



**T.C.
AKDENİZ UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT**

**MA
THESIS**

**IDEAS OF TERTIARY INSTRUCTORS ON
EMERGENCY REMOTE EDUCATION DURING
COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

İzlem PAYDAŞ

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING
MASTER'S PROGRAM**

ANTALYA, 2022

T.C.
AKDENİZ UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING MASTER’S PROGRAM

**IDEAS OF TERTIARY INSTRUCTORS ON EMERGENCY REMOTE
EDUCATION DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

MA THESIS

İzlem PAYDAŞ

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. F. Özlem SAKA

Antalya, 2022

DOĞRULUK BEYANI

Yüksek lisans tezim olarak sunduğum bu çalışmayı bilimsel, ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yol ve yardıma başvurmaksızın yazdığımı, yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçalardan gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu ve bu eserleri her kullanışımında alıntı yaparak yararlandığımı belirtir; bunu onurumla doğrularım. Enstitü tarafından belli bir zamana bağlı olmaksızın, tezimle ilgili yaptığım bu beyana aykırı bir durumun saptanması durumunda, ortaya çıkacak tüm ahlaki ve hukuki sonuçlara katlanacağımı bildiririm.

.....01.2022

İzlem PAYDAŞ

T.C.

AKDENİZ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

İzlem Paydaş'ın bu çalışması **28.01.2022** tarihinde jürimiz tarafından **Yabancı Diller Eğitimi** Ana Bilim Dalı **İngiliz Dili Eğitimi** Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak oy birliği/oy çokluğu ile kabul edilmiştir

İMZA

Başkan : Prof. Dr. Abdulvahit Çakır
(Ufuk Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fak., Yab. Diller Eğt. Bölümü)

Üye : Prof. Dr. Binnur Genç İlter
(Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fak., Yab. Diller Eğt. Bölümü)

Üye (Danışman) : Doç. Dr. F. Özlem Saka
(Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fak., Yab. Diller Eğt. Bölümü)

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİNİN ADI:

Ideas of Tertiary Instructors on Emergency Remote Education During Covid-19 Pandemic

ONAY: Bu tez, Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunca belirlenen yukarıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından uygun görülmüş ve Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunun tarihli ve sayılı kararıyla kabul edilmiştir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to my dearest advisor Assoc. Professor Dr Özlem Saka, who has always been with me even though we are in different cities. Her guidance and knowledge made this work possible, and my dreams come true.

I would also like to give special thanks to all lecturers I feel so lucky to have come across through my educational journey; Professor Dr Binnur Genç İlter, Assist. Prof. Dr Simla Course, Assoc. Professor Dr Mustafa Caner and Assoc. Professor Dr Hüseyin Kafes as much as my lecturers from bachelor degree for their invaluable contributions.

I would like to wholeheartedly thank to my classmates, especially Seren Özgür and Esra Dönüş. I appreciate Seren Özgür, who is my thesis-mate and helped my work significantly, with her IT support and Esra Dönüş, who took care of the paperwork in Antalya. Their companionship has always inspired me.

I would like to thank my family for their motivational support. I owe my warmest thanks to my mommy who prepared delicious dishes and brought them to my desk when I had long-night studying sessions, and finally, to my colleagues; Hüseyin Öztürk and Murat Ata, who supported me in my most challenging times.

ABSTRACT

IDEAS OF TERTIARY INSTRUCTORS ON EMERGENCY REMOTE EDUCATION DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC

PAYDAŞ, İzlem

MA, Foreign Languages Education Department

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. F. Özlem SAKA

January 2022, 120 pages

The physical separation of learner and the instructor principle within the educational landscape is not a new phenomenon. Distance education heritage has already had its own methods, theory and history (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). The establishment of the first railway lines and correspondence schools were around the same time (Peters, 2020). Since then, distance education has constantly been evolved like a living organism. The progress has varied the possibilities, reached larger groups and spread to make education accessible for all. However, the outbreak of Coronavirus makes the separation even more popular nowadays. With the pandemic, emergency remote education terminology has come to the fore, while many current versions of instructional delivery from a distance have caused conceptual confusion. Here, distinguishing these concepts is crucial to properly evaluate emergency remote education. The purpose of the study is to present the roots of the instructor and learner separation principle by reviewing distance education history to expand upon it. It reintroduces these distinct concepts to perceive the currently encountered situation better. The significance of the present study is that emergency remote education is significant to be researched, because of its novelty in the field of education; to adopt new normal and examine today so that we can direct the future in a better way. The study's ultimate purpose was to explore the experienced emergency remote education process and compare the differently structured institutions from the perspectives of English language instructors. To take a photograph of the novel emergency remote education, In this study, the opinions of one hundred and thirty-four instructors who have been working for preparatory programs of universities' schools of foreign languages are asked. The results have clearly shown that three dimensions concerning the views on emergency remote education are; emergency remote education in terms of its interaction with students, universities and finally, the overall process evaluation. The study reveals that both foundation and state universities experienced the process in a very similar

way. Both foundation and state university instructors are not satisfied with their students' learning processes. Nevertheless, the study happily reports that the universities were able to manage the process successfully, and emergency remote education experience has helped the improvement of instructors' technological skills.

Keywords: *Emergency Remote English Language Education, Distance Education, Teacher Opinion.*



ÖZET

HAZIRLIK OKULLARI ÖĞRETİM ELEMANLARININ COVID-19 SALGINI SÜRECİNDE UYGULANAN ACIL UZAKTAN EĞİTİM İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞLERİ

PAYDAŞ, İzlem

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. F. Özlem SAKA

Ocak 2022, 120 sayfa

Öğretmen ve öğrencinin fiziksel olarak ayrı olması prensibi eğitim dünyasında yeni bir olgu değildir. Uzaktan eğitimin kendine has tarihi, yöntemleri ve teorisi vardır (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). Tarihteki ilk uzaktan eğitim örnekleri ile tren yolu yapımının tarihi aynı zamana denk düşmektedir (Peters, 2020). O zamandan beri, uzaktan eğitim devamlı olarak gelişmeye devam etmiştir. Bu ilerleme, eğitimin daha geniş kitlelere ulaşmasına ve yaygınlaşarak herkes için erişilebilir olmasına olanak sağladı. Korona virüs öğretmen ve öğrencinin fiziksel olarak ayrı olması olgusunu son dönemde daha da popüler hale getirdi. Böylelikle; uzaktan eğitim, alanyazındaki diğer terimler ile karıştırılırken, acil durum uzaktan eğitimi terminolojisi de gündeme gelmiş oldu. Bu noktada, kavramlar arasındaki ayrımı iyi yapmak, acil durum uzaktan eğitim sürecini doğru anlamak için önemlidir. Bu çalışma, uzaktan eğitimin tarihini irdeleyerek, öğretmen ve öğrencinin ayrı olduğu eğitim olgusunun temellerini anlatmayı hedeflemektedir. Böylelikle, güncel durumumuzun daha iyi kavranacağı düşünülmektedir. Çalışma, acil durum uzaktan eğitimi kavramı, eğitim dünyasında nispeten yeni olduğu için önemlidir. Acil durum uzaktan eğitimi, güncel durumumuzu iyi değerlendirmek ve geleceği bu doğrultuda şekillendirebilmek için araştırmaya değer bir konudur. Bu çalışmanın ana amacı; İngiliz dili öğretim elemanlarının görüşlerine başvurarak, farklı yapılaşmaya sahip olan eğitim kurumlarının acil durum uzaktan eğitim deneyimlerini karşılaştırmaktır. Çalışma, üniversitelerin yabancı diller yüksekokullarının hazırlık programında görev alan yüz otuz dört öğretim elemanının görüşünü alarak, acil durum uzaktan eğitim deneyimini gözler önüne sermeye çalışmaktadır. Araştırmanın sonucuna göre, acil durum uzaktan eğitim değerlendirmesinde üç farklı boyut elde edilmiştir; Öğretim elemanları acil durum uzaktan eğitimini öğrenci, üniversite ve süreç değerlendirmesi olacak şekilde ele almıştır. Araştırmanın sonucu hem vakıf hem de devlet üniversitelerinin, acil durum uzaktan eğitim sürecini çok benzer şekilde deneyimlediğini ortaya koymuştur. Hem

vakıf, hem devlet üniversitesi öğretim elemanları, öğrencilerin öğrenme süreçlerinden memnun değildir. Öte yandan, üniversitelerin acil durum eğitim sürecini başarıyla yönettikleri ve öğretim elemanlarının süreçte teknolojik becerilerini geliştirme fırsatı bulduğu araştırmanın bulguları arasındadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Acil Durum Uzaktan İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Uzaktan Eğitim, Öğretmen Görüşü.*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ÖZET	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	x

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. Background	4
1.3. Higher Education Worldwide during Pandemic	5
1.4. Statement of the Problem.....	7
1.5. Significance of the Study.....	8
1.6. Purpose of the Study.....	9
1.7. Research Questions.....	10
1.8. Scope of the Study.....	10
1.9. Limitations and Assumptions.....	11
1.10. Functional Definitions and Use of Concepts	11

CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction.....	13
2.2. Generations of Distance Education	13
2.2.1. First Generation – Correspondence Model	14
2.2.2. Second Generation – Multimedia Model.....	15
2.2.3. Third Generation – Telelearning Model	16
2.2.4. Fourth Generation – The Flexible Learning Model	17
2.2.5. Fifth Generation – The Intelligent Flexible Learning Model	17
2.3. Definition of Concepts.....	18
2.4. Theory of Distance Education.....	21
2.5. Studies with Instructors Opinion on Education from Distance.....	27

2.5.1.	Studies with Instructor Opinion on Distance Education.....	27
2.5.2.	Studies with Instructor Opinion on Emergency Remote Education.....	29
2.5.2.1.	Student and Learning Dimension.....	29
2.5.2.2.	Institution - University Dimension.....	32
2.5.2.3.	Teacher and Teaching Dimension.....	33

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1.	Introduction.....	36
3.2.	Research Design.....	37
3.3.	Instrument.....	38
3.3.1.	The Questionnaire.....	38
3.3.2.	Validity and Reliability Analysis.....	40
3.4.	Setting and Participants.....	42
3.5.	Data Collection Procedure.....	44
3.6.	Data Analysis.....	44

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

4.1.	Introduction.....	46
4.2.	Findings.....	46
4.2.1.	Comparison of Views on Emergency Remote Education in Terms of University Types.....	46
4.2.2.	T-test.....	48
4.2.3.	Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool.....	49
4.2.4.	Open Ended Questions.....	51
4.2.4.1.	RQ.4. The Difference between Emergency Remote Education and Online education.....	51
4.2.4.1.1.	Emergency Remote Education is the Only Choice.....	52
4.2.4.1.2.	Psychological Factors.....	53
4.2.4.1.3.	Unplanned Switch.....	54
4.2.4.2.	RQ.5. The Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance.....	54

4.2.4.2.1..... Motivation and Other Psychological Factors as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance	55
4.2.4.2.2. No Obligation for Attendance as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance.....	56
4.2.4.2.3. Technology Related Problems as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance.....	57
4.2.4.2.4. Lack of Self-Discipline as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance	57
4.2.4.2.5. Ineffective Instruction as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance	57
4.2.4.3. RQ.6. The Biggest Difficulty Experienced During Emergency Remote Education	58
4.2.4.3.1. Students' Attendance as the Biggest Difficulty	59
4.2.4.3.2. Motivation and Other Psychological Factors as the Biggest Difficulty .	59
4.2.4.3.3. Lack of Interaction as the Biggest Difficulty	59
4.2.4.3.4. Technology Related Problems as the Biggest Difficulty	60

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction.....	62
5.2. Discussion Conclusion.....	62
5.2.1. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students	63
5.2.1.1. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students In Terms of University Types.....	63
5.2.1.2. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students Comparison with Other Factors	65
5.2.1.3. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students within the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool	65
5.2.2. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Universities.....	66
5.2.2.1. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Universities In Terms of University Types.....	67
5.2.2.2. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Universities Comparison with Other Factors.....	67

5.2.2.3	Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with University within the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool.....	68
5.2.3.	Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education Process	68
5.2.3.1.	Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education Process In Terms of University Types	69
5.2.3.2.	Evaluation of emergency remote education Proces Comparison with Other Factors.....	69
5.2.3.3	Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education Process within the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool	71
5.2.4.	Open-ended Questions	72
5.2.4.1.	The Difference between Emergency Remote Education and Online education.....	72
5.2.4.2.	The Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance.....	74
5.2.4.3.	The Biggest Difficulty Experienced During The Emergency Remote Education	76
5.3.	Pedagogical Implementations and Suggestions For Future Research	78
5.3.1.	Pedagogical Implementations.....	78
5.3.2.	Suggestions For Future Research	80
REFERENCES		81
APPENDICES.....		91
PLAGIARISM REPORT		119
BİLDİRİM.....		120

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. KMO and Bartlett's Test.....	40
Table 3.2. Factor analysis	41
Table 3.3. Demographic Characteristics of Participants.....	43
Table 4.1 Comparison of Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students views	47
Table 4.2. Comparison of Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with University views	47
Table 4.3. Comparison of Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education views.....	48
Table 4.4. Descriptive Statistics for Comparison of Factors	48
Table 4.5. T test for Comparison of Factors	49
Table 4.6. Descriptive statistics for each question in the research.....	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The introduction chapter of the thesis aims to provide a brief opening to the distance education concept. Distance education in Turkey has been overviewed and differentiated from emergency remote education notion for a better understanding of the thesis main interest. The snapshot of higher education during the Covid-19 pandemic has been presented here. The purpose, significance of the study, limitations, functional definitions, and research questions are given a place in the chapter.

1.1. Introduction

With the trends of interactive foreign language education, the main interest of the scholars diverged into technology driven practices. Technology has always had power in the field of education. It has been used for many years to meet certain needs, particularly to empower communication and to improve interaction among educational participants (Garrison, 2000). Thereby, technology has always helped education spread, reach and connect a larger audience. Distance education that best benefits from the affordances of technology aims to destroy the distance, contrary to its name and suggests the motto of *education for all* (Anderson & Simpson, 2012). As a special type of educational model in the educational landscape, distance education creates another way of instruction delivery by using technology. The basic principle of the distance educational model which, distinguishes it from face to face education is the physical separation of teacher and student (Saykılı, 2018). It is a different educational model which requires the use of technology. Nevertheless, viewing distance education concept as the physical distance or just as use of technology is barren.

According to Moore and Kearsley (2012), distance education is a multidimensional concept. These aspects are pedagogy, since it is a pedagogy which is distinctive from face-to-face format and; heritage, having a history unlike other terms. Distance education's history includes a different philosophy of providing access to learning (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). It has different organizational forms (ibid). Distance education is a system that integrates

subsystems; learning, teaching, communication, design and management functioning to be collective (ibid).

As the heritage description, distance education, generally related to andragogy, dates back to the 1720s (Guri-Rosenblit, 2005). The establishment of the first railway lines and correspondence schools were around the same time (Peters, 2020). As being the first example of distance form of education, Caleb Phillips placed a newspaper advertisement offering weekly shorthand lessons to prospective students on March 20, 1728 (Holmberg, 1995, p. 3). Anna Tucker, the founder of Boston Society to Encourage Study at Home, can be seen as the mother of distance education (Beaudoin, 2018, p. 103). Baath (1985) writes about more conclusive evidence of distance education, pioneered by a Swedish university offering “Composition through the medium of the Post” in the 1800s (as cited in Wang & Sun, 2001). Another early effort was made by Isaac Pitman in England, what was later to become Sir Isaac Pitman Correspondence Colleges (Harting & Erthal, 2005). Teaching through mail was first commenced by Chautauqua Correspondence Collage (Moore & Kearsley, 2012, p. 24). In the 19th century, Skerry’s College in Edinburgh, University Correspondence College in London and the University of Chicago and Illinois Wesleyan University in the USA were considered among the initial institutions in the tertiary level distance education (Saykılı, 2018). In the case of language teaching; in 1856, a language school by correspondence was organized in Germany (Dib, 1988). Additionally, Anna Eliot Ticknor formed a school mainly targeting female students in Boston and taught 24 subjects including German and French languages (Harting & Erthal, 2005).

Since then, distance education has made a remarkable impact on the educational landscape. The demand and interest in the market of distance education have increased. Rationale behind the growth is; distance education promises to reach wider groups of audiences, to make the education time and cost-effective, accessible for the disadvantaged individuals of society (Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2008). Distance education eliminates time, cost and place limitations. Therefore, many companies have funded distance programmes (Duffy & Kirkley, 2004). Dozens of educational institutes, and organizations have offered distance formats for a variety of courses within the formal and non-formal education contexts worldwide (ibid). However, whether as an obstacle or advantage diminishing the constraints, distance remained a disagreement in the literature. Unsurprisingly, distance education and face-to-face model have been compared as mainstream of distance education, and it has been

a subject of criticism. While the effectiveness of distance education respect to face-to-face one has been created room for debate, the instructors' views on distance education have been discussed in the literature as well, since it is a mainframe deciding to the conflicting side of the coin.

In Turkey context as a developing country, distance education has been applied since 1982. However, before 1982 there were some attempts and non-formal applications of distance education nationwide. Ankara University-Law Faculty-Bank and Trade Law Research Institute initiated the first concrete practice on distance education in Turkey in 1956 (Rüzgar, 2004). With this first step, the bank personnel was trained to be literate (ibid). Between the years of 1974-1976, Turkish students who graduated from secondary education were offered a correspondence teacher training pilot collage program including English language teacher education, however the project was not successful, and the students were transferred to a formal institution (Ozkul, 2001). The Ministry of National Education started an experimental distance education program to raise the literacy rate of citizens between 1975 and 1978 (Rüzgar, 2004). The programme referred to YAY-KUR used both print and television channels, yet this attempt to Turkish distance education turned out to be unsuccessful too and the program never reflected onto the total education system of country (ibid). In 1981, studies delivered through television, again aiming an increase in literacy rates resulted in that the Council of Higher Education (YOK) governed the empowerment of Turkish universities to make distance education in 1982 (Gürer, Tekinarslan & Yavuzalp, 2016). Anadolu University located in Eskişehir province was constituted to start distance education (ibid). In the following years, distance education in Turkey has gained popularity thanks to the contributions of Sakarya University, Middle East Technical University besides Anadolu University (ibid). Today, Anadolu University, with its open education faculty including various departments is considered one of the ten mega- universities of the world delivering undergraduate degree programs and others such as degree completion programs (Ozkul, 2001). The technologies to deliver distance education in Anadolu University and other Turkish higher education institutions are generally one-way, based on learner-content instruction and aim to reach mass population. On the other hand, improving information and communication technologies have been developing the applications, investments of distance education, contributing the background and establishment of distance education centres in the nation (Gürer, et al., 2016). Today, 4439703 students receive distance and open education in

Turkish universities according to the data gathered from the Council of Higher Education in 2021 (YOK, 2021). In the context of English as a foreign language education, Fono Correspondence Education Institute and Limasollu Naci Publication have been the oldest Turkish institutions teaching foreign languages through distance education since the early 1950s (Adıyaman, 2002). They have been prior to the governmental set up, although they have been non-governmental institutions (Geray, 2007). Fono has been specialized in English, German and French languages, including bilingual books, dictionaries, cassettes (ibid). Today, these institutions continue their services through the internet (Adıyaman, 2002; Geray, 2007).

1.2. Background

Newly discovered Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) disease emerged from Wuhan, China in December 2019. The highly transmissible virus rapidly spread in Europe in a short period of time and finally has become a global pandemic. Globally, as of 18 February 2022, there have been 418,650,474 confirmed cases of COVID-19, including 5,856,224 deaths, reported to WHO (World Health Organization [WHO], 2022). As Covid-19 takes hold, the world has gone through some changes in different areas of social life. The pandemic has posed some challenges and partially blocked the economy, trade, manufacturing, tourism, health sector, education and many other institutions of social order. Individuals have been encouraged to isolate themselves for the sake of global public health. Many governments imposed lockdowns with concerns about the extension of the novel virus. Education systems have been disrupted across the globe and have been affected by the emerging changes and regulations as well. The pandemic caused school and university closures for the 1.5 billion students worldwide (UNESCO, 2020). Most governments implemented nationwide school closures, whereas several others have carried out localized ones. The closures have been followed by a transition to emergency remote education within the capable institutions.

Educational institutes have shut down onsite classes in response to the pandemic, and many of them have offered distance classes for the sustainability of education (Alhawsawi, Jawhar, 2021). The unpredicted switch has caused ambiguities for policy makers and practitioners (Erarslan, 2021). Ministries of education, higher education councils, educational organizations, stakeholders, institutes; in short, those concerned have looked for either national or local solutions within the bounds of possibilities. However; the accessibility,

feasibility, quality and effectiveness of distance education have been criticized by all society members all around the world. Nevertheless, the current situation we are facing is better to be identified as emergency remote education caused by a pandemic which is a *silent emergency* as described in the literature (Chand, Joshi & Dabhi 2004; Sinclair, 2002). The division of distance education and emergency remote education is crucial to properly evaluate the pandemic process and protect distance education's reputation (Bozkurt, 2020). These *emergency* and *distance* notions are distinguished in aims, features and applications. Emergency remote education term itself contains two attributes of teaching as “emergency” and “remote” (Hazaea, Bin-Hady & Toujani, 2021). The word “emergency” represents unusual, unanticipated situations such as wars, catastrophes, and pandemics (ibid). “Remote” stands for an on-distance mode of teaching (ibid).

As emergency suggests, the educational model applied during a pandemic is urgently carried out, by rehashing the courses intended to be taught face-to-face into distance formats (Brereton, 2020). Per contra, distance education is deliberate, resulted of approximately six-month planning and design. Emergency remote education never objectives to recreate a temporary educational ecosystem and cannot be the same with distance education inherently (Hodges, Moore, Lockee, Trust & Bond, 2020). Rather, it is a temporary cure, a rapid response to crises or emergencies, as education is a fundamental human right. In sum, it is fair to say that emergency remote education is inevitability, but distance education is a preference (Bozkurt, 2020). Distance education directs its empirical heritage purposefully to planned, systematic instructional activities around the idea of life-long learning, yet emergency remote education is a way of problem-solving to keep education alive (ibid).

