IN THE LENS OF EFL INSTRUCTORS: EMERGENCY REMOTE EDUCATION[1]

İzlem PAYDAŞ[2]   Fatma Özlem SAKA[3]

Article Info	Abstract
	Distance education is a well-known type of education, which is conducted when students do not have the chance or time to attend school physically. With the Covid 19 pandemic, distance education has come to the fore under the name of emergency remote education. This study's ultimate purpose is to explore the experienced emergency English language remote education process and compare the private and state universities from the perspectives of tertiary instructors. To take a photograph of the novel emergency remote education, the opinions of one hundred and thirty-four English language instructors who have been working for English preparatory programs at universities' schools of foreign languages were asked. To collect the data, instructors were given a questionnaire. After the data collection, items were divided into 5 groups such as online education, instructors' adaptation to online education, university support, learners, and instructors' online course. Then each question was examined through SPSS. The means were found to see the highest value each item had. Also, the answers of both university instructors were compared using chi- square and the items which show a statistically significant difference were presented in the study. As a result, it was found that both university instructors have similar ideas about the emergency remote teaching during the Covid- 19.

1. Introduction

During the Covid-19 pandemic, the world went through some changes in different areas of social life. Governments imposed lockdowns with concerns about the extension of the novel virus. Education systems were disrupted across the globe and were affected by the emerging changes and regulations as well. Educational institutes shut down onsite classes in response to the pandemic, and many of them offered classes from distance, for the sustainability of education (Alhawsawi & Jawhar, 2021). With the outbreak of the pandemic, emergency remote education terminology became a hot topic in the educational research, while many current versions of instructional delivery from a distance caused conceptual confusion. In

this context, the division of distance education and emergency remote education is crucial to evaluate the pandemic process properly (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", which represents unusual, unanticipated situations such as wars, catastrophes, and pandemic, and "remote", which stands for an on-distance mode of teaching (Hazaea, et al., 2021).

Distance education, which is seen as the umbrella term of the physical learner-instructor separation, has passed through some changes, and led up some other concepts. 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 (Guri-Rosenblit, 2005; King et al., 2001; Moore et al. 2011; Tsai & Machado, 2002). 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 and 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). However, by its very definition, distance education highlights the separation of learner from the instructor (Guri-Rosenblit, 2005; Saykılı, 2018).

The emergency remote education notion differs in terms of its aim. While distance education is purposeful and intended, emergency remote education looks for immediate actions for emergencies. As emergency suggests, the educational model applied during the pandemic is urgently carried out, by changing the courses intended to be taught face-to-face into distance formats (Brereton, 2021). Emergency remote education never has objectives to recreate a temporary educational ecosystem and cannot be the same with distance education inherently (Hodges et al., 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 an 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).

Instructors' opinion on distance education is a determiner for the effectiveness and quality of distance programs, learning and teaching. American Distance Education Consortium (2008, as cited in Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009: 105) defines faculty

satisfaction as "the perception that teaching in the online environment is effective and professionally beneficial" and mentions three sub-categories of faculty satisfaction: learner-related, instructor-related, and institution-related motives. 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.

In the case of emergency remote education applied during pandemic, studies investigated teacher opinion are presented and emergency remote education is examined within the scope of learners- learning perspective, institution perspective, and finally teacher-education evaluation. Participation, attendance, involvement, engagement, and interaction themes were the most stressed learning-related issues in many studies; generally speaking, as the problematic aspect of emergency remote education (Altınpulluk, 2021; Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020; Cantürk & Cantürk, 2021; Müller et al., 2021;). Altınpulluk's work (2021) revealed that instructors consider one of the biggest learning challenges of emergency remote education as decreased attendance because it was not obligatory during the pandemic. Similarly, 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. Moreover, Müller et al. (2021) voiced that it is difficult to diagnose and meet learner needs in a virtual environment. Besides, 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). Furthermore, Atmojo and Nugroho (2020) described the challenges experienced in EFL classes from the perspective of teachers as students' misperception of online learning and evaluating it like informal, just like holiday, difficulty in strengthening the emotional bond between the teacher and learners, and engaging low motivated, passive students. Gao and Zhang (2020) also defined classroom management as one of the challenges of emergency remote English teaching as instructors did not observe their students and have eye contact with them.

