

**REPUBLIC OF TURKIYE
AMASYA UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION PROGRAM**

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS'
PERCEPTIONS ABOUT FACE-TO-FACE LANGUAGE TEACHING
AND EMERGENCY REMOTE LANGUAGE TEACHING AFTER THE
COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

Master's Thesis

ENSAR ASLANTÜRK

AMASYA

May – 2024

T.C.
AMASYA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI

COVID-19 PANDEMİSİ SONRASINDA İNGİLİZCE
ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN YÜZ YÜZE DİL ÖĞRETİMİ VE ACİL
UZAKTAN DİL ÖĞRETİMİ HAKKINDAKİ ALGILARI ÜZERİNE
KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR ÇALIŞMA

Hazırlayan
Ensar ASLANTÜRK

Tez Danışmanı
Doç. Dr. Kadim ÖZTÜRK

AMASYA – 2024

TEZ ONAY SAYFASI

Ensar ASLANTÜRK tarafından hazırlanan “A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS ABOUT FACE-TO-FACE LANGUAGE TEACHING AND EMERGENCY REMOTE LANGUAGE TEACHING AFTER THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC” (Covid-19 Pandemisi sonrasında İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Yüz Yüze Dil Öğretimi ve Acil Uzaktan Dil Öğretimi hakkındaki Algıları Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı bir Çalışma) başlıklı çalışma aşağıdaki jüri tarafından 19/04/2024 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda oy birliği ile Amasya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalında Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri

İmza

Danışman : Doç. Dr. Kadim ÖZTÜRK

Üye : Prof. Dr. Yeşim BEKTAŞ ÇETİNKAYA

Üye : Doç. Dr. Melike BAŞ

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylıyorum. .../05/2024

.....

Doç. Dr. Hasan YERKAZAN

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitü Müdürü

ETİK BEYAN SAYFASI

Tezimin içerdiki yenilik ve sonuçları başka bir yerden almadığımı ve bu tezi Amasya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsünden başka bir bilim kuruluşuna akademik gaye ve unvan almak amacıyla vermediğimi; tez içindeki bütün bilgilerin etik davranış ve akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde edilerek sunulduğunu, ayrıca tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanan bu çalışmada kullanılan her türlü kaynağa eksiksiz atıf yapıldığını, bu tezde sunduğum çalışmanın özgün olduğunu bildirir, aksinin ortaya çıkması durumunda aleyhime doğabilecek tüm hak kayıplarını kabullendiğimi beyan ederim.

19/04/2024

Ensar ASLANTÜRK

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS ABOUT FACE-TO-FACE LANGUAGE TEACHING AND EMERGENCY REMOTE LANGUAGE TEACHING AFTER THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

Ensar ASLANTÜRK

Amasya University, Institute of Social Sciences

Department of Foreign Language Education, M.A., April/2024

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kadim ÖZTÜRK

The outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic has affected the process of teaching and learning all around the world. Along with the rapid changes in the educational contexts, English teaching and learning methods have changed to a great extent as well. Similarly, teachers’ motivation, thoughts, ideas, emotions and perceptions have been affected by these changes. After the transition from face-to-face education to online education at the first stage, all the stakeholders of the education tried to comply with the necessities of the distance education system. By investigating the perceptions of English language teachers about emergency remote English teaching, this study aims to find out the perceptions of teachers after turning back to face-to-face language teaching in terms of different aspects and domains following Covid-19 pandemic in Turkey. In this quantitative and descriptive study, data were obtained from 138 English teachers, working at different levels of public schools, by conducting an online questionnaire. The collected data were analyzed through IBM SPSS 24.0 software package. Normality test, t-test and one-way ANOVA test were applied to the questionnaire to get results. The insights and findings gained from the study can be used in further studies to enable a better virtual education in the future and to explore and propose solutions to the possible problems resulting from the practises in emergency remote language teaching.

Keywords: English teaching, online teaching, emergency remote language teaching, face-to-face education, teachers’ perceptions

ÖZET

COVID-19 PANDEMİSİ SONRASINDA İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN YÜZ YÜZE DİL ÖĞRETİMİ VE ACİL UZAKTAN DİL ÖĞRETİMİ HAKKINDAKİ ALGILARI ÜZERİNE KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR ÇALIŞMA

Ensar ASLANTÜRK

Amasya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans, Nisan/2024

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Kadim ÖZTÜRK

Covid-19 pandemisinin ortaya çıkışı, tüm dünyada öğretme ve öğrenme sürecini etkilemiştir. Eğitim bağlamlarındaki hızlı değişimlerle birlikte İngilizce öğretme ve öğrenme yöntemleri de büyük ölçüde değişmiştir. Aynı şekilde öğretmenlerin motivasyonları, düşünceleri, fikirleri, duyguları ve algıları da bu değişimlerden etkilenmiştir. İlk aşamada yüz yüze eğitimden çevrimiçi eğitime geçişin ardından eğitimin tüm paydaşları, uzaktan eğitim sisteminin gereklerine uymaya çalışmıştır. Bu çalışma, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin acil uzaktan İngilizce öğretimine ilişkin algılarını araştırarak, Türkiye'de Covid-19 salgını sonrasında yüz yüze dil öğretimine döndükten sonra öğretmenlerin farklı boyutlar ve alanlar açısından algılarını ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Nicel ve tanımlayıcı bu çalışmada, veriler devlet okullarının farklı kademelerinde görev yapan 138 İngilizce öğretmeninden çevrimiçi bir anket uygulanarak elde edilmiştir. Elde edilen veriler IBM SPSS 24.0 yazılım paketi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlara ulaşmak için ankete normallik testi, t-testi ve tek yönlü ANOVA testi uygulanmıştır. Çalışmadan elde edilen içgörü ve bulgular, gelecekte daha iyi bir sanal eğitimin sağlanması ve acil uzaktan dil öğretimi uygulamalarından kaynaklanan olası sorunların araştırılması ve çözüm önerilerinin getirilmesi amacıyla ileriki çalışmalarda kullanılabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İngilizce öğretimi, çevrimiçi öğretim, acil uzaktan dil öğretimi, yüz yüze eğitim, öğretmen algıları

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to offer my utmost gratitudes to my dear supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kadim ÖZTÜRK for his great effort, support and guidance in the production process of my thesis study. I would like to thank my lecturers who contributed a lot to me during my MA period. I owe my brother, Haluk ASLANTÜRK, a dept of gratitude for his valuable assistance.

I am also very grateful to my precious wife, Rabia ASLANTÜRK, who has always been by my side with her support during this difficult process.

And to my beloved daughter, Beren...

Ensar ASLANTÜRK

19/04/2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ETİK BEYAN SAYFASI	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ÖZET	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABBREVIATIONS	xi

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Problem Statement.....	2
1.3. Research Questions	3
1.4. Scope of the Study.....	5
1.5. Significance of the Study.....	5
1.6. Limitations and Assumptions	6

CHAPTER II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1. Teaching Environments.....	7
2.1.1. Online Teaching	7
2.1.2. Face-to-Face Teaching	9
2.1.3. Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT)	10
2.2. The Differences between Online Teaching and Emergency Remote Teaching.....	12
2.3. Advantages and Disadvantages of Emergency Remote Language Teaching (ERLT)...	13
2.4. The Roles of English Teachers in Emergency Remote Teaching	14

CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY	16
3.1. Research Design	16
3.2. Participants of the Study.....	16
3.3. Data Instrument	18
3.4. Data Collection.....	19
3.5. Data Analysis.....	20

CHAPTER IV

4. FINDINGS	21
4.1. Normality Test.....	21
4.2. T-test Results	22
4.2.1. T-test Results between the Gender and the Variables of the Survey	22
4.3. One-way ANOVA Results	26
4.3.1. One-way ANOVA Results between the Participants' Ages and the Sub- dimensions of the Survey	26
4.3.2. One-way ANOVA Results between the Participants' Levels of the Schools and the Sub-dimensions of the Survey	30
4.3.3. One-way ANOVA Results between the Participants' Years of Professional Experience and the Sub-dimensions of the Survey	34
4.4. Descriptive Statistics Results	38
4.4.1. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Attitude” Sub-dimension	38
4.4.2. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Learning Outcomes” Sub-dimension	39
4.4.3. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Skills” Sub-dimension	40
4.4.4. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Support” Sub-dimension	40
4.4.5. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Students” Sub-dimension	41
4.4.6. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Course Design” Sub-dimension	42
4.4.7. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Classroom Interaction” Sub-dimension.....	43
4.4.8. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Assessment” Sub-dimension	43

4.4.9. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Feedback” Sub-dimension.....	44
--	----

CHAPTER V

5. DISCUSSION.....	45
--------------------	----

CHAPTER VI

6. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	49
-------------------------------------	----

6.1. Recommendations for Future Research.....	50
---	----

REFERENCES	51
------------------	----

APPENDICES	63
------------------	----

Appendix 1. Demographic Information of the Participants	64
---	----

Appendix 2. Teaching English during Lockdown Scale	65
--	----

Appendix 3. Google Forms – Consent Form.....	68
--	----

Appendix 4. Approval of Ethical Committee	69
---	----

Appendix 5. Permission for Research Application	71
---	----

Appendix 6. Permission Mail for the Use of the Questionnaire.....	72
---	----

CURRICULUM VITAE

Hata! Yer işareti tanımlanmamış.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. Gender Distribution of Participants	16
Table 3.2. Age Distribution of Participants	17
Table 3.3. Distribution of Participants according to the Type of Schools.....	17
Table 3.4. Distribution of Participants according to Years of Professional Experience.....	18
Table 4.1. Normality Test Results	22
Table 4.2. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Attitude' Sub-dimension according to the Gender Variable and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores.....	22
Table 4.3. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Learning Outcomes' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores.....	23
Table 4.4. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Teachers' Skills' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores.....	23
Table 4.5. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Support' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores	23
Table 4.6. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Students' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores	24
Table 4.7. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores in the Research from the 'Course Design' Sub-dimension according to the Gender Variable, and the T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores	24
Table 4.8. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores in the Research from the 'Classroom Interaction' Sub-dimension according to the Gender Variable, and the T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores	24
Table 4.9. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores in the Research from the 'Assessment' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores	25
Table 4.10. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores in the Research from the 'Feedback' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between	

the Mean Scores.....	25
Table 4.11. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Attitude’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research.....	26
Table 4.12. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Learning Outcomes’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research	26
Table 4.13. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Teachers’ Skills’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research	27
Table 4.14. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Support’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research.....	27
Table 4.15. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Students’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research.....	27
Table 4.16. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Course Design’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research.....	28
Table 4.17. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Classroom Interaction’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research	28
Table 4.18. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Assessment’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research	29
Table 4.19. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Feedback’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research	29
Table 4.20. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Attitude’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools	30
Table 4.21. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Learning Outcomes’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools	30
Table 4.22. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Teachers’ Skills’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools	31
Table 4.23. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Support’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools	31
Table 4.24. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Students’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools	32
Table 4.25. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Course Design’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools.....	32

Table 4.26. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Classroom Interaction’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools	32
Table 4.27. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Assessment’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools	33
Table 4.28. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Feedback’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools	33
Table 4.29. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Attitude’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience	34
Table 4.30. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Learning Outcomes’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience	34
Table 4.31. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Teachers’ Skills’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience	35
Table 4.32. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Support’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience	35
Table 4.33. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Students’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience	36
Table 4.34. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Course Design’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience.....	36
Table 4.35. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Course Design’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience.....	37
Table 4.36. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Assessment’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience	37
Table 4.37. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Feedback’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience	38
Table 4.38. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Attitude” Sub-dimension.....	38
Table 4.39. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Learning Outcomes” Sub-dimension .	39
Table 4.40. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Skills” Sub-dimension.....	40
Table 4.41. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Support” Sub-dimension	40
Table 4.42. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Students” Sub-dimension	41
Table 4.43. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Course Design” Sub-dimension	42
Table 4.44. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Classroom Interaction” Sub-dimension	43
Table 4.45. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Assessment” Sub-dimension.....	43
Table 4.46. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Feedback” Sub-dimension	44

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations	Definitions
MoNE	Ministry of National Education
TRT	Turkish Radio and Television
ERLT	Emergency Remote Language Teaching
ERT	Emergency Remote Teaching
TEdL	Teaching English during Lockdown
DDoNE	District Directorate of National Education

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Towards the end of the year 2019, a viral outbreak called as ‘Covid-19’ broke out in the city of Wuhan, China. With the rapid spread of the outbreak, all the countries across the world were naturally obliged to take immediate and serious precautions to prevent its spread and decrease the negative effects of this outbreak in many fields of life. Social distancing and confinement became obligatory for an uncertain period of time in order to prevent and stop the effect of the Covid-19 pandemic. Education, doubtlessly, instantly became one of the foremost fields affected by Covid-19 pandemic to a great extent and it was taken into consideration as immediately as possible. The closure of the schools was the first attempt of the governments because the most threatening factor triggering the spread of the outbreak was the mobility and the close contact of people. Huh (2020) specified some ways for preventing public from catching the corona virus such as wearing a mask, cleaning the hands properly and not coming into close contact with people. In the light of this reality, governments decided to close many public places to provide social distancing. In Turkey, on March 16, 2020, all of the lower and higher educational institutions decided to close the doors of schools for three weeks following the declaration of Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. The period of the school closures was extended afterwards because of the ongoing threat of Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, education began to take its new shape.

Despite the undesirable existence of the serious viral outbreak, education had to be continued. The need for reshaping the education system thoroughly pushed the governments to put some implementations into practice such as national TV broadcasts for the school courses to continue education during school suspension period. For this reason, three different TV channels for three different school levels (primary, secondary and high school) were established by TRT [Turkish Radio and Television] and the lessons were organized by MoNE. Additionally, teachers and students made use of some digital educational platforms because they enabled them to reach information sources and lesson contents easily and quickly. EBA [Education and Information Network] is the formal education and information network for the lower school levels in Turkey. Not only by establishing TV channels but also by utilizing online meeting platforms such as Zoom, the MoNE tried its best to continue

education in Turkey. The online meeting platforms provided a chance of online teaching during the transition period from a conventional face-to-face education to the distance education.

Thamarana (2016) noted that “Now that technology has enabled us to expand teaching and learning beyond the limits of the classroom” (E-Learning and its Evolution section). Thus, online teaching emerged as the most preferred type of education because the teachers and the students didn’t have to be in the real classroom atmosphere. With the help of technology, students, teachers and parents could interact with each other whenever and wherever they want (Fansury et al., 2020). Some other studies mentioned advantages and disadvantages of the online teaching. While some factors such as resource diversity, sustainable education and self-control were seen as the advantages, other factors like lack of interaction, infrastructure and insufficient time were listed as disadvantages (Hebebe et al., 2020). Although having virtual classes were accepted as advantageous in a way, they lack some important aspects of face-to-face education. Mutual face-to-face interaction and having eye-contact between teachers and students were among these aspects (Pregowska et al., 2021). The transition from face-to-face classes to online classes was a multi-dimensional issue which brought about many other benefits and obstacles for teachers and students.