1.3. Higher Education Worldwide during Pandemic

China having a crowded higher education system, announced the transition to online education for higher education institutes on 28 January 2020. Many standard exams were cancelled of even date (Crawford, Henderson, Rudolph, Malkawi, Glowatz, Burton, Magni & Lam, 2020). Nevertheless, as the first country experiencing the virus, the start of the spring semester took almost a month for many universities since not all of them had the capacity and capability to transition (ibid). The switch has influenced 30 million students, academic and administrative staff within 3.000 institutions (Telli Yamamoto & Altun, 2020). Lau, Yang and Dasgupta (2020) noted that Chinese universities offered 4,254 different courses online

however there was a considerable number of students who were not able to access the education due to the lack of equipment in the rural areas of China during the pandemic process. On the other side, online education has been criticized by many and there was a group of students who refused to attend online classes as they found the teaching model insufficient or their home environment uncomfortable. This situation became a trending topic in social media (Telli Yamamoto & Altun, 2020).

The United States of America owns several universities that have developed online education systems and offered online programmes internationally for many years (Duffy & Kirkley, 2004). Although the first suspected on-campus case was reported in mid-January, the higher education sector did not attempt to switch online education until March (Crawford, et al., 2020). Then, the infection rate dramatically increased, and American states and universities switched to remote teaching one by one (ibid). However, many of them are concerned about the international enrolment drops (American Council on Education [ACE], 2020). Consequently, these institutions came up with some practical solutions providing conveniences to keep the enrolment rates high, such as meeting the needs of Chinese students who weren't able to travel.

The United Kingdom hasn't promoted the school closures in the early pandemic periods, in the light of government's herd immunity policy (Telli Yamamoto & Altun, 2020). Authorities stated that the institutions could decide locally to stop face to face teaching if needed and some universities switched to online mode, and cancelled some exams (ibid). The British government, like Northern Ireland declared nationwide closures on 20 March while all schools, colleges, and universities in the Republic of Ireland were closed on 13 March (BBC News, 2020a). Schools have reopened for all age groups in the 2020 fall term by including some hybrid models, new funding policies for students who need equipment and some modifications to the General Certificate of Secondary Education exams that are determinant on university admissions (GOV.UK, 2020).

Turkey has met the outbreak of the virus later when it's compared with European countries and had a chance to observe other countries' policies and plan its prevention actions accordingly. Firstly, the Council of Higher Education imposed a three-week-long break, then announced to complete the spring term remotely on 23 March 2020 (YÖK, 2020a). The current capacities of higher education institutes have been analysed and it has been determined that one hundred twenty-three universities have Distance Education Research and

Application Centres (UZEM) and they are capable of offering distance education (YÖK, 2020b). The needs of universities that are insufficient in terms of technical infrastructure have been decided to meet by cooperating with others. Again, on 23 March, YÖK prepared a common lesson material cloud for the use of all universities. YÖK decided that universities would schedule the dates of applied courses' delivery locally (YÖK, 2020b). In the 2020-2021 academic year, all Turkish universities continued to deliver education remotely.

1.4. Statement of the Problem

In higher education, the views of instructors towards distance education are crucial for the learning and the value of online education (Dooley & Murphey, 2000; Harris & Krousgill, 2008; Gurer, et. al., 2016). To determine the quality of distance education, faculty satisfaction needs to be investigated (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009). Moreover; Ulmer, Watson and Derby (2007) recommended that the perception of instructors on distance education should be asked beforehand to design and serve an effective distance education program since instructors' opinions on distance education shape the effectiveness and quality of distance education. The concept of teacher opinion is shaped by learner sourced factors such as learner motivation, attendance and performance; institution sourced for instance: recognition, support, well planned and piloted material, content and curriculum and finally instructor sourced ones are technology literacy, workload, pedagogic competence (Borg, 2003).

In the available literature in 2020-2021 date range reflecting the Covid-19 process, the studies investigating instructor opinion on distance education point the technologic challenges, the poor-quality of interaction, concerns of the feasibility of distance delivery for language education, deficient learner attendance and participation (Wen & Hua, 2020; Gao & Zhang 2020). However, no study investigating the Covid-19 emergency English language education programs of the differently structured universities' preparatory schools within the framework of the instructors' opinions could not be found in the available literature. For this reason, the study aims to fill the gap in the field by evaluating the varied dimensions of the university English preparatory programs of emergency education referring to the instructors' opinions; by comparing public and foundation contexts.

Preparatory schools in the Turkey context offer a general English language program lasting one academic year for university students, before starting their departmental programme. Before the pandemic, these programs were undertaken mainly in face-to-face

setting or as a blended programme. English language instructors, who graduated from English language teacher education programmes or graduates of English language and literature, American culture and literature, English translation and interpreting, and English linguistic departments with a pedagogical formation certificate work for the schools of foreign languages. The main aim of the programmes is to prepare learners for their future departmental education for following mainstream courses and enable them to communicate in English language. Turkish universities offer varied programmes of which the medium of instruction is one hundred per cent English language, thirty per cent English language or one hundred per cent Turkish language (Mevzuat Bilgi Sistemi, 2021). Preparatory education is optional for ones that are covered entirely in Turkish language yet, the preparatory education is compulsory for the two other types (ibid). That obligation is valid nationally for all associate, undergraduate and graduate programmes. (ibid). The targeted proficiency levels within CEFR that each programme aims to achieve or the scores, requirements to be exempted from the preparatory, to complete it successfully are determined locally by the universities and differ from department to department (ibid). For instance, in many universities, English language and literature, English language teacher education programmes have different requirements. They need to verify with higher scores that they are adequate to start their departmental education when compared with other departments.

1.5. Significance of the Study

It is fair to admit that the unpredicted and unanticipated switch to emergency remote education might be challenging for most teaching institutions. When it is considered that teaching and learning from a distance have a different nature from face to face one and emergency education requires its specific content, the problem in the scope of the thesis is significant to be researched.

The findings of this study may be significant in describing the Covid-19 emergency education. The research goals to end up with themes and suggestions which may guide the design and planning stages for the content of online and emergency education programmes. The findings may show some insights into English language education from a distance. The study may contribute to future research by suggesting recommendations. It inspire for educators with its recommendations for best practices related to distance instruction. The findings may also support institutions in terms of how to navigate crises and plan their future

policies. It will contribute scientific knowledge by guiding future applications and raising awareness of necessary adaptation to “the new normal” in language education.

1.6. Purpose of the Study

Schools of foreign languages of the universities in the scope of the study had similar problems and applications that every higher educational institute did. Education was applied from a distance by necessity, without any needs analysis or planning phase in English preparatory programmes. To understand the process, in addition to problems such as technical infrastructure, internet and computer access, technology competence; elements that impress the effectiveness of the program such as implementation, learning outcomes and objectives, digital content should also be touched on. When focusing on effectiveness, analysing the entire learning process and acquisition is essential rather than the preferred technological tools (Salaberry, 2000). During the pandemic process, in which the effectiveness of emergency remote education is discussed on a global scale, not only by educators and students but also by individuals from all walks of life, educational programs and their applications should be evaluated with diverse dimensions and subsequently strengthened in order for achieving effective learning in emergency education.

The purpose of the study is to explore how the pandemic was handled in different settings by including both foundation and state universities. Involving both state and foundation universities will help understanding the experience with its different aspects from a wider perspective; by creating an opportunity for comparison among institutions differently structured. The study on how this immediate transition was experienced logistically and managed by faculty and instructors provides a baseline for establishing future best practices for distinct ways of instructional delivery and crisis. The study will reveal the differences among the universities in terms of learner, teacher and institution perspectives including technical infrastructure, application, digital content and curriculum subcategories in line with the opinions of the instructors who are the implementers of the EFL program. Considering that the Covid-19 pandemic has been on the agenda of the world for a short time and the pandemic has transformed social life in every sense in all countries; it can be said that the study will contribute to scientific knowledge by providing guiding ideas in order to keep up with the new normal in education.

1.7. Research Questions

This study presents the following research questions in order to explore the academic staff's opinion who works for schools of foreign languages of foundation and state universities on English language education during Covid-19 pandemic:

RQ1. Is there a statistically significant difference between state university and foundation university academic staff's views on learner dimension of emergency remote education?

RQ2. Is there a statistically significant difference between state university and foundation university academic staff's views on teaching dimension of emergency remote education?

RQ3. Is there a statistically significant difference between state university and foundation university academic staff's views on university actions and policies applied during emergency remote education?

RQ4. According to the views of academic staff is there a difference between distance teaching during a typical academic semester and emergency remote education?

RQ5. What are the factors affecting learners' attendance and participation to the virtual classes according to the views of academic staff?

RQ6. What are the difficulties that academic staff working at the state and foundation universities experienced during emergency remote education?

1.8. Scope of the Study

The study contains the schools of foreign languages of some foundation and state universities located in Turkey. The accessible population who teaches general English and English for specific purposes at university preparatory level was used to create a sample. The emergency remote education model which was switched suddenly in the 2020 spring term and the model applied in the 2020-2021 academic year that was possibly more expected, where instructors become more familiarized with remote teaching were both in the scope of the study.

1.9. Limitations and Assumptions

Naturally, studies have certain limitations. In this study, a single method was used to collect data. Moreover, the data of the study were gathered via digital tools due to the Covid-19 preventions. The gathered data are limited in terms of the number of participants involved in the present study. That is why; it does not reflect the population. To have a holistic understanding of the distance education models in the pandemic process, testing and evaluation branches that are not in the scope of the study should also be taken into account.

Furthermore, the opinions of the instructors alone would not be adequate to come up with concrete conclusions, claim any facts or evaluate the process holistically. The limitations of the study are to describe the process with subjective opinions of instructors, without involving learners', administrators' opinions or the testing and evaluation steps. On the other side, the study initially intended to be carried out within İzmir province. The population was determined as the instructors who work for foundation and states universities located in İzmir, and the process was planned to take a month. So, the researcher obtained permission from the universities in İzmir. However, the desired amount of data weren't able to be gathered during the expected data collection procedure. Therefore, the schedule has been overviewed, it took approximately two months, and the questionnaire was shared via social media to reach more participants. As a result, data were gathered from many different cities.

1.10. Functional Definitions and Use of Concepts

Distance education: Distance education is teaching and planned learning in which teaching normally occurs in a different place from learning, requiring communication through technologies as well as special institutional organization (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). In the thesis, the term distance education is used as an umbrella term, in the broadest sense including related sub-concepts mentioned in the literature such as e-learning, online learning and computer-based learning (Keegan, 1996 as cited in Moore, Deane & Galyen, 2011). In this study, the expression of distance education is preferred by functioning for all, as it is the most catch-all term.

Instructor Opinion: The term opinion is used interchangeably in the current study to mean thoughts, feelings and perspectives by including related concepts in the literature; intention, assumption, cognition, satisfaction, perception, disposition, engagement, view, motive.

Interaction: Interaction as an instructional exchange between these entities: learner-content, learner-instructor, and learner-learner (Lauzon & Moore, 1989)

CMC-computer mediated communication: communication that takes place between human beings via the instrumentality of computers” (Herring, 1996).

Online: In the present study, the word *online* is used to mean virtual, only within the data gathering instrument. *Online course, online education, online teaching, before- during the pandemic* statements are placed in the questionnaire, rather than distance education or emergency remote education terminologies to guide the responders who might not be familiar with the differences between the concepts.

Emergency remote education: Education during and after complex humanitarian emergencies (for instance, long term displacement of refugees), rapid educational responses during crises (which is the traditional understanding of the term ‘emergency’), and post-crisis educational reconstruction (Sinclair, 2002).

ERLT: Emergency Remote Language Teaching.

Learning objective: A very general statement about the larger goals of the course or program (Hartel & Foegeding, 2004)

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This part of the thesis is divided into two sections in order to provide a full range of the distance education notion of the research. The first section offers a theoretical framework of distance education by expanding upon its history, definitions and theories. Furthermore, it deals with conceptual confusion by clearing the related terminologies versus distance education concepts. The second part reviews instructors' opinions on education from a distance and related research examples containing both emergency remote education and distance education in the literature.

2.2. Generations of Distance Education

The implementation of radio, television, computer, internet in teaching and learning has revolutionized distance education. Yet, it is better to prefer the word “evolution” instead of revolution when talking about distance education (Harting & Erthal, 2005). Since distance education is a continuum in which delivery methods, interaction patterns, techniques upgrade as one generation progresses to another. Garrison (1985) claimed that shifts have occurred in distance education particularly with regards to the concepts of interaction and independence. According to Wang and Sun (2001) the dividing line for each generation occurs when distance education takes a step forward to advance “the mode of subject matter delivery” and “learner-instructor interaction”. However, setting a line among the generations or evaluating them separately might cause a misconception in the case of distance education (Anderson & Dron, 2011). As, no single generation is a cure for everything, and each has constructed upon what has previously served, instead of vanishing the earlier versions (ibid). All the models have continued to be used to address the distinct needs (ibid).

Besides, the evolution is not solely fed by whatever technology releases. Examining distance education with the awareness of Drumm's (2019) mantra of *pedagogy before technology* may lead us to an insightful sense of what exactly distance education has been over the years. Rather than totally relying on technological inventions, it is more appropriate to claim that what technology brings and allows have been combined with the pedagogic

approaches regarding distance education. In contrast to the common misunderstanding, not the technological developments alone, but the interrelation between technology and some shifts in educational philosophies have constantly reshaped the heritage and history of distance education. Thus, the concepts in the educational landscape such as socially constructed learning, autonomy, life-long learning, self-directed learning, communicative, constructivist approaches have expanded upon technology and contributed progressively to the scope and quality of distance education. Although there is a tendency to have either a technologic or pedagogic deterministic view while defining generations, the perspective of the concept should not be limited with the choice of one so that one can see the process and the progress clearly (Anderson & Dron, 2011).

In 1989, Nipper suggested a generational framework consisting of three generations of distance education for the first time (Anderson & Simpson, 2012) in a somehow technologic deterministic way (Anderson & Dron, 2011). Subsequently, Taylor constructed on Nipper's work (1989) and proposed fourth and fifth generations to keep pace with the new developments (Taylor, 1995; Taylor, 2001). Among the few efforts of identifying "generation" in the literature, it is proper to cite Garrison (1985) here, who states;

Generation is used to suggest the building upon previous capabilities. The development of the generations of distance education represents, in systems terminology, a hierarchical structure with an increasing differentiation of technological capacity for integrating unique delivery systems. In other words, new media can be combined with older media to provide a greater range of choice for the design of effective distance education delivery systems.

2.2.1. First Generation – Correspondence Model

The first generation of distance education, also known as correspondence education, heavily depended on postal services and print technologies. First-generation mainly aimed to grant educational opportunities to those without easy access to educational institutions. These groups often targeted women and working-class people because neither group was well served by formal education institutions (Anderson & Simpson, 2012). The only material available was self-instructional texts to carry the educational content (White, 2003, p. 14). Communication was one-way, generally carried through writing between teachers and learners (Holmberg, 1995). Few language courses were offered in the first generation period since the context and media were not fruitful to practice four macro language skills especially,

listening-speaking ones (White, 2003, p. 14). The first generation lasted nearly a century, the longest generation in the history of distance education (Wang & Sun, 2001).

2.2.2. Second Generation – Multimedia Model

Broadcast technologies such as radio, television, telephone, cassettes characterized the second generation of distance education (Anderson & Simpson, 2012). The establishment of the Open University UK in 1969 is illustrated with the second generation era and the use of broadcast in education (White, 2003, p. 14). Numerous distance, open education universities were founded, and extensive course enrolments were achieved during this time. The courses reached millions of students (Anderson & Simpson, 2012).

The use of broadcast enhanced the diversity of materials, and delivery modes of content and it provided audio, video, and multi-media channels (Taylor, 2001). University of Salt Lake City was the first university using educational radio in 1921, and educational television was presented by the State University of Iowa in 1934 (Seattler, 1990 as cited in Moore & Kearsley, 2012). However, the print medium did not lose its domination during the second generation (White, 2003, p. 14). Like the first generation, learning was seen as the responsibility of learner as an individual activity. The model was teacher-centred, drew on cognitive or behavioural theories and around the mentality of acquisition of information from the material (Anderson & Simpson, 2012). Cognitive behaviourist understanding in distance education fitted well with print packages, postal- correspondence interaction and mass media while providing an individualized learning model with high levels of student freedom in terms of space and pace (Anderson & Dron, 2011).

The communication and interaction ingredients, as Today's understanding, of the educational model remained minimal (ibid). Instead of what we currently expect from communication and interaction in the educational context, Holmberg's controversial concept of "guided didactic communication" facilitated in Holmberg's word "*teaching-learning conversation*" in these periods (Holmberg, 1995a; Holmberg 1995b; Holmberg, 1997; Holmberg, 1999; Saykılı, 2018). Guided didactic communication reflects a conversational approach containing both real and communication via phone, e-mail and communication presented in print, recorded materials aiming to involve learners emotionally in learning and encourage them to exchange views (Holmberg, 1999). In the light of guided didactic

communication, communication was achieved through the interaction with material during the second generation.

2.2.3. Third Generation – Telelearning Model

The late 1960s was a time of radical changes in distance education. The third generation of distance education was driven by information and telecommunication technologies and their affordances for interactive distance learning (White, 2003, p. 15). Asynchronous interaction, audio conferencing and e-mailing were commonly benefited, and broadcast TV, radio and computers were employed in education during this time. Because of that, Taylor (2001) referred to the third generation as the “Telelearning Model”. On the other hand, Garrison (1985) used the term “computer generation” to call the third generation.

The turning point that emerged during the third generation was the Articulated Instructional Media Project (AIM) directed by Wedemeyer in 1964 (Moore & Kearsley, 2012, p. 32). AIM drew attention to the potential of varied media use; viewing the learner as an individual, meeting the personalized needs, and self-directed, independent learning in the 1960s (ibid). He introduced the concept of “learning centres” (Garrison, 2000). It was the first time when distance education was seen as a “total system” (Moore & Kearsley, 2012, p. 32). Wedemeyer contributed to the educational approach and counselled the establishment of the British Open University (Garrison, 2000).

The recognition of interaction ingredient fostered a change in the notion of distance education as well as extensive use of telecommunication technologies. Moore’s theory of transactional distance (1993) which emphasises the importance of dialogue, structure and interaction was influential on the move beyond first and second generation (Anderson & Simpson, 2012). That is why, computer-mediated communication (CMC) emerged and became a distinguishing feature of the third generation. CMC, through conferencing enabled the distance language courses to practice aural and oral competencies in the scope of language learning which were weaknesses of first and second generation (White, 2003, p. 16). The technological improvements and valuing interaction were a threshold in distance education operations navigating the earlier focus on organization and didactic teaching to a tendency of the social construction of knowledge (Anderson & Simpson, 2012).

2.2.4. Fourth Generation – The Flexible Learning Model

As the Internet and Web technologies matured, massive use of Internet in learning has ushered in the fourth generation of distance education in the mid-1990s (Wang & Sun, 2001; Garrison, 1985). In 1982, the International Council for Correspondence Education changed its name to the International Council for Distance Education to reflect the developments in the field (Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2008) with the change, recognition of the term distance education occurred (Holmberg, 1995 p. 3). The most significant distinction of the fourth generation which is also labelled as The Flexible Learning Model by Taylor (1995) from the others is, the application of asynchronous to synchronous communication and videoconferencing technologies (Wang & Sun, 2001). According to Taylor (ibid) the combination of interactive multimedia offered by internet and other resources previously used in the second and third generations promised effective distance learning. In the fourth generation, “*guided didactic conversation*” that has been criticized as causing one-way knowledge transmission, learner’s passivity and subordination (Holmberg, 1999) has been replaced with real time, two-way communication for the first time. Especially in the case of language teaching, where the four language skills require being developed through communicative practices, the limitation physical distance has posed; the deficiency of spontaneous communication has been overcome by web technologies (Wang, 2004). Wang (2004) preferred the adjectives such as “*real-time technology*” and “*interactive technology*” to describe the extent to which the technology maintains the proximity and empowers the interactivity in distance language learning.

2.2.5. Fifth Generation – The Intelligent Flexible Learning Model

The fifth generation of distance education goes beyond the fourth, The Flexible Learning Model by integrating the automated functionalities into the existing internet technologies that distance education has already been familiar with from the applications of fourth generation (Taylor, 2001). Taylor idealises the fifth generation by adding “intelligence” to his flexible model and articulate that the model “*re-humanizes the distance education*”. The Intelligent Flexible Learning Model establishes an e-university to provide campus experiences with the services of automated courseware production systems, automated pedagogical advice systems, and automated business systems. The e-university concept shares the same elements; online interactive multimedia and internet-based access to

WWW resources with the fourth one (Jayatilleke & Kulasekara, 2019). While the fourth generation strives for interaction in the distance through CMC, the fifth one again gives a role to CMC, but this time updated with an automated response system. The other addition the fifth generation releases, is customizable e-interface; campus portal access to institutional processes and resources that enables e-application, e-enrolment, e-administration and e-publishing. The model offers an e-content management system which produces cross-media and gives way to diverse delivery modes. In the light of all, Taylor introduces the Generic Online Offline Delivery (GOOD) Project developed locally at the University of Southern Queensland (USQ) (ibid).

Taylor (2001) states that the applications of fourth generation Internet- based delivery models are similar to traditional tutorial-based on campus teaching wherein the same instructor usually teaches, provides academic support and assesses to a group of students. In the fourth generation, instructors do the same by the medium of CMC via online discussion groups, bulletin boards, mailing lists, with an instructor being necessary to manage groups and to facilitate a reasonable quality of interaction and academic support that is not significantly different from conventional on campus teaching (ibid). Whereas, in Taylor's words fifth generation automated operations have, "*one-to-many communication system*" which enhances the quality of communication, and reduces the costs and teacher-dependence. In the fifth generation, CMC serves a rich source of interaction that can be systematically structured and stored in a database to be reused for instructional purposes (ibid).

2.3. Definition of Concepts

Many efforts have been made to define and redefine distance education, each of which reflects divergent angles and characteristics followed with generations. Unsurprisingly, there are several suggested definitions for distance education in the literature. The reason behind it is that distance education is not a new phenomenon as mentioned, and it has passed through some waves and methods. As, Phipps and Merisotis (1999, p. 11) stated; "*It is important to understand what is meant by 'distance learning.' Because the technology is evolving, the definition of what distance learning is, continues to change*". Techno-social changes around the globe have mediated distance education by creating new forms and reconceptualising it around the idea of life-long learning.