For the institution-based component of teacher opinion on emergency remote education, faculty support, and decision making related to pandemic have been

discussed (Akbana et al., 2021; Altınpulluk, 2021; Kurnaz & Serçemeli, 2020). A meta-analysis study by Akbana et al. (2021) showed that support from the school or university has been more frequently reported by the teachers. Similarly, gaining support and training from the faculty has been stated in other studies (Kurnaz & Serçemeli, 2020; Mishra et al., 2020). Unfortunately, some lecturers have not received enough support or training (Altınpulluk, 2021; Lie et al, 2020). Again, Altınpulluk (2021) found that institution- based problems included the changes in institutional policies, uncertainty in the syllabus and crowded classes. In the study of Potyrala et al. (2021) the best solution for the encountered troubles during the pandemic was found to work as a team and to provide psycho-emotional support to both learners and teachers.

Finally, the emergency remote education process was evaluated from the instructors' perspectives in terms of instructors' self-competences, professional development, and their adaptation and perceptions towards teaching from distance in the literature (Erarslan, 2021; Moser et al., 2021; Nugroho et al., 2021). While Erarslan (2021) reported that English language remote lecturers thought they witnessed a challenging adaptation process to emergency remote education, he focused on the adaptation to the faculty support and training. Furthermore, the lecturers' prior distance teaching experiences were evaluated as a factor influencing lecturers' views on emergency remote education and their speed of adaptation as well. (ibid).

Many studies suggested that emergency remote education experience helped instructors' professional development. Akbana et al. (2021) found 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) stated that English for academic purposes remote instructors believe that remote teaching fosters instructors' professional identity and facilitates access to authentic materials and adds variety to the class activities. The study of Nugroho et al. (2021) conducted with Indonesian EFL teachers figured out that creativity and attractiveness in teaching are both the problem and can be the cure during emergencies. 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 environments. Besides, creative activities can be a solution to learner demotivation and dropped participation challenges encountered during the pandemic (ibid). Potyrala et al. (2021) evaluated the process from an optimistic perspective and stated that the pandemic requires

more autonomous education, in short, an educational environment for the post-pandemic future.

In Turkey, the situation was similar to the other countries all over the world. After the pandemic outbreak, schools and universities shut down for a while, and later they all started to teach using online facilities. As it was a new thing for students and teachers, they had to get accustomed to this new type of teaching although they found it challenging. Education in schools of foreign languages was carried out from the distance as well and university students and mostly English language instructors were faced with many problems under the effect of the pandemic. This article aims at revealing the ideas of instructors working in universities' English preparatory programmes of school of foreign languages on emergency remote foreign language education in state and private universities.

1.1. Research Question

In this article, the following research question was formulated to find out how emergency remote education is evaluated from the perspectives of language instructors at university:

What do language instructors at state and private universities think about the emergence remote education process applied during the Covid 19?

To find the answer for this question, the following questions were investigated:

1. What are the ideas of foreign language instructors at state and private universities about online education during the emergency remote teaching?
2. What are the ideas of foreign language instructors at state and private universities about their adaptation to online education during the emergency remote teaching?
3. What are the ideas of foreign language instructors at state and private universities about university support during the emergency remote teaching?
4. What are the ideas of foreign language instructors at state and private universities about learners during the emergency remote teaching?
5. What are the ideas of foreign language instructors at state and private universities about their online courses during the emergency remote teaching?

2. Method

In this study, the quantitative method was employed to reach varied cases and a larger audience, and it has the survey research design because 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. Quantitative research approaches

are used to describe current conditions by reaching large groups (Gay et al., 2012, p. 9). Quantitative inquiry is systematic, standardized and ideally universal for almost any audience. (Dörnyei, 2007). With the numerical data collected, survey research answers questions about the status of the subject of the study (Gay et al., 2012). One common type of survey research involves assessing the opinions, preferences, attitudes, practices, concerns, or interests of a group of people (Gay et al., 2012, p.185). Therefore, to get the ideas of English language instructors in state and private universities, the survey design of the quantitative research methods was used.

2.1. Participants

For comparing the ideas of English language instructors working for private and state universities in Turkey, where English is taught as a foreign language, a research group involving the instructors working in universities' English preparatory programmes of school of foreign languages were determined from convenience sampling. The 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. 199). 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 the Covid-19 pandemic emergency remote education. A hundred and thirty-four instructors participated in the study. A hundred one instructors work for state universities, while thirty-three of them teach at private ones. 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 (69%). Participants are mostly from state universities (n=101) and speak Turkish as their native language (98%). Again, more than half of the participants have teaching experience of 6-17 years (60%). Participants mostly did not teach online before COVID-19 (72%). The number of people having online teaching experience is only 24 (18%). The demographic characteristics of 134 instructors working in various universities and participating in the research are shown as follows:

Table 1. *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
			Online Teaching Experience Before COVID-19		
University Types					
State	101	75.40	None	97	72.40
Private	33	24.60	Hybrid	13	9.70
Native Languages			Full Online	24	17.90
Turkish	131	97.77			
Foreign Languages	3	02.23			

2.2. Instrument

In this research, a self-made questionnaire was used to collect the data required to undertake the present study. Survey research data are mainly collected through questionnaires, which are the written form of questions to be answered by the participants of the survey (Gay et al., 2012). Hence, the questionnaire (in the appendix) was chosen as the data collection tool so that the study could find the answers to its research questions.