Viewing the education period during Covid-19 lockdown from a perspective of efficacy of online lessons is not plausible. Governments’ abrupt decision to implement remote teaching brought along many novelties for teachers. There were some requirements for teachers to carry out this teaching process as effectively and beneficially as possible. Being competent enough in using technology, offering useful materials, preparing suitable learning settings, interacting effectively with students in front of the screen are among some of these requirements (Orhan & Beyhan, 2020). Countries, affected by the corona virus, carried out different practises for teachers during the online teaching period. Therefore, in the decision-making process of this thesis study, it was seen vital to investigate such a multi-dimensional issue by examining and deciphering the English language teachers’ perceptions about face-to-face language teaching and emergency remote language teaching [ERLT] after the Covid-19 pandemic in Turkey.

1.2. Problem Statement

Education is an important area of life that has to be continued under any circumstances. Being aware of this fact, governments tried to find some solutions in order to

overcome the negative effects of worldwide pandemic on education. TV broadcasts, online education, education and information networks, synchronous and asynchronous lessons are among these immediate solutions. Live lessons were the most preferred way of education in this period because countries needed to find an urgent and effective way. Turkey also preferred this way of education. Thus, the concept of emergency remote teaching [ERT] gained high importance because its method was teaching remotely in emergency situations like wars, pandemics, etc.

This thesis study offers an insight into ERT practises and the thoughts and views of teachers who were working at primary, secondary and high schools of a province of Turkey. There are a few studies investigating the ERT period in Turkey from different aspects. Among these aspects are challenges faced during the implementation of ERT, the self-efficacy of language teachers, and the reconstruction of language teacher identity in ERT. However, there is a research gap as the number of studies focusing on the perceptions, views and attitudes of English teachers about face-to-face education and emergency remote teaching following the Covid-19 lockdown in Turkey is insufficient.

1.3. Research Questions

Placing the teachers' perceptions at the core heart of the inquiry, this study aimed to provide answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the English teachers' perceptions about emergency remote English teaching and face to face English teaching?
 - 1.1. What are the perceived advantages of emergency remote English teaching and face to face English teaching?
 - 1.2. What are the perceived disadvantages of emergency remote English teaching and face to face English teaching?
 - 1.3. What kind of challenges did the teachers face during online teaching and face to face teaching?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the genders of English teachers in terms of
 - a. the attitude of English teachers during emergency remote teaching?
 - b. the learning outcomes during emergency remote teaching?
 - c. teachers' skills for remote teaching during emergency remote teaching?
 - d. receiving support during emergency remote teaching?

- e. adaptation of students during emergency remote teaching?
 - f. the course design during emergency remote teaching?
 - g. the classroom interaction during emergency remote teaching?
 - h. the assessment during emergency remote teaching?
 - i. the feedback during emergency remote teaching?
3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the age groups of English teachers in terms of
- a. the attitude of English teachers during emergency remote teaching?
 - b. the learning outcomes during emergency remote teaching?
 - c. teachers' skills for remote teaching during emergency remote teaching?
 - d. receiving support during emergency remote teaching?
 - e. adaptation of students during emergency remote teaching?
 - f. the course design during emergency remote teaching?
 - g. the classroom interaction during emergency remote teaching?
 - h. the assessment during emergency remote teaching?
 - i. the feedback during emergency remote teaching?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference between the levels of the schools of English teachers in terms of
- a. the attitude of English teachers during emergency remote teaching?
 - b. the learning outcomes during emergency remote teaching?
 - c. teachers' skills for remote teaching during emergency remote teaching?
 - d. receiving support during emergency remote teaching?
 - e. adaptation of students during emergency remote teaching?
 - f. the course design during emergency remote teaching?
 - g. the classroom interaction during emergency remote teaching?
 - h. the assessment during emergency remote teaching?
 - i. the feedback during emergency remote teaching?
5. Is there a statistically significant difference between the professional experiences of English teachers in terms of
- a. the attitude of English teachers during emergency remote teaching?
 - b. the learning outcomes during emergency remote teaching?
 - c. teachers' skills for remote teaching during emergency remote teaching?
 - d. receiving support during emergency remote teaching?
 - e. adaptation of students during emergency remote teaching?

- f. the course design during emergency remote teaching?
- g. the classroom interaction during emergency remote teaching?
- h. the assessment during emergency remote teaching?
- i. the feedback during emergency remote teaching?

1.4. Scope of the Study

The perceptions of English language teachers who are the active members of ERT process during the lockdown are the main components of this study. All of the participants of this study work at public primary, secondary and high schools in the central districts of a province of Turkey. 138 English language teachers participated in the current study via filling in an online questionnaire form. Considering the perceptions of English teachers about ERT and face-to-face teaching period in Turkey, this thesis study focuses on views and attitudes of teachers about ERT, their skills for remote teaching, their thoughts on feedback, assessment, classroom interaction, course design, learning outcomes, students' adaptation and receiving support from stakeholders of teaching and learning process during the Covid-19 pandemic.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The continuity of education was provided via putting the ERT into process across the world. After investigating the existing literature, it is seen that there are many studies focusing on views and perceptions of teachers and students related to distance education practises. However, the concept of ERT is a relatively new term and it differs from conventional distance education. Although the current literature involves studies on the perceptions of teachers about ERT from all fields, there are limited studies on English language teachers' perceptions about ERT specifically.

To gain a sound impression on the perceived issues on ERT period by English teachers, it is of vital importance to reach participants who are experienced in remote teaching during the lockdown in Turkey. Therefore, the existence of participants of this study, who experienced the ERT process, makes this study significant. The insights of these teachers are valuable because they will provide new perspectives both for stakeholders of education and for MoNE to deal with and manage a possible emergency remote teaching process effectively.

1.6. Limitations and Assumptions

Some limitations of this study need to be acknowledged. The most important limitation of this study is that it was carried out with English teachers working at only state schools in a province of Turkey. The teachers at private schools, who are not included in the present study, can present different opinions and factors. The participants of the study are teachers working at Erzurum province of Turkey in the Eastern Anatolian Region. Thus, it is recommended to carry out more studies on emergency remote language teaching in other contexts. Moreover, considering some remarkable factors such as the financial statuses of families, technological opportunities, the existence of problems related to the infrastructure of the regions, teachers' and students' skills and competencies in using technological devices, etc., it is obvious that the results and insights will vary considerably. Therefore, there are many issues while determining and revealing characteristics of emergency remote language teaching.

CHAPTER II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Prior to spring 2020, conventional face-to-face education was the most preferred way of teaching. Following the school closures due to the worldwide pandemic, face-to-face education gave its way to contemporary distance education. The studies before Covid-19 pandemic mostly focused on the use of technology in real classroom settings (e.g. Dudeney & Hockly 2007; Gilakjani 2013; Gömleksiz 2004; Hennessy et al., 2005; Kılıçkaya & Seferoğlu 2013; Parvin 2015; Wong et al., 2006). However, distance education and ERT are different practises from face to face education.

Former studies, related to education after Covid-19 pandemic, have tried to find answers to some issues concerning distance education in general (e.g. Basilaia & Kvavadze 2020; Oranburg 2020). The use of technology, teachers' and learners' mastery of technology, attitudes towards online education (Unger & Meiran 2020), online interaction, students' performance (Gonzalez et al. 2020) and the perspectives of students and teachers towards online education (Orhan & Beyhan 2020) are some of these issues. Some studies shed light on teachers's perspectives, activities and challenges they faced during emergency remote teaching period (e.g. Erkan & Balbay, 2021a; Juárez-Díaz & Perales, 2021; Latif & Alhamad, 2023; Nugroho et al., 2021; Situmorang et al., 2021). In the present study, the main focus is on the perspectives of English teachers about emergency remote teaching and face-to-face teaching facilities, which have different teaching settings from each other, following the period after Covid-19 pandemic.

2.1. Teaching Environments

2.1.1. Online Teaching

Along with the rapid and increasing developments in the field of technology and the internet, online education has become popular in the educational surroundings in the world. The internet has brought many opportunities to the education world, such as asynchronous classes, synchronous classes, easy and quick access to resources, resource diversity and simultaneous distant interactions between the learners and the teachers. Moreover, it enables learners to participate in the classes in a non-spatial and time-independent atmosphere, (Redmond, 2011; Pregowska, 2021). Therefore, it is inevitable not to mention the profound

effect of online teaching throughout its history.

The existence of distance education is not a brand new issue. Before the internet, distance education could be carried out through using some of mass media like television and radio because they enabled easy and cost-free access (Pregowska et al., 2021). Although this type of distance education is not similar to the one in the modern sense, it has early traces of online education. Nevertheless, it is an equivocal matter for educators because it lacks the interaction between the learner and the lecturer (Shih, et al., 2003). Thus, it is confounding again because it is hard to determine to what degree the education is influential if there is no interaction between the teacher and the learner. The one-way structure of the education provided by TV and radio broadcasts brought about the effectiveness issue for teaching online. In the following years of online teaching, computer-based training and computer-assisted instruction became prominent because they helped learners and teachers interact with each other, even in a restricted way, via interactive software (Shih, et al., 2003). After the invention of the internet, distance education has changed its way to a different direction.

Distance education does not contain classical classroom environment and it is a broader term than online teaching because it includes all forms of classes taught via TV, radio, telephone etc. The most outstanding thing that separates online teaching from distance education is that it uses the internet. (Ko & Rossen, 2017). Therefore, it is possible to teach at anywhere and at anytime (Ely, 2003; Khan, 2005). Students can take their courses whenever and wherever they want in an asynchronous environment. They also have a chance to take synchronous classes for their educational needs thanks to online teaching. In Turkey, the MoNE provided both types of online teaching for students by preparing video-recorded classes, which were broadcasted on TV and shared on EBA, and offering simultaneous courses held by the teachers affiliated to the MoNE. Providing synchronous and asynchronous lessons to the students, the MoNE paved the way for students who had different learning skills. Asynchronous teaching is useful for the students who are self-directed. On the other hand, synchronous teaching is more preferable for students who need direction and support by the teacher (Oranburg, 2020).

In conclusion, online teaching, with its history, structure, practises, advantages and disadvantages, is a large-scaled field of study itself. Thus, it would be insufficient to touch on and express all of the facets of online teaching in the present study. Leaving the pros and cons of the online teaching aside, it would also be crucial to mention some controversies and queries about it. In their books, Ko and Rossen (2017) point out to some of these concerns. They talk about the uncertainty of the time issue of online teaching and the roles of the

teachers if they don't see their students face-to-face. The debates on the characteristics and the efficiency of online teaching still arouses in the the educational literature. While some of the educators are inclined with online teaching, others still take a stand against it and support face-to-face education for an effective instruction.

2.1.2. Face-to-Face Teaching

In face-to-face teaching, the instructor interacts with the learners in the same setting within a certain time period. On one hand, the co-existence of the teacher and the students in the same classroom environment is advantageous for the learners who learn better when they receive support from the teacher (Karakaya, 2022). This type of learners can be classified as the learners who have interpersonal intelligence according to Gardner's multiple intelligences theory. Students with interpersonal intelligence prefer cooperative real-time activities, group brainstorming sessions and they think that being socially together in a real setting is important for language learning (Behjat, 2012). Therefore, it is clear that face-to-face teaching atmosphere enables a better learning for those students. On the other hand, some students accomplish their educational goals when they keep their own pace of studying because they have intrapersonal intelligence (Wuensch, et al., 2006). Online teaching environment is more preferable for this type of learners with self-paced learning ability, so these students consider online teaching more convenient than face-to-face teaching because it allows self-pacing (e.g. Beard and Harper, 2002; Ponzurick et al., 2000; Vamosi et al., 2004; Wisan et al., 2001).

Many characteristics of face-to-face teaching were studied by the researchers in the existing literature. Mutual interaction between the teacher and the students is reported as the most outstanding characteristic of face-to-face instruction (e.g. Albiansyah, et al., 2021; Bali & Liu, 2018; Huachizaca, et al., 2022; Seçkin et al., 2020; Sun, et al., 2008; Tu, 2000; Yusny, et al., 2021). Facial expressions and use of body language in the real classroom environment are the other issues considered important in some studies (e.g. Hood, 2011; Gherheş, et al., 2021; Wuensch, et al., 2006). According to Nayci (2020), being able to ask questions easily, effective information exchange and peer learning are among the leading strengths of face-to-face education. Other studies discuss about the workload and the roles of the teachers in a face-to-face class. In his thesis study, Çetinkaya (2022) states that teachers have a low level of workload in face-to-face education setting. In some studies, it is revealed that the role of the teacher is effective in determining the motivation and success of the learners (e.g. Mentzer, et al., 2007; Meyer, 2007). Although there are studies investigating the issues related to face-to-face education, with the outbreak of the worldwide pandemic in 2019, the main focus in the existing literature has concentrated more on the practice of remote teaching.

2.1.3. Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT)

It was of vital importance to continue education in all countries which were adversely affected by the worldwide Covid-19 pandemic for a certain period of time. In order to lessen the negative effects of pandemic on education sector, governments decided to put some immediate precautions into practice. First and foremost was the social distancing. Governments, including Turkey, had to provide social distancing in all areas of life, so a rapid shift from the traditional face-to-face education to a contemporary distance education was inevitable following the decision of school closures.

The term ‘ERT’ was first used by Hodges et al. (2021) to offer a different name that would aid in differentiating what was genuinely happening from authentic online instruction. The writers made a clear distinction between online learning, which has been researched for over 20 years prior to the pandemic, and ERT. The main argument is that online teaching involves properly planned instruction delivered over enough time to design, organize, and implement a strong educational system using a specifically chosen online system. While ERT is a new term for describing the education system under emergent or crisis situations, online teaching and distance education exist for many years preceding the Covid-19 pandemic.

It would be noteworthy to define distance education before moving on to emergency remote teaching. In the most general sense, distance education can be defined as a planned modality of teaching in which teachers and students are physically distant from each other. However, the structure and definition of distance education has changed throughout the years in which it was applied in different forms. In his book, Holmberg (2005) mentions two types of communication: one-way traffic and two-way traffic. In one-way traffic, the textual course materials, which are readily-prepared, are delivered by the teacher to the learner and this form of distance education is seen as ‘*simulated communication*’. On the other hand, in two-way of traffic, there is a real interaction between the learners and the teacher. Therefore, it is of no doubt that there is not a single form of distance teaching when its history is investigated. The former definitions of distance education were made considering the printed materials (Saykili, 2018). From the telegraph, telephone, radio and television broadcasts to the computers, internet and smart phones, communication methods have changed over the years. Together with the developments in technology in the following years, the concept of distance education has been reshaped in line with these advances.