Further, these changes in defining distance education have led up some other concepts. Distance education has included these concepts and somehow has been confused with them. Distance education and related terminologies, for instance; open learning, online learning, e-learning have been used interchangeably and inconsistently in the literature, encountered as synonyms, and this caused some misunderstandings (Moore, et al. 2011; Tsai & Machado, 2002; Guri-Rosenblit, 2005; King, Young, Richmond & Schrader, 2004).

The terms containing *learning*, such as online learning, e-learning only mirror the learners' side by missing out educator, teaching, the educational design that are the other components of education (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). Distance learning has a more learner-centred sense in the European context (White, 2003, p. 11). Besides, the word choice of learning in a term is problematic because learning may take place anyhow, perhaps accidentally, without being a part of the educational process, not necessarily within the framework of education although learning in education is planned, designed and directed by educators (Moore & Kearsley, 2012; King, et. al, 2004). On the other side, some other terms define the education by the technology used, such as online education, e-learning (Tsai & Machado, 2002). Online education emphasises the use of internet technologies (Moore & Kearsley, 2012), in the e-learning term, the prefix *e* stands for electronic technologies and these terms evoke a current version of distance education (Saykılı, 2018). Finally, other concepts used as synonyms to distance education are distributed and open education. They reflect the philosophy, state of mind of the programme. While “*open*” term promises freedom, “*distributed*” denotes the availability of education at any place, positive connotative and sense of advantageous educational program more. However, by its very definition, distance education highlights the separation of learner from the instructor (Saykılı, 2018; Guri-Rosenblit, 2005). The separation of instructor and learner principle which is the fundamental characteristic works for other terminologies as well. That is why it is proper to claim that distance education is the broadest one, the umbrella term compared to all others which only address a narrower or more specific side of distance education.

After covering related concepts and terms to clear up distance education, it is worth mentioning Rumble to provide a basic clarification for distance education. According to Rumble (1986) distance education is “*the distance learner as one who is physically separated from the teacher*” (as cited in Gunawardena & McIsaac, p. 359). Besides, King, Nugent, Russel and Lacy define distance education as “*a class of methods of instruction, either formal*

or non-formal, that place the learner apart in time and/or space from the teacher...” (1999, p. 275). The definition includes the promising side of distance education: the potential to offer non-formal education that is considered by many scholars quicker to react to meet the needs of students and the communities (Dib, 1988).

Another definition Holmberg (1989, p. 181 as cited in Saykılı, 2018) came up with redefined the traditional understanding of distance education by the technological developments providing capacity to network groups of learners. The definition was an attempt to change the concept of “learner as individual” through learning in groups. On the other side, the definition underlines the nature of learning;

Distance education is a concept that covers the learning-teaching activities in the cognitive and/or psycho-motor and affective domains of an individual learner and a supporting organization. It is characterized by non-contiguous communication and can be carried out anywhere and at any time, which makes it attractive to adults with professional and social commitments. (Holmberg 1989, p. 181, as cited in Saykılı, 2018)

Moore and Kearsley (1996) define distance education to highlight the perspective that distance education is a theory of teaching and learning which has its unique structure as; the intended learning that takes place out of a classroom setting and it is a result of specially designed instructional techniques, communication fostered via technology as well as requiring special organization and administration (White, 2003, p. 11).

Garrison and Archer (2000) define distance education by emphasizing its necessary characteristics; communication and interaction as;

“Distance education implies that the majority of educational communication between (among) teacher and student(s) occurs non- contiguously. Distance education must involve two-way communication between (among) teacher and student(s) for the purpose of facilitating and supporting the educational process. Distance education uses technology to mediate the necessary two-way communication. (p. 175)”

Shelley (2000) stated another definition for distance education by taking the autonomy component into account which reflects a relatively more current, learner-centred aspect to distance education. The definition presents the distance in a positive connotation, contrary to general acceptance, by praising the flexibility and avoidance from the obligation of physical presence rather than being an obstacle. She suggests that distance education is a flexible system that values learner choice in time, place, and pace.

Definitions generally include the following components, based on the work of Keegan (1980)

- ***The separation of teacher and learner***; in terms of time and or place.
- ***The educational organization***; in preparing and delivering materials and providing support.
- ***The use of media***; including hardcopy and softcopy, audio, visual to carry content.
- ***The communication devices***; to facilitate two-way communication and interaction
- ***The face to face contact***; providing motivation, group cohesion and support function
- ***The support services***; including what is given by the teacher, relating to wider aspects of study and the role of the distance learner (as cited in Rumble, 1989).

The earliest definitions of distance education aimed to reflect differing assumptions and viewpoints to the concept, yet definitions themselves are not enough to constitute a theory (Garrison, 2000). Furthermore, most of the attempts to clarify distance education focus on the comparison between the face-to-face model and distance education since, for some scholars, distance education is a simulation of the face-to face model (Wang & Sun, 2001). However, for others, distance education is already a distinct learning-teaching experience that Moore and Kearsley (2012) describe as “organised and planned experiences” which require its special design, techniques and methods to occur. Therefore, in their words, learning in the distance is “not accidental but rather intentional” (ibid). In the light of all, distance education, being distinct from the traditional form of education, is a particular, long-established discipline of the educational field and a mode of teaching which has its own theories (Holmberg, 1995, p. 161).

2.4. Theory of Distance Education

Before diving into the theory of distance education, it may be beneficial to briefly explicate what is meant by theory and what it stands for. According to Garrison (2000) theory is “*a coherent and systematic ordering of ideas, concepts, and models with the purpose of constructing meaning to explain, interpret and shape practice*”. Organized body of knowledge, framework is a needed tool as education is a purposeful activity. Within this activity, the theory is a map around the phenomena guiding to take effective actions (ibid).

When we take into consideration that theory is essential to learn from the past and to plan for the future accordingly; it is a must to review the theory of distance education throughout its history.

According to Keegan (1986) historical approaches to the theory of distance education can be framed around three paradigms (as cited in Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2008). Theories of autonomy led to the theory from the 1960s and 1970s, while there was a trend of viewing distance education as an industrialized form of education again in the 1960s. The third theoretical foundation Keegan mentioned is theories of interaction and communication in the 1980s (ibid). As Garrison (2000) observes, the theoretical improvement in distance education has progressed from an organizational perspective to transactional mentality interested in learning and teaching issues.

Charles Wedemeyer (1971) who is considered the father of American distance education (Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2008) had an influential role in the history of distance education by introducing the liberal independence notion. Clearly, he didn't acknowledge any theory or terminology to the field, but his theoretical contribution moved the organizational and administrative focus of distance education to educational issues concerning learning at a distance (Garrison, 2000). The independent learning concept introduced by Wedemeyer's AIM project, promised self-directed, autonomous learning which is ideal for different learning styles, personalized needs which create an opportunity for learner choice, goal determination and freedom, thanks to the diversity of media (ibid). Garrison (2000) stresses that his innovative shift to the pedagogical issues from organizational concerns triggered a new era for distance education from correspondence understanding and became fundamental for theory development. Wedemeyer invented the functions of *course design team*, *instructional designers*, *technology specialists*, *content experts* (Wedemeyer & Najem, 1969 as cited in Moore & Kearsley, 2012, pp. 32-33). He led to the idea of a fully autonomous institution, a total system, enabled to give its own degrees, with its own funds and its own faculty (Moore & Kearsley, 2012) with the principle of equality for all in access to education (Garrison, 2000). He inspired the open university concept and the system approach and took a role in establishing the United Kingdom Open University which is the first open university (Moore & Kearsley, 2012).

Otto Peters (1967) pioneered the distance education theory (Moore & Kearsley, 2012) and introduced the industrial production model of distance education that became one of the

major theoretical constructs of distance education. Peters claimed that the form of teaching changed like all aspects of life with the beginning of the nineteenth century (Peters, 2020). Moreover, Peters evaluated industrialization as the symbol of humankind's progress and realized a similarity between industrialization and distance education because both are moved by technical support (ibid). In the views of all, Peters characterized distance education as a distribution of knowledge and skills rationalized by the adaptation of industrial techniques; division of labour, organizational principles and mass production (Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2008). The industrial approach attempted to establish a profitable model of distance education concerning economic scales (Garrison, 2000). It was mainly interested in producing numerous materials like mass production in the industry delivered by media which is equivalent to technical support like production of any machine (Peters, 2000). It purposed to split the production process containing course design, assessment, teaching activity into units, with the technique of division of labour, for increased specialization, to reach great numbers, anywhere – anytime like an assembly line in factories travels the workpiece where the worker remains (ibid). The model originated from behaviourism which was popular in those days (Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2008). This model had an impact on the establishment of open universities such as United Kingdom Open University (UKOU) (ibid) and still inspires the organization of distance education (Garrison, 2000). Yet, Garrison (2000) and some others criticized the organizational model as it leaves the learning-teaching issues behind.

Another prominent theorist in the field of distance education is Borje Holmberg who contributed to the theory with his “guided didactic conversation” concept in 1989. He defended the crucial element, communication between the learner and the distance tutor. Furthermore, the theory had a conversational style, placing learning and teaching at the core (Garrison, 2000). Due to the economic and space rooted limitations, he transferred the mission of maintaining conversation to the self-instructional materials (Garrison, 2000). The role of the teacher was mainly simulated with the help of written form of input (Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2008). Holmberg (1999) describes the educational conversation in two forms; the real, face-to-face one occurring in a physical classroom and in the distance, especially in university education context, the conversation with a text supporting learner engagement (Holmberg, 1999). According to Holmberg (1999) the course developers are responsible for designing materials that function in encouraging emotional involvement and opportunity for reflection to ideas, rather than materials revealing information only (ibid). The guided didactic

conversation theory has been questioned in terms of its efficiency. Peters (1998) states that it is not realistic for material developers to write communicative materials that perfectly fit with learners' personal styles (as cited in Holmberg, 1999). Garrison (2000) opposed the efficiency of communication by stating the didactic limitation of one-way communication. However, the theory was significant in the history of distance education theory since it had an empathy approach for the first time to reduce the disadvantage of distance with, in Holmberg's words, "friendly conversation" serving for motivation.

Michael Moore's transactional distance theory that is another influential effort, and possibly the most-known theory in distance education history, appeared in 1972 (Moore, 1991). Moore, changed the interpretation of distance by holding that the distance is not geographic, but pedagogic existing even in classroom settings. In other words, distance is felt as a psychological and communicational space. John Dewey's (1946) philosophical transaction approach "organism-in-environment-as-a-whole" inspired the transactional distance theory (ibid). The transaction concept explains interactivity and actions of human-being as basically social-exchange or sets of "*trans-action*" both are shaped by and shape the environment, rather than independent "*inter-action*" (Dewey, 1946). Therefore, Moore (1991) looks at the distance from Dewey's (1946) transaction viewpoint as; behavioural patterns of individuals in a situation and claims that the transactional distance exists in all educational contexts to differing extents.

The variables deciding the level of transactional distance are; dialogue, structure and autonomy, and their amounts seen in an educational programme. The dialogue macro-factor, concerns the exchange of words and other symbols between learners and teachers aimed at future creation of knowledge (Keegan, 2000). Dialogue which is very similar to interaction differently consists only positive qualities which are purposeful, constructive and valued by each learning-teaching participant (ibid). In the concept of interaction, however one gives instruction when others respond; that is why dialogue term is preferred to mean all participants' active and authentic contributions (ibid). To what extent dialogue occurs in a programme and its nature are determined by the educational philosophy of the individuals who design the course, the personalities of teacher and learner, the subject-matter of the course, and finally by environmental factors (Moore, 2019). Moore (1991) states that even in correspondence model, the distance instructor fosters dialogue through a material with the reader learner as an extreme example but, he mentions his hopes for greater dialogue with the

help of developing technologies reflected in the design of courses and training of instructors (Moore, 1991). Secondly, the structure macro-factor basically analyses the curricula of the educational programme (ibid). The structure expresses the educational objectives, teaching strategies, preferred materials and evaluation methods of the course, each of which might be quasi-industrial, strictly specified by the designers reflecting much behaviourist, cognitivist approaches or might be responsive to learners' choices and individual needs, giving space for instructors' deviation with a constructivist perspective (ibid). More structure can be observed in any traditional distance course, resulting more transactional distance. The final variable affecting the transactional distance is autonomy. Moore (1991) claims that the distance programmes can be examined according the extent to which the teacher or the learner controls the main teaching-learning processes, and can be classified according to the level of learner autonomy permitted by the programme. Again, like the dialogue macro-factor, Moore idealizes the higher degree of autonomy in a distance course to decrease the transactional distance (ibid). Moore (2019) discusses that these three variables of the transactional distance theory determine the success of distance teaching. The appropriate amount for them within the course varies the context, content and institutions.

Another contribution to the distance education theory is the control concept proposed by Garrison and Baynton. Garrison and Baynton (1987) claim that autonomy and independence issues in distance education are neither comprehensible nor adequate, although they are always seen as the ultimate aim of andragogy. Garrison and Baynton (1987) argue that the physical separation of teacher and learner is misperceived as independence which causes conceptual confusion between independence and self-study. While independence can be simplified as *a freedom from the influence of others*, the independence itself is too narrow in order for the occurrence of learning in the distance (ibid). Independence alone is not valuable without the awareness of what to do with it (ibid).

Consequently, Garrison and Baynton (1987) develop the control concept to achieve richer independence combined with power and support dimensions. Control puts forward and can be attained by a dynamic balance of these three essential components. Independence again, represents learner choice, freedom to choose, diagnosis of learning needs, and formulating own learning goals (ibid). Power stands for the capacity of assuming responsibility, intellectual ability, cognitive style, motivation to direct learning independently and proficiency, competence in abilities and skills (Saykılı, 2018). Additionally, in the

concept of control, support from the external resources such as teacher and material is required to make use of independence. Independence is philosophical, coming together with the physiological function of power and support associated with structure; creating control over the learning process (Garrison & Baynton, 1987). On condition that these three components are in balance, control can be achieved and then, the learner can learn from a distance (Saykılı, 2018).

Short, Williams and Christine introduced the social presence (SP) notion to the theory of distance education in 1976 (Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997). The development of SP is closely relative to the concepts of collaborative learning, knowledge building, and online community (Saykılı, 2018). The SP strives to understand the social climates of interaction, in the distance education context CMC medium. It concerns with the presence, perception of distant learner in a sequence of interaction. SP accepts the variant nature of distance two-way communication which is quite different from face-to-face one and it is a significant predictor of perception of learning, sense of linked, and effectiveness of the programme (Gunawardena, 1995; Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2008; Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997). SP has been clarified as *“degree of salience of the other person in the interaction and the consequent salience of the interpersonal relationships...”* (Short et al., 1976, p. 65 as cited in Gunawardena, 1995). The feeling of “real person” in the virtual interaction is associated with two other dimensions suggested by Argyle and Dean (1965) concept of “intimacy,” and by Wiener and Mehrabian (1968) concept of “immediacy” (Tu & McIsaac, 2002). Physical distance, eye contact, smiling, and personal topics of conversation are the clues conveying intimacy (ibid). Whereas immediacy includes both verbal reflecting the manner of the speaker and nonverbal information for instance; formality of dress, and facial expressions (Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997). Immediacy refers to levels of the psychological distance which a communicator puts between himself - herself and others (Gunawardena, 1995). Greater intimacy and immediacy enhancing the high level of SP indicate achieving greater interaction. The communication medium, CMC in an online environment, affects SP depending on its capabilities and quality of the degree of permitting transmission of indicatives such as gestures, and posture (ibid). These variations are pivotal in figuring out the way individuals interact. On the other hand, SP is conveyed by communicators as well, an instructor, for instance who takes a role in the interaction by transmitting social cues (Saykılı, 2018). The CMC medium might be considered more disadvantaged for exchange of cues than the face-to-face environment

however, equilibrium theory suggests that the lack of verbal formed cues can be compensated by other forms of language, other symbol systems to communicate, to convey affective messages (Gunawardena, 1995; Saykılı, 2018). Through these different forms, the desired level of intimacy, immediacy and finally SP can be achieved by replacing them with face-to-face applications (Saykılı, 2018). In the light of all, SP has become an intriguing concept in the efforts of understanding the communication element through distance. Tu and McIsaac (2002) redefined the SP notion by the additional ingredients of social context, online communication and interactivity to the intimacy and immediacy factors. Social context includes task-oriented communications, trust relations, informal social relationships, private settings impacting SP positively (Tu & McIsaac, 2002). Moreover, online communication is related to computer communication literacy and online language (ibid). Interactivity cues that have a positive effect on SP are; appropriate communication styles, strategies and length, timely responses and feedback (ibid).

2.5. Studies with Instructors Opinion on Education from Distance

Instructors' opinion on distance education is a determiner for the effectiveness and quality of distance programs, learning and teaching. As a consequence, instructors' ideas towards distance education have been at the literature's agenda with separate concepts. Bolliger and Wasilik (2009) define faculty satisfaction as "*the perception that teaching in the online environment is 'effective and professionally beneficial'*" and mention three sub-categories of faculty satisfaction. These are learner-related, instructor-related and institution-related motives (ibid). Borg (2003) shed light on psychological constructs deciding what language teachers believe, know and think as *teacher cognition*. Borg (2003) illustrates teacher cognition with teacher learning factor both interested in schooling experiences and in-service development, classroom practice and contextual factors consisting of institutional, physical, and social ones. Satisfaction, cognition and other similar concepts lightening the teachers' disposition to teaching at a distance has been an inquiry of distance education for decades and has been researched.

2.5.1. Studies with Instructor Opinion on Distance Education

The findings of researches conducted prior to Covid-19 endorse the framework grounded categorization of aspects mentioned above. Harris and Krousgill (2008) highlighted

the significance of faculty satisfaction in the success of distance education. According to their study, recognition, student and faculty support, and process flexibility are influencers on satisfaction and viewpoints of instructors (ibid). Schifter (2002) stated the motivational factors leading instructors' views on distance education are; instructors' personal motivation to use technology, support and training received from the institution, flexibility in working conditions such as hours, location. These are among the positive factors, whereas concerns about the quality of course, absence of technical background are perceived negatively by instructors who teach from a distance (ibid). Dooley and Murphey (2000) noted that distance instructors saw; administrative support and encouragement, extensive infrastructure and the internet as strengths and opportunities of distance education. On the contrary, the instructors expressed some threats and weaknesses related to distance education, such as; using old models to develop new policies, slow action on critical issues, weak communication channels (ibid).

Özgöl, Sarıkaya and Öztürk (2016) found out that the negative opinions of instructors emphasise the themes; a reduction in learners' attendance and participation in classes, fall of learners' success and performance, the workload in the course preparation phase, poor quality of content. As the positive opinions; easy access and prestige perception and reduced workload in terms of delivering instruction and feedback were revealed (ibid). Broady and Ortmann (2002) pointed out the instructors' uncomfortable feeling of technology use and time consumingness perception and suggested training to change instructors' point of view. Again, Gurer, et al. (2016) revealed that according to instructors' opinions on distance education: the online platform; pedagogic, technical, material support and training; the richness of online material and content, interaction among instructor and learner; learner motivation - participation and finally, instructors' online teaching experiences are domains of effective distance education. Ulmer et al. (2007) acknowledged affirmatively that instructors with distance teaching experience see distance education superior to face-to-face education, compared to those who don't have any distance teaching experience.

Bolliger and Wasilik (2009) explicated that the most rated pillar among learner, instructor and institutional categories is learner-related satisfaction of instructors who valued "providing flexible and convenient access" the most. Unlike common findings of other researches, the study concluded that the participants agree with distance learners' active involvement and participation (ibid). However, there are some findings consistent with the

literature, the study addressed that instructors believe that distance teaching requires more investment of time and workload than face-to-face setting (ibid). Murphy, Shelley, White and Baumann (2011) just focus on instructor-related opinions of distance tutors in their study and explored that distance instructors care; knowledge of distance education, technology use and teaching, subject matter expertise.

2.5.2. Studies with Instructor Opinion on Emergency Remote Education

The studies conducted after the breakout of the Covid-19 pandemic suggest similar themes although the principle of distance education which is planned is different from emergency remote education. Participation, attendance, involvement, engagement and interaction themes were the most stressed ones in many studies; generally speaking, as a problematic aspect of emergency remote education. Whether the nature of language acquisition is transferable to the virtual environment or not has been given a place in the literature. Some studies have focused on each language sub-skills and systems one by one within the student-related opinions of instructors. For the institution-based component of teacher opinion on emergency remote education, faculty support, and decision making related to pandemic have been discussed. Finally, the teacher-teaching side was mainly focused on teachers' perceived self-competences and evaluation of emergency remote education in general.

2.5.2.1. Student and Learning Dimension

Learner motivation, participation, attendance, engagement, interaction were probably, the most dramatically emerged themes in the available emergency remote education literature. Altınpulluk's work (2021) revealed that instructors examine one of the biggest learning challenges of emergency remote education as not-obligatory attendance. In the study, the participants point to learners' dropped attendance, week content and being novel at distance education practices as the problematic sides of emergency remote education (ibid). Cantürk and Cantürk (2021) found that English language teachers address the biggest difficulty they had during emergency remote education as the absence of interaction and participation. Moser et, al (2021) manifested that remote language instructors have some concerns about the learner outcomes and they have difficulty with keeping language learners motivated, although the participants rated most "the teacher adjustment theme" positively followed by course

design, interaction and language learner outcome, which means; they think that they made the required adaptations such as reaching out learners, supporting and motivating them, teaching in a more distance pertinent way but they weren't able to be satisfied with learner motivation and participation. Güngör, Çangal and Demir (2020) revealed similar findings; Turkish as foreign language remote instructors stated that the biggest disadvantage of teaching Turkish from a distance was the absence of interaction. Moreover, Müller, Goh, Lim and Gao (2021) showed that faculty members stated that student engagement was the main problem they faced, although some stated written communication is an encouraging option to interact with shy students. Additionally, they voiced that it is difficult to diagnose and meet learner needs in a virtual environment (ibid). Further, practical and applied learning experiences such as role-plays, debates, group-works, some experimentation cannot be practised online according to the results of the study (ibid). Kurnaz and Serçemeli (2020) explicated that instructors stressed the most demanding aspect of emergency remote education; lack of interaction and low attendance. Furthermore, Atmojo and Nugroho (2020) described the challenges experienced in EFL classes from the perspective of teachers as; students' misperception of online learning evaluating it like informal, just like holiday, difficulty in strengthening the emotional bond between teacher and learner - engaging low motivated, passive students. Gao and Zhang (2020) also indicated the emergency remote English as a foreign language instructors' opinions on eye-contact and interaction limitations. Another study exposed that the difficulties educators encountered were lack of interaction and learner motivation, not being able to reach all determined learning outcomes, difficulty in teaching according to the individual interests of learners (Korkmaz & Toroman, 2020). Dolmacı and Dolmacı (2020) reported that their participants evaluated the disadvantages of remote teaching as; a fall in attendance and demotivation of learners, impracticableness of interaction and group-works. Similarly, Christoforou (2021) used the *black screen* phenomenon which refers to the absence of learners, or their turned off cameras, mics during a virtual class in her study.