The available literature on distance education, emergency remote education, language education from distance, English language education programme at university tertiary level, and instructor opinions were reviewed by the researcher to develop the questionnaire to be used as a data-gathering tool. In the end, the questionnaire items were designed around mainly emerged themes of 1) online education, 2) adaptation to online teaching, 3) learners during the emergency remote teaching, 4) technical support from the universities during the emergency remote teaching, 5) online courses during the emergency remote teaching.

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-private distinction) and their previous distance teaching experience. The second section asks participants to evaluate the pandemic process in terms of different themes. In total, there are forty questions in the questionnaire presented to the participants. The questionnaire had a five–point-Likert scale with the levels from 1 completely disagree to 5 completely agree which show the level of agreement with each item.

The questionnaire merely contains the *online education* terminology. *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 some participants are not familiar with it. Three experts were consulted to review the questionnaire before it is applied to participants. Then the questionnaire was designed via Google Forms and delivered online due to the pandemic prevention.

2.3. Data Collection

The data were collected in one go because the study has a cross-sectional survey research design. The researcher gathered data by herself on voluntary basis. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic conditions, data were gathered via a virtual tool. Google Forms was adjusted not to ask for the responders' e-mail addresses while sending their forms, on purpose, to keep their personal information confidential. 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.

2.4. Data Analysis

For the data analysis, the SPSS statistics program was used to examine the data attained from the research. The mean of each item was found to see which items have the highest value from the perspectives of English instructors of state and private universities. Besides, the answers of state and private university instructors were compared with the chi-square test in terms of each item to see if there is a statistically significant difference between the instructors of these two types of universities. Before the chi-square test was carried out, the five-point- Likert scale in the questionnaire was turned into a three-point- Likert scale, including answers as agree, neutral and disagree to get more accurate results for the comparison between private and state university instructors.

3. Findings

The items in the questionnaire were divided into 5 groups to answer the research questions in this section. Firstly, the answers were discussed according to their means. Later, the items that show statistically significant difference according to chi-square results were presented.

The first research question seeks the ideas of foreign language instructors at state and private universities about online education during the emergency remote teaching. To understand the instructors' ideas deeply, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th, and 7th items in the

questionnaire are involved in this group and the results are given in Table 2 as in the following:

Table 2. *Instructors' ideas about online education*

Items about online education	Private $\bar{X}\pm Sd$	State $\bar{X}\pm Sd$	Total $\bar{X}\pm Sd$
Online education is a suitable learning environment for learning & teaching English language.	3.00 ±1.118	2.84±1.164	2.88±1.151
Online education offers more varied activity types, materials and learning opportunities.	2.88±1.111	3.03±1.228	2.99±1.198
I would be interested in teaching online again in the future.	3.45±1.063	3.52±1.064	3.51±1.060
Online teaching helped me to gain new pedagogical skills.	3.88±1.139	3.89± .882	3.89± .947
Online teaching helped me to gain new technological skills.	4.27±1.098	4.50± .757	4.44± .854

Although state university instructors (2.84) and the whole research group (2.88) disagree with the idea of the suitability of online educaton for learning and teaching English, private university instructors (3.00) neither agree nor disagree with this idea. The next item seeks their ideas about if online education offers more varied activity types, materials and learning opportunities. Private university instructors (2.88) and the whole research group (2.99) disagree with this idea. State university instructors (3.03) neither agree nor disagree with the idea. They are asked if they are interested in teaching online again in the future. Both state university (3.52) and private university instructors (3.45) neither agree nor disagree with this idea. When they are asked if online teaching helped them to gain new pedagogical skills, both private university (3.88) and state university instructors neither agree nor disagree with this statement. On the other hand, both private (4.27) and state university instructors (4.50) agree that online teaching helped them to gain new technological skills. For the items related to online education there is not a significant difference between private and state university instructors' ideas.