What is distance education? Distance education is a method of teaching and learning which is needed and applied when the teacher and the students have to be in different places.

Therefore, following the school closures, transitioning from face to face education to distance education is a plausible decision for the continuum of education. It is significant to call the remote education during the Covid-19 pandemic as emergency remote teaching (ERT) rather than distance education or online teaching. Although there have been a lot of studies on distance education before the Covid-19 pandemic, comparing the former distance education with the one implemented rapidly after the corona virus outbreak is not appropriate (Nilsson, 2021). The distance education during the Covid-19 is called as ERT by the researchers in the literature and they separate traditional distance education from ERT. While giving a definition of ERT, Hodges et al. (2020) explained that, “In contrast to experiences that are planned from the beginning and designed to be online, emergency remote teaching (ERT) is a temporary shift of instructional delivery to an alternate delivery mode due to crisis circumstances” (p.6). There are many other studies suggesting that ERT is an unplanned and a different practice of teaching from the other forms of distance education because it is implemented only after the times of crisis or under unforeseen circumstances such as wars, catastrophes, pandemics etc. (e.g. Barbour et al., 2020; Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020; Burde et al., 2017; Crompton et al., 2021; Erarslan, 2021; Fuchs, 2022; Izgı Onbaşılı & Sezginsoy, 2021; İnal, 2022; Sinclair, 2001; Whittle et al., 2020).

It is difficult and even impossible to foresee emergency situations. Thus people cannot take necessary precautions in advance so that they can prevent the possible destructions of the crisis. This unpredictability of crisis times results in not being able to get ready for online teaching. Bozkurt and Sharma (2020) puts forward that in comparison with distance education, ERT has an unplanned structure. Therefore, some problems related to education occur during the implementation of ERT because of the rapid transition to distant teaching. All of the stakeholders of education are affected by the sudden changes in a way. In some studies, researchers point out that teachers and learners have negative attitudes for online teaching and learning. One of the reasons behind this negative stance against ERT is being inexperienced and uninformed about online education (Aji et al., 2020; Astuti & Solikhah, 2021; Erarslan, 2021; Fuad et al., 2020; Lie et al., 2020; Moser et al., 2021; Novikov, 2020; Orhan & Beyhan, 2020; Rahayu & Wirza, 2020). Accordingly, lack of experience affects the motivation of teachers and students and this situation poses questions about the effectiveness of ERT. Tayşi and Alagözlü (2023) concludes that dissatisfaction of the students stems from the low levels of motivation of the learners. When the literature about the ERT is analyzed, it is obviously seen that problems related to the infrastructure in some regions and the access to the internet, lack of technological devices, restricted digital literacy

skills of students and parents have an influence on demotivation of them (Ferri et al., 2020; Rathert & Ağçam, 2022). As it was stated earlier in this study, the unplanned structure of ERT makes it necessary to investigate its characteristics, advantages, disadvantages, challenges for the stakeholders of it and differences from the planned online teaching.

2.2. The Differences between Online Teaching and Emergency Remote Teaching

Online teaching and emergency remote teaching are two basic sub-fields of distance education practises. They share a lot of similar peculiarities but they also differ from each other in some aspects. The main difference between these two concepts is the structure of the time in which online teaching and ERT are implemented. While the online teaching is planned and prepared beforehand, ERT emerges during crisis times like wars, disasters or pandemics. Hodges et al. (2020) state, “Well-planned online learning experiences are meaningfully different from courses offered online in response to a crisis or disaster” (p.1). Online teaching is a planned way of education in light of appropriate pedagogical approaches but ERT is like an imitation of face-to-face education and its procedures by using technological devices (Sezgin, 2021).

Being a temporary practise of education, ERT differs from online teaching in this sense. In emergency remote teaching, the purpose is not to create a permanent remote teaching environment but to offer a provisional learning and teaching atmosphere till the crisis, which caused the ERT, abates (Barbour et al., 2020; Hodges et al., 2020; Jin et al., 2022). The temporary teaching environment of ERT compels students and teachers to think about what they will do the things to reach their goals and how they will do them. On the other hand, a well-planned online teaching environment creates a more flexible, reliable and alternative atmosphere for them (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020).

With the help of technology and the internet, learners and teachers can easily access to any kind of online sources within seconds. This is a great opportunity for them to be able to utilize these sources to achieve their educational objectives. From webinars, video-recorded lectures, e-books, educational games, interactive activities to audios and videos, there is a great deal of resource diversity for learners and teachers in the virtual platforms. All of these resources and many others are accessible to the learners and teachers in online teaching setting because it is a pre-planned process. However, ERT may lack these resources because it is implemented under extraordinary situations. There is a high probability of not being able

to reach these resources for some students or teachers because of problems related to the internet access under emergency situations (Çalık & Altay, 2021). Among the main reasons underlying the limited or no internet access are the infrastructure of some regions and financial situations of families (Brooks et al., 2020; Cahyadi, et al., 2022; Ezra et al., 2021; Misirli & Ergulec, 2021). Therefore, many researchers mentioned equity factors emerging here as impediments for teachers or learners during the implementation of ERT (Aguiera & Nightengale-Lee, 2020; Czerniewicz et al., 2020; Ezra et al., 2021; Grek & Landri, 2021; Lipovec et al., 2022; Manca & Delfino, 2021; Seabra et al., 2021)

2.3. Advantages and Disadvantages of Emergency Remote Language

Teaching (ERLT)

Following the confinement decisions of governments so as to prevent the rapid spread of corona virus worldwide, lives of people underwent a lot of changes. The urgent need to close the doors of schools immensely affected the education sector. The temporary shift from an in-person environment to a virtual one obviously brought about some major changes in teaching and learning systems. It was a crystal-clear fact that these changes influenced the foreign language teaching and learning, too.

The instruction and the methods of foreign language teaching have undergone some changes especially after the advancements in technology. Technology has brought many opportunities for language learners and teachers. Prior to Covid-19 pandemic, teachers and students could benefit from technology as supplementary to in-class education via blended learning (Thornbury, 2006). When the teachers and the learners were not in the same setting, they could also benefit from fully online classes (Keegan, 2013). Although planned online classes existed in the past, the way of online instruction implemented during the ERT period is different, which is mentioned beforehand in the present study. It will be useful to mention some advantages and disadvantages of ERLT after the implementation of it.

ERLT offers a self-regulated online learning environment to the language learners (Juárez-Díaz & Perales, 2021; You & Kang, 2014). This environment provides students a better learning of the target language by keeping their own pace. Therefore, language teachers can easily follow students' individual progress step-by-step (Yuniastari & da Silva, 2022). ERLT also provides digital resource diversity for language learners (Sarı, 2022). As well as learners, by means of accessibility to reach the digital sources, teachers make use of these sources during their teaching process for an effective instruction. The flexibility of ERLT is

another bright side of it according to some researchers (Mukhtar et al., 2020; Naqvi & Zehra, 2020). ERLT is also time-saving for teachers and students (Ferri et al., 2020). The existence of online games, ICT and web 2.0 tools is a great opportunity in language teaching during ERLT (Bachiri & Oifa, 2020; Jong, 2021; Ploj Virtic et al., 2021). Teachers utilizes different web 2.0 tool for different skills of language. For example; they use '*padlet*' for the writing skill of the students, while using '*podbean*' for speaking activities (Nayman & Bavlı, 2022).

As for the disadvantages of ERLT, it is of certain that motivation of students and teachers has changed to a great extent (Paydaş & Saka, 2022). According to Meşe and Sevilen (2021), teachers had to cope with the low level of motivation of students during ERLT. In their study, Erkan and Balbay (2021a) claim that some teachers felt like novice teachers because they are inexperienced in ERT, which caused to demotivate them. In language classes, it is indisputable that peer works and group works play a significant role. Prior to ERLT, group works were done with the active participation strong interaction of students in real classroom settings. However, during ERLT, group works are not effective as they were in face-to-face education (Nayman & Bavlı, 2022). Similarly, it is hard for teachers to control the group activities because the number of the students who turn on their cameras or microphones is insufficient. Another disadvantage of ERLT is about the participation of students to online classes. Studies in the literature on ERLT show that the level of attendance of the students to virtual classes is rather low compared to the rate of participation in face-to-face teaching (Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020; Cantürk & Cantürk, 2021; Lukas & Yunus, 2021; Moser et al., 2021; Paydaş & Saka, 2022). Among many other factors affecting the ERLT process are the connection problems to online classes (Castelli & Sarvary, 2021; Isaei & Barjesteh, 2023; Lehman, 2020; Lin & Gao, 2020; Rathert & Ağçam, 2022).

2.4. The Roles of English Teachers in Emergency Remote Teaching

English teachers had some roles in the classroom in face-to-face education. However, after the rapid transition to ERLT, these roles changed because of the different structure of the emergency remote teaching setting. In this new teaching atmosphere, English teachers had to learn how to teach online and how to increase their technological knowledge and competence (Lie et al., 2020; Moser et al., 2021).

According to Bailey and Lee (2020), language teachers were role guides and models for their learners during the ERLT process. Teachers needed to direct their students about how to conduct online English lessons and how to make better use of it. Thus, their first role

was being a mentor. In face-to-face education before Covid-19, teachers' main roles were information-providers and assessors. However, in ERLT, being supporters and facilitators for their students were among their main roles (Can, 2022; Erkan & Balbay, 2021a; Martin et al. (2019). Erkan and Balbay (2021b) conclude that lack of interaction and instant feedback are the main factors triggering the demotivation of students. Therefore, here teachers should have a motivator role during the implementation of ERLT for an effective teaching. In addition, teachers were in the controller role in face-to-face education but in ERLT they began to own a planner role because they have to plan their online classes in many aspects.

Research has demonstrated that instructors are crucial to the success of online instruction and that their interactions with students can affect how well students learn (Lee & Choi, 2011; Yerby, 2017). The way educators carry out their roles influences the academic success of their students (Kang & Im, 2013; Wright et al., 2015), students' contentment with virtual learning (Burnett et al., 2007; Sher, 2009) and motivation of their learners (Brenton, 2014; Cole et al., 2017). Apart from teachers pedagogical and technical roles, some other roles are also effective in determining the sustainability and effectiveness of online classes.

In order to draw the students' attention to the online classes under the troublesome crisis times, teachers have to try to make their students emotionally ready for learning. Coppola et al. (2002) discovered that for online teaching to be effective, the affective role—that is, the teacher's emotional support of the student—as well as the general classroom environment are necessary in addition to the technical, managerial, and pedagogical responsibilities. This means that teachers own more crucial roles when compared to face-to-face teaching. That's why they must integrate their previous roles with the ones that they undertake during the implementation of ERT.

CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

The present study on the perceptions of English language teachers after the implementation of emergency remote teaching following the worldwide Covid-19 period was carried out by applying descriptive design in quantitative research methods. According to Dörnyei (2007), “Quantitative inquiry is systematic, rigorous, focused and tightly controlled, involving precise measurement and producing reliable and replicable data that is generalizable to other contexts” (p.34). As this study tries to reveal the perceptions of English teachers about face to face and emergency remote English teaching during emergency remote teaching, descriptive quantitative research design was used to see quantifiable information for statistical analysis of teachers’ views.

3.2. Participants of the Study

This thesis study was conducted with 138 English language teachers, out of a total of 436 English language teachers, working at state schools in 3 central districts of Erzurum, Turkey. The male and female participants are of different ages and the level of their schools and their years of professional experience differ. As seen in Table 3.1, 99 female and 39 male teachers participated in the study.

Table 3.1. Gender Distribution of Participants

Gender	Number (N)	Percentage (%)	Total percentage (%)
Male	39	28,3	28,3
Female	99	71,7	100,0
Total	138	100,0	

Of the 138 English teachers participating in the research, 76 of them are between the ages of 25-34, 53 of them are between the ages of 35-44, and 9 of them are between the ages of 45-54 (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2. Age Distribution of Participants

Age	Number (N)	Percentage (%)	Total Percentage (%)
25-34	76	55,1	55,1
35-44	53	38,4	93,5
45-54	9	6,5	100,0
Total	138	100,0	

All of the participants work at state schools affiliated to MoNE. 30 of them work at primary schools, 60 of them work at secondary schools and 48 of them work at high schools (Table 3.3).

Table 3.3. Distribution of Participants according to the Type of Schools

The Level of the School You Work at	Number (N)	Percentage (%)	Total Percentage (%)
Primary School	30	21,7	21,7
Secondary School	60	43,5	65,2
High School	48	34,8	100,0
Total	138	100,0	

Considering their terms of duty, 14 of the participants' experience is less than 5 years, 72 of them have 5-10 years of experience, 35 of them have 11-15 years of experience, 5 of them have 16-20 years of experience and 12 of them have more than 20 years of professional experience (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4. Distribution of Participants according to Years of Professional Experience

Professional Experience (Years)	Number (N)	Percentage (%)	Total Percentage (%)
Less than 5	14	10,1	10,1
5-10	72	52,2	62,3
11-15	35	25,4	87,7
16-20	5	3,6	91,3
More than 20	12	8,7	100,0
Total	138	100,0	

Creswell (2009) describes random sampling as “a procedure in quantitative research for selecting participants. It means that each individual has an equal probability of being selected from the population, ensuring that the sample will be representative of the population” (p.346). In order to generalize the conclusions of this study to the whole population, random sampling was preferred. Another reason behind selecting the participants in the study was their being the members of emergency remote English teaching and face to face English teaching process during Covid-19 crisis in Turkey in different levels of state schools.

3.3. Data Instrument

The data collection instrument of this study comprises of 59 items. The answers of the questionnaire used in this study are 5-point Likert type and it includes the answers in the range of 1- strongly disagree and 5- strongly agree.

In order to investigate the shifts in the beliefs and methods of PreK–12 and post–secondary language teachers' education during COVID-19, Moser et al. (2021) carried out a nationwide survey in 45 states in the USA. The authors said that such research has a considerable importance, since little is known about how language educators achieved emergency remote language teaching in the spring of 2020. Few language teachers in this survey had positive feelings about teaching online prior to the pandemic. PreK–12 teachers and those without prior ERT expertise had the least confidence in the course's ability to achieve its objectives, despite feeling that their courses were well-designed. Their worries were focused on the learning outcomes for the students, but they understood that safety came

first in this emergency.