The language skills and system competencies of the learners are evaluated in the literature too. The usefulness of virtual instruction has been presented as a concern (Alhawsawi & Jawhar, 2021). In a detailed view, each language skill and system competencies of learners are examined by the teacher opinion on emergency remote education studies. Giacosa, Salusso and Zacccone's study (2021) including views of both learners and higher education instructors showed that receptive skills; reading and listening competencies

are examined as satisfactory, whereas perceptive ones, writing and speaking are not satisfactory in emergency remote education. Christoforou (ibid) figured out that in the light of instructors' views; the most negatively affected language skill in higher language education is writing since the black screen gives learners a chance of using Google Translate or Autocorrect programs. Along with, Karataş and Tunçer's work (2020) in Turkey context included pre-service EFL teachers and the data proved that pre-service English teachers ranked the least negatively affected language skill to the most in order as; writing, listening, reading, speaking. Karakuş, Ucuzsatar, Karacaoğlu, Esendemir and Bayraktar (2020) claimed that the majority of Turkish language teachers thought; emergency remote education is suitable for listening language skill as in virtual classes learners are passive listeners while for the practice of other sub-skills reading, writing and speaking distance education is not a suitable setting. Again, Dolmacı and Dolmacı (2020) examined each language skill as well, according to the results of their work, lecturers' views on the most to the least teachable language skills from a distance are in order of; reading, writing, listening, speaking. For the language systems lecturers considered that grammar and vocabulary can be taught either way, but pronunciation sub-system is better practiced in a classroom setting (ibid).

The other topic that has come to the fore in emergency remote education literature is access to technology, technical infrastructure and learner technology literacy. The lecturers have scrutinised these themes from the perspective of learners, or as a factor influencing learning according to the results of some studies. Lecturers' concerns about the hardness of access to the distance education for learners' side or their weakness in technology literacy themes were mentioned (G. Cantürk & A. Cantürk, 2021; Akbana, Rathert & Ağçam, 2021). The negative effect of weak technical infrastructure on the flow of lessons, such as problems in video, voice quality, connection were echoed as well (Erarslan, 2021; Güngör et, al., 2020; Hazaea, et, al., 2021; Moser et, al., 2021; Korkmaz & Toraman, 2020).

On contrary, some studies pointed out positive views of lecturers on emergency remote education in the learning and learner perspective frame. Zhang (2020) concluded that remote Chinese language instructors who participated in the study have a positive opinion on remote education. Most of the participants stress the benefits of remote teaching; increased teaching quality and learner motivation, new possibilities for meeting different needs and using varied tools (ibid). Saidi and Afshari (2021) also demonstrated that English for academic purposes remote instructors have an optimist disposition towards remote teaching

during the pandemic. The participants referred to the use of technology smoothens English for academic purposes education by providing an opportunity for learner-centred, need-based instruction (ibid). According to their responses; the use of technology increases learner motivation, autonomy and their intercultural understanding (ibid). Additionally, the results of some studies proved that instructors have a positive perception of remote teaching as it provides sustainability of education in pandemic conditions (G. Cantürk & A. Cantürk, 2021; Kapar & Bhandari, 2020). Gao and Zhang (2020) pointed out that lecturers consider that emergency remote educations' advantages are a variety of online materials and retrievable sessions. In another study, easy access to class materials and education anywhere without a time limitation easiness were mentioned (Güngör, et. al., 2020). Furthermore, emergency remote education's potential of fostering learner autonomy has been discussed in many studies (Akban et al., 2021; Karataş & Tuncer, 2020; Kurnaz & Seçmeli, 2020; Munteanu, 2021; Potyala, Demeshkant, Czerwicz, Lanczkowska & Tomczyk, 2021).

2.5.2.2. Institution - University Dimension

Institution-related opinions search for instructors' perspectives towards the curriculum and online platform determined by the institution, the approach of the institution to decision making, in-service trainings, support system, and crisis management. Support is the key to sudden emergencies. Emergency remote education requires faculty support including course design support, content and professional development for instructional continuity (Hodges, et al., 2020).

Meta-analysis work of Akban et al. (2021) showed that support from the school or university has been more frequently reported by the teachers than insufficient support. Similarly, gaining support and training from the faculty has been stated in other studies (Kurnaz & Seçmeli, 2020; Mishra, Gupta & Shree, 2020). On the contrary, some lecturers though they haven't received enough amount of support or training (Altınpulluk, 2021; Lie, Tamah, Gozali, Triwidayati, Utami & Jemadi, 2020). Another study figured out that participants believed that they need more training (Trust & Whalen, 2020).

The easiness of the preferred online platform was also stressed by the lecturers (Kurnaz & Seçmeli, 2020). Gao and Zhang (2020) indicated other way round that the instructors had some adaptation problems to the used platform. Again, Altınpulluk (2021) found that instructors address the technological challenges, institution based problems are the

changes in institution policies, uncertainty in the syllabus and crowded classes. Potyala, et. al. (2021) found out that head teachers stated the best solution for the encountered troubles during the pandemic was working as a team and providing psycho-emotional support to both learners and teachers.

2.5.2.3. Teacher and Teaching Dimension

Finally, emergency the remote education process was evaluated from the teaching and instructor's perspective in the literature. Instructors' self-competences, professional developments, and their adaptation and perceptions towards teaching from distance themes were reviewed. Moreover, the distance teaching experiences of the lecturers were mentioned in the available literature.

Alhawsawi and Jawhar (2021) concluded that the biggest challenge encountered by the higher education instructors is technological literacy. The data of the study proved that instructors stressed their concerns about the usefulness of online instruction. The English teachers' perceived lack of technological knowledge or competence, digital literacy were also given a place in other studies (Erarslan, 2021; Potyala, et, al., 2021; Chiatoh & Chia, 2020; Gao & Zhang, 2020). However, there is another study that pointing instructors believe they are capable of technology use (Kurnaz & Seçmeli, 2020).

The technology literacy theme was evaluated from a contextual perspective as well in a study. According to the work of Hazaea, Bin-Hady, Toujani (2021) in which they compared the experience of ERLT in higher education among Arab League countries, the challenges differ from one context to another. The results showed that low-technologic countries had more infrastructure problems than high-technologic ones whereas, in high technologic countries difficulties are resulted in both learners and lecturers' lack of technology literacy (ibid). In parallel, Lie et, al. (2020) highlighted almost impossibility of accessing technology or insufficient internet technologies in Indonesia context.

Lecturers' adaptation to emergency remote education theme was underlined in the literature (Nugroho, et. al., 2021; Erarslan, 2021). While Erarslan (2021) reports that English language remote lecturers think they have witnessed a challenging adaptation process to emergency remote education, he relates the adaptation to the faculty support and training. Meanwhile, the lecturers' prior distance teaching experience was evaluated as a factor influencing lecturers' views on emergency remote education and their speed of adapting as

well in the literature. Moser, et, al. (2021) revealed that few lecturers taught from a distance before the pandemic and especially those without prior distance teaching experience are much more concerned about learner outcomes, even though there is no significant difference among all participants in terms of design and adjustment variables of the study (ibid). Another study supported the role of prior exposure to distance teaching and revealed that there is a correlation between distance teaching engagement and prior distance teaching experience (Lie, et, al., 2020). Kurnaz and Serçemeli (2020) claimed that the majority of the participants cited that they didn't have distance teaching experience before the pandemic and again the majority doesn't want to continue teaching from distance after the Covid-19 pandemic. In contrast, Trust and Whalen (2020) found that the participants mainly teaching in public schools, having average sixteen years of teaching experience and mainly have blended or online teaching experience before the pandemic reported that they had some challenges in adopting remote teaching and their pedagogy.

Moreover, many studies suggested that emergency remote education experience helped instructors' professional development. Akbana, Rathert and Ağçam (2021) figured out with their meta-analysis work that most emergency remote English language education studies made it clear that emergency remote teaching helps teachers' technological skills. Saidi and Afshari (2021) concluded that English for academic purposes remote instructors believe that remote teaching fosters instructors' professional identity and facilitates access to authentic materials, adds variety to the class activities. The study of Nugroho, Hanghegh, Triana (2021) conducted with Indonesian EFL teachers figured out that creativity and attractiveness in teaching are both the problem and can be the cure during ERLT. According to the results of the study, EFL teachers consider that emergency remote education is an opportunity for designing more creative, interactive and exciting classes and learning opportunities (ibid). On the other side, again creative activities can be a solution to learner demotivation and dropped participation challenges encountered during the pandemic (ibid). Potyala et, al. (2021) evaluated the process from an optimistic perspective and stated that the pandemic promise more autonomous education, in short an educational environment for the post-pandemic future.

Some studies have gone through the teachability of languages from distance issue. Lecturers' preferences between virtual and face-to-face settings were compared in some studies. Kapar and Bhandari (2020) manifested that secondary level English teachers suggest

that although teaching from a distance is the safest and best option in the pandemic conditions, it is only an alternative way, and it cannot replace face to face classes. The study explored that virtual classes are less satisfactory and interactive (ibid). Dolmacı and Dolmacı (2020) underlined with their work that lecturers believe the face-to-face educational setting is more effective to teach a foreign language. Altınpulluk (2021) pointed out instructors' view on that online environment is not appropriate for some fields. Besides, Korkmaz and Toroman (2020) conducted that most of the educators working for both state and public institutions hold online education is not efficient for skill teaching such as language skills and arts. In the case of distance education, Barış and Çankaya (2016) highlighted the academic staff's view on the impracticality of practising English productive skills through distance.

Although the results of many studies underline the unsuitable nature of language acquisition for the virtual environment, and the instructors' preference to face-to-face setting rather than virtual one, there are some future positive intention in the available literature. Jin, Xu, Deifell and Angus (2021) concluded that language instructors intend to adopt online teaching in post-pandemic due to their perceived values of online language education and self-confidence in their competencies. Besides, Müller, Goh, Lim and Gao (2021) showed that although the faculty members expressed their strong preference for face-to-face education, they intend to incorporate some newly acquired remote education components with their teaching going forward.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

The research intends to take a photograph of English language emergency remote education based on the opinions of state and foundation university instructors. The results of this study will indicate the evaluation of English language emergency remote education experience. The readers will find the insights of learner participation, language skills' and systems' competencies of students, institutions' policies for the unpredicted transition, and instructors' beliefs on teaching from a distance. These findings could inspire the future agenda of education from a distance. The methodology for this regard is presented in this chapter. The research design, participants of the research, instruments of the research, procedures of data collection, and data analysis were explained in detail. The following research questions desired to be answered in this study:

- Is there a statistically significant difference between state university and foundation university academic staff's views on learner dimension of emergency remote education?
- Is there a statistically significant difference between state university and foundation university academic staff's views on teaching dimension of emergency remote education?
- Is there a statistically significant difference between state university and foundation university academic staff's views on university actions and policies applied during emergency remote education?
- According to the views of academic staff is there a difference between distance teaching during a typical academic semester and emergency remote education?
- What are the factors affecting learners' attendance and participation to the virtual classes according to the views of academic staff?
- What are the difficulties that academic staff working at the state and foundation universities experienced during emergency remote education?

3.2. Research Design

In this study, the quantitative method was employed, because it aims to reach varied cases and a larger audience, and it has the survey research design because of that it is mainly interested in the views of English preparatory remote instructors. This is a cross-sectional survey study as the data were collected in one go. The details of the research design and the reasons why that specific method has been chosen are explained in the following paragraphs in detail.

Quantitative social research originates the progress of natural sciences in the nineteenth century (Dörnyei, 2007). Therefore, “*scientific method*” associated with natural sciences and numerical values inspired early applied linguistic researches and many of them adopted the quantitative method (ibid). Even though several aspects of the scientific method are transferable to social studies, there are fundamental differences between the social and natural sciences (ibid). Today, the quantitative method in applied linguistics is still commonly applied and carries general principles of the scientific method. However, it shows some certain distinctive features since it is interested in human-beings (ibid). Quantitative research approaches are used to describe current conditions by reaching large groups (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2012, p. 9). Quantitative inquiry is systematic, standardized and ideally universal for almost any audience (Dörnyei, 2007, pp. 31-33). Unlike the qualitative one, the quantitative approach is centred around the common features and patterns among the groups of individuals rather than single, specific individuals and cases (ibid). In the present study, the quantitative method was preferred to explore the differences between foundation and state institutions instead of focusing on a single case which means the study includes a large group within its scope.

Survey research determines and reports the way of things are; it involves collecting numerical data to answer questions about the current status of the subject of study (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2012, p. 9). One common type of survey research involves assessing the opinions, preferences, attitudes, practices, concerns or interests of a group of people (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2012 p. 185). The present study aims to explore the opinions of instructors on language education during the Covid-19 pandemic. Moreover, it benefits from the numerical data rather than verbal data collection tools such as interview as it targets reaching out to both foundation and state institutions located in Turkey. Therefore, the study adopted a survey research design.

Cross sectional survey design collects data from selected individuals at a single point in time. The design effectively provides a snapshot of the current opinion in a population

(Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2012, p. 185). In contrast, longitudinal studies examine the process, craves for comparisons assumed to have occurred with the effect of time and to do so, repeatedly collects data over an extended period (ibid). The present study is curious about the opinions of instructors and intends to reflect the current situation instead of observing the changes over time. That is why the study collected the data at one sitting, at a specific point in time, in parallel to the nature of the inquiry of the study. Therefore, it has a cross-sectional survey design.

3.3. Instrument

In this research, a self-made questionnaire was used in order to collect the data required to undertake the present study. Survey research data are mainly collected through questionnaires (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2012, p. 185). A questionnaire is an appropriate instrument to reach large groups, and take a photograph of abrupt switch witnessed in numerous schools of foreign languages from the perspective of instructors (ibid). Hence, the questionnaire is chosen as the data collection tool of the present study so that, the study can find the answers of its research questions.

3.3.1. The Questionnaire

The available literature on distance education, emergency remote education, language education from distance, English language education programme in university tertiary level, instructor opinion were reviewed by the researcher to develop the questionnaire to be used as a data gathering tool. Additionally, the researcher based on her own emergency remote education experiences as well as considering the informal chats with her colleagues while designing the questionnaire. In the end, the questionnaire items were designed around mainly emerged themes of 1) technical infrastructure, 2) adaptation to the pandemic process, 3) learner participation, 4) methods of instructional delivery, 5) practicability for the practice of all language skills and systems, 6) meeting learning outcomes and objectives.

The first section of the questionnaire seeks demographic information of the participants including age, native language, years of teaching experience, type of institution they have been working for (state-public distinction) and their previous distance teaching experience. The second section doesn't divide the items or group the questions not to limit the themes with the pre-determined ones. For the possibility of varied dimensions, to shape the themes in the light of data emerged after data collection, this section is not led with subtitles

or grouped questions purposefully. This part asks participants to evaluate the pandemic process from the aforementioned themes.

The technical infrastructure theme includes items such as the effect of technology, maybe some technical problems, on the flow of the virtual classes, the instructors' technologic skill development, easiness and effectiveness in terms of the use of the online platform. Their adaptation to the pandemic process, the general view on distance language education, the extent of autonomy they have felt, the views on their teaching action and professional development during emergency remote education. The adaptation of the universities for which the participants work; their policies, support system and training they have provided were asked to get data about the adaptation to the process. Whereas, learner participation seeks the factors affecting attendance, interactional patterns and interaction element taking place during virtual classes. Methods of instructional delivery theme was included with the questions asking the strategies, techniques applied, objectives of the instruction, meeting learners' needs and interests, the practice of each language skills and systems, and their amount within the instruction. Practicability for the practice of all language skills and systems was also questioned in the questionnaire. The instructors' preferences between face-to-face, virtual environments, comparison between these two environment competences were given a place. Finally, meeting learning outcomes reflected the perceived learner competencies in language skills and systems, to what extent the anticipated learning objectives were achieved.

The questionnaire includes distinct item types to gather fruitful data. There are more controlled items to keep the flow structured around the research questions which are called structured items, and some unstructured ones that are freer to reach greater opinions. The questionnaire contains 40 five-point likert scale items that require participants to rate their agreement among *strongly disagree* – *disagree* – *neutral* – *agree* – *strongly agree* options. One of the five-point likert questions offers the option of *never* – *rarely* – *sometimes* – *often* – *always* to learn about frequency. There are two checklist items that crave participants to choose as many options as they desire. The questionnaire also includes four free response items, open ended questions to give an opportunity to the occurrence of not previously determined themes. For instance, one of the open-ended questions is seeking the biggest difficulty pursued during emergency remote education. In total, there are forty-five questions in the questionnaire presented to the participants in the order of item type to make it more responder friendly. However, ten items were excluded after factor analysis. As conclusion, thirty-five questions were considered in this study.

The questionnaire was designed via Google Forms and delivered online due to the pandemic prevention. The instrument was consulted for validity and reliability. Three experts were consulted to review the questionnaire. The reader can access the full version of the questionnaire in the Appendix 1. The questionnaire contains the *online education* terminology only. *The online education during the pandemic – before the pandemic* statements are used to prevent any confusion. Emergency remote education term is avoided deliberately in case that there are some participants who are not familiar with it.

3.3.2. Validity and Reliability Analysis

Alpha Coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) was used to measure the reliability of the instrument formed from a number of sources. The alpha coefficient, which shows the internal consistency of the measurement, proceeds values between 0 and 1 by calculating the average correlations of the items that comprise the scale (Streiner, 2003). The closer the Cronbach Alpha coefficient is to 1, the more reliable the survey is (Dörnyei, 2007, pp. 206-207). The Cronbach Alpha value of the study is 0.89. This result shows that the reliability of the survey is quite high.

For measuring validity, structural validity that is defined as the power of the measurement tool to represent the psychological feature that it targets to test has been conducted (Streiner, 2003). Exploratory factor analysis is used quite recurrently to reveal the construct validity. In factor analysis, Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) is used to determine the adequacy of the sample. The KMO value acquired in the study was calculated as 0.89. KMO value over 0.80 is considered to be excellent. Barlett Sphericity analysis was directed to conclude whether the relationship between the expressions is sufficient. The test results were found to be significant (, 000). Table 2 shows KMO and Bartlett's test values.

Table 3.1. KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.897
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4451.238
	Df	300
	Sig.	.000

3.3.3. Factor Analysis

In the exploratory factor analysis, 3 different factors were obtained as a result of the analysis of the basic components with varimax rotation. According to the analysis results seen

in the table, there are three basic factors in which the scale was originally prepared to include 45 questions. However, due to cross loading and low factor loads, items 3,6,9,15,18,24,29,32,33 and 34 were removed from scale, and a structure with 35 items and 3 factors appeared in the test. The discluded items are as listed above;

3. Online education offers more varied activity types, materials and learning opportunities.

6. Online teaching helped me to gain new pedagogic skills.

9. I had a more tolerant, flexible approach, style towards my students than I had before Covid-19.

15. The instructors were expected to use the same face to face curriculum, materials, teaching objectives in online education.

18. The university expected the instructors to change the teaching objectives, prepare different or modified curriculum, materials special for online education.

24. The offered online course content was qualified.

29. My online course included opportunities for students to interact with me as the instructor.

32. My online course was more learner-centred than my face-to-face classes.

33. Under the special condition, catching up with the curriculum became more important than doing sufficient amount of practice.

34. I reached out to students frequently (3-5 times per week) through email and / or announcements.

The total variance explanation rate of these 3 factors is 62,221%. In this framework, the named factors and the items included in these factors are as follows:

Table 3.2. Factor analysis

Variables	Factor Loads
Factor I: Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students (Variance Explained: 28,615)	
22. The technical problems (video –audio- voice quality of online classes, connection, difficulties in uploading digital materials etc.) affected the flow of lessons negatively.	.5411
23. My online course had measurable, appropriate objectives.	.523
25. My online course met the students' individual interests.	.664
26. My online course met the students' existing needs related with English.	.731
27. My online course included equal amount of activities suitable for pair, group and individual work.	.664
28. My online course included authentic examples of language and / or culture.	.556
30. My online course included opportunities for students to interact with one another.	.670
31. My online course gave the students the opportunity to use and reflect their language knowledge.	.662
35. The students' improvement of English speaking skills was satisfactory.	.675
36. The students' improvement of English listening skills was satisfactory.	.718
37. The students' improvement of English reading skills was satisfactory	.719
38. The students' improvement of English writing skills was satisfactory.	.783
39. The students' improvement of English grammar was satisfactory	.742
40. The students' improvement of English vocabulary was satisfactory.	.726
41. My online students' overall performances were as satisfactory as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.	.787
42. I was pleased with the communication, rapport and interaction I had with my online students as much as I had in the face-to-face setting.	.647
43. My online students attended, participated the online classes as much as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.	.535
44. The reading, writing, listening, speaking skills and vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation language systems were well balanced in my online course.	.602
45. Online education during COVID-19 is / would likely be different from online education during a typical academic	.787

semester.

