking sessions and learning experience exchange seminars. Empirical data from a local undergraduate university show that under this model, the incidence of students' learning anxiety has dropped significantly, while their classroom participation has increased substantially.

4.1.4 Adopt diversified evaluations to comprehensively assess effectiveness

A holistic assessment is adopted to comprehensively evaluate the course's teaching effectiveness, integrating multi-dimensional content, diverse forms, pluralistic subjects, varied methods, and multi-perspective functions. Key elements include students' academic performance and classroom behavior, combined with regular, process-based, and final assessments; dual-subject participation by teachers and students; and assessment functions oriented toward promoting learning, teaching, and examinations, supported by online tools provided by MOOC platforms.

4.2 Effect Analysis

Empirical research conducted by a university in South China has underscored the significant advantages of the MOOC-based dual-teacher blended teaching model in college English instruction, particularly in three core dimensions: enhancing students' learning engagement, cultivating autonomous learning abilities, and optimizing teaching quality. The university implemented the model in a college English course (covering 6 classes and 323 students) over two academic semesters, complemented by questionnaire surveys (valid response rate: 89.3%) and in-depth interviews (10 students and 6 teachers selected via purposive sampling).

The research findings showed that in terms of students, 84.9% of respondents expressed approval of the teaching model, with 78.5% reporting "significantly increased learning interest due to enhanced classroom interactivity" and 75.3% noting that "personalized practice and targeted guidance effectively addressed long-standing language weaknesses". Additionally, 80.8% of students indicated improvements in their autonomous learning planning and collaborative discussion abilities.

All participating teachers (100%) confirmed that "dual-teacher collaboration significantly reduced routine teaching workload (e.g., knowledge explanation) and improved teaching precision by focusing on personalized guidance." Meanwhile, 83.3% of teachers reported that "systematic collaborative exchanges with MOOC instructors and peer offline teachers substantially enhanced their own blended teaching design and implementation capabilities."

Furthermore, the model effectively strengthened teacher-student interaction, with in-class interactive participation rate increased by 40%, directly contributing to the overall improvement of teaching quality.

5 CONCLUSIONS

This study focuses on the application of MOOCs in college English teaching by constructing a MOOC-based dual-teacher blended model. It clarifies the collaborative division of labor and provides practical guidance for offline teachers to transition into compound roles. Notably, the model effectively addresses three key challenges in college English teaching: enhancing teachers' blended teaching competencies, improving curriculum adaptability, and optimizing the fairness of evaluation. It also demonstrates significant advantages in boosting students' learning interest, strengthening their autonomous learning abilities, and elevating overall teaching quality.

Despite achieving certain results, this model still has room for improvement. For one thing, some teachers' information literacy remains inadequate to support in-depth collaboration. For another, the integrated application of information technology is still in the exploratory phase.

The future development of the MOOC-based dual-teacher blended teaching model in college English will focus on three core dimensions. First, the model will deepen technology integration and innovation. An intelligent recommendation system will be built by leveraging artificial intelligence, big data and other technologies to deliver personalized learning paths for students, while precise teaching feedback will be generated for teachers through learning behavior data analysis, continuously enhancing MOOC teaching adaptability. Second, the model will advance the diversification of teaching formats. Based on the traditional online-offline integration model, immersive teaching approaches such as virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) will be actively explored to enrich learning experiences and optimize learning outcomes. Third, the model will refine the learning evaluation system. Multi-dimensional indicators covering both learning processes and outcomes will be established, and academic integrity supervision will be strengthened to ensure the fairness and accuracy of evaluation results.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

FUNDING

The project was supported by 2021 University-Industry Collaborative Education Program of the Ministry of Education (Project No. 202102093110).

REFERENCES

[1] Rizwan S, Nee C K, Garfan S. Identifying the Factors Affecting Student Academic Performance and Engagement Prediction in MOOC Using Deep Learning: A Systematic Literature Review. IEEE Access, 2025, 13: 18952-18982.
[2] Feng Xiaoying, Wang Ruixue, Wu Yijun. A Literature Review on Blended Learning: Based on Analytical Framework of Blended Learning. Journal of Distance Education, 2018, 36(03): 13-24.
[3] Keengwe J, Kang J J. A Review of Empirical Research on Blended Learning in Teacher Education Programs. Education and Information Technologies, 2013, 18(3).
[4] Garrison D R, Vaughan N D. Institutional Change and Leadership Associated with Blended Learning Innovation: Two Case Studies. Internet & Higher Education, 2013(4): 24-28.
[5] Pancsofar N, Petroff J G. Professional Development Experiences in Co-Teaching: Associations with Teacher Confidence, Interests, and Attitudes. Teacher Education and Special Education, 2013, 36(2): 83-96.
[6] Nie Yong, Gao Hongying, Wang Xin. Construction of Community Model of "Double-teacher Teaching": Analysis and Research on the Relationship between Elements and Structure. E-Education Research, 2020, 41(12): 65-70. DOI: 10.13811/j.cnki.eer.2020.12.009.
[7] Zhou Fangmiao, He Xiangyang. A Practical Study on the Mechanism of Sharing High-Quality Teaching Resources through Dual-Teacher Classrooms. Chinese Journal of ICT in Education, 2020(05): 45-49.
[8] Diao Junfeng, Han Xibin. The Development of Criteria to Assess Dual Professional TVET Teachers' Teaching Competency. Modern Distance Education, 2021(06): 13-20. DOI: 10.13927/j.cnki.yuan.20211012.007.
[9] Fan Ye, Sun Qingxiang, Ji Peiying. Exploring collaborative interdisciplinary team teaching for ESP courses in the context of the “Four New” Construction: A case study of Fudan University's academic English course for medical students. Foreign Language World, 2023(05): 8-15.
[10] Stewart T, Perry B. Interdisciplinary Team Teaching as a Model for Teacher Development. Tesl Ej, 2005, 9(2): 1-17.