The questionnaire measures and identifies the perceptions of teachers towards emergency remote teaching period after Covid-19 pandemic. The Likert-type questionnaire consisting of 59 items looked at different aspects of teaching English online. These aspects were called as sub-dimensions of the questionnaire in the present thesis study. These nine sub-dimensions are (1) teachers' attitudes towards online teaching (attitude), (2) learning outcomes, (3) adaptation, motivation and skills of students towards online teaching (students), (4) adequate support offered by the stakeholders of education (support), (5) course design elements to manage online classes (course design), (6) teacher's skills for remote teaching (skills), (7) assessment, (8) classroom interaction and (9) feedback. The sub-dimensions of the questionnaire were used in accordance with the study of Moser et al. (2021) who are the developers of the questionnaire of the present study. The same sub-dimensions were used by Babić (2021) in her thesis study. In her study, published in Croatia, she tries to find out the perceptions of teachers on the transition from face-to-face classes to ERT and the perceived benefits and challenges of this shift.

According to Cohen et al., (2007) for the alpha coefficient that guide can be checked: “>0.90 very highly reliable; 0.80–0.90 highly reliable; 0.70–0.79 reliable; 0.60–0.69 marginally/minimally reliable” (p.506). The scale of the present study was preferred because it was proven to be reliable with a Cronbach Alpha value of 0,926. The questionnaire was developed by Moser et al., (2021) and it included two parts. Part one deals with the demographic information of the participants (see Appendix 1), and part two is related to attitudes and perceptions of the teachers (see Appendix 2). English version of the questionnaire was presented in a virtual setting to get authentic and concise answers to the questions.

3.4. Data Collection

The data were obtained via using an online version of the questionnaire. This online questionnaire was created in Google Forms and it was applied to the English participants working at state schools. After preparing the online version of the questionnaire it was published and shared with teachers through their institutions using social platforms. The data of the present study were gathered during the face-to-face school period right after the end of school closures because of the pandemic. In his book, Dörnyei (2007) states that using questionnaires is popular because of their characteristics like being easy to construct, being

extremely versatile and being able to gather a great deal of information quickly and being processible. By asking participants 59 questions in a quantitative way, this study was able to collect and process the data quickly by having a deep and sharp insight.

3.5. Data Analysis

The data, collected from English teachers (N=138) to uncover their perceptions about ERT implementation during Covid-19 pandemic after returning to face-to-face education, were analyzed with the help of IBM SPSS 24.0 software package. Descriptive statistics methods were applied to reach the number and percentage distributions of demographic characteristics of the participants. T-test analysis of independent groups was conducted to identify the relationship between two different variables (gender) and the sub-dimensions of the teaching English during lockdown (TEdL) survey. One-way ANOVA tests were conducted to determine the relationship between the participants' ages, the level of institutions where the participants work, participants' tenure and the sub-dimensions of the teaching English during lockdown survey. With the help of the findings gained in consequence of these analyses, it was aimed to clarify and find answers to the research questions of the present study.

CHAPTER IV

4. FINDINGS

In this section of the present study, normality test results are presented in Table 4.1. The results of the t-test analysis of independent groups conducted to determine the relationship between two different variables (gender) and the sub-dimensions of the teaching English during lockdown survey are presented in Tables 4.2 - 4.10. The one-way ANOVA test analysis results, which were conducted to determine the relationship between the participants' ages and the teaching English during lockdown survey's sub-dimensions, are presented in Tables 4.11 - 4.19. The analysis results of the one-way ANOVA test conducted to determine the relationship between the level of institutions where the participants work and the sub-dimensions of the teaching English during lockdown survey are presented in Tables 4.20 - 4.28. The one-way ANOVA test analysis results performed to determine the relationship between the participants' tenure and the sub-dimensions of the teaching English during lockdown survey are presented in Tables 4.29 - 4.37. The perceptions of participants regarding emergency remote language teaching (ERLT) and in-person instruction, as well as the benefits and drawbacks of both, were ascertained through the use of descriptive statistics. Additionally, the difficulties teachers encountered both during and after ERLT implementation were examined. These findings are presented in tables 4.38 – 4.46.

4.1. Normality Test

The normality test was applied to decide whether the sub-dimensions of the teaching English online during lockdown scale were normally distributed. The normality test results are shown in this section in Table 4.1. When the normality distribution table was examined, it was determined that the skewness (.095) and kurtosis (2.852) values of teaching English online during lockdown survey were between +3 and -3 standard deviations. It is seen that these values are sufficient for normal distribution (De Carlo, 1997; Groeneveld & Meeden, 1984; Hopkins & Weeks, 1990; Moors, 1986). Accordingly, in light of these statistical results, parametric tests were applied to the questionnaire (See Table 4.1).

Table 4.1. Normality Test Results

Teaching English online during lockdown		
N	Valid	138
	Missing	0
Mean		3,2305
Median		3,1949
Mode		3,12
Std. Deviation		,49274
Skewness		,095
Std. Error of Skewness		,206
Kurtosis		2,852
Std. Error of Kurtosis		,410

4.2. T-test Results

4.2.1. T-test Results between the Gender and the Variables of the Survey

Table 4.2. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Attitude' Sub-dimension according to the Gender Variable and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	t	p
Attitude	Male ¹	39	3,2601	,60064	1,62	,106
	Female ²	99	3,0924	,52283		

There is no statistically significant difference between the scores of male and female teachers on the gender variable and the 'attitude' sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.3. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Learning Outcomes' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	t	p
Learning Outcomes	Male ¹	39	3,0000	,68825	,883	,379
	Female ²	99	2,8970	,58719		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores received by female and male teachers from the gender variable of the TEdL survey and the 'learning outcomes' sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.4. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Teachers' Skills' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	t	p
Teachers' skills	Male ¹	39	3,3883	,74010	1,35	,177
	Female ²	99	3,2035	,71168		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores received by male and female teachers from the gender variable of the TEdL survey and the 'teachers' skills' sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.5. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Support' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	t	p
Support	Male ¹	39	3,1709	,94241	,686	,494
	Female ²	99	3,0640	,77398		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of male and female teachers from the gender variable and the 'support' sub-dimension of the

TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.6. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores from the 'Students' Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	t	p
Students	Male ¹	39	3,2692	,61340	1,33	,185
	Female ²	99	3,0947	,72097		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of male and female teachers from the gender variable of the TEdL survey and the 'students' sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.7. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores in the Research from the 'Course Design' Sub-dimension according to the Gender Variable, and the T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	t	p
Course Design	Male ¹	39	3,2981	,64291	1,08	,281
	Female ²	99	3,1591	,69294		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores received by female and male teachers from the gender variable of the TEdL survey and the 'course design' sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.8. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores in the Research from the 'Classroom Interaction' Sub-dimension according to the Gender Variable, and the T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	t	p
Classroom Interaction	Male ¹	39	3,4322	,63929	,511	,610
	Female ²	99	3,3665	,69602		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores

received by female and male teachers from the gender variable of the TEdL survey and the ‘classroom interaction’ sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.9. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores in the Research from the ‘Assessment’ Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	t	p
Assessment	Male ¹	39	3,6068	,59908	1,85	,066
	Female ²	99	3,3973	,59842		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores received by female and male teachers from the gender variable of the TEdL survey and the ‘assessment’ sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.10. Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores in the Research from the ‘Feedback’ Sub-dimension according to Gender Variable, and T-test Values of the Differences between the Mean Scores

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	t	p
Feedback	Male ¹	39	3,5333	,81607	,408	,684
	Female ²	99	3,4768	,69793		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores received by female and male teachers from the TEdL survey gender variable and the ‘feedback’ sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

4.3. One-way ANOVA Results

4.3.1. One-way ANOVA Results between the Participants' Ages and the Sub-dimensions of the Survey

Table 4.11. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Attitude’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research

	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Attitude	25-34 ²	76	3,1034	,59868	,452	,637
	35-44 ³	53	3,1725	,47575		
	45-54 ⁴	9	3,2540	,54294		
	Total	138	3,1398	,54895		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the ages of the teachers participating in the research and the scores they received from the ‘attitude’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.12. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Learning Outcomes’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research

	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Learning Outcomes	25-34 ²	76	2,9868	,60252	,948	,390
	35-44 ³	53	2,8679	,65156		
	45-54 ⁴	9	2,7556	,50772		
	Total	138	2,9261	,61660		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the ages of the teachers participating in the research and the scores they received from the TEdL survey's ‘learning outcomes’ sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.13. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Teachers’ Skills’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research

	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Teachers' Skills	25-34 ²	76	3,3120	,71930	,807	,448
	35-44 ³	53	3,2156	,73840		
	45-54 ⁴	9	3,0159	,65249		
	Total	138	3,2557	,72195		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the ages of the teachers participating in the research and the scores they received from the ‘teachers’ skills’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.14. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Support’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research

	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Support	25-34 ²	76	3,0768	,84522	,196	,822
	35-44 ³	53	3,0912	,82143		
	45-54 ⁴	9	3,2593	,69278		
	Total	138	3,0942	,82292		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the ages of the teachers participating in the research and the scores they received from the ‘support’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.15. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Students’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research

	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Students	25-34 ²	76	3,1447	,75748	,001	,999
	35-44 ³	53	3,1415	,62790		
	45-54 ⁴	9	3,1528	,56519		
	Total	138	3,1440	,69456		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the ages of the teachers participating in the research and the scores they received from the ‘students’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.16. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Course Design’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research

	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Course Design	25-34 ²	76	3,1908	,72067	,019	,982
	35-44 ³	53	3,2123	,64328		
	45-54 ⁴	9	3,1806	,59329		
	Total	138	3,1984	,67976		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the ages of the teachers participating in the research and the scores they received from the ‘course design’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.17. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Classroom Interaction’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research

	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Classroom Interaction	25-34 ²	76	3,3722	,71030	1,338	,266
	35-44 ³	53	3,4582	,62481		
	45-54 ⁴	9	3,0635	,68553		
	Total	138	3,3851	,67881		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the ages of the teachers participating in the research and the scores they received from the ‘classroom interaction’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.18. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Assessment’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research

	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Assessment	25-34 ²	76	3,4408	,64848	,164	,849
	35-44 ³	53	3,4906	,56935		
	45-54 ⁴	9	3,3889	,42492		
	Total	138	3,4565	,60389		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the ages of the teachers participating in the research and the scores they received from the ‘assessment’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.19. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Feedback’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Age Variable of the Participants in the Research

	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Feedback	25-34 ²	76	3,4658	,74861	,775	,463
	35-44 ³	53	3,5698	,72047		
	45-54 ⁴	9	3,2667	,64031		
	Total	138	3,4928	,73063		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the ages of the teachers participating in the research and the scores they received from the ‘feedback’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

4.3.2. One-way ANOVA Results between the Participants' Levels of the Schools and the Sub-dimensions of the Survey

Table 4.20. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the 'Attitude' Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools

	The Level of the School	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Attitude	Primary School ¹	30	3,1190	,40421	,060	,942
	Secondary School ²	60	3,1333	,64097		
	High School ³	48	3,1607	,51095		
	Total	138	3,1398	,54895		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the level of the institutions the participants work at and the scores they received from the 'attitude' sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.21. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the 'Learning Outcomes' Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools

	The Level of the School	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Learning Outcomes	Primary School ¹	30	3,0133	,51711	,393	,676
	Secondary School ²	60	2,8933	,59314		
	High School ³	48	2,9125	,70368		
	Total	138	2,9261	,61660		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the level of the institutions the participants work at and the scores they received from the 'Learning outcomes' sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.22. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Teachers’ Skills’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools

	The Level of the School	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Teachers' Skills	Primary School ¹	30	3,3619	,62859	,677	,510
	Secondary School ²	60	3,1810	,79686		
	High School ³	48	3,2827	,68066		
	Total	138	3,2557	,72195		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the level of the institutions the participants work at and the scores they received from the ‘teachers’ skills’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.23. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Support’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools

	The Level of the School	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p	diff
Support	Primary School ¹	30	3,2778	,58613	4,363	,015	2 < 3
	Secondary School ²	60	2,8639	,89542			
	High School ³	48	3,2674	,79726			
	Total	138	3,0942	,82292			

It is determined that there is a statistically significant difference ($p < .015$) between the level of the institutions the participants work at and the scores they received from the ‘support’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey. As a result of Post-Hoc tests conducted to determine between which groups was the difference, it was seen that the perceptions of Secondary School teachers were lower than those of High School teachers ($p < 0.05$). The possible reason for this statistical significance is explained in the discussion section of the present study.

Table 4.24. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Students’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools

	The Level of the School	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Students	Primary School ¹	30	3,0083	,67828	1,496	,228
	Secondary School ²	60	3,1083	,70990		
	High School ³	48	3,2734	,67765		
	Total	138	3,1440	,69456		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the level of the institutions the participants work at and the scores they received from the ‘students’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.25. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Course Design’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools

	The Level of the School	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Course Design	Primary School ¹	30	3,1917	,71524	1,954	,146
	Secondary School ²	60	3,0854	,70354		
	High School ³	48	3,3438	,60992		
	Total	138	3,1984	,67976		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the level of the institutions the participants work at and the scores they received from the ‘course design’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.26. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Classroom Interaction’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools

	The Level of the School	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Classroom Interaction	Primary School ¹	30	3,2048	,69449	2,405	,094
	Secondary School ²	60	3,3524	,73996		
	High School ³	48	3,5387	,55855		
	Total	138	3,3851	,67881		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the level of the institutions the participants work at and the scores they received from the ‘classroom interaction’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.27. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Assessment’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools

	The Level of the School	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Assessment	Primary School ¹	30	3,5278	,47562	,271	,763
	Secondary School ²	60	3,4306	,65476		
	High School ³	48	3,4444	,61726		
	Total	138	3,4565	,60389		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the level of the institutions the participants work at and the scores they received from the ‘assessment’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.28. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Feedback’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Levels of the Schools

	The Level of the School	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Feedback	Primary School ¹	30	3,6733	,52123	1,240	,293
	Secondary School ²	60	3,4200	,83215		
	High School ³	48	3,4708	,70075		
	Total	138	3,4928	,73063		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the level of the institutions the participants work at and the scores they received from the ‘feedback’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

4.3.3. One-way ANOVA Results between the Participants' Years of Professional Experience and the Sub-dimensions of the Survey

Table 4.29. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the 'Attitude' Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience

	Years of Professional Experience	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Attitude	Less than 5 ¹	14	3,3469	,56789	,944	,441
	5-10 ²	72	3,0774	,57939		
	11-15 ³	35	3,2122	,42769		
	16-20 ⁴	5	3,0286	,68064		
	More than 20 ⁵	12	3,1071	,60647		
	Total	138	3,1398	,54895		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the years of professional experience of the participants and the scores they received from the 'attitude' sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.30. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the 'Learning Outcomes' Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience

	Years of Professional Experience	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Learning Outcomes	Less than 5 ¹	14	3,2449	,80115	1,826	,127
	5-10 ²	72	3,3135	,71555		
	11-15 ³	35	3,2163	,72461		
	16-20 ⁴	5	3,3429	,79923		
	More than 20 ⁵	12	3,0000	,68647		
	Total	138	2,9261	,61660		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the years of professional experience of the participants and the scores they received from the 'learning

outcomes' sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.31. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the 'Teachers' Skills' Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience

	Years of Professional Experience	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Teachers' Skills	Less than 5 ¹	14	3,2449	,80115	,529	,714
	5-10 ²	72	3,3135	,71555		
	11-15 ³	35	3,2163	,72461		
	16-20 ⁴	5	3,3429	,79923		
	More than 20 ⁵	12	3,0000	,68647		
	Total	138	3,2557	,72195		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the years of professional experience of the participants and the scores they received from the 'teachers' skills' sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.32. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the 'Support' Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience

	Years of Professional Experience	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Support	Less than 5 ¹	14	3,3929	,90253	,730	,573
	5-10 ²	72	3,0694	,84695		
	11-15 ³	35	2,9762	,77664		
	16-20 ⁴	5	3,2667	,63026		
	More than 20 ⁵	12	3,1667	,80716		
	Total	138	3,0942	,82292		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the years of professional experience of the participants and the scores they received from the 'support' sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.33. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Students’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience

	Years of Professional Experience	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Students	Less than 5 ¹	14	3,2679	,68791	,677	,609
	5-10 ²	72	3,0660	,74676		
	11-15 ³	35	3,2500	,64810		
	16-20 ⁴	5	3,3500	,58229		
	More than 20 ⁵	12	3,0729	,55509		
	Total	138	3,1440	,69456		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the years of professional experience of the participants and the scores they received from the ‘students’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.34. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Course Design’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience

	Years of Professional Experience	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Course Design	Less than 5 ¹	14	3,2500	,71723	,096	,983
	5-10 ²	72	3,1823	,73755		
	11-15 ³	35	3,2000	,58802		
	16-20 ⁴	5	3,3500	,65192		
	More than 20 ⁵	12	3,1667	,62915		
	Total	138	3,1984	,67976		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the years of professional experience of the participants and the scores they received from the ‘course design’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.35. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Course Design’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience

	Years of Professional Experience	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Classroom Interaction	Less than 5 ¹	14	3,4694	,68496	,267	,898
	5-10 ²	72	3,3948	,70903		
	11-15 ³	35	3,4041	,58337		
	16-20 ⁴	5	3,2571	,91138		
	More than 20 ⁵	12	3,2262	,73467		
	Total	138	3,3851	,67881		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the years of professional experience of the participants and the scores they received from the ‘classroom interaction’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.36. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Assessment’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience

	Years of Professional Experience	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Assessment	Less than 5 ¹	14	3,3333	,55470	1,464	,217
	5-10 ²	72	3,5718	,62413		
	11-15 ³	35	3,3095	,56178		
	16-20 ⁴	5	3,4667	,95307		
	More than 20 ⁵	12	3,3333	,40825		
	Total	138	3,4565	,60389		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the years of professional experience of the participants and the scores they received from the ‘assessment’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.37. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding the ‘Feedback’ Sub-dimension Scores of the TEdL Survey according to the Participants' Years of Professional Experience

	Years of Professional Experience	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	f	p
Feedback	Less than 5 ¹	14	3,5143	,63592	,897	,468
	5-10 ²	72	3,5583	,74602		
	11-15 ³	35	3,4629	,72562		
	16-20 ⁴	5	3,5600	,88769		
	More than 20 ⁵	12	3,1333	,69978		
	Total	138	3,4928	,73063		

It is determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the years of professional experience of the participants and the scores they received from the ‘feedback’ sub-dimension of the TEdL survey ($p < 0.05$).

4.4. Descriptive Statistics Results

In this section, descriptive statistics results were used in order to determine the perceptions of participants about emergency remote language teaching and face-to-face language teaching, the advantages and disadvantages of ERLT and face-to-face teaching and the challenges the teachers faced during and after the implementation of ERLT. So as to answer the research question 1 and its three sub-questions, the mean and standard deviation scores of each sub-dimension were analyzed using descriptive statistics, and these results were shown on tables.

4.4.1. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Attitude” Sub-dimension

Table 4.38. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Attitude” Sub-dimension

Item	ATTITUDE	Mean	Sd.
1	Prior to Spring 2020, I had positive attitudes towards teaching English online.	3,05	1,07
2	Prior to Spring 2020, I had negative attitudes towards teaching English online.	2,88	1,15

18	I think remote teaching saves time.	3,18	1,16
19	I think remote teaching increased my workload.	3,39	1,14
20	I needed more time to prepare for online classes than I need for face-to-face classes.	3,34	1,13
57	If I had the option to choose between online and face-to-face teaching during lockdown, I would choose online.	2,39	1,29
59	As a result of this transition to remote teaching and learning, I returned to face-to-face teaching with a stronger set of instructional skills and knowledge.	3,71	1,04

The mean score of the item 59 indicates that most of the participants attained a better foundation in instructional skills and knowledge when they went back to teaching in person. This can also be accepted as a perceived advantage of ERLT (see Table 4.38).

4.4.2. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Learning Outcomes” Sub-dimension

Table 4.39. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Learning Outcomes” Sub-dimension

Item	LEARNING OUTCOMES	Mean	Sd.
3	Prior to Spring 2020, I believed that students could do equally well or better when learning English online than in a face-to-face/school setting.	2,55	1,17
4	Prior to Spring 2020, I believed that students would do worse when learning English online than in a face-to-face/school setting.	3,19	1,18
5	I now believe that language learning outcomes can be attained equally well in an online and in a face-to-face setting.	2,72	1,18
6	I now believe that language learning outcomes can be attained better in an online setting.	2,34	1,11
7	I now believe that language learning outcomes can be attained better in a face-to-face setting.	3,81	1,12

Most of the participants currently believe that face-to-face instruction yields better language learning outcomes according to the mean scores of items 6 and 7. This result can also be seen as a perceived disadvantage of ERLT in terms of language learning outcomes (see Table 4.39).

4.4.3. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Skills” Sub-dimension

Table 4.40. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Skills” Sub-dimension

Item	SKILLS	Mean	Sd.
8	When I started teaching online, I had all or most of the necessary skills to carry out online lessons.	2,96	1,16
10	I learned how to teach online, by teaching online during the pandemic.	3,84	1,05
11	I did not face any major obstacles when conducting online classes.	2,84	1,19
12	I am satisfied with how I carried out online English lessons during lockdown.	2,96	1,11
16	During the COVID pandemic, I was equally confident teaching in an online setting as I was in a face-to-face setting.	3,00	1,22
17	I prepared for my online classes in detail.	3,77	0,97
25	I rarely experienced problems with the technology I used.	3,39	1,21

The mean scores of items 8, 10, and 11 show that most of the teachers didn't have the necessary skills to carry out online classes when they began to teach online (see Table 4.40). This can be seen disadvantageous during the implementation of ERLT and this situation can also be a challenge for language teachers to carry out their remote classes.

4.4.4. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Support” Sub-dimension

Table 4.41. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Support” Sub-dimension

Item	SUPPORT	Mean	Sd.
9	I received formal training for remote teaching during the COVID pandemic.	2,85	1,19
21	Adequate support was offered by the school for remote teaching.	3,07	1,22
22	Adequate support was offered by MoNE for remote teaching.	3,18	1,17
23	Adequate support was offered by DDoNE for remote teaching.	3,15	1,14
24	Support for remote teaching was mainly provided by peers.	3,25	1,01
33	My school's professional development and teacher support has adequately prepared me for a seamless transition to remote teaching.	3,03	1,04

Most of the participants stayed neutral about getting support from the stakeholders of education during the ERLT period (see Table 4.41).

4.4.5. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Students” Sub-dimension

Table 4.42. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Students” Sub-dimension

Item	STUDENTS	Mean	Sd.
26	My students adapted well to online lessons.	2,69	1,22
27	My students appeared more anxious than prior to COVID-19.	3,24	1,11
28	The majority of my students took the transition to remote teaching and learning seriously.	2,78	1,17
29	The rate of students’ absence was higher compared to face-to-face teaching.	3,61	1,43
30	My students had the digital skills needed to participate in online lessons.	3,00	1,21
31	My students had access to technology needed to participate in online classes.	2,84	1,25
32	My students seemed less motivated during online lessons.	3,78	1,13
58	As a result of this transition to remote teaching and learning, my students gained additional skills and competences for their future education.	3,21	1,11

According to the mean scores of items 26 and 32, most of the teachers stated that their students couldn’t adapt well to online classes and their motivation levels were lower in online classes (see Table 4.42). According to this finding, students’ low level of motivation and their adaptation problems can be listed among the perceived disadvantages of ERLT.

4.4.6. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Course Design” Sub-dimension

Table 4.43. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Course Design” Sub-dimension

Item	COURSE DESIGN	Mean	Sd.
34	My online courses included opportunities for students to practice all four skills.	2,88	1,26
35	I designed my online lessons according to typical stages of teaching (i.e. pre-activity, whilst-activity and post-activity).	3,44	1,08
36	I reduced the amount of work during COVID-19 that my students might normally complete in a typical semester.	3,18	1,11
14	I was able to organize collaborative activities (pair or group work) online.	2,74	1,21
15	I generally held synchronous classes.	3,03	1,18
39	I regularly uploaded the content I taught to a learning management system.	3,42	1,07
44	My course included authentic examples of language and/or culture.	3,31	1,06
45	It is more difficult to manage online classes compared to face-to-face teaching.	3,55	1,23

The mean scores of items 14 and 45 show that most of the teachers found it more difficult to manage online classes compared to face-to-face classes. Most of them had challenges in applying collaborative activities like pair or group work in their online classes as well (see Table 4.43). These findings can be listed among the perceived disadvantages of ERLT and these can be among the challenges for language teachers during the remote English classes.

4.4.7. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Classroom Interaction” Sub-dimension

Table 4.44. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Classroom Interaction” Sub-dimension

Item	CLASSROOM INTERACTION	Mean	Sd.
13	I was able to engage students in classroom discussions online.	2,98	1,12
37	There was less interaction between students and me (the educator) in online classes compared to face-to-face classes.	3,75	1,19
38	There was less interaction between students in online classes compared to face-to-face classes.	3,86	1,17
40	My course included opportunities for students to interact with oneanother synchronously.	3,24	1,05
41	My course included opportunities for students to interact with oneanother asynchronously.	3,05	1,09
42	My course included opportunities for students to interact with me (the educator) synchronously.	3,50	1,03
43	My course included opportunities for students to interact with me (theeducator) asynchronously.	3,28	1,04

Considering the mean scores of items 37 and 38, it is seen that there are some problems in the interaction of the students and the teacher. In comparison to in-person classes, most of the participants agreed that there was less interaction among students in online classes. This finding can also be admitted as a disadvantage of ERLT in terms of interaction in the classroom (see Table 4.44). The existence of the problems in the classroom interaction can also be a challenge for teachers to teach their lessons in an effective way.

4.4.8. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Assessment” Sub-dimension

Table 4.45. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Assessment” Sub-dimension

Item	ASSESSMENT	Mean	Sd.
46	Written exams are more convenient than oral for online assessment.	3,17	1,24
47	Oral exams are more convenient for online assessment.	3,24	1,18
48	Alternative assessment is the best choice for online lessons.	3,66	0,93
49	I have had difficulties with students cheating on online exams.	3,44	1,13

50	I have altered my grading policies or procedures during COVID-19.	3,63	0,95
51	I often had to extend the deadline for submitting work.	3,57	0,91

The mean scores of items 48, 50, and 51 indicate that most of the teachers changed their assessment policies and procedures and they had to postpone the due date for students' assignments during the ERT period (see Table 4.45). This finding can also be listed among the perceived disadvantages of ERLT.

4.4.9. Descriptive Statistics Results of “Feedback” Sub-dimension

Table 4.46. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of “Feedback” Sub-dimension

Item	FEEDBACK	Mean	Sd.
52	I provided written or verbal feedback at least once per week.	3,66	0,94
53	I could give less feedback to my students compared to face-to-face teaching.	3,33	1,15
54	My students were aware of when/how frequently I am online to assist them and/or provide feedback.	3,47	0,96
55	I felt I needed to be available to my students 24/7.	3,52	1,09
56	I communicated regularly with students' parents during lockdown.	3,47	1,11

According to the mean scores of the item 52, the majority of the teachers gave verbal or written feedback to their students at least once a week. Moreover, most of the participants believed that they had to be accessible to their students at all times. This finding can be a sign of the challenge of ERLT for teachers (see Table 4.46).

CHAPTER V

5. DISCUSSION

In order to answer research question 1 and its sub-questions, the descriptive statistics of the items were examined. The perceptions of the participants about ERLT were tried to be uncovered in the present study by examining the mean and standard deviation scores of the items.

The mean and standard deviation scores of the items were analyzed in the present study in order to find answer to research question 1.1, which is about the perceived advantages of ERLT by English language teachers. Considering the mean and standard deviation scores of the items 10, 24, 35 and 59, returning to in-person teaching with stronger set of instructional skills and knowledge, gaining experience with online teaching, receiving support from peers can be listed among some of the advantages of emergency remote teaching process. In her study, Babić (2021), who focused on the same sub-dimensions of this study, expresses that teachers are now more competent and eager to use digital sources. Moreover, other benefits mentioned by participants include ERT's accessibility as well as its comfort and safety features in her study. Dickau (2021) concludes that through interactions with colleagues, peer support had a favorable impact on teachers' sense of self-efficacy.

In light of the findings in the present study, so as to answer research question 1.2, it is seen that teachers mostly agreed on the item 10 ($\bar{X}=3,84$). 57 (41.3%) of the participants agreed and 41 (29.7%) of them strongly agreed on this item. This shows that majority of the teachers didn't have enough experience and knowledge on how to carry out their online classes till they started teaching online during pandemic. This can be accepted as a disadvantage because having limited or no knowledge about the teaching process has a negative effect on the efficiency of the ERLT classes. Regarding teachers' lack of prior experience with remote teaching, the results of Moser et al. (2021) were likewise supported by the current study. According to Marković et al. (2021, p. 102) over 80% of educators said they had never utilized an e-platform prior to the Covid-19. Çalık and Altay (2021) state that despite the abundance of opportunities for continuing education, students and teachers lack the knowledge and expertise to benefit from most of them. Therefore, having the necessary opportunities does not necessarily mean that ERT will be succeeded positively.

Another outstanding finding in the present study can be clearly seen when the item 7 ($\bar{X}=3,81$) is analyzed. 59 of the teachers (42.8%) agreed and 41(29.7%) of them strongly

agreed on this item. They currently think that in-person instruction can yield better language learning outcomes. This finding may show that online language teaching during ERLT is somehow disadvantageous in terms of language learning outcomes. Erarslan (2021) reached the same result with this study. He states that language instructors were largely concerned about the poorer learning outcomes that stem from teaching English online. Thanks to having responsibilities for their self-directed learning, learners can attain language learning outcomes better. However, in their study, Juárez-Díaz and Perales (2021) reported that only a few students took the responsibility. Thus, the implementation of ERT had a negative effect on learning outcomes.