Factor II: Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Universities (Variance Explained: 24,738)	
10. The university I have been working for provided sufficient orientations – seminars - workshops on online education (how to use the online platform etc.).	.827
11. The university was able to shift online education effectively and smoothly.	.778
12. The university made proper decisions related with online education on time.	.759
13. The university supported the instructors frequently. (keeping in touch, informing, leading with announcements, schedules, rubrics, online meetings, etc.)	.820
14. When I had a problem during the process, I was able to receive support from the university easily.	.804
16. The university provided flexibility to the instructors during online education (deciding on class hours, pacing, using extra materials, etc.)	.506
19. The online platform, learning management system or video conferencing tool (Zoom, Teams, Sakai, Google Meet etc.) determined by the university was an appropriate choice.	.593
20. The online platform was easy for me to use.	.600
21. I was able to use the online platform effectively.	.551
Factor III: Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education Process (Variance Explained: 8,867)	
1. Before Covid-19, I believed that students could perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting.	.591
2. Online education is a suitable learning environment for learning & teaching English language.	.584
4. I was able to adapt online teaching easily.	.565
5. I would be interested in teaching online again in the future.	.636
7. Online teaching helped me to gain new technologic skills.	.644
8. I used different teaching strategies, approaches, activity types during Covid-19 process because of the different nature of online setting.	.520
17. Each instructor moved uniquely, less standardized - centralized across the university during the online education than they did in the face-to-face setting.	.545

Factor analysis was carried out to diminish the number of variables in the questions. Factors designed and entitled are; interaction of emergency remote education with students, interaction of emergency remote education with universities, and evaluation of emergency remote education process. As such, the questionnaire designed by the researcher and used in the present study can be called a tool. Therefore, after the factor analysis, the designed questionnaire has become Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool which is enable to gather the opinion of instructors in terms of literature guided ERLT themes. The reader can access the full version of the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool in Appendix 2

3.4. Setting and Participants

The data collection procedure was undertaken in a virtual setting because of the Covid-19 pandemic conditions and the data collection tool was presented to the participants in a digital format. For the purpose of comparing the ideas of English language instructors working for foundation and state universities in Turkey, where English is considered as a foreign language, a research group involving the instructors teaching in universities' English preparatory programmes of school of foreign languages were determined from convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is a sampling method where the participants meet with

certain practical criterion and are volunteers, available to take a part in the study (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 99). Instructors were eligible if they; a) have been teaching in a school of foreign languages English preparatory program of a university and b) have been teaching during Covid-19 pandemic emergency remote education.

The names of the participants weren't be asked due to confidentiality. Again, the names or the total number of the universities for which the participants work remained uncertain due to that the name of the institution was asked as an optional question in the questionnaire for participants' privacy. Some responders didn't give any detail about the name of the university or the province in which the university is located and they just stated if it is a foundation or a state institution because, it is the main inquiry of the study.

According to the information collected through the demographic questions, a hundred and thirty-four instructors participated in the study. A hundred one instructors work for a state university, while thirty-three of them teach in a foundation one. One hundred thirty-one of the participants speak Turkish as the native language, and only three participants are native speakers of other languages. The participants are between the ages of twenty-four and forty-eight. When the age ranges of participants are compared, more than half of the participants are between 30-41 ages and account for the majority of respondents as comparison of ages (69%). Participants are mostly from state university (n=101) and speaking Turkish native language (98%). Again, more than half of participants have teaching experience as 6-17 years (60%). Participants mostly didn't teach online before COVID-19 (72%). The number of people having online teaching experience are only 24 (18%). This information was collected through the questionnaire's demographic information section.

The results and assessments regarding the demographic characteristics of 134 instructors working in various universities and participating the research are as follows:

Table 3.3. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Demographic characteristics of the respondents participated in the research					
Age	f	%	Years of Teaching Experience	f	%
24-29	11	08.20	0-5 years	24	17.91
30-35	56	41.79	6-11 years	46	35.07
36-41	37	27.61	12-17 years	34	25.37
42-47	16	11.94	18-22 years	17	12.68
48 ≥	14	10.44	23 ≥	13	38.23
University Types			Online Teaching Experience Before COVID-19		
State	101	75.40	None	97	72.40
Foundation	33	24.60	Hybrid	13	9.70

Native Languages			Full Online	24	17.90
Turkish	131	97.77			
Foreign Languages	3	02.23			

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure of the study started after the construction of the final version of the questionnaire instrument and ethics approval from the ethical committee of Akdeniz University. The data were collected in one go because the study has a cross-sectional design. The researcher gathered data by herself on a voluntary basis. The data gathering process planned to be conducted between May and June in the second term of the 2020-2021 academic year but, the desired number of participants wasn't reached. So, the dateline was postponed for a month.

All of the universities planned to be included in the study were obtained permission. These are both foundation and state ones located in İzmir province only. Nonetheless, the proper number of participants for a quantitative study wasn't able to be achieved and the link of the questionnaire was shared on social media to increase the number. Some of the responders participated in the study through social media. In fact, the change was an advantageous development for the progress of the study and the diversity of the participants. In that case, instructors all around the nation, much more universities and broader range of ideas took place in the present research.

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic conditions, data were gathered via a virtual tool. Google Forms was adjusted not to ask the responders' e-mail addresses while sending their forms, on purpose, to keep their personal information foundation and confidential. In that way, the researcher reached the filled forms anonymously. In the informing letter, participants were informed about the security of personal data, the purpose of the study and what exactly they were expected to do. Their consent was gained before they filled out the form.

3.6. Data Analysis

As stated above, the quantitative data were gathered from the participants so as to address the research questions in this study. The numerical data and the limited number of qualitative data obtained from the open-ended questions were analysed to provide insights

into English language instructors' opinions on emergency remote education. The collected data were subjected to statistical analysis utilizing SPSS statistical software package.

For the data analysis, the SPSS statistics program was used to examine the data attained from the research. Factor analysis was carried out to diminish the number of variables in the questions concerning the interaction of emergency remote education with students, interaction of emergency education with universities, and evaluation of emergency remote education process and add a new dimension. With the help of SPSS, the arithmetic mean and percentages of all questions in the questionnaire were calculated. T-test and variance analysis were conducted to determine the differences between the averages.



CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

The aim of the present study was to reveal and compare the opinions of instructors working for state and foundation universities, on emergency remote English language education carried out schools of foreign languages. The views of the state, public university instructors were examined to figure if there are statistically significant differences in the themes of; views on teaching, views on learners and views on university. The findings attained through numerical data analysis were presented in the following part of this chapter.

4.2. Findings

4.2.1. Comparison of Views on Emergency Remote Education in Terms of University Types

One of the main inquiry of the present study is to compare the experienced emergency remote education process between the state and foundation institutions. In this study, after the factor analysis three factors emerged. A t-test was run by taking these three factors into account to compare the foundation and state universities. According to the results of the t-test, there is no statistically significant difference between foundation and state universities in terms of the interaction of emergency remote education with students, the interaction of emergency remote education with universities and evaluation of emergency remote education process.

The first factor, the interaction of emergency remote education with students examines the ideas of instructors working at state and foundation universities on learners. When their ideas are compared, it is found that there isn't a statistically significant difference between state and foundation university instructors in terms of interaction of emergency remote education with students ($P > .05$, $P = .291$). As can be seen from Table 4.1, the mean of the foundation university (3.28) is close to that of the state university (3.13).

Table 4.1 Comparison of Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students views in terms of University Type

		N	Mean	SD	t	df	P
Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students	Foundation	33	3.28	.73	1.060	132	.291
	Public	101	3.13	.67			

The second factor, the interaction of emergency remote education with universities evaluates state and foundation university instructors' views on their universities. When their opinions are compared, it is found that there isn't a statistically significant difference between state and foundation university instructors in terms of the interaction of emergency remote education with university ($P > .05$, $P = .774$). As the readers can see from Table 4.2, the mean of the foundation university (3.81) is close to that of the state university (3.86).

Table 4.2. Comparison of Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with University views in terms of University Type

		N	Mean	Sd	t	df	P
Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with University	Foundation	33	3.81	.95	-.289	41	.774
	Public	101	3.86	.61			

The last factor, evaluation of emergency remote education process shows state and foundation university instructors' views on emergency remote education process including their self-evaluation. When their viewpoints are compared, it is found that there isn't a statistically significant difference between state and foundation university instructors in terms of evaluation of emergency remote education ($P > .05$, $P = .824$). As it is shown in Table 4.3, the mean of the foundation university (3.37) is close to that of the state university (3.34).

Table 4.3. Comparison of Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education views in terms of University Type

		N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education	Foundation	33	3.37	.69	.223	132	.824
	Public	101	3.34	.62			

The results of the t-test clearly show that, there is no statistically significant differences between foundation and state university instructors' views on student, university, and process evaluation dimensions of emergency remote education. These results cause a curiosity about whether there are some statistically significant differences among the means of factors as pairs. To figure it out, another t-test was run for the comparison of factors.

4.2.2. T-test

Finally, the tool was examined in terms of the differences among the emerged factors; the interaction of online education with students, the interaction of online education with universities, and evaluation of emergency remote education process to highlight the themes echoed most by the participants. To compare these three factors as pairs, t-test was applied. The results prove that there are statistically significant differences among the factors. The mean of the second factor, the interaction of emergency remote education with universities is the highest (3.85), while the third factor, evaluation of emergency remote education process follows it with the mean 3.35. Finally, the mean of the first factor, the interaction of emergency remote education with students is the lowest (3.17).

Table 4.4. Descriptive Statistics for Comparison of Factors

	Mean	N	Sd
Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students	3.17	134	.69
Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with University	3.85	134	.71
Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with University	3.85	134	.71
Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education	3.35	134	.63
Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students	3.17	134	.69
Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education	3.35	134	.63

Table 4.5. T test for Comparison of Factors

Compared Groups	Mean differences	T	df	P
Factor 1-2	-.68	-10.186	134	.000
Factor 2-3	.50	7.678	134	.000
Factor 1-3	-.18	-2.983	134	.003

When the factors were compared as pairs, it was seen that the means of the first factor, the interaction of emergency remote education with students (3.17) is lower than the means of the second factor which is the interaction of emergency remote education with university (3.85). A t-test was carried out to see if there is a statistically significant difference between them. As a result, it can be said that the difference between these first and second factors is statistically significant ($P < .05$, $P = .000$).

In the comparison of second and third factors, it was found that the means of the second factor, the interaction of emergency remote education with university (3.85), is higher than the third factor, evaluation of emergency remote education's means (3.35). According to the t-test results, it is seen that the difference between these first and second factors is statistically significant ($P < .05$, $P = .000$).

Finally, when the first and third factors are compared, the interaction of emergency remote education with students, the first factor's means (3.17) is lower than the third, evaluation of emergency remote education's means (3.35). The results of the t-test prove that there is a statistically significant difference between the first and third factors ($P < .05$, $P = .003$).

4.2.3. Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool

After factor analysis and t-tests, descriptive statistics was run for each item taking place in the tool in order to elicit the most-commonly stressed opinions, to have a deeper look at the pandemic process. The means of each question presented in the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool were calculated. Here, the questions of the questionnaire which haven't been evaluated and discarded after the factor analysis have not been included. Table 4.6 shows the results of the descriptive statistics of the tool questions as follows;

Table 4.6. Descriptive statistics for each question in the research

Questions	Std.	
	Mean	Dvt.

1. Before Covid-19, I believed that students could perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting.	2.33	1.002
2. Online education is a suitable learning environment for learning & teaching English language.	2.88	1.151
4. I was able to adapt online teaching easily.	3.60	1.019
5. I would be interested in teaching online again in the future.	3.51	1.060
7. Online teaching helped me to gain new technologic skills.	4.44	.854
8. I used different teaching strategies, approaches, activity types during Covid-19 process because of the different nature of online setting.	4.01	.841
10. The university I have been working for provided sufficient orientations – seminars - workshops on online education (how to use the online platform etc.).	3.66	1.157
11. The university was able to shift online education effectively and smoothly.	3.71	1.046
12. The university made proper decisions related with online education on time.	3.74	1.069
13. The university supported the instructors frequently. (keeping in touch, informing, leading with announcements, schedules, rubrics, online meetings, etc.)	3.99	1.000
14. When I had a problem during the process, I was able to receive support from the university easily.	4.01	.989
16. The university provided flexibility to the instructors during online education (deciding on class hours, pacing, using extra materials, etc.)	3.24	1.118
17. Each instructor moved uniquely, less standardized - centralized across the university during the online education than they did in the face-to-face setting.	2.65	1.099
19. The online platform, learning management system or video conferencing tool (Zoom, Teams, Sakai, Google Meet etc.) determined by the university was an appropriate choice.	3.97	1.033
20. The online platform was easy for me to use.	4.14	.851
21. I was able to use the online platform effectively.	4.15	.845
22. The technical problems (video –audio- voice quality of online classes, connection, difficulties in uploading digital materials etc.) affected the flow of lessons negatively.	3.37	1.121
23. My online course had measurable, appropriate objectives.	3.80	.754
25. My online course met the students' individual interests.	3.27	.959
26. My online course met the students' existing needs related with English.	3.52	.924
27. My online course included equal amount of activities suitable for pair, group and individual work.	2.70	1.263
28. My online course included authentic examples of language and / or culture.	3.76	.943
30. My online course included opportunities for students to interact with one another.	3.21	1.239
31. My online course gave the students the opportunity to use and reflect their language knowledge.	3.54	.963
35. The students' improvement of English speaking skills was satisfactory.	2.88	1.090
36. The students' improvement of English listening skills was satisfactory.	3.12	1.069
37. The students' improvement of English reading skills was satisfactory.	3.32	.978
38. The students' improvement of English writing skills was satisfactory.	3.16	1.105
39. The students' improvement of English grammar was satisfactory	3.57	1.014
40. The students' improvement of English vocabulary was satisfactory.	3.51	1.002
41. My online students' overall performances were as satisfactory as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.	2.63	1.080
42. I was pleased with the communication, rapport and interaction I had with my online students as much as I had in the face-to-face setting.	2.89	1.180
43. My online students attended, participated the online classes as much as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.	2.25	1.229
44. The reading, writing, listening, speaking skills and vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation language systems were well balanced in my online course.	3.04	1.156
45. Online education during COVID-19 is / would likely be different from online teaching during a typical academic semester.	2.63	1.080

According to the results of the descriptive statistics of the questions, the item “*Online teaching helped me to gain new technologic skills.*” is the one which is the most highlighted by the instructors taking part in this study (M=4.44). The second most positively evaluated question is “*I was able to use the online platform effectively.*” (M=4.15). The results show that the participant instructors consider that emergency remote education improves their professional development in the way of technology competence and they are comfortable about using technology. The results made it clear that the most pleasing side of emergency remote education was technology related benefits of the process. On the contrary, the most dramatically emerged questions were “*Before Covid-19, I believed that students could*

perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting.” which proves that the participants strongly believe that the face-to-face setting is a better environment for the learners’ overall performances (M=2.33). The second most negatively evaluated item is *“My online students attended, participated the online classes as much as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.”* (M=2.25). Here, the data reveal that low learner attendance is a big problem experienced in the process of emergency remote education. The results are not surprising since, as the t-test results which was presented on the previous page reveal *the interaction of emergency remote education with student* dimension reflects the most unpleasing views of participants among the other two factors. In short, this can be summarized that participants believe that emergency remote education helps to improve their technological skills; however student don’t perform equally well as they do in a face-to-face setting, and they don’t attend or participate in virtual classes.

4.2.4. Open Ended Questions

The questionnaire includes three open-ended questions that ask for freer viewpoints of instructors. These questions aim to give the participants a space to find their voices and reflect upon their emergency remote education experiences in a broader sense. The emergence of not pre-determined, varied themes is targeted for a deeper understanding of the process. The fourth research question asks a comparison between distance education and emergency remote education experiences, while the fifth research question wants to figure out the factors affecting the students’ participation and attendance. Finally, the sixth research question desires to learn the most significant difficulty experienced during emergency remote education. The researcher analysed the qualitative data and came up with the mostly emerged themes. These open-ended questions are discussed one by one under their titles in detail.

4.2.4.1. RQ.4. The difference between emergency remote education and distance education

The fourth research question asked participants to compare their emergency remote education experience with their online education experience if they had before the pandemic; if not, how they would compare them. The inquiry was reflected as a five-point likert question in the questionnaire first, as *“Teaching online during COVID-19 is / would likely be different from online teaching during a typical academic semester.”* and then, as a

follow-up open-ended question “*Why?*” was posed. Most of the participants believe that online education during a typical academic year is or would be different from emergency remote education applied during the Covid-19 pandemic. Sixty-nine of them have chosen *agree* option, while twenty-seven of them state that they strongly agree. However, only eighty-seven of the participants answered the open-ended question. According to the analysis of qualitative data, the primarily emerged theme is that emergency remote education is the only way of delivering the instruction, that is why it is different from online education. The secondly echoed theme is psychological factors of emergency which sixteen participants stated. Finally, eleven participants differ emergency remote education from distance one because of the unexpected transition experienced. Seven participants who answered the open-ended question believe that emergency remote education and distance education practices are the same.

4.2.4.1.1. Emergency Remote Education is the Only Choice

Seventeen of the responders state an opinion that distance education was or would be an elective course but emergency remote education is the only way of delivering instruction during the pandemic.

As one of the participants states;

“Under normal circumstances it would probably be a matter of choice, not the only choice.”

Similarly, another participant claims;

“Because then it would be something elective, not obligatory.”

In parallel, another participant notes down;

“This situation was obligatory rather than a choice to learn English.”

Affirmatively, one of the participants writes as;

“Covid did not provide another option, it is compulsory but during a typical semester, students do it voluntarily.”

Furthermore, some participants highlighted that in a distance education programme carried out in a typical academic semester, teacher, and students had - would have a chance

of face-to-face interaction. Moreover, they claim that generally hybrid mode of instruction delivery was – would be preferred rather than a fully distance programme.

As one of the participants highlights;

“At a normal time, classes could be hybrid and only some of the lessons could be conducted online so it would be more helpful because I would have a face to face contact with students on some days.”

“In a typical academic semester, the online sessions were implemented partially. However, during the pandemic it was compulsory.”

“It will be a choice and probably as part of a hybrid program.”

“We were not supposed to teach online all sections of the book, just some.”

Additionally, some participants underlined that being a part of distance education in a typical academic term is based on a voluntary basis for both learners and instructors. The necessity of emergency remote education has a negative effect on its participants.

As one of the participants answered;

“The students and teachers have to go through the online education process due to covid-19. Under normal circumstances or before the pandemic, the students and teachers knew what they were getting when they attend or teach online classes. However, because of covid-19, everyone had to go through the online education process, and most students and teachers hated it (not me).”

Another participant claimed;

“Covid -19 makes online education mandatory and you don’t have another option. It gives pressure on students so it affects them negatively.”

4.2.4.1.2. Psychological Factors

According to the analysis of qualitative data, it is seen that sixteen of the participants consider that emergency remote education and distance education is or would be different because of the psychological effect of the pandemic, which is not valid for distance education. The participants claim that both learners and themselves have been negatively influenced during emergency remote education. In the case of distance education, there weren’t or wouldn’t be such psychological impacts. As some participants state;

“Mood. Teachers’ and students’ moods were fluctuating just like the number of cases and deaths.”

“We used the same platform and specifically prepared materials, so it is not actually different for the teacher and students in terms of learning or teaching opportunities. However, it can be different only because of the negative impact of Covid-19 on our psychology.”

“Students would feel less anxious about their health if we taught English online during a typical academic semester. They got stuck at home and couldn’t see their friends and teachers. They didn’t experience the campus environment. These all affected their psychology in a negative way. They were not listening to the lectures willingly.”

4.2.4.1.3. Unplanned Switch

Another emerged theme about the division of distance education applied in a typical academic semester, and emergency remote education is that according to the eleven participants, emergency remote education is unplanned. In contrast, distance education was or would be well-designed. Moreover, the unplanned switch from learners’ side was stated by some of the participants too. Some participants’ statements are as shared;

“More preparation can be done to meet the requirements, needs and objectives.”

“This time we had no other choice and we weren’t ready.”

“There was not enough time for preparation both for teachers and institutions.”

“Some of the students do not have the equal opportunities/equipment to join in the lectures during the pandemic. Normally, they would find a device for their classes or find a suitable place for them to follow their classes.”

“...It also highly depends on the circumstances the students have been through. Pandemic conditions were obligatory and we were all caught up unprepared but from now on we would be more used to it.”

4.2.4.2. RQ5. The Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance

The fifth research question was curious about the reasons influencing student attendance to the virtual classes. The participant instructors were asked to formulate an opinion on the factors of student attendance and participation. In total, one hundred and thirty-five participants answered the open-ended question. The question was reflected as: *“What do you think were the factors affecting students’ attendance and participation?”* in the questionnaire. The researcher avoided having a leading statement such as *“Why do you think the attendance rates were low?”* or *“Why do you think learners attended the classes?”* and manipulating participants’ responses. In short, she didn’t predetermine any position towards

the learner attendance rates. As a consequence, some responders provided data about the factors impacting not attending whereas some others discussed the ones enhancing attending to the virtual classes. In total, one hundred and nineteen participants answered the open-ended question. According to the analysis of qualitative data, the majority of the participants claim that the attendance rates were low, and they brainstormed the reasons behind it; however there are some others who came up with the occasions of attending the virtual classes but, a miserable amount of them occurred in the analysis.

In the light of the data, the most frequently emerged themes on the factors affecting students' non-attending to the virtual classes are; motivational factors and no-obligatory attendance. After them, technical problems were echoed too. On the other side, eleven of the participants stated some other reasons such as; the financial problems that made students have to work, that is why they didn't attend the virtual classes; sharing the computer - the electronic devices with other family members; and their home environments which were not suitable for attending the virtual classes.

4.2.4.3. Motivation and Other Psychological Factors as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance

According to the analysis of qualitative data, forty-one of the participants came up with motivation as the non-attending reason. In addition to motivation, other psychological factors for instance; anxiety at being ahead of a camera, pandemic anxiety, and no opportunity for socializing were echoed. Some of the data are as presented;

“not feeling well physiologically.”

“Their bad mood because of the pandemic”

“In my opinion, they lost their motivation since there is almost no controlling mechanism except for their own determination and will. This resulted in a lack of interest for some students.”

“Students were fed up with staying at home and doing the same things every day. This can prevent them attending class regularly, because normally they can do different things to change mood and they come to school as refreshed.”

“Lessons are recorded, they are afraid of making mistakes.”

“hopelessness, being unwilling to study anymore”

“General uncertainty about the future days and fear of catching the illness, losing beloved ones, etc. seriously affected everyone’s motivation for doing anything, as well as students’.”