53 (38.4%) of the participants in the present study agreed and 42 (30.4%) of them strongly agreed that students seemed less motivated during online classes. This is also a disadvantage of ERT for learners and teachers because the less motivated the students are, the less effective the teaching is. Among the pedagogical challenges for teachers during the implementation process of ERT, Ferri et al. (2020) emphasizes the lack of learners' motivation.

In order to see the other challenges faced by English language teachers during the implementation process of ERLT, the numerical data were analyzed to answer research question 1.3 by looking at the mean scores of the items. 51.4% of the participants in this study agreed and strongly agreed that ERT increased their workload. Likewise, MacIntyre et al. (2020) stressed about the fact of increased workload. This finding in the present study can result from the inadequate support and lack of preliminary preparation for ERT. During ERT period, teachers had to design their online classes and course materials by themselves without prior knowledge on how to design their lessons. Therefore, their workload increased and this situation also gave rise to the amount of time they need to prepare for their ERT classes. 52.9% of teachers also agreed and strongly agreed that they needed more time to prepare for online classes than they need for face-to-face classes. Nugroho et al.'s (2021) study supports this fact as well. Being obliged to extend deadline for assignments, being unable to organize collaborative activities (pair or group work), less interaction between students and the educator and the high rate of students' absence in online classes compared to face-to-face classes are among the other main challenges faced by the participants of the present study.

To identify the statistically significant differences, answers of English language teachers were analyzed under four variables; gender, age, level of the institution and years of professional experience. These variables were associated with nine sub-dimensions of the study.

In order to answer the research question 2, the numerical data were analyzed. The findings obtained from the gender variable showed no statistically significant difference with any of the sub-dimensions of the questionnaire. From the type of assessments they preferred to the feedback issue and other sub-dimensions, the teachers, either male or female, have gone through very similar processes during the unprecedented implementation of ERT in our country. This may be seen as the reason behind this finding. Similar to the present study, Kurnaz et al. (2020) found no significant difference considering the gender variable.

According to the findings of this study, after analyzing the data to answer research question 3, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference between the sub-dimensions of the questionnaire and the age variable. The reason behind this finding may result from the relationship between the ages of the participants and the years in which technology evolved. 93.47 % of the participants (N=129) are aged between 25-44. Therefore, it can be said that the majority of the participants are familiar with the technological processes and digital world considering the evolution of technology and their ages. This enables them a better adaptation to online education and its practises. Examining the related literature, it is seen that Yaşar (2023) found no significant difference for the age variable as well. However, according to Yıldırım (2022), teachers aged 22-30 experienced more difficulties in the distance education process than English teachers aged 41-50 and 51 and over. Thus, this may reveal that having technological competence is not the only issue affecting the perceptions of teachers. Similarly, Şeker (2023) states in her study that age variable has effect on teacher's online teaching self efficacy.

Considering the findings related to the level of the schools where participants work, the numerical data were analyzed to answer research question 4 and it is determined that there is a statistically significant difference ($p < .015$) between the level of the institutions and the scores they received from the 'support' sub-dimension of the TEdL survey. According to the one-way ANOVA test results, English teachers working at secondary schools stated that they had less support from the MoNE, DDoNE and their institutions during the emergency remote teaching period than the high school teachers. This result may be due to the fact that high school students would attend university entrance exam at the end of the second term of the school period. The existence of the university entrance exam may have urged MoNE, DDoNE and the high schools to give the priority to high school classes. As far as investigated, it is seen that none of the researchers of the related studies reached the same result for the 'support' sub-dimension. However, Yıldırım (2022) found statistically significant difference for sub-dimensions of his scale like language skills, student motivation

and assessment. In the present study, there is no statistically significant difference in any other sub-dimensions of the scale.

According to the analyses so as to find an answer to research question 5, the findings of the present study about ‘years of professional experience’ variable showed no statistically significant difference. This finding may indicate that being an experienced or an inexperienced teacher does not affect the perceptions about ERLT period because it is a brand new teaching environment for all of the teachers. Yaşar (2023) and Ceylan (2019) reached the same result as this study. They also conclude that there is no statistically significant difference for ‘term of duty’ variable in their studies. They infer that EFL teaching time does not significantly influence the perceptions of teachers about online education. However, in their research, Güngör et al. (2020) express that experienced teachers have comparatively negative attitudes towards online education.

CHAPTER VI

6. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Following the Covid-19 confinement decisions of the governments throughout the world, education has gone under a vast majority of changes. After the decision of school closures to enable social distancing to prevent the spread of coronavirus among people, governments had to find instant solution to the education issue. At the beginning, many of the governments, including Turkey, offered national TV broadcasts to maintain education. Distance education practises have already been existed for many years from classical methods to web-based online methods. These distance education methods are planned ways of teaching and learning but emergency remote education practise is unplanned and immediate. Therefore, the unplanned structure of ERT brought along many concerns and issues for all of the stakeholders of education. Educational institutions, teachers, students and parents had to cope with many problems and novelties.

During the implementation process of ERT, teachers have naturally obliged to reshape the way of their teaching by changing many things from the course materials to the methods they use during their teaching. Accordingly, their thoughts, views, feelings and perceptions have undergone some changes after switching to emergency remote teaching from a conventional face-to-face education. The present thesis study aimed to find out the perceptions of English language teachers about the emergency remote language teaching. To reach this aim, a quantitative questionnaire was applied to the teachers to get a deep insight of their thoughts about ERLT. The questionnaire, comprising of 59 items, was preferred because it has nine sub-dimensions related to the educational process. From the attitudes of participants, learning and teaching outcomes and support they received during ERT to feedback and assessment, many issues were tried to be cleared out in this study.

It was seen as a necessity to reveal and figure out teachers' perceptions about ERT because ERT is a new way of teaching which emerges at the times of emergency situations like wars and pandemics. Just like in the world, in Turkey, it is of paramount importance to understand, take necessary precautions and make preparations for a potential emergency remote teaching implementation in the future. Therefore, this study also aimed at proposing insights for the stakeholders of education about the issues encountered during the ERT practise. According to the results of this study, teachers have some positive opinions and perceptions about ERT but they also take a negative stance against some characteristics of

ERT. In the existing literature, some researchers state that teachers have positive attitudes towards ERT and distance education (e.g. Çiçek et al., 2020; Koca, 2021; Kocayiğit & Uşun, 2020). In contrast, some other researchers express that teachers have negative attitudes towards ERT because teachers think that ERT and distance education cannot be a substitute of face-to-face teaching (e.g. Arı & Kanat, 2020; Balaman & Hanbay, 2021; Gören et al., 2020; Kaya & Uylas, 2022; Kuset et al., 2021).

According to the findings and the issues perceived by the participants of this thesis study, it is highly possible to say that there is a need for some training programs for all of the stakeholders of education, especially for teachers. Planning and applying some in-service trainings can be useful for a possible ERT implementation in the future. Moreover, especially developing the technological infrastructure, creating online platforms for remote classes and providing easy access to these platforms, trying to increase student motivation by integrating technology and even online classes into the education system, increasing the awareness of education stakeholders in order not to get astonished in times of possible future crisis situations are among the significant factors according to the gainings from this study.

6.1. Recommendations for Future Research

This thesis study was done by receiving the opinions of 138 English language teachers working at public schools of a province of Turkey. Therefore, teachers, working at private schools can perceive different issues. Similarly, by expanding the sample size, getting a deeper insight can be possible. It is also recommended that studies in emergency remote language teaching contexts be carried out. Beside quantitative questions, qualitative questions can be directed to the participants to find out other possible factors affecting the views of teachers.

REFERENCES

- Aguliera, E., & Nightengale-Lee, B. (2020). Emergency remote teaching across urban and rural contexts: Perspectives on educational equity. *Information and Learning Sciences*, 121(5/6), 471-478.
- Aji, W. K., Ardin, H., & Arifin, M. A. (2020). Blended learning during pandemic corona virus: Teachers' and students' perceptions. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 8(2), 632-646.
- Albiansyah, A., Hidayat, D. N., & Aringga, R. D. (2021). EFL students' perceptions toward online English learning during the Covid-19 outbreak. *ELLITE: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 6(1), 1-8.
- Arı, A. G., & Kanat, M. H. (2020). Covid-19 (Koronavirüs) üzerine öğretmen adaylarının görüşleri. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, (Salgın Hastalıklar Özel Sayısı)*, 459-492.
- Astuti, M., & Solikhah, I. (2021). Teacher perception in teaching English for SMP in Klaten regency during Covid-19 outbreak. *IJOTL-TL*, 6(1), 1-13.
- Atmojo, A. E. P., & Nugroho, A. (2020). EFL classes must go online! Teaching activities and challenges during Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Register Journal*, 13(1), 49-76.
- Babić, M. (2021). *Teachers' Perspectives on Emergency Remote English Language Teaching during the COVID-19 Pandemic* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rijeka. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Department of English Language and Literature).
- Bachiri, H., & Oifaa, T. (2020). The role of ICT in the teaching of productive skills in English during Covid-19: Teachers' perceptions and obstacles. *Linguistic Forum-A Journal of Linguistics*, 2(2), 35-44.
- Bailey, D. R., & Lee, A. R. (2020). Learning from experience in the midst of Covid-19: Benefits, challenges, and strategies in online teaching. *Computer Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal (CALL-EJ)*, 21(2), 176-196.
- Balaman, F., & Tiryaki, S. H. (2021). Corona virüs (Covid-19) nedeniyle mecburi yürütülen uzaktan eğitim hakkında öğretmen görüşleri. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10(1), 52-84.
- Balbay, S., & Erkan, G. (2021b). Online language learning in times of crisis: Hindrance or opportunity? *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, 4(3), 448-463.
- Bali, S., & Liu, M. C. (2018). Students' perceptions toward online learning and face-to-face

- learning courses. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 1108. (012094).
- Barbour, M. K., LaBonte, R., Hodges, C. B., Moore, S., Lockee, B. B., Trust, T., & Kelly, K. (2020). Understanding pandemic pedagogy: Differences between emergency remote, remote, and online teaching. State of the Nation: K-12 e-Learning in Canada.
- Basilaia, G., & Kvavadze, D. (2020). Transition to online education in schools during a SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic in Georgia. *Pedagogical Research*, 5(4).
- Beard, L. A., & Harper C. (2002). Student perceptions of online versus on campus instruction. *Education*, 122, 658-663.
- Behjat, F. (2012). Interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences: Do they really work in foreign-language learning? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 32, 351-355.
- Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to Coronavirus pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), i-vi.
- Brenton, S. (2014). "Effective online teaching and learning," in a handbook for teaching and learning in higher education (London, United Kingdom: Routledge), 161–173.
- Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: Rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*, 395(10227), 912–920.
- Burde, D., Kapit, A., Wahl, R. L., Guven, O., & Skarpeteig, M. I. (2017). Education in emergencies: A review of theory and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(3), 619-658.
- Burnett, K., Bonnici, L. J., Miksa, S. D., and Kim, J. (2007). Frequency, intensity and topicality in online learning: an exploration of the interaction dimensions that contribute to student satisfaction in online learning. *J. Education Libr. Inf. Sci.* 48 (1), 21–35.
- Cahyadi, A., Hendryadi, Widyastuti, S., & Suryani. (2022). Covid-19, emergency remote teaching evaluation: The case of Indonesia. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(2), 2165-2179.
- Çalık, E. Ö., & Altay, I. F. (2021). Analysis of English lesson broadcasts during emergency remote teaching from pedagogical, instructional and technical aspects. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science*, 1(2), 71-87.
- Can, T. (2022). Emergency remote teaching: challenges faced and actions taken by English language instructors at the time of the pandemic. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Turkey.

- Cantürk, G., & Cantürk, A. (2021). Determining the opinions of English teachers about the distance online education experience in Covid-19 pandemic by using metaphors. *International Journal of Current Approaches in Language, Education and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1-37.
- Ceylan, H. (2019). Fen bilgisi öğretmenlerinin eğitim-öğretiminde, Eğitim Bilişim Ağında (EBA) yararlanmaya ilişkin görüşleri. Unpublished master's thesis. Trakya University, Turkey.
- Çiçek, İ., Tanhan, A., & Tanrıverdi, S. (2020). Covid-19 ve eğitim. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 49 (1), 1091-1104.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.
- Cole, A., Anderson, C., Bunton, T., Cherney, M., Fisher, V. C., Featherston, M., et al. (2017). student predisposition to instructor feedback and perceptions of teaching presence predict motivation toward online courses. *Online Learn. J.* 21 (4), 245–262.
- Coppola, N. W., Hiltz, S. R., and Rotter, N. G. (2002). Becoming a virtual professor: pedagogical roles and asynchronous learning networks. *J. Management Inf. Syst.* 18 (4), 169–189
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Crompton, H., Burke, D., Jordan, K., & Wilson, S. W. (2021). Learning with technology during emergencies: A systematic review of K-12 education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(4), 1554-1575.
- Czerniewicz, L., Agherdien, N., Badenhorst, J., Belluigi, D., Chambers, T., Chili, M., ... & Wissing, G. (2020). A wake-up call: Equity, inequality and Covid-19 emergency remote teaching and learning. *Postdigital science and education*, 2(3), 946-967.
- DeCarlo, L.T. (1997). On the meaning and use of kurtosis, *Psychological Methods*, 2: 292-307.
- Dickau, A. R. (2021). Peer support and teacher self-efficacy: A case study of the transition to emergency remote teaching during Covid-19. *A Project Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies*, Concordia University of Edmonton.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics* (Oxford Applied Linguistics). Oxford University Press.
- Dudeney, G., & Hockly, N. (2007). How to teach English with technology?
- Ely, D. P. (2003). Selecting media for distance education. Syracuse, NY: ERIC

- Clearinghouse on Information & Technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED480236)
- Erarslan, A. (2021). English language teaching and learning during Covid-19: A global perspective on the first year. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, 4(2), 349-367.
- Erkan, G., & Balbay, S. (2021a). How English language instructors coped with the onset of the pandemic and remote language teaching: A case study. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(4), 1198-1211.
- Ezra, O., Cohen, A., Bronshtein, A., Gabbay, H., & Baruth, O. (2021). Equity factors during the Covid-19 pandemic: Difficulties in emergency remote teaching (ert) through online learning. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(6), 7657-7681.
- Fansury, A. H., Januarty, R., & Ali Wira Rahman, S. (2020). Digital content for millennial generations: Teaching the English foreign language learner on Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 55(3), 1-12.
- Ferri, F., Grifoni, P., & Guzzo, T. (2020). Online learning and emergency remote teaching: Opportunities and challenges in emergency situations. *Societies*, 10(4), 86.
- Fuad, M., Ariyani, F., Suyanto, E., & Shidiq, A. S. (2020). Exploring teachers' TPACK: Are Indonesian language teachers ready for online learning during the Covid-19 outbreak? *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(11B), 6091-6102.
- Fuchs, K. (2022). The difference between emergency remote teaching and e-learning. *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 7, p. 921332). Frontiers.
- Gherheș, V., Stoian, C. E., Fărcașiu, M. A., & Stanici, M. (2021). E-learning vs. face-to-face learning: Analyzing students' preferences and behaviors. *Sustainability*, 13(8), 4381.
- Gilakjani, A. P. (2013). Factors contributing to teachers' use of computer technology in the classroom. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 1(3), 262-267.
- Gömlüksiz, M. N. (2004). Use of education technology in English classes. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 3(2), 71-77.
- Gonzalez, T., De La Rubia, M. A., Hincz, K. P., Comas-Lopez, M., Subirats, L., Fort, S., & Sacha, G. M. (2020). Influence of Covid-19 confinement on students' performance in higher education. *PloS one*, 15(10), e0239490.
- Gören, S. Ç., Fazilet, G. Ö. K., Yalçın, M., Göregen, F., & Çalışkan, M. (2020). Küresel salgın sürecinde uzaktan eğitimin değerlendirilmesi: Ankara örneği. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 49(1), 69-94.
- Grek, S., & Landri, P. (2021). Education in Europe and the Covid-19 pandemic. *European*

- Educational Research Journal*, 20(4), 393-402.
- Groeneveld, R.A. & Meeden, G. (1984), Measuring skewness and kurtosis, *The Statistician*, 33, 391-399.
- Güngör, H., Çangal, Ö., & Demir, T. (2020). Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak uzaktan öğretimine ilişkin öğrenci ve öğretici görüşleri. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40(3), 1163-1191.
- Hebebe, M. T., Bertiz, Y., & Alan, S. (2020). Investigation of views of students and teachers on distance education practices during the Coronavirus (Covid-19) Pandemic. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 4(4), 267-282.
- Hennessy, S., Ruthven, K., & Brindley, S. U. E. (2005). Teacher perspectives on integrating ICT into subject teaching: Commitment, constraints, caution, and change. *Journal of curriculum studies*, 37(2), 155-192.
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*, 27.
- Hodges, C. B., Moore, S. L., Lockee, B. B., Aaron Bond, M., & Jewett, A. (2021). An instructional design process for emergency remote teaching. *Radical solutions for education in a crisis context: Covid-19 as an opportunity for global learning*, 37-51.
- Holmberg, B. (2005). *Theory and practice of distance education*. Routledge.
- Hood, S. (2011). Body language in face-to-face teaching: A focus on textual and interpersonal meaning. *Semiotic margins: Meaning in multimodalities*, 31-52.
- Hopkins, K.D. & Weeks, D.L. (1990), "Tests for Normality and Measures of Skewness and Kurtosis: Their Place in Research Reporting," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 50: 717-729.
- Huachizaca, V., Granda, J., Castillo, K., Quezada, J. P., & Herrera, R. (2022). Effects of blended English learning in superior education: A case study. *AsiaCALL Online Journal*, 13(5), 83-99.
- Huh, S. (2020). How to train health personnel to protect themselves from SARS-CoV-2 (novel coronavirus) infection when caring for a patient or suspected case. *Journal of educational evaluation for health professions*, 17.
- İnal, S. (2022). Emergency remote teaching in Turkey: A systematic literature review (Doctoral dissertation). Bilkent University, Turkey.
- Isaee, H., & Barjesteh, H. (2023). Screening EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions of emergency remote teaching during Covid-19 pandemic: A comparative analysis.

- Izgi Onbaşılı, Ü., & Sezginsoy, B. (2021). Distance education in the Covid-19 pandemic period: Opinions of primary pre-service teachers about teaching practice course. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, 4(4), 726-744.
- Jin, L., Deifell, E., & Angus, K. (2022). Emergency remote language teaching and learning in disruptive times. *Calico Journal*, 39(1), i-x.
- Jong, B. (2021). Using padlet as a technological tool for assessment of students 'writing skills in online classroom settings. *International Journal of Education*, 9(2), 411-423.
- Juárez-Díaz, C., & Perales, M. (2021). Language teachers' emergency remote teaching experiences during the Covid-19 confinement. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 23(2), 121-135.
- Kang, M., and Im, T. (2013). Factors of learner-instructor interaction which predict perceived learning outcomes in online learning environment. *J. Computer Assist. Learn.* 29, 292–301.
- Karakaya, G. (2022). An analysis of face-to-face education versus Emergency-remote teaching: readiness of ELT teacher trainees. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Bursa Uludağ University, Turkey.
- Kaushik, M., & Guleria, N. (2020). The impact of pandemic Covid-19 in workplace. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 12(15), 1-10.
- Kaya, A., & Uylas, S. D. (2022). Teachers' views on distance education: Turkey in the Covid-19 pandemic process: Teachers' views on distance education. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 14(1), 625-654.
- Keegan, D. (2013). *Foundations of distance education*. Routledge.
- Khan, B. H. (2005). Learning features in an open, flexible, and distributed environment. *AACE Journal*, 13(2), 137-153.
- Kılıçkaya, F., & Seferoğlu, G. (2013). The Impact of CALLiInstruction on English language teachers' use of technology in language teaching. *Journal of Second and Multiple Language Acquisition*, 1, 20–38.
- Ko, S., & Rossen, S. (2017). *Teaching online: A practical guide*. Taylor & Francis.
- Koca, M. F. (2021). Pandemi sürecinde ortaokullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin uzaktan eğitime karşı tutumları: Osmaniye ili örneği. Osmaniye Korkut Ata Üniversitesi.
- Kocayiğit, A., & Salih, U. (2020). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığına bağlı okullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin uzaktan eğitime yönelik tutumları (Burdur ili örneği). *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8(23), 285-299.
- Kurnaz, A., Kaynar, H., Barışık, C. Ş., & Doğrukök, B. (2020). Öğretmenlerin uzaktan

- eğitime ilişkin görüşleri. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 49(1), 293-322.
- Kuset, Ş., Özgem, K., Şaşmacıoğlu, E., & Güldal, Ş. (2021). Evaluation of the impact of distance education on children in preschool period: Teachers' opinions. *Near East University Online Journal of Education*, 4(1), 78-87.
- Latif, M. M. A., & Alhamad, M. M. (2023). Emergency remote teaching of foreign languages at Saudi universities: Teachers' reported challenges, coping strategies and training needs. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-26.
- Lee, Y., and Choi, J. (2011). A Review of online course dropout research: Implications for practice and future research. *Education Tech Res. Dev* 59, 593–618.
- Lie, A., Tamah, S. M., Gozali, I., Triwidayati, K. R., Utami, T. S. D., & Jemadi, F. (2020). Secondary school language teachers' online learning engagement during the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 19, 803–832.
- Lipovec, A., Zmazek, B., & Pesek, I. (2022). Education equity in times of emergency remote teaching: The case of Slovenia.
- Lukas, B. A., & Yunus, M. M. (2021). ESL Teachers' challenges in implementing e-learning during Covid-19. *international journal of learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(2), 330-348.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (2020). Language teachers' coping strategies during the Covid-19 conversion to online teaching: Correlations with stress, wellbeing and negative emotions. *System*, 94, 102352.
- Manca, S., & Delfino, M. (2021). Adapting educational practices in emergency remote education: Continuity and change from a student perspective. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(4), 1394-1413.
- Martin, F., Budhrani, K., Kumar, S., & Ritzhaupt, A. (2019). Award-winning faculty online teaching practices: Roles and competencies. *Online Learning*, 23(1), 184-205.
- Mentzer, G. A., Cryan, J., & Teclehaimanot, B. (2007). Two peas in a pod? A comparison of face-to-face and web-based classroom. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 15(2), 233-246.
- Meşe, E., & Sevilen, Ç. (2021). Factors influencing EFL students' motivation in online learning: A qualitative case study. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, 4(1), 11-22.
- Meyer, K. A. (2007). Student perceptions of face-to-face and online discussions: The advantage goes to... *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 11(4), 53-69.

- Babić, M. (2021). *Teachers' Perspectives on Emergency Remote English Language Teaching during the COVID-19 Pandemic* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rijeka. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Department of English Language and Literature).
- Misirli, O., & Ergulec, F. (2021). Emergency remote teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic: Parents experiences and perspectives. *Education and information technologies*, 26(6), 6699-6718.
- Moore, M. G. (1993). *Three types of interaction*. In Harry K, John M and Keegan D (Eds.) *Distance Education: New Perspectives* (New York: Routledge)
- Moors, J. J. A. (1986). The meaning of kurtosis: Darlington reexamined. *The American Statistician*, 40, 283-284.
- Moser, K. M., Wei, T., & Brenner, D. (2021). Remote teaching during Covid-19: Implications from a national survey of language educators. *System*, 97, 102431.
- Mukhtar, K., Javed, K., Arooj, M., & Sethi, A. (2020). Advantages, limitations and recommendations for online learning during Covid-19 pandemic era. *Pakistan journal of medical sciences*, 36(COVID19-S4), S27.
- Naqvi, S., & Zehra, I. (2020). Online EFL emergency remote teaching during Covid-19, challenges and innovative practices: A case of Oman. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Proceedings of 2nd MEC TESOL Conference*.
- Nayci, Ö. (2020). Student opinions regarding strengths and weaknesses of face to face and online teaching. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*.
- Nayman, H., & Bavlı, B. (2022). Online teaching of productive language skills (PLS) during emergency remote teaching (ERT) in EFL classrooms: a phenomenological inquiry. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 10(1), 179-187.
- Nilsson, L. (2021). Distance education in high schools in Sweden during Covid-19: Analysis of students' perceptions.
- Novikov, P. (2020). Impact of Covid-19 emergency transition to on-line learning on international students' perceptions of educational process at Russian University. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 11(3), 270–302.
- Nugroho, A., Haghegh, M., & Triana, Y. (2021). Emergency remote teaching amidst global pandemic: voices of Indonesian EFL teachers. *VELES (Voices of English Language Education Society)*, 5(1), 66-80.
- Oranburg, S. (2020). Distance education in the time of coronavirus: quick and easy strategies for professors. *Duquesne University School of Law Research Paper*, (2020-02).
- Orhan, G., & Beyhan, Ö. (2020). Teachers' perceptions and teaching experiences on distance

- education through synchronous video conferencing during Covid-19 pandemic. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 7(1), 8-44.
- Parvin, R. H., & Salam, S. F. (2015). The effectiveness of using technology in English language classrooms in government primary schools in Bangladesh. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, 2(1), pp. 47-59.
- Paydaş, İ., & Saka, F. Ö. (2022). In the lens of EFL instructors: Emergency remote education. *International Journal of Current Approaches in Language, Education and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 103-127.
- Ploj Virtic, M., Dolenc, K., & Šorgo, A. (2021). Changes in online distance learning behaviour of university students during the coronavirus disease 2019 outbreak, and development of the model of forced distance online learning preferences. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 10(1), 393-411.
- Ponzurick, T. G., France, K. R., & Logar, C. M. (2000). Delivering graduate marketing education: An analysis of face-to-face versus distance education. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22, 180-187.
- Pregowska, A., Masztalerz, K., Garlińska, M., & Osial, M. (2021). A worldwide journey through distance education-from the post office to virtual, augmented and mixed realities, and education during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Education Sciences*, 11(3), 118.
- Rahayu, R. P., & Wirza, Y. (2020). Teachers' perception of online learning during pandemic Covid-19. *The Journal of Educational Research (JPP)*, 20(3), 392-406.
- Rathert, S., & Ağçam, R. (2022). Learning at Risk? Language teaching under emergency remote conditions. *Pedagogika*, 146(2), 39-59.
- Redmond, P. (2011). From face-to-face teaching to online teaching: Pedagogical transitions. In Proceedings of the 28th Annual Conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE 2011). University of Southern Queensland.
- Sarı, G. (2022). Primary school Turkish - English teachers' perceptions towards online teaching process: challenges and experiences. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, Turkey.
- Saykili, A. (2018). Distance education: Definitions, generations, key concepts and future directions. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 5(1), 2-17.
- Seabra, F., Abelha, M., Teixeira, A., & Aires, L. (2021). Learning in troubled times: Parents' perspectives on emergency remote teaching and learning. *Sustainability*, 14(1), 301.

- Seçkin, Z., Elçin, A., & Doğan, O. (2020). A quantitative investigation of university students' perceptions concerning the learning processes amid the pandemic of Covid-19. *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 22(39), 187-205.
- Şeker, Ç. (2023). Exploring Turkish EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy during Covid-19 pandemia. Unpublished master's thesis. Çağ University, Turkey.
- Sezgin, S. (2021). Acil uzaktan eğitim sürecinin analizi: Öne çıkan kavramlar, sorunlar ve çıkarılan dersler. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(1), 273-296.
- Sher, A. (2009). Assessing the Relationship of Student-Instructor and Student-Student Interaction to Student Learning and Satisfaction in Web-Based Online Learning Environment. *J. Interactive Online Learn.* 8, 102–120.
- Shih, T. K., Antoni, G. D., Arndt, T., Asirvatham, A., Chang, C. T., Chee, Y. S., ... & Wang, Y. H. (2003). A survey of distance education challenges and technologies. *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies (IJDET)*, 1(1), 1-20.
- Sinclair, M. (2001). Education in emergencies. Learning for a future: Refugee education in developing countries, 1-84.
- Situmorang, K., Pramusita, S. M., & Nugroho, D. Y. (2021). English teachers' reflections and lessons learned in language teaching during Covid-19 pandemic. *Eduvelop: Journal of English Education and Development*, 5(1), 50-61.
- Sun, P. C., Tsai, R. J., Finger, G., Chen, Y. Y., & Yeh, D. (2008). What drives a successful e-Learning? An empirical investigation of the critical factors influencing learner satisfaction. *Computers & education*, 50(4), 1183-1202.
- Tayşi, E., & Alagözlü, N. (2023). Emergency remote teaching: EFL instructors' satisfaction with teaching online. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (34), 1199-1216.
- Thamarana, S. (2016). Role of e-learning and virtual learning environment in English language learning. In *Conference Paper*.
- Thornbury, S. (2006). *The dictionary of terms and concepts used in English language teaching*. Macmillian Education: Macmillian for Limited Publishing
- Tu, C. H. (2000). On-line learning migration: From social learning theory to social presence theory in a CMC environment. *Journal of network and computer applications*, 23(1), 27-37.
- Unger, S., & Meiran, W. R. (2020). Student attitudes towards online education during the COVID-19 viral outbreak of 2020: Distance learning in a time of social distance.