4.2.4.4. No Obligation for Attendance as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance

The data analysis proves that twenty-nine of the participants consider that voluntary attendance affected student attendance and participation in virtual classes. They claim that students haven’t attended or participated when there is no obligation. As mentioned above, some participants listed the reasons for attending and participating in virtual classes. The analysis made it clear that twenty-eight of the participants who supported that their students attended the classes showed the obligation of attending as the main factor. Here are the samples statements from the participants who claim that no-obligation was the factor of not-attending;

“Attendance was not compulsory. “

“Biggest factor is that they don't fail because of attendance.”

“Some of them were just absent during the lesson although their names appeared on the screen.”

“Because attendance was not mandatory.”

“Attendance not affecting students’ success/grades according to the updated university regulations.”

“Attendance is not taken.”

In the contrary, fifteen participants debated the reasons for attending the classes, and they stated that the students attended the classes because it was compulsory. Here are some responses;

“Class Performance Grades and the possibility of failure due to non-attendance.”

“Absenteeism limit”

“Participation grade”

4.2.4.5. Technology Related Problems as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance

The analysis of qualitative data showed that twenty-six of the participants pointed to technology related problems as the factor affecting student attendance. The participants believe that students didn't attend or participate in the virtual classes due to the lack of equipment, Technological insufficiencies, difficulty in the access to internet connection or poor internet literacy. Some of the responses to the open-ended question are reflected as;

“not having access to a computer/internet connection that meets the minimum requirements”

“not being used to be on screen, poor computer literacy, lack of resources”

“... some of them had technical problems.”

4.2.4.6. Lack of Self-Discipline as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance

The analysis clarified that twelve of the participants believe that the reason behind not-attending or participating in the virtual classes is the lack of students' self-discipline. Furthermore, some of them consider that recorded sections give students the chance of not attending the classes. Some of the responses are as given;

“Our students had the chance to watch the classes which were recorded in case not everyone has the internet connection at the time of sync classes, and there was no attendance pressure on them. That was abused. The possibility to watch the videos afterwards discouraged students from participating in sync classes. Some kept delaying watching the recorded classes and after a while they lost the track. Lack of time management and self-discipline on the side of students made things worse.”

“Laziness, comfort at home and ignorance “

“Sleeping habits”

“...watching the recording instead of joining the actual class.”

“Personality”

4.2.4.7. Ineffective Instruction as Factors Affecting Learner Participation and Attendance

Furthermore, few participants criticized the teaching side for students' not attending the virtual classes. For the teaching side phrase, not targeting anyone in virtual classes, the

mode of delivery of instruction, lack of online material, and the content are meant here. In brief, the situation that we are in caused low attendance to the virtual classes, according to the answers of some participants. The number of them is very little only six of the participants thought that ineffective instruction caused non attending, but the researcher finds them significant to highlight. She believes it is good to reconsider, go beyond them, so they are going to be interpreted in the discussion section. Therefore, these answers to the factors affecting attendance question are given below as;

“Not considering online classes as 'classes'”

“unmotivating tasks”

“They didn’t enjoy virtual classes as interaction was difficult.”

“They participate in the classes when they find the activities enjoyable, interesting and useful.”

The researcher interpreted that the students haven’t participated in the lessons when they haven’t found the activities enjoyable, interesting or useful.”

“They find online classes ineffective to learn a language.”

“The course should meet the students’ interest...”

The researcher concluded from the statement that the participant considers the course failed to meet the students’ interest, and that reflected as low attendance rates.

4.2.4.8. RQ6. The Biggest Difficulty Experienced During Emergency Remote Education

The biggest challenge encountered by instructors during the pandemic was asked as the last research question. In total, one hundred twenty-seven participants answered the question. The mostly emerged themes are students’ attendance- participation and, psychological factors, twenty-nine participants have written about both of these two themes. Following that lack of interaction category has been stated by twenty-eight participants which is quite close to the participation and psychological factors dimensions. Moreover, technology caused problems are stated as the most considerable difficulty by the participants. There are fifteen participants who consider that work-load and their home environment were their biggest challenges during the process.

4.2.4.8.1. Students' Attendance as the Biggest Difficulty

Twenty-nine of the participants pointed the absence of students as the biggest difficulty they have experienced during emergency remote education. They also mentioned their feelings on lack of learner attendance, and how they are psychologically affected by the feeling of being alone during the virtual classes. Here are presented some of the answers;

"Attendance problems, being alone in the session. Feeling like a silly youtuber."

"Online lessons, and the students who are ghosts during the lesson."

"...It was really hard to get a respond from my students, so I felt like I was talking to myself the whole time."

"Having students who were not visible although they were online."

4.2.4.8.2. Motivation and Other Psychological Factors as the Biggest Difficulty

Again, twenty-nine of the participants who answered the open-ended question stressed motivation as the biggest challenge of emergency remote education. The participants include both learners' and their own motivation and the effort they made to motivate their students, as well as the other psychological factors in their responses. Some of the iconic answers are shared as follows;

"Trying to motivate students while I cannot help myself in that sense."

"not feeling like a real teacher."

"Even I or my family members had health problems and I didn't feel well psychologically, I had to continue teaching as if nothing happened."

"Always being concerned about the health and well-being of my relatives and friends."

"building a classroom atmosphere and a sense of belongingness"

4.2.4.8.3. Lack of Interaction as the Biggest Difficulty

The limitation of interaction in emergency remote education was addressed as the biggest difficulty by twenty-eight participants who answered this open-ended question. Some of them claimed that because of the deficiency of interaction they weren't able to monitor their students and their learning process. At the same time, some others felt lonely because of the lack of interaction. Moreover, some evaluated the lack of interaction as the biggest

difficulty since it made the communicative activities difficult to cover. Some of the answers are given below as;

“The biggest difficulty for me was not seeing anyone in front of me while I was teaching. The students preferred not turning on their cameras-except for presentation and speaking exams. Therefore, I did not see their expressions and emotions. In face-to-face teaching, the atmosphere in the classroom tells a lot about how students are feeling and whether they are interested in the material or not. When I could not observe the body language, I felt alone. I dealt with it by always keeping my camera on and looking at myself. At least, this way, I could see a human being while I was trying to teach.”

“doing communicational activities during the lessons.”

“Monitoring students’ progress was very challenging for me.”

“having a rapport with my students and having my class time as effective as in face to face teaching.”

“trying to interact with my students.”

“Not being able to make students work as pairs or groups as they are not voluntary to speak since they know that they were being observed and recorded.”

“Lack of face to face interaction as most of the students don't prefer to switch on their cameras during classes.”

“There is no eye contact”

“Not being able to socialize”

“Not able to understand their emotions because of not turning on their cams.”

4.2.4.8.4. Technology Related Problems as the Biggest Difficulty

Twenty-four of the responders answered the question of the biggest difficulty experienced during the emergency remote education process as the technological problems. They mentioned the problems they have encountered and the ones their students faced. Some answers are presented as seen in the following;

“Students experiencing difficulties with technology”

“Internet speed”

“Quality of connection”

“Technical problems”

“connectivity problems while teaching from home”

“Technophobia”.

The results obtained from the tool have been analysed and shared here. The research questions have been answered. The results have shown that in the first, second, and third research questions, there is no statistically significant difference between state and foundation universities in terms of university, student, and process evaluation of emergency remote education. The data analysis for the fourth research question, the difference between emergency remote education and distance education experiences, has revealed that instructors differentiate emergency and distance education around the themes of; the only choice, psychological factors, and unplanned switch. The fifth research question has sought learner attendance. According to the results, it has seen that the emerged themes have been; psychological factors, no-obligation, technology-related problems, lack of self-discipline, and ineffective instruction. The final research question has asked the biggest challenge experienced during emergency remote education. The results have reported that learner attendance, psychological factors, lack of interaction, and technology-related problems have been the biggest difficulties. These results will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

The chapter outlines the discussion of the experienced sudden switch to virtual education from face to face setting. The results attained through analysis of the research data are summed up, interpreted in this section. The subtitles under the teacher opinion concept; teacher opinion on *learning*, *institution* and *process evaluation* themes obtained from factor analysis which are parallel to the dimensions guided by the literature are discussed within each subheading. This section also presents the drawn conclusion of the study which aims to investigate the ERLT in schools of foreign languages by discussing previous studies on emergency remote education and language education at a distance. After discussing emergency remote education employed during the Covid-19 pandemic, recommendations are suggested for the sake of scientific knowledge which is inexperienced in emergency education due to the novelty of the pandemic. Recommendations are aiming to light up future studies and strengthen emergency education applications, education from a distance which is gaining popularity nowadays as an impact of agenda topic of the globe.

5.2. Discussion & Conclusion

This study seeks an answer to whether there is statistically a significant difference between the emergency remote education views of English language instructors working at foundation and state universities. The research questions purposing to find the answer are as follows;

- Is there a statistically significant difference between state university and foundation university academic staff's views on learner dimension of emergency remote education?
- Is there a statistically significant difference between state university and foundation university academic staff's views on teaching dimension of emergency remote education?

- Is there a statistically significant difference between state university and foundation university academic staff's views on university actions and policies applied during emergency remote education?
- According to the views of academic staff is there a difference between distance teaching during a typical academic semester and emergency remote education?
- What are the factors affecting learners' attendance and participation to the virtual classes according to the views of academic staff?
- What are the difficulties that academic staff working at the state and foundation universities experienced during emergency remote education?

5.2.1. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students

The first emerged factor's interest was if there was a statistically significant difference between foundation and state universities in terms of emergency remote education's interaction with students. This factor reflects the learning and learner angle of emergency remote education. Learners' improvement of language skills and their performances, needs and interests, in short anything related with *while virtual class* are evaluated under this factor. The factor is aligned with the first research question tries to find an answer to it.

5.2.1.1. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students In Terms of University Types

Here, the first research question, if there is a statistically significant difference between state and foundation university instructors' views on the interaction of emergency remote education with students is purposed to be answered. The results of the study made it clear that both institution types similarly experienced the process of Covid-19 when it comes to student perspective. The results of the present study hold that both foundation and state remote instructors are not satisfied with neither learning practices, the improvements of language skills and systems nor meeting with learning outcomes. So, the first research question finds its answer, no because the analysis shows that there are no statistically significant differences between views of state and foundation university instructors on the learner dimension of emergency remote education. The similarity between these institution types result lets the researcher comment on the learners' experience of emergency remote

education. Without the division of institution type, learners were probably not familiar with the autonomy concept. They were able to manage neither emergency remote education nor their learning during the process. Both state and foundation university students weren't able to handle learning since they were never exposed to autonomy before. Also, their previous learning experiences including high-school education can be examined too, maybe as a suggestion for further studies, because the preparatory programme means it is students' first year at the university. When they were high-school students they weren't seen as adults who could take the responsibility. Therefore, the researcher believes that no statistically significant difference between the university types resulted because of the lack of autonomy of the students.

From another angle, both university types had an unanticipated transition to remote education with the breakout of the Corona virus. Unplanned virtual programme could be the point behind the dissatisfying classroom activities, unbalanced practice or acquisition of language skills and systems. The switch was suddenly happened in the middle of the 2019-2020 academic year which started as a face-to face programme for both foundation and state universities. Almost all higher education institutions had to keep using the curriculum which was designed as a whole year package and intended to be applied in a face to face setting. Therefore, none of the university types had a chance to design, test or revise a programme, syllabi that is especially developed for virtual language education. While the nature of language acquisition itself is very in need of purposeful interactional and communicative practices, the virtual environment requires some purposeful interactional and instructional arrangement distinctively so that the learning can take place in a virtual environment. Therefore, the similarity between the viewpoints of instructors from both university types could be the result of being under the same circumstances, unplanned curriculum. Unsurprisingly, some previous studies with no foundation or state institution comparison point to the aligned findings. It is relatable that without institution type division, instructors from both foundation and state institutions have one thing in common, which is instructors' concerns and dissatisfaction about language learners' perceived competencies (Karataş, et.al., 2020; Karakuş, et. al., 2020; Giacosa, et. al., 2021).

5.2.1.2. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students Comparison with Other Factors

The data displayed that the student dimension is the most negatively evaluated theme compared with two other themes. Affirmatively, Bolliger and Wasilik (2009) concluded in their study that instructors underlined “*the learner-related satisfaction*” most among learner, instructor and institutional satisfaction categories by stating their worries about the learning process. Both foundation and state instructors believe their learners’ attendance and participation levels were low. They both are not satisfied with meeting learning objectives, interactional patterns taking place during the classes, technical problems affecting the learning such as internet connection, reflection and use of authentic language and cultural knowledge. In short, everything related to learning is under satisfaction according to the instructors’ opinions. That is why, the reader can conclude that both foundation and the state university remote instructors have concerns about their learners’ perceived learning and improvements according to the results of the present study. When the instructors state their views on; interaction of emergency remote education with universities and evaluation of emergency remote education process, they are more optimistic. When we take into account that the participant instructors involved in this study are experienced teachers, only twenty-four of the participants have been teaching for less than five years; it is normal to see that they were able to handle the process better than their learners.

5.2.1.3. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Students within the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool

Furthermore, as the reader will remember, the items of the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool were examined one by one and the most negatively evaluated items appeared as “*Before Covid-19, I believed that students could perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting.*” (M=2.33) and secondly, “*My online students attended, participated the online classes as much as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.*” (M=2.25). According to these results, it is proper to claim that the instructors’ perceived student participation and learning are the most problematic sides of emergency remote education. These two greatest problems; dissatisfaction with perceived learning, low attendance and participation obstacles are the keys that we all should think about. Every member of the teaching part of education, instructors, and stakeholders should ask why they have lost our audience. Why couldn’t they reach the targeted population? At

that point, the attendance issue can be a threshold. Any effort made for effective language acquisition may become trash due to the lack of attendance; on the other side ineffectiveness of the attempts aiming at language acquisition may trigger not attending the virtual classes. To get out of this dilemma, we need to build a bridge between teaching and learning.

As suggested in the literature, the social presence concept; the sense of being there during the virtual class, socializing via technology can be inspiring for policymakers, designers and instructors. We may start by switching our focus on reaching, and engaging with our learners first, as individuals from solely teaching. Especially in the case of language education, where any kind of conversation we have with our learners is never a waste of time because our ultimate aim is already to have our learners enabled to communicate in whatever form. The teaching dimension is going to be discussed under the evaluation of emergency remote education section. For now, it can be said that apparently, many instructors failed to contact the learners and achieve the *presence* while struggling to teach. This is no one's fault because the education from a distance is a whole system, in which instructors, institutions, organization, and design all function collaboratively. We can draw the conclusion that during emergency remote education, we just taught while nobody was learning. However, teaching always subordinates learning. It is a group of purposeful actions aiming to result in learning. Teaching itself is meaningless without accomplishing the desired learning. In the case of emergency remote education, it is proper to claim that learners got lost rather than using the space as an opportunity of autonomy since they were not autonomous or ready when they witnessed the learning from a distance. Seemingly, they were used to learning in a spoon-feeding style. As Garrison and Baynton (1987) discuss with their control concept, autonomy itself is dangerous without the awareness of what to do with it.

5.2.2. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Universities

The second research question searches an answer how the English preparatory school instructors' opinions were about the strategies that universities used to handle emergency remote education process. The second factor of the study is interested in the university dimension of instructors' examination of emergency remote education applied during the pandemic. This factor questions the universities' policy making as a response to the pandemic, the crisis management, their support systems and the training they have provided to their academic staff.

5.2.2.1. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Universities In Terms of University Types

The second research question interested in whether there is a statistically significant difference between state and foundation university instructors' views on the university dimension. According to the results of the present study there is no statistically significant difference between foundation and state university instructors in the university dimension. The results showed that both university types stayed in touch with their instructors, guided them by the meetings, announcements during the process. The instructors believe they reached the support by their universities when they had a problem. Therefore, it is clear that there is no statistically significant difference between foundation and state university instructors' views on university component of emergency remote education. The result is pleasing, since many participants state lots of difficulties they have encountered as presented in the results section and will be discussed later. At least, the sense of being supported and guided by their institution may help them stay resilient.

5.2.2.2. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with Universities Comparison with Other Factors

According to the results, this dimension was the most positively evaluated pillar among three other dimensions. The participant instructors are pleased with the help and support they have received from the university for which they have been working. Similarly, Akbana et, al. (2021) revealed that English language instructors think they got the support from their institutions although, unfortunately, the same cannot be said for students and their learning. They got enough amount of training provided by the university. However, many lecturers state an opposing view in the available literature and address their need for more training (Altınpulluk, 2021; Lie, Tamah, Gozali, Triwidayati, Utami & Jemadi, 2020). Moreover, in the present study, instructors consider that the university they have worked for determined a proper virtual platform. It is proper to infer that instructors think universities performed well and did their best during emergency remote education.

The optimistic views of instructors on the university factor is promising for future better applications. From instructors' points of view; faculties provided the needed support, training and they had their instructors feel that they are not alone during the challenging process by extension, they can go further and take part in the improvement of the future distance education or emergency remote education applications. In instructors' opinions,

universities performed well, were able to handle the difficulties, in order that they can reflect their success to achieve the perception of successful education. This means they have the potential to increase the desired level of learning from a distance.

5.2.2.3. Interaction of Emergency Remote Education with University within the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool

According to the analysis of questions taking place in the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool, the prominent questions are respectively as;

“Before Covid-19, I believed that students could perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting.”

“My online students attended, participated the online classes as much as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.”

These questions are the ones that have been evaluated most negatively within the tool. They have already been discussed under the interaction of emergency remote education with students factor. The other mostly highlighted questions are in the order of their means as;

“Online teaching helped me to gain new technologic skills.”

“I was able to use the online platform effectively.”

These questions have been the most positively examined questions of the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool. They are the concerns of instructors' self-assessment, and they are going to be a thought on under the evaluation of emergency remote education process factor.

5.2.3. Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education Process

The third factor of the research is instructors' evaluation of the emergency remote education process, in parallel to the third research question. Here, the instructors' views on emergency remote education in general, their preferences regarding the mode of instruction delivery have been consulted. Their own role during the process, their perceptions towards teaching English as a foreign language from a distance have been examined. This factor targets to answer the third research question.

5.2.3.1. Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education Process In Terms of University Types

To come up with an answer to the third research question, the instructors' evaluation of emergency remote education process, the evaluation of emergency remote education process factor has been discussed under this title. The results of the study made it clear that instructors from both institution types have a similar perception towards emergency remote education. According to the results, again, no statistically significant difference was determined between foundation and state university instructors' opinions on the process evaluation. The similarity between their perceptions can be caused by the same conditions they both encountered. The transition to emergency remote education was sudden for both university types and their instructors. Both groups had to follow a curriculum, and apply a programme designed to be used in a face-to-face setting.

Additionally, the role of distance teaching experience has been discussed in the literature as a determiner in the views of lecturers on teaching from a distance (Borg, 2003). In the present study, the demographic characteristics of the instructors revealed that ninety-seven of them hadn't experienced teaching from a distance before the pandemic outbreak. When we take into account that in this study, there are one hundred and thirty-four instructors in total, we can conclude that many of both foundation and state instructors don't have previous distance teaching experience. That can occasion the similar evaluation of emergency remote education.

5.2.3.2. Evaluation of emergency remote education Process Comparison with Other Factors

The dimension, evaluation of the emergency remote education process is evaluated in a more optimistic way when it is compared to the interaction of emergency remote education with the student factor. Whereas, the participant instructors approach it more pessimistically than the interaction of emergency remote education with the university factor. This final factor requires a great deal of self-assessment. For sure, instructors are not the only subject of the issue, yet they are included indirectly when they evaluate the process. To sum, everything evaluation of emergency remote education process factor contains, somehow relates to the instructors' themselves even though, they are not responsible for all the things going on in this factor as they are the implementers of emergency remote education. Perhaps, having an inner evaluation or talking about a topic that closely relates to them are more hesitant than

remarking on others'. Furthermore, their strong beliefs about the other two factors may let them doubt their own side. They strongly believe that the learning outcomes haven't been achieved, although the university they have been working for did its best. What is for the rest is; themselves. However, in the light of the qualitative data collected through the open-ended questions that will be handled in the following sub-titles, and it can be interpreted that instructors consider they have made a great effort to reach out, involve, and teach their learners. Therefore, being too pessimistic about themselves cannot be expected but, it is also normal not to be so proud of the teaching side. In short, the instructors have a neutral disposition towards the evaluation of emergency remote education process factor.

The present study doesn't state any strict position in terms of willingness to continue teaching from a distance or desire to turn back to the face-to-face setting, although the instructors strongly believe that learners' overall performance is better in a face-to-face context, on the contrary to the many studies suggest (Kurnaz & Seçmeli, 2020; Trust & Whalen, 2020; Erarslan, 2021). In many studies however, it has revealed that the instructors prefer to teach in a face-to-face setting (ibid). Again, due to the neutral disposition, the teachability of language skills and systems from a distance cannot come into prominence in the present study, even though this is a glaring and controversial topic in the literature, and many studies have composed that virtual environment is not proper for neither learning nor teaching a foreign language (Kapar & Bhandari, 2020; Altınpulluk, 2021; Korkmaz & Toroman, 2020; M. Dolmacı & A. Dolmacı, 2020; Erarslan, 2021). So, we cannot come up with a sharp statement about the instructors' views on the mode of instruction delivery preferences or teachability of English as a foreign language from a distance.

While the teachability of foreign languages, transferability of interaction from a distance is argumentative, and the instructors of the present study have an objective perspective on teaching and their own teaching action from a distance, using the best of crises, learning and making progress under this condition are logical. When the instructors' approach to teaching during emergency remote education is in between; reflecting neither a complaint aggressively nor complete satisfaction, there is a question bearing in mind: Is it possible that the condition they ended up in emergency remote education resulted from a longstanding problem that they had already had, even in their physical classrooms? As Moore (2019) argues, transactional distance is physiologic. The distance is a matter of understanding; it is on our minds, even if we are physically at school within four walls of a classroom (ibid).