- International Journal of Technology in Education and Science (IJTES)*, 4(4), 256-266.
- Vamosi, A. R., Pierce, B. G., & Slotkin, M. H. (2004). Distance learning in an accounting principles course: Student satisfaction and perceptions of efficacy. *Journal of education for Business*, 79, 360-366.
- Whittle, C., Tiwari, S., Yan, S., & Williams, J. (2020). Emergency remote teaching environment: A conceptual framework for responsive online teaching in crises. *Information and Learning Sciences*, 121(5/6), 311-319.
- Wisan, G., Nazma, S., Pscherer, C. P., Jr. (2001). Comparing online and face-to-face instruction at a large virtual university: Data and issues in the measurement of quality. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Institutional Research, Long Beach, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED456790)
- Wong, A. F., Quek, C. L., Divaharan, S., Liu, W. C., Peer, J., & Williams, M. D. (2006). Singapore students' and teachers' perceptions of computer-supported project work classroom learning environments. *Journal of research on technology in education*, 38(4), 449-479.
- Wright, R., Jones, G., D', A., and Alba, N. A. (2015). Online students' attitudes towards rapport-building traits and practices. *Ijil* 17 (1), 36–58.
- Wuensch, K. L., Aziz, S., Ozan, E., Kishore, M., & Tabrizi, M. (2006). Pedagogical characteristics of online and face-to-face classes. In *E-Learn: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education* (pp. 2422-2429). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Yaşar, Ö.F. (2023). The perspectives of secondary school EFL teachers on online teaching in the shadow of the Covid-19 pandemic. Unpublished master's thesis. Çağ University, Turkey.
- Yerby, J. (2017). An analysis of presence in an asynchronous online undergraduate mastery course using structural equation modeling [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University.
- Yıldırım, U. (2022). Turkish EFL teachers' views on emergency remote teaching during the Covid-19 period. Unpublished master's thesis. Akdeniz University, Turkey.
- You, J. W., & Kang, M. (2014). The role of academic emotions in the relationship between perceived academic control and self-regulated learning in online learning. *Computers & Education*, 77, 125-133.
- Yuniastari, R., & da Silva, A. M. (2022). The advantages and disadvantages of offline and

emergency remote online general English classes. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 16(2), 394-412.

Yusny, R., Rizki, F., Trisnawati, I. K., & Mulia, M. (2021). Offline or online?: EFL students' perceptions on working in face-to-face and virtual learning modes. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 9(1), 113-128.





APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Demographic Information of the Participants

PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Gender:

Male ☐

Female ☐

2. Age:

Under 25 ☐

25-34 ☐

35-44 ☐

45-54 ☐

Over 55 ☐

3. The level of the school you work at:

Primary School ☐

Secondary School ☐

High School ☐

4. Professional Experience (Years):

Less than 5 ☐

6-10 ☐

11-15 ☐

16-20 ☐

More than 20 ☐

Appendix 2. Teaching English during Lockdown Scale

TEACHING ENGLISH DURING LOCKDOWN

1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree

#	Statement	Level of agreement				
1	Prior to Spring 2020, I had positive attitudes towards teaching English online.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Prior to Spring 2020, I had negative attitudes towards teaching English online.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Prior to Spring 2020, I believed that students could do equally well or better when learning English online than in a face-to-face/school setting.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Prior to Spring 2020, I believed that students would do worse when learning English online than in a face-to-face/school setting.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I now believe that language learning outcomes can be attained equally well in an online and in a face-to-face setting.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I now believe that language learning outcomes can be attained better in an online setting.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I now believe that language learning outcomes can be attained better in a face-to-face setting.	1	2	3	4	5
8	When I started teaching online, I had all or most of the necessary skills to carry out online lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I received formal training for emergency remote teaching during the COVID pandemic	1	2	3	4	5
10	I learned how to teach online, by teaching online during the pandemic.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I did not face any major obstacles when conducting online classes.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I am satisfied with how I carried out online English lessons during lockdown.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I was able to students to engage students in classroom discussions online.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I was able to organize collaborative activities (pair or group work) online.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I generally held synchronous classes.	1	2	3	4	5
16	During the COVID pandemic, I was equally confident teaching in an online setting as I was in a face-to-face setting.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I prepared for my online classes in detail.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I think remote teaching saves time.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I think remote teaching increased my workload	1	2	3	4	5
20	I needed more time to prepare for online classes than I need for face-to-face classes.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Adequate support was offered by the school for remote teaching.	1	2	3	4	5

22	Adequate support was offered by MoNE for remote teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Adequate support was offered by DDoNE for remote teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Support for remote teaching was mainly provided by peers.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I rarely experienced problems with the technology I used.	1	2	3	4	5
26	My students adapted well to online lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
27	My students appeared more anxious than prior to COVID-19.	1	2	3	4	5
28	The majority of my students took the transition to remote teaching and learning seriously.	1	2	3	4	5
29	The rate of students' absence was higher compared to face-to-face teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
30	My students had the digital skills needed to participate in online lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
31	My students had access to technology needed to participate in online classes.	1	2	3	4	5
32	My students seemed less motivated during online lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
33	My school's professional development and teacher support has adequately prepared me for a seamless transition to remote teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
34	My online courses included opportunities for students to practice all four skills.	1	2	3	4	5
35	I designed my online lessons according to typical stages of teaching (i.e. pre-activity, whilst-activity and post-activity).	1	2	3	4	5
36	I reduced the amount of work during COVID-19 that my students might normally complete in a typical semester.	1	2	3	4	5
37	There was less interaction between students and me (the educator) in online classes compared to face-to-face classes.	1	2	3	4	5
38	There was less interaction between students in online classes compared to face-to-face classes.	1	2	3	4	5
39	I regularly uploaded the content I taught to a learning management system.	1	2	3	4	5
40	My course included opportunities for students to interact with one another synchronously.	1	2	3	4	5
41	My course included opportunities for students to interact with one another asynchronously.	1	2	3	4	5
42	My course included opportunities for students to interact with me (the educator) synchronously.	1	2	3	4	5
43	My course included opportunities for students to interact with me (the educator) asynchronously.	1	2	3	4	5
44	My course included authentic examples of language and/or culture.	1	2	3	4	5

45	It is more difficult to manage online classes compared to face-to-face teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
46	Written exams are more convenient than oral for online assessment.	1	2	3	4	5
47	Oral exams are more convenient for online assessment.	1	2	3	4	5
48	Alternative assessment is the best choice for online lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
49	I have had difficulties with students cheating on online exams.	1	2	3	4	5
50	I have altered my grading policies or procedures during COVID-19.	1	2	3	4	5
51	I often had to extend the deadline for submitting work.	1	2	3	4	5
52	I provided written or verbal feedback at least once per week.	1	2	3	4	5
53	I could give less feedback to my students compared to face-to-face teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
54	My students were aware of when/how frequently I am online to assist them and/or provide feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
55	I felt I needed to be available to my students 24/7.	1	2	3	4	5
56	I communicated regularly with students' parents during lockdown.	1	2	3	4	5
57	If I had the option to choose between online and face-to-face teaching during lockdown, I would choose online.	1	2	3	4	5
58	As a result of this transition to remote teaching and learning, my students gained additional skills and competences for their future education.	1	2	3	4	5
59	As a result of this transition to remote teaching and learning, I returned to face-to-face teaching with a stronger set of instructional skills and knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 3. Google Forms – Consent Form

FACE-TO-FACE LANGUAGE TEACHING AND EMERGENCY REMOTE LANGUAGE TEACHING

I am an English teacher in Erzurum and a Master of Arts student in English Language Teaching in Amasya University. This thesis study aims at uncovering and comparing English language teachers' perceptions about face-to-face language teaching and emergency remote language teaching after the Covid-19 pandemic. You are invited to take part in this MA thesis study because you are an active member of emergency remote language teaching and face-to-face language teaching.

Taking part in this study is entirely voluntary and your refusal or withdrawal will involve no penalty or loss, now or in the future.

If you confirm to take part in this study, you will be asked to join an online questionnaire and fifty-nine questions will be asked to you related to the topic.

Your answers to my questions will be saved via Google Forms and will only be used in the report of this thesis study. Your personal information will not be shared with anyone and your name will be kept confidential in the report. Replying the questions in the questionnaire will last about 20 minutes.

If you want any further information concerning this project or if you have any problems which may be related to your involvement in the project, you can contact the researcher on

Thanks for your contributions.

Ensar ASLANTÜRK – Master of Arts student – Amasya University

Appendix 4. Approval of Ethical Committee



T.C.
AMASYA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Bilim Etik Kurulu
Sosyal Bilimler Etik Kurulu

Sayı : E-30640013-100-89652
Konu : Ensar ASLANTÜRK

13.09.2022

REKTÖRLÜK MAKAMINA
Sayın Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ayfer SU BERGİL
Anabilim Dalı Başkanı

İlgi : 12.08.2022 tarihli ve 84419 sayılı yazı.

Daha önce ana bilim dalınızda görev yapıp emekli olan Doç. Dr. Kadim Öztürk tarafından başkanlığımıza başvurusu yapılan "**A Comparative Study on English Language Teachers' Perceptions about Face-to-Face Language Teaching and Emergency Remote Language Teaching after the Covid-19 Pandemic (Covid-19 Pandemisi Sonrasında İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Yüz Yüze Dil Öğretimi ve Acil Uzaktan Dil Öğretimi Hakkındaki Algıları üzerine Karşılaştırmalı bir Çalışma)**" adlı araştırma Sosyal Bilimler Etik Kurulu tarafından bilimsel araştırma etiği yönünden incelendi ve değerlendirildi. Konu ile ilgili kurul görüşü ektedir. Evrakın ilgili danışman ve öğrencilere iletilmesi hususunda gereğini ve bilgilerinizi arz/rica ederim.

Doç. Dr. Songül KEÇECİ KURT
Etik Kurul Başkanı

Ek:

- 1- Ensar Arslantürk Başvuru Değerlendirme (2 Sayfa)
- 2- Ensar ASLANTÜRK (20 Sayfa)

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Belge Doğrulama Kodu :BSUBL83TCP Pin Kodu :70972

Belge Takip Adresi :
<https://turkiye.gov.tr/ebd?eK=5544&eD=BSUBL83TCP&eS=89652>

Adres:Akbilek Mah. Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. No:7 Merkez/Amasya
Telefon:2600060 Faks:2600059
e-Posta:genelsekreterlik@amasya.edu.tr Web:http://www.amasya.edu.tr/iddari/etik-kurul/bilim-etik-kurulu.aspx
Kep Adresi:amasyauniversitesi@hs01.kep.tr

Bilgi için: Songül KEÇECİ KURT
Unvanı: Etik Kurul Başkanı

Tel No: 1



	AMASYA ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ETİK KURUL DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU

Ek-1

Araştırmanın Başlığı : “A Comparative Study on English Language Teachers’ Perceptions about Face-to-Face Language Teaching and Emergency Remote Language Teaching after the Covid-19 Pandemic (Covid-19 Pandemisi Sonrasında İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Yüz Yüze Dil Öğretimi ve Acil Uzaktan Dil Öğretimi Hakkındaki Algıları üzerine Karşılaştırmalı bir Çalışma)”	
Başvuru Formunun Etik Kurula geldiği tarih	12.08.2022
Başvuru Formunun Etik Kurulda incelendiği tarih	12.09.2022
Karar tarihi	12.09.2022

SONUÇ

1.	☒ Kabul
2.	☐ Düzeltme gereklidir: Etik sorun olabilecek sorular/maddeler, süreçler ya da unsurlar bulunmaktadır. Açıklama:
3.	☐ Red Gerekçe, Görüş, Tavsiye ve Açıklamalar:

Başvuru dosyasının incelenmesinde hazır bulunan ve araştırmayla doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak ilişkisi bulunmayan Etik Kurul başkan ve üyelerinin ad,soyad ve imzaları.

(Başkan)
Doç. Dr. Songül KEÇECİ
KURT

(Üye-Bşk Yardımcısı)
Doç. Dr. Fatih CAN

(Üye- raportör)
Doç. Dr. Melike BAŞ

Appendix 5. Permission for Research Application



T.C.
ERZURUM VALİLİĞİ
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : E-36648235-605.01-69798665
Konu : Araştırma ve Uygulama İzni
(Ensar ASLANTÜRK)

02/02/2023

VALİLİK MAKAMINA

İlgi: Amasya Üniversitesi Rektörlüğünün 30.01.2023 tarihli ve E.114145 sayılı yazısı.

İlgi yazı doğrultusunda; Amasya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans programı 208010507 numaralı öğrencisi Ensar ASLANTÜRK tarafından Doç. Dr. Kadim ÖZTÜRK danışmanlığında yapılması planlanan; *"Covid-19 Pandemisi Sonrasında İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Yüz Yüze Dil Öğretimi ve Acil Uzaktan Dil Öğretimi Hakkında Algılarının İncelenmesi ve Karşılaştırılması"* konulu araştırma ve anket uygulama çalışması için izin talebinde bulunulmuştur.

İlgi yazılar ve ekleri, Bakanlığımızın 21.01.2020 tarihli ve E.1563890 (2020/2) sayılı Genelgesi çerçevesinde Komisyonumuzca incelenmiş olup *"Araştırmaların, eğitim öğretim faaliyetlerini aksatmayacak şekilde, gönüllülük esasıyla ve varsa veli onay belgesinin onaylatılması"* ve komisyon kararlarında belirtilen veri toplama araçlarının kullanılarak uygulama ve anket çalışmasının yapılması, yapılan çalışmalarının sonuçlarının birer örneğinin Müdürlüğümüz Strateji Geliştirme Şube Müdürlüğü (AR-GE Birimi)'ne gönderilmesi ve çalışmaların bir eğitim öğretim yılını kapsayacak şekilde yapılması Müdürlüğümüzce uygun görülmektedir.

Makamlarınızca da uygun görüldüğü takdirde olurlarınıza arz ederim.

Salih KAYGUSUZ
İl Milli Eğitim Müdürü

OLUR
Ahmet ÖZDEMİR
Vali a.
Vali Yardımcısı

Ek: İlgi Yazılar (1 Adet Dosya)

Bu belge güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Adres : Muratpaşa Mah. Yönetim Cad. Hükümet Konağı İl MEM Kat:3

Belge Doğrulama Adresi : <https://www.turkiye.gov.tr/meb-ebys>

No:311 Ar-Ge Birimi

Bilgi için: Nihat GÜLÜM

Telefon No : 0 (442) 234 48 00

Unvan : Şef

E-Posta: arge25@meb.gov.tr

İnternet Adresi: erzurummem@meb.gov.tr

Faks:4422351032

Kep Adresi : meb@hs01.kep.tr

Bu evrak güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır. <https://evraksorgu.meb.gov.tr> adresinden 4f90-b3bf-3a09-bc2e-0849 kodu ile teyit edilebilir.

Appendix 6. Permission Mail for the Use of the Questionnaire