Maybe, what is needed is Dewey's (1946) philosophical trans-action "organism-in-environment-as-a-whole" which inspires the transactional theory. Perhaps, emergency remote education just made the deep-rooted problem more visible and intolerable. Maybe teaching and other aspects of education had already been disconnected from learning. From that line of vision, teaching should be scrutinized as emergency remote education can be a chance of facing the facts to align teaching with learning. Especially when it comes to education from a distance, the teaching part is crucial like the other dimensions; learning, communication, design, management (Moore & Kearsley, 2012). As the distance education concept claims, all components of education make sense when they function together (ibid).

5.2.3.3. Evaluation of Emergency Remote Education Process within the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool

When the questions reflected in the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool were analysed individually by taking their means into account, the results revealed that the most positively evaluated items are as follows;

"Online teaching helped me to gain new technologic skills."

"I was able to use the online platform effectively."

The great news is that the instructors feel comfortable and confident in terms of technology use, and they have gained new professional skills; maybe without emergency remote education experience, they would have never practised technology use that much. Even in the worst scenario, it is pleasing to see a benefit. The strong belief in the development of technology competence and confidence is hopeful and promising for future applications. Even in the face-to-face setting, the instructors may implement and integrate the use of technology into their teaching more than before. Since no one can deny the role of technology in education in whatever mode of instruction delivery. After the pandemic, when instructors go back to the face-to-face mode, apparently, the use of technology will become widespread. Moreover, the instructors' positive beliefs on their own technology use and professional developments during the process are unsurprising results. There are a variety of similar findings pointing instructors who are neither very pleased nor so pessimist about teaching in emergency remote education, in other words; many other studies similarly report that

instructors view emergency remote teaching as a potential opportunity to develop their teaching skills although it is not accepted as the best mode of instruction delivery (Müller, et, al., 2021; Jin et, al., 2021; Potyala et, al., 2021; Nugroho, et, al., 2021; Saidi & Afshari, 2021; Akbana, et, al., 2021).

5.2.4. Open-ended Questions

The open-ended questions purposed to answer the rest of the research questions by gathering freer information about the emergency remote education process from foundation and state university instructors. There were three open-ended questions in the questionnaire in line with the fourth, fifth and sixth research questions. The first one aimed to compare instructors' emergency remote education experience and their previous distance education one if they have and to learn the ideas of those who haven't experienced distance education before about what kind of difference would be. The role of demotivation, and being unprepared have been discussed here. The other two open-ended questions sought the biggest difficulty experienced during emergency remote education and the factors impacting student participation and attendance. According to the analysis of qualitative data, the motivation theme emerged dramatically in the responses to both questions. Again, attendance emerged as a highlighted theme in the biggest difficulty question. In short, especially motivation and attendance themes were seen as highly significant answers in open-ended questions.

5.2.4.1. Difference between Emergency Remote Education and Distance Education

The fourth research question, the academic staffs' views on differences between distance education and emergency remote education, aimed to compare instructors' emergency remote education experience with their previous distance teaching experience. For those who had never taught from a distance before the Covid-19 pandemic, the open-ended question was posed as how different it would be. According to the results, instructors evaluate these two concepts separately. Emergency remote education is the only choice, and psychological factors and unplanned switch themes emerged. The qualitative data showed that the most of the instructors believe emergency remote education is the only choice under the pandemic conditions; however, in a typical academic semester, the distance classes were –

would be elective courses, or a hybrid program was – would be implemented rather than an entirely distant one. The researcher concludes that instructors feel the lack of interaction deeply and need some face-to-face contact. As Keegan (1980) suggests with his distance education definition, distance education includes face-to-face sessions. In contrast, even the limited face-to-face contact wasn't achieved in the emergency context. Moreover, as the Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool analysis reveals, the instructors feel comfortable using technology. Probably, they are not against the virtual environment itself; in a hybrid program, they felt – would feel better.

Besides, motivation and other psychological factors theme occurred while differentiating emergency remote education and distance education. According to the results, the psychological effects of the pandemic differ emergency remote education from distance education. As emergency education literature claims, emergency remote education should take care of individuals' psychological states as well as providing the sustainability of education (Sinclair, 2002). In addition to their teaching role, the content, curriculum, and training should support the educational participants psychologically (ibid.). Seemingly, instructors had a difficulty with motivating their learners and themselves during the process. The challenge of keeping individuals motivated is among the findings of this study, as the biggest difficulty experienced during the process. It is left as a further discussion; however, it is worth mentioning here as well. The researcher interprets that psychological support was needed during the pandemic. The content of the training that instructors received from their institutions hasn't been researched in the present study, yet the researcher concludes that it didn't contain any psychological support. The support shouldn't be limited to technical or academic one. For instructors, psychological support with in-service training, for learners by designing educational content accordingly might help to diminish the negative psychological impacts of the pandemic.

Finally, the instructors mentioned unplanned switch, which is one of the main distinctions between emergency and distance notions. Instructors claimed that being unready was the fundamental difference between emergency remote education and distance education. With the pandemic experience, one can assume that the awareness of different instructional delivery modes has raised. From now on, universities and instructors may switch their focus on emergency and distance teaching practices, the role of autonomy in education, technology use, and technical infrastructure. In short, when instructors compare emergency remote

education and distance education, they state that they would be more prepared in a typical academic year. Moreover, they believe that they would have face-to-face contact with their learners, maybe not always, but at least sometimes. Both they and their students would be less worried and they could motivate themselves to motivate their students.

5.2.4.2. The Factors Affecting Learner Attendance and Participation

The fifth research question asked instructors' opinions on learner attendance. The question figured out the perceived factors of student attendance or non-attendance to the virtual classes. Motivation and other psychological factors, no-obligation, technology, self-discipline and ineffective instruction themes emerged as the answer of the research question. The majority of instructors believe that students didn't attend the virtual classes due to demotivation. The second most frequently emerged theme is no-compulsory attendance but, the researcher believes that these two themes can be examined together since, no-compulsory attendance could also be demotivating.

Motivation, attendance and participation troubles can be considered a loop, feeding each other. Attendance was not an obligation in some universities during the 2020-2021 academic year, which can be the motive behind not attending the classes during the pandemic as many participants discuss. In parallel to the present study, Altınpulluk (2021) gave a place to the non-obligatory of attendance on learners' low attendance in his study. Many instructors have come up with that student haven't attended the virtual classes because they don't fail due to absenteeism. Universities in Turkey have obligated the attendance issue locally in the 2020-2021 academic year. While some implemented compulsory attendance, others have decided the other way round. No-compulsory attendance is a student-friendly application for those with financial problems or no access to technology. The decision sounds fair to protect the disadvantaged students, especially within the state university context which delivers the instruction free. However, it is abusable, or at least, it can be a motive for demotivation. Attendance obligation itself is a very strong tool to keep the sense of discipline of which deficiency has been shown by some instructors as the reason for not attending the virtual classes. On the other side, the instructors who have listed the factors of attending the classes address the obligatory attendance and participation grades. This result is not surprising and obviously arouses a curiosity; which universities participated in this study applied compulsory

attendance? The ones that have regulated compulsory attendance are the foundation institutions or the state ones. Unfortunately, they all remained a mystery because the data were gathered anonymously and the names of the universities were asked as an optional question. However, in Turkey, which is a developing country, compulsory attendance might be harsh, but it is observable that we need some binding rules where the students are not autonomous enough to establish their own.

From another perspective, the quantitative data of this study supported that both learners and instructors were anxious about their own and beloved ones' state of health. Everyone experienced the psychological influences of pandemic negatively during emergency remote education. We can draw another conclusion from the data, even though the motivational factors haven't been examined in the present study because they are not in the scope of it. This is because lack of learner motivation or pandemic anxiety might trigger not to attend, in addition to no obligation for attendance. Possibly, as a consequence of both or either, for whatever reason, learners' low attendance has come up frequently in emergency remote education literature, similarly to the present study's results (G. Cantürk & A. Cantürk, 2021; Müller, et. al, 2021; Kurnaz & Serçemeli, 2020; Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020; Korkmaz & Toroman, 2020; M. Dolmacı & A. Dolmacı, 2020).

When the themes emerged are summarised, the researcher has drawn a conclusion. The instructors tried hard, even when they lost their hopes. They struggled to convince their students to participate in the virtual classes. In return, they weren't able to reap the benefit of it. They strived to keep both themselves and their students motivated. In other words, the researcher understands that the instructors got tired of these useless efforts.

Speaking of uselessness, few participants discuss the ineffectiveness and unattractiveness of instruction as a factor of students' nonattendance. The appearance frequency of that perspective is under being statistically significant among the other data. However, the researcher finds it thought-provoking, and has some words on it. While "*Do the teaching component have to be fun, or is not enjoying the virtual classes an excuse for not attending them?*" questions that bear in the researcher's mind are debatable, it is still worth noting them down here. Especially in andragogy, where it is expected that learners may have instrumental motivation, which means having pragmatic reasons to acquire a foreign language, for instance; language acquisition as a career goal; where students are supposed to have a longer attention span and a sense of responsibility, do instructors really have to force

them for their good? Yet, in the researcher's humble opinion, at this point, when they don't have any motivation, instructors have the power of providing extrinsic one. Therefore, even if instructors are demotivated show must go on. Instructors need to make sure that they did their bests, particularly under such conditions, where everybody is going through a challenging process and remember that they have great potential to make learning more attractive. However, students' perceptions of the ineffectiveness and uselessness of instruction are teaching's mistake. Instructors, and institutions need to take the blame here, even though they are not responsible for students' entertainment. At least, it is the teaching side's duty to convince the learners the usefulness and effectiveness of the instruction. Alternatively, perhaps, even the instructors don't believe it wholeheartedly. Maybe they need to be convinced of the usefulness of teaching from a distance.

While emergency remote education is a separate concept from distance education, as mentioned previously, many universities taking place in Turkey were not familiar with even the distance education culture. As a result, it is better to kick around the ineffectiveness of virtual instruction here. It might also be a factor on learners' perceived unpleasing language development. Alhawsawi and Jawhar (2021) mentioned the instructors' opposing views on the effectiveness of their virtual instruction. In the Turkey context, Erarslan (2021) showed with his meta-analysis work that remote English language instructors don't consider that the learning outcomes have been met. In other respects, low attendance to the classes itself is enough for dissatisfaction of learners' language competencies. Even the most ideally effective instruction is pointless when there is no learner around to acquire it. In contrast to the present study's findings, some other previous studies revealed that there are some instructors who consider that emergency remote education helps both learner participation and their language competencies, although the number of them is relatively fewer than the negative evaluation in the available literature (Saidi & Afshari, 2021; Zhang, 2020).

5.2.4.3. The Biggest Difficulty Experienced During Emergency Remote Education

The sixth research question purposed to reveal the enormous difficulty instructors encountered during emergency remote education. Attendance theme became the most dramatically emerged one, as well as being discussed under its own research question. Next,

again, motivation and other psychological factors, lack of interaction and technology themes occurred. As previously discussed, the researcher concludes that attendance and demotivation themes were the main source of problems. They affected each other and appeared in other research questions in short, all through the emergency remote education process.

Technology-related problems, as well as interaction, have come into prominence. The drawback of limited interaction in emergency remote education has already been overviewed in literature (Kurnaz & Seçmeli, 2020; Korkmaz & Toroman, 2020; Gao & Zhang, 2020; Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020; Christoforou, 2021). These drawbacks are undeniable, but pushing the limits is possible to achieve the maximum benefit. Even though we cannot have physical contact, the interaction in a virtual class can be maximized. The instructors have examined the interaction from their own and learners' perspectives, but the researcher believes that institutions are responsible for the virtual interaction. Instructors alone can only adapt the curriculum more interactively. They cannot go in a totally separate direction by ruining the unity within the institution. Therefore, it is mainly universities' responsibility to adapt their programme, curriculum to emergency remote education in a more interactive way. They ought to be the ones who lead instructors and encourage them to have interactive remote practices. On the other side, we can go further to the student perspective from that point. The more interactive virtual classes students have, the more motivation they have in order to learn. That can be the solution to previously argued attendance trouble too. As the researcher has already claimed, attendance and motivation themes should be seen as conjoined twins. When the instruction is more interactive, as much as being more effective, it will be more motivating. The next step will be the virtual classes where the students attend, participate, and finally learn. In short, interaction may head the sequence, and can be the key that opens all the giant gates that we think will stay locked forever.

When we come to the technology-related setbacks as the biggest difficulty, instructors mentioned technical problems that both their students and themselves have experienced during the virtual classes. The results made it clear that the great number of instructors agree that the technical problems have negatively affected the remote lessons. The qualitative data gathered from the technology-related problems as the biggest difficulty varies; some of them approach the technical problems as students' problems while others reflect the instructors' own challenges. Some responses are not detailed enough to figure out whether these technical problems are caused by the individual's quality of connectivity or by the universities'

technical infrastructure as it is an open-ended question. Neither individuals nor universities were prepared for the pandemic, and technology has become one of the obstacles in emergency remote education, according to the analysis of the qualitative data. Likewise, the literature has touched on the connection problems, poor video, and audio quality (Güngör et, al., 2020; Hazaea, et, al., 2021; Moser et, al., 2021; Korkmaz & Toraman, 2020). Erarslan (2021) revealed that the use and access to educational technology pose a challenge in delivering effective English virtual courses. Generally speaking, universities have nothing to do with the individual students' or instructors' access to the internet from their houses or the electronic devices in Turkey, especially for state universities. However, ideally, institutions should be the providers of technology as education is a fundamental right and should be accessible for everyone. Nevertheless, it can be forecasted that although foundation universities have more financial resources to strengthen their technical infrastructure, both institution types will work on technology more than they have ever done before.

5.3. Pedagogical Implementations and Suggestions For Future Research

The present study purposed to look at emergency remote education in the context of English language education carried out in the schools of foreign languages of universities. It reflected, examined and came up with some comments on the experience of emergency remote education. For the sake of the language education field, some humble suggestions are offered here. Some enquiries which are not in the scope of the study remained as still a concern for future research due to the limitations presented for future research.

5.3.1. Pedagogical Implementations

The present study revealed that both foundation and state university English language instructors think that emergency remote education improved their technology competence, and were comfortable about using technology during the process. Also, it was found out that the instructors don't believe that learners have had an effective learning experience during the process. In accordance with these very brief results, one can foresee that the integration of technology into educational practices will be more innovative and creative. When we take into account the fact that emergency remote education has increased the use of technology in education, it has switched the focus on different modes of delivering the instruction; it is better to adapt to *new normal* as early as possible within the educational context. Obviously,

even when the emergency has been overcome, its influences will go on recreating a new pedagogical understating. As argued before, teaching itself is not enough for the occurrence of learning. One of the study's most significant findings is that emergency remote education process hasn't achieved effective learning. Maximizing the benefits of whatever we have learnt from the crises, staying up to date may serve for better, more qualified educational practices, reasonable instructional outcomes and may bring a variety to the learning opportunities. As instructors, policymakers, educational designers, stakeholders, we all need to do our parts.

- When instructors return to the physical classrooms, they should reconsider the control concept. They ought to prepare themselves and their learners gradually for the ongoing changes not to battle alone again. In short, they are supposed to teach the culture of learning so that learners do what they are supposed to do; learning as much as instructors who meet the teaching requirements. Autonomy; taking the responsibility of learning and teaching actions, and control over them takes time, but it is always achievable.
- Teaching dimension that has great potential to make *learning* more attractive should be worked on. All the aspects of teaching should be planned, designed well by consulting the professionals' views. Literature enlightens the inspiring distance or emergency educational practices.
- Interactional patterns, teaching practices from a distance differ from the face-to-face applications. The different nature of the virtual and face-to face modes of instructional delivery should be considered. They require their unique applications. When all steps are appropriately examined, planned, tested and redesigned, learning will be affected automatically in a good way.
- Universities should get equipped with technology, make appropriate policies and prevent such crises. Emergency remote education and different modes of instructional deliveries need to be valued. Research and development policies are crucial, so financial resources should be devoted to them.
- The instructors' technology literacy and competencies, the way they integrate technology into their teaching, and their professional developments in terms of distance teaching competencies and flexibility in the modes of delivering teaching

should be strengthened with pre and in-service training, by faculty of educational sciences both for current and future teachers.

5.3.2. Suggestions For Future Research

Some suggestions for further research by presenting the limitations and objectives of the present study might be put forward as follows;

- The study only consulted the opinions of instructors. Further studies can go over the learners' and administrators' views and come up with comparisons among them.
- The testing and evaluation component of emergency remote education was not within the scope of the study. Viewing the opinions on it can be researched to have a broader perspective while reflecting emergency remote education process.
- The study inherently was not interest in having an experiment, offering any claim. The perceived performances, competencies asserted in the study can be tested in future studies.
- The present study adapted the quantitative research method. Future studies can obtain a diversity of the data with the mixed research method.
- The similar research questions and themes of inquiry can be revised by including more participants since one of the limitations of the present study is the limited number of participants who take part in the study.

REFERENCES

- Adiyaman, Z. (2002). Uzaktan eğitim yoluyla yabancı dil öğretimi. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 1(1), 92-97.
- Akbana, Y. E., Rathert, S., & Agcam, R. (2021). Emergency remote education in foreign and second language teaching. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 97-124. <https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.865344>
- Alhawsawi, S., & Jawhar, S. S. (2021). Negotiating pedagogical positions in higher education during Covid-19 pandemic: teacher's narratives. *Heliyon*, 7(6), e07158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07158>
- Altınpulluk, H. (2021). Türkiye'deki öğretim üyelerinin Covid-19 küresel salgın sürecindeki uzaktan eğitim uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 41(1), 53-89.
- Anderson, B., & Simpson, M. (2012). History and heritage in distance education. *Journal of Open, Flexible, and Distance Learning*, 16(2), 1-10.
- Anderson, T., & Dron, J. (2011). Three generations of distance education pedagogy. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 12(3), 80-97. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v12i3.890>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v13i1.49-76>
- Barış, M. F., & Çankaya, P. (2016). Opinions of academic staff about distance education Akademik personelin uzaktan eğitim hakkındaki görüşleri. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(1), 399. <https://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v13i1.3378>
- BBC News. (2020, March 20). UK PM Boris Johnson announces closure of pub, bars and restaurants [Video]. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/av/uk-51980664>
- BBC News. (2021, September 10). Covid: Will I need a job and what will university be like this term? Retrieved January 10, 2022, from <https://www.bbc.com/news/explainers-52753913>
- Beaudoin, M. (2018). United States of America. In A. Qayyum & O. Zawacki-Richter (Eds.), *Open and Distance Education in Australia, Europe and the Americas* (pp. 103-116). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0298-5_12

- Bolliger, D. U., & Wasilik, O. (2009). Factors influencing faculty satisfaction with online teaching and learning in higher education. *Distance Education*, 30(1), 103–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910902845949>
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81–109. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903>
- Bozkurt, A. (2020). Koronavirüs (Covid - 19) pandemi süreci ve pandemi sonrası dünyada eğitime yönelik değerlendirmeler : Yeni normal ve yeni eğitim paradigması. *Açıköğretim Uygulamaları ve Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(3), 112–142.
- Brereton, P. (2020). Emergency Remote Training: Guiding and Supporting Teachers in Preparation for Emergency Remote Teaching. *ICU*, 35, 1–13.
- Broady-Ortmann, C. (2002). Teachers' perceptions of a professional development distance learning course. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 35(1), 107–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2002.10782373>
- 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 (CALESS)*, 3(1), 1–38.
- Chand, V. S., Joshi, S., & Dabhi, R. (2004). 'Emergency education': The missing dimension in education policy. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 2(3), 223–235. <https://doi.org/10.1023/b:erpp.0000034507.09754.f6>
- Chiatoh, B. A., & Chia, J. (2020). The Covid-19 pandemic and the challenge of teaching English online in higher institutions of learning in Cameroon. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 2(5), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2020.2.5.4>
- Christoforou, M. (2021). *Language teaching through the “black screen”: Implications of an emergency remote teaching context in higher education*. 2603–2610. <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2021.0566>
- Crawford, J., Butler Henderson, K., Rudolph, J., Malkawi, B., Glowatz, M., Magni, P. A., & Lam, S. (2020). Covid-19: 20 countries' higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 3(1). <http://journals.sfu.ca/jalt/index.php/jalt/index>

- Dewey, J., & Bentley, A. F. (1946). Interaction and transaction. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 43(19), 505–517.
- Dib, C. Z. (1988). Formal, non-formal and informal education: Concepts/applicability. *Interamerican Conference on Physics Education*, 300–315.
- Dolmacı, M., & Dolmacı, A. (2020). The views of lecturers in foreign language teaching via synchronous distance education: A Covid19 case. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 18(2), 707–734.
- Dooley, K. E., & Murphey, T. P. (2000). How the perspectives of administrators, faculty, and support units impact the rate of distance education adoption. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 3(4).
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Qualitative, quantitative, and mix methods research. In *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 24–47). Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Quantitative data analysis. In *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 197–230). Oxford University Press.
- Drumm, L. (2019). Folk pedagogies and pseudo-theories: How lecturers rationalise their digital teaching. *Research in Learning Technology*, 27, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.25304/rlt.v27.2094>
- Duffy, T. M., & Kirkley, J. R. (2004). Introduction: Theory and practice in distance education. In T. M. Duffy & J. R. Kirkley (Eds.), *Learner-Centered Theory and Practice in Distance Education: Cases from higher education* (pp. 3–16). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Education and Skills Funding Agency. (2020, May). *ESFA funded adult education budget (AEB): Funding and performance management rules 2020 to 2021* (Version 3-August 2020). https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/977854/ESFA_funded_adult_education_budget__AEB__funding_and_performance_rules_2020_to_2021.pdf
- 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*. <https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.907757>
- Gao, L. X., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Teacher learning in difficult times: Examining foreign language teachers' cognitions about online teaching to tide over Covid-19. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.549653>

- Garrison, D., & Archer, W. (2000). *Transactional Perspective on Teaching and Learning: A Framework for Adult and Higher Education*. Pergamon Press.
- Garrison, D. R. (1985). Three generations of technological innovations in distance education. *Distance Education*, 6(2), 235–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158791850060208>
- Garrison, D. R., & Baynton, M. (1987). Beyond independence in distance education: The concept of control. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 1(3), 3–15.
- Garrison, R. (2000). Theoretical challenges for distance education in the 21st century : A shift from structural to transactional issues. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 1(1), 1–17.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). Introduction to Educational Research. In *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (10th ed., pp. 3–60). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). Survey Research. In *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (10th ed., pp. 183–202). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Geray, C. (2007). A case: The place of Fono correspondence institute in distance education in Turkey. *International Journal of Educational Policies*, 1(1), 33-62.
- Giacosa, A., Salusso, D., & Zaccone, M. C. (2021, April). *Using OERS in emergency distance language learning: A case study*. MOOCs, Language learning and Mobility: design, integration, reuse, Italy. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03216427/>
- Gunawardena, C. N. (1995). Social presence theory and implications for interaction and collaborative learning in computer conferences. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 1(2/3), 147–166.
- Gunawardena, C. N., & McIsaac, M. S. (2008). Distance education. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology* (2nd ed., pp. 355–395). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Gunawardena, C. N., & Zittle, F. J. (1997). Social presence as a predictor of satisfaction within a computer-mediated conferencing environment. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 11(3), 8–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923649709526970>
- Güngör, H., Çangal, Ö. ve Demir, T. (2020). The views of learners and instructors as to distant teaching Turkish as a foreign language. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40(3), 1163-1191.

- Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2005). 'Distance education' and 'e-learning': Not the same thing. *Higher Education*, 49(4), 467–493. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-0040-0>
- Gürer, M. D., Tekinarslan, E., & Yavuzalp, N. (2016). Çevrimiçi ders veren öğretim elemanlarının uzaktan eğitim hakkındaki görüşleri. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.17569/tojq.74876>
- Harris, D. A., & Krougrill, C. (2008). Distance education: New technologies and new directions. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 96(6), 917–930. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2008.921612>
- Hartel, R. W., & Foegeding, E. A. (2006). Learning: Objectives, Competencies, or Outcomes? *Journal of Food Science Education*, 3(4), 69–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-4329.2004.tb00047.x>
- Harting, K., & Erthal, M. (2005). History of distance Learning. *Information Technology, Learning and Performance Journal*, 23(1), 35–44. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/219815808/fulltextPDF?accountid=7287>
- Hazaea, A. N., Bin-Hady, W. R. A., & Toujani, M. M. (2021). Emergency remote English language teaching in the Arab league countries: Challenges and remedies. *Call-Ej*, 22(1), 201–222.
- Herring, S. C. (1996). Introduction. In *Computer-Mediated Communication: Linguistic, Social and Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (pp. 1-12). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). Remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*, 1–15.
- Holmberg, B. (1995). The evolution of the character and practice of distance education. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 10(2), 47-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268051950100207>
- Holmberg, B. (1995). *Theory and Practice of Distance Education* (2nd (ed.)). Routledge.
- Holmberg, B. (1997). Distance-education theory again. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 12(1), 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268051970120105>
- Holmberg, B. (1999). The conversational approach to distance education. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 14(3), 58–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268051990140309>

- Jayatilleke, B. G., & Kulasekara, G. U. (2019). Correspondence to intelligent flexible learning model: Challenges and implications at the open university of Sri Lanka. *E-Proceedings of the International Conference on Distance Learning*, 46–54.
- Jin, L., Xu, Y., Deifell, E., & Angus, K. (2021). Emergency Remote Language Teaching and U.S.-Based College-Level World Language Educators' Intention to Adopt Online Teaching in Postpandemic Times. *The Modern Language Journal*, 105(2), 412–434. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12712>
- Kapar, H., & Bhandari, L. P. (2020). Teaching English during Covid-19: Nepalese teachers' voices. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 2(5), 76–81. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2020.2.5.8>
- Karakuş, N., Ucuzsatar, N., Karacaoğlu, M. Ö., Esendemir, N., & Bayraktar, D. (2020). Türkçe öğretmenleri adaylarının uzaktan eğitime yönelik görüşleri. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 220–241. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.752297>
- Karataş, T. Ö., & Tuncer, H. (2020). Sustaining language skills development of pre-service EFL teachers despite the Covid-19 interruption: A case of emergency distance education. *Sustainability*, 12(19), 8188. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12198188>
- Keegan, D. (2000). Theory of transactional distance: Micheal G. Moore. *Theoretical Principles of Distance Education* (2nd ed., pp. 22-38). Routledge.
- King, F., Young, M., Drivere-Richmond, K., & Schrader, P. (2001). Defining distance learning and distance education. *Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education*, 9(1).
- King, J., Nugent, G., Russell, E., & Lacy, D. (1999). Distance education policy in post-secondary education: Nebraska as a case study. *15th Annual Conference on Distance Teaching & Learning*, 275–281.
- Korkmaz, G., & Toraman, Ç. (2020). Are we ready for the post Covid-19 educational practice? An investigation into what educators think as to online learning. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 4(4), 293–309. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijtes.v4i4.110>
- Kurnaz, E. & Serçemeli, M. (2020). Covid-19 Pandemi Döneminde Akademisyenlerin Uzaktan Eğitim ve Muhasebe Eğitimine Yönelik Bakış Açıları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *USBAD Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Akademi Dergisi* 2(3), 262-288.

- Lau, J., Yang, B., & Dasgupta, R. (2020). *Will the corona-virus make online education go viral?* The World University Rankings.
<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/will-coronavirus-make-online-education-go-viral>
- Lauzon, A. C., & Moore, G. A. B. (1989). A Fourth Generation Distance Education System: Integrating Computer-Assisted Learning And Computer Conferencing. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 3(1), 38–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08923648909526649>
- Lie, A., Mina Tamah, S., Gozali, I., Retno Triwidayati, K., Sari Diah Utami, T., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4626>
- Mishra, L., Gupta, T., & Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 1, 100012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100012>
- Moore, J. L., Dickson-Deane, C., & Galyen, K. (2011). E-Learning, online learning, and distance learning environments: Are they the same? *Internet and Higher Education*, 14(2), 129–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.10.001>
- Moore, M. G. (1991). Editorial: Distance education theory. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 5(3), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923649109526758>
- Moore, M. G. (2019). The theory of transactional distance. In M. G. Moore & W. Diehl (Eds.), *Handbook Of Distance Education* (4th ed., pp. 32–46). Routledge.
- Moore, M., & Kearsley, G. (2012). Basic concepts. In *Distance education: A system view of online learning* (3rd ed., pp. 1–22). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Moser, K. M., Wei, T., & Brenner, D. (2021). Remote teaching during Covid-19: Implications from a national survey of language educators. *System*, 97, 102431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102431>
- Munteanu, S. C. (2021). The Good, the Bad and the Ugly of Emergency Online Language Teaching at University. *Intertext*, 1/2 (57/58), 208–213. <https://doi.org/10.54481/intertext.2021.1.24>

- Murphy, L. M., Shelley, M. A., White, C. J., & Baumann, U. (2011). Tutor and student perceptions of what makes an effective distance language teacher. *Distance Education*, 32(3), 397–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2011.610290>
- Müller, A. M., Goh, C., Lim, L. Z., & Gao, X. (2021). Covid-19 Emergency eLearning and Beyond: Experiences and Perspectives of University Educators. *Education Sciences*, 11(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11010019>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v5i1.3258>
- Ozgol, M., Sarikaya, I., & Ozturk, M. (2017). Students' and teaching staff's assessments regarding distance education applications in formal education. *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, 7(2), 294. <https://doi.org/10.5961/jhes.2017.208>
- Ozkul, A. E. (2001). Anadolu University distance education system from emergence to 21st century. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 2(1), 15–31. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.15455>
- Peters, O. (2020). Distance teaching and industrial production: A comparative interpretation in outline. In D. Sewart, D. Keegan, & B. Holmberg (Eds.), *Distance Education: International Perspectives* (1st ed., pp. 95–113). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003033950>
- Phillips, R., & Merisotis, J. (1999). *What is the difference? A review of contemporary research on the effectiveness of distance learning in higher education*.
- Potyrała, K., Demeshkant, N., Czerwec, K., Jancarz-Lanczkowska, B., & Tomczyk, Ł. (2021). Head teachers' opinions on the future of school education conditioned by emergency remote teaching. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(6), 7451–7475. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10600-5>
- Rumble, G. (1989). Concept: On defining distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 3(2), 8–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923648909526660>
- Ruzgar, N. S. (2004). Distance Education in Turkey. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 5(2), 22–32. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-60566-198-8.ch095>
- Saidi, M., & Afshari, M. (2021). Computer-assisted language learning in English for academic purposes courses: Eliciting the instructors' perspectives within the Covid-19 pandemic period. *FUTURE of MEDICAL EDUCATION JOURNAL*, 11(1), 13–17.

- Salaberry, M. R. (2000). Pedagogical design of computer mediated communication tasks: Learning objectives and technological capabilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 28–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00050>
- Saykılı, A. (2018). Distance education: Definitions, generations, key concepts and future directions. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 5(1), 2-17.
- Schifter, C. (2002). Perception differences about participating in distance education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 5(1).
- Shelley, M. A. (2000). Distance education. In M. S. Byram (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. (pp. 183-187). Routledge.
- Sinclair, M. (2002). What is ‘emergency education’? In *Planning Education in and After Emergencies* (pp. 21–23). the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Streiner, D. L. (2003). Starting at the beginning: An introduction to coefficient alpha and internal consistency. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 80(1), 99–103. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327752JPA8001_18
- Taylor, J. (2001). Fifth generation distance education. *Instructional Science and Technology*, 4(1), 1–14.
- Taylor, J. C. (1995). Distance education technologies : The fourth generation. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 11(2), 1–7.
- Telli Yamamoto, G., & Altun, D. (2020). Coronavirus and the rising of online education. *Journal of University Research*, 3(1), 25–34. <https://doi.org/10.26701/uad.711110>
- Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 28(2), 189–199.
- Tsai, S., & Machado, P. (2002). E-learning basics: essay: E-learning, online learning, web-based learning, or distance learning: unveiling the ambiguity in current terminology. *ELearn Magazine*, 2002(7), 3.
- Tu, C.-H., & McIsaac, M. (2002). The relationship of social presence and interaction in online classes. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 16(3), 131–150. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15389286AJDE1603_2
- World Health Organization. (2022, February 18). *WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) dashboard*. Retrieved February 18, 2022, from

<https://covid19.who.int/>

- Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı. (2016, March). *Yükseköğretim kurumlarında yabancı dil öğretimi ve yabancı dille öğretim yapılmasında uygulanacak esaslara ilişkin yönetmelik* [Regulation on the principles to be applied in foreign language teaching and teaching in a foreign language in higher education institutions] (No. 29662). Official Newspaper. <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2016/03/20160323-6.htm>
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı. (2020a, March 13). *YÖK Koronavirüs (Covid-19) bilgilendirme notu-1* [Council of Higher Education Coronavirus (Covid-19) information note-1]. [Press release]. https://www.yok.gov.tr/Sayfalar/Haberler/2020/coronavirus_bilgilendirme_1.aspx
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı. (2020b, March 18). *YÖK üniversitelerde uygulanacak uzaktan eğitime ilişkin açıklama* [Council of Higher Education statement on distance education to be applied in universities]. [Press release]. <https://www.yok.gov.tr/Sayfalar/Haberler/2020/universitelerde-uygulanacak-uzaktan-egitime-iliskin-aciklama.aspx>
- Zhang, C. (2020). From face-to-face to screen-to-screen: CFL teachers' beliefs about digital teaching competence during the pandemic. *International Journal of Chinese Language Teaching*, 1(1), 35–52. <https://doi.org/10.46451/ijclt.2020.06.03>

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Ideas of Tertiary Instructors on Emergency Remote Education during Covid-19 Pandemic

12.01.2022 15:46

Ideas of Tertiary Instructors on Emergency Remote Education during Covid-19 Pandemic

Ideas of Tertiary Instructors on Emergency Remote Education during Covid-19 Pandemic

You are invited to participate in a research conducted by English Language Teacher Education Department MA student İzlem PAYDAŞ from Akdeniz University. This survey and MA thesis are supervised by Ph.D. Özlem SAKA. This study will attempt to explore online English language education in school of foreign languages during the Covid-19 pandemic process. Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary. There is no right or wrong answer in the survey. You are expected to choose options that best reflect your opinion. The survey results will be analysed for MA thesis. Your personal data will only be used by the researcher for research purposes and will be kept private and confidential.

I sincerely thank you for your kind cooperation and contribution. You can contact for your questions, comments.



(paylaşılmıyor) [Hesap değiştir](#)



* Gerekli

Consent *



I have read and understood the provided information. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

SECTION 1

Demographic and Contextual Factors

Age *

Yanıtınız



<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSNajz8iNXW5EJuD-jsmf9nBEALRygiirYQIRUJlch8YU66Dg/viewform>

1/20

Native Language *

Yanıtınız

Years of teaching experience *

Yanıtınız

Working for a ... university. *

☐ Private

☐ Public

The university you have been working for

Yanıtınız

Have you ever taught a class online before COVID-19? *

☐ Yes, fully online

☐ Yes, hybrid

☐ No

SECTION 2

This section of the survey will explore your opinion of online language education, actions taken by the university you have been working for, your students' performances, and your professional experiences.



1. Before Covid-19, I believed that students could perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

2. Online education is a suitable learning environment for learning & teaching English language. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

3. Online education offers more varied activity types, materials and learning opportunities. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree



4. I was able to adapt online teaching easily. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

5. I would be interested in teaching online again in the future. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

6. Online teaching helped me to gain new pedagogic skills. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree



7. Online teaching helped me to gain new technologic skills. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

8. I used different teaching strategies, approaches, activity types during Covid-19 process because of the different nature of online setting. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

9. I had a more tolerant, flexible approach, style towards my students than I had before Covid-19. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree



10. The university I have been working for provided sufficient orientations – seminars – workshops on online education (how to use the online platform etc.) *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

11. The university was able to shift online education effectively and smoothly. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

12. The university made proper decisions related with online education on time. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



13. The university supported the instructors frequently. (keeping in touch, informing, leading with announcements, schedules, rubrics, online meetings, etc.) *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

14. When I had a problem during the process, I was able to receive support from the university easily. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

15. The instructors were expected to use the same face to face curriculum, materials, teaching objectives in online education *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



16. The university provided flexibility to the instructors during online education (deciding on class hours, pacing, using extra materials, etc.) *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

17. Each instructor moved uniquely, less standardized - centralized across the university during the online education than they did in the face-to-face setting. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

18. The university expected the instructors to change the teaching objectives, prepare different or modified curriculum, materials special for online education. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

19. The online platform, learning management system or video conferencing tool (Zoom, Teams, Sakai, Google Meet etc.) determined by the university was an appropriate choice. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

20. The online platform was easy for me to use. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

21. I was able to use the online platform effectively. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



22. The technical problems (video –audio- voice quality of online classes, connection, difficulties in uploading digital materials etc.) affected the flow of lessons negatively. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

23. My online course had measurable, appropriate objectives. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

24. The offered online course content was qualified. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



25. My online course met the students' individual interests. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

26. My online course met the students' existing needs related with English. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

27. My online course included equal amount of activities suitable for pair, group and individual work. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



28. My online course included authentic examples of language and / or culture. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

29. My online course included opportunities for students to interact with me as the instructor. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

30. My online course included opportunities for students to interact with one another. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



31. My online course gave the students the opportunity to use and reflect their language knowledge. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

32. My online course was more learner-centered than my face-to-face classes. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

33. Under the special condition, catching up with the curriculum became more important than doing sufficient amount of practice. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



34. I reached out to students frequently (3-5 times per week) through email and / or announcements. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

35. The students' improvement of English speaking skills was satisfactory. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

36. The students' improvement of English listening skills was satisfactory. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



37. The students' improvement of English reading skills was satisfactory. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

38. The students' improvement of English writing skills was satisfactory *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

39. The students' improvement of English grammar was satisfactory *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



40. The students' improvement of English vocabulary was satisfactory *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

41. My online students' overall performances were as satisfactory as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

42. I was pleased with the communication, rapport and interaction I had with my online students as much as I had in the face-to-face setting.

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



43. My online students attended, participated the online classes as much as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

44. The reading, writing, listening, speaking skills and vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation language systems were well balanced in my online course. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree



45. Rate each language skill and system given below according to their practice frequency in the online program. *

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Speaking	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Listening	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Reading	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Writing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Grammar	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Vocabulary	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Pronunciation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

46. a) Teaching online during COVID-19 is / would likely be different than online teaching during a typical academic semester. *

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

46. b) Why?

Yanıtınız

47. What do you think were the factors affecting students' attendance and participation? *

Yanıtınız

48. The biggest difficulty I experienced during Covid-19 was ... *

Yanıtınız

49. I also experienced difficulties like; *

- ☐ Decline in learners' participation, attendance
- ☐ Technical- technological challenges
- ☐ Increase in work-load
- ☐ Time-consumingness
- ☐ Access to internet – computer
- ☐ Instructor's dissatisfaction of learning even when learners attend
- ☐ Diğer:



50. Which tools did you use during the online teaching *

- ☐ Discussion forum
- ☐ Asynchronous class
- ☐ Synchronous class
- ☐ Video record (prepared before Covid-19)
- ☐ Video record (prepared during Covid-19)
- ☐ Reading Passage
- ☐ Power Point Presentation (prepared before Covid-19)
- ☐ Power Point Presentation (prepared during Covid-19)
- ☐ Essay
- ☐ Announcement
- ☐ Web Page
- ☐ Self- prepared Document, Materials
- ☐ Diğer:

Is there anything else you want to share related to online education during Covid-19 ?

Yantınız

Gönder

Formu temizle

Google Formlar

Appendix B. Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Tool

Section 1. Demographic Information

Demographic and Contextual Factors

*Age?

*Native Language

*Years of Teaching Experience

*Working for a ... university

-Foundation

-State

*The university you have been working for

*Have you ever taught a class online before COVID-19?

-Yes, fully online

-Yes, hybrid

-No

Section 2.

This section of the survey will explore your opinion of online language education, actions taken by the university you have been working for, your students' performances, and your professional experiences.

1.The technical problems (video –audio- voice quality of online classes, connection, difficulties in uploading digital materials etc.) affected the flow of lessons negatively.

-Strongly disagree

- Disagree

- Neutral

-Agree

-Strongly agree

2. My online course had measurable, appropriate objectives

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

3. My online course met the students' individual interests.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

4. My online course met the students' existing needs related with English.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

5. My online course included equal amount of activities suitable for pair, group and individual work.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

6. My online course included authentic examples of language and / or culture.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

7. My online course included opportunities for students to interact with one another.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

8. My online course gave the students the opportunity to use and reflect their language knowledge.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

9. The students' improvement of English speaking skills was satisfactory.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

10. The students' improvement of English listening skills was satisfactory.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

11. The students' improvement of English reading skills was satisfactory.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

12. The students' improvement of English writing skills was satisfactory.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

13. The students' improvement of English grammar was satisfactory.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

14. The students' improvement of English vocabulary was satisfactory.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

15. My online students' overall performances were as satisfactory as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

16. I was pleased with the communication, rapport and interaction I had with my online students as much as I had in the face-to-face setting.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

17. My online students attended, participated the online classes as much as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

18. The reading, writing, listening, speaking skills and vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation language systems were well balanced in my online course.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

19. Online education during COVID-19 is / would likely be different from online education during a typical academic semester.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

20. The university I have been working for provided sufficient orientations – seminars - workshops on online education (how to use the online platform etc.).

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

21. The university was able to shift online education effectively and smoothly.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

22. The university made proper decisions related with online education on time.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

23. The university supported the instructors frequently. (keeping in touch, informing, leading with announcements, schedules, rubrics, online meetings, etc.)

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

24. When I had a problem during the process, I was able to receive support from the university easily.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

25. The university provided flexibility to the instructors during online education (deciding on class hours, pacing, using extra materials, etc.)

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

26. The online platform, learning management system or video conferencing tool (Zoom, Teams, Sakai, Google Meet etc.) determined by the university was an appropriate choice.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

27. The online platform was easy for me to use.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

28. I was able to use the online platform effectively.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

29. Before Covid-19, I believed that students could perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

30. Online education is a suitable learning environment for learning & teaching English language.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

31. I was able to adapt online teaching easily.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

32. I would be interested in teaching online again in the future.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

33. Online teaching helped me to gain new technologic skills.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

34. I used different teaching strategies, approaches, activity types during Covid-19 process because of the different nature of online setting.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

35.Each instructor moved uniquely, less standardized - centralized across the university during the online education than they did in the face-to-face setting.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Özgeçmiş

Kişisel Bilgiler

Adı Soyadı : İzlem Paydaş
Doğum Yeri ve Tarihi :

Eğitim Durumu

Lisans Öğrenimi : İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi
İngilizce Öğretmenliği
Yüksek Lisans Öğrenimi : Akdeniz Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili
Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı
Bildiği Yabancı Diller : İngilizce
Bilimsel Faaliyetleri : CELTA

İş Deneyimi

Stajlar : Eyüboğlu Koleji
Projeler :
Çalıştığı Kurumlar : Ege Üniversitesi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi

İletişim

E-Posta Adresi :

Tarih

PLAGIARISM REPORT

IDEAS OF TERTIARY INSTRUCTORS ON EMERGENCY REMOTE EDUCATION DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC

ORIJINALLIK RAPORU

% 15	% 13	% 5	% 4
BENZERLİK ENDEKSİ	İNTERNET KAYNAKLARI	YAYINLAR	ÖĞRENCİ ÖDEVLERİ

BİRİNCİL KAYNAKLAR

1	www.acarindex.com İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
2	acikbilim.yok.gov.tr İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
3	www.researchgate.net İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
4	acikerisim.akdeniz.edu.tr:8080 İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
5	Kelly Moser, Tianlan Wei. "COVID-19 and the pre-existing language teacher supply crisis", Language Teaching Research, 2021 Yayın	<% 1
6	etheses.whiterose.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<% 1
7	files.eric.ed.gov İnternet Kaynağı	<% 1
8	icci-epok.maku.edu.tr İnternet Kaynağı	<% 1

BİLDİRİM

Hazırladığım tezin/raporun tamamen kendi çalışmam olduğunu ve her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi taahhüt eder, tezimin/raporumun kağıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Akdeniz Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım:

- Tezimin/Raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.
- Tezim/Raporum sadece Akdeniz Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.
- Tezimin/Raporumun 1 yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin/raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

İzlem PAYDAŞ