The second research question is about their adaptation to online education education during the emergency remote teaching and 4th, 8th, 18th, and 19th items in the questionnaire are investigated. The mean value of their answers for the items related to adaptation to online education is shown in Table 3:

Table 3. *Instructors' ideas about their adaptation to online education*

Items about their adaptation to online education	Private $\bar{X}\pm Sd$	State $\bar{X}\pm Sd$	Total $\bar{X}\pm Sd$
I was able to adapt online teaching easily.	3.61±1.088	3.60±1.001	3.60±1.019
I used different teaching strategies, approaches, activity types during Covid-19 process because of the different nature of online setting	4.15± .765	3.97± .854	4.01± .841
The online platform was easy for me to use.	3.97±1.104	4.20± .749	4.14± .851
I was able to use the online platform effectively.	4.09±1.042	4.17± .775	4.15± .845

Both private (3.61) and state university instructors (3.60) neither agree nor disagree with the item that shows they were able to adapt to online teaching easily. Private university instructors (4.15) and the whole research group (4.01) agree with the idea that they used different teaching strategies, approaches, activity types during Covid-19 process because of the different nature of online setting. State university instructors (3.97) neither agree nor disagree with this idea. The next item wants to learn if they found the online platform easy to use. State university instructors (4.20) and the whole group (4.14) found it easy to use. However, private university instructors (3.97) neither agree nor disagree with this idea. When they are asked if they were able to use the online platform effectively, both private (4.09) and state university instructors (4.17) agree with this idea. For each item in this group, there is no statistically significant difference between both groups of instructors' ideas.

The third research question focuses on the university support during the emergency remote teaching and this group is composed of 10th, 11th,12th,13th,14th,15th,16th, and 17th items in the questionnaire.

Table 4. Instructors' ideas about university support during the emergency remote teaching

Questions about university support	Private $\bar{X}\pm Sd$	State $\bar{X}\pm Sd$	Total $\bar{X}\pm Sd$
The university I have been working for provided sufficient orientations, seminars, and workshops on online education (how to use the online platform etc.).	3.67±1.472	3.66±1.042	3.66±1.157
The university was able to shift online education effectively and smoothly.	3.82±1.380	3.67± .918	3.71±1.046
The university made proper decisions related with online education on time.	3.48±1.460	3.82± .899	3.74±1.069
The university supported the instructors frequently (keeping in touch, informing, leading with announcements, schedules, rubrics, online meetings, etc.).	4.18±1.103	3.93± .962	3.99±1.000

Questions about university support	Private $\bar{X}\pm Sd$	State $\bar{X}\pm Sd$	Total $\bar{X}\pm Sd$
When I had a problem during the process, I was able to receive support from the university easily.	4.03±1.237	4.01± .900	4.01± .989
The university provided flexibility to the instructors during online education (deciding on class hours, pacing, using extra materials, etc.)	3.09±1.128	3.29±1.117	3.24±1.118
The university expected the instructors to change the teaching objectives, prepare different or modified curriculum, materials special for online education.	3.09±1.182	2.91± .971	2.96±1.025
The online platform, learning management system or video conferencing tool (Zoom, Teams, Sakai, Google Meet etc.) determined by the university was an appropriate choice.	3.94±1.171	3.98± .990	3.97±1.033

In this group, the first item is about orientation, seminars and workshops on online education provided by their universities. Both private (3.67) and state university instructors (3.66) neither agree nor disagree with the idea that the university they have been working for provided sufficient orientations, seminars, and workshops on online education. When they are asked if the university was able to shift online education effectively and smoothly, both private (3.82) and state university instructors (3.67) neither agree nor disagree with the idea. Private university instructors (4.18) agree with the idea that the university supported the instructors frequently. State university instructors (3.93) and the whole group (3.99) neither agree nor disagree with this idea. Both private (4.03) and state university instructors (4.01) agree with the idea that when they had a problem during the process, they were able to receive support from the university easily. The next item wants to learn if the university provided flexibility to the instructors during online education. Both private (3.09) and state university instructors (3.29) neither agree nor disagree with this idea. When they are asked if the university expected the instructors to change the teaching objectives, prepare different or modified curriculum, materials special for online education, state university instructors (2.91) and the whole research group (2.96) disagree with this idea. However, private university instructors (3.09) neither agree nor disagree with this idea. Both private (3.94) and state university instructors (3.98) neither agree nor disagree with the idea that the online platform, learning management system or video conferencing tool determined by the university was an appropriate choice.

For the items that show statistically significant difference between private and state universities as presented here: The chi-square test result of the item that the university was to shift online education effectively and smoothly is as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. *The university was to shift online education effectively and smoothly*

	Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Total		df	χ2	P
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Private	8	24.2	1	3.0	24	72.7	33	100.0	2	7.350	.02
State	13	12.9	22	21.8	66	65.7	101	100.0			
Total	21	15.7	23	17.2	90	67.2	134	100.0			

The answers given to this item shows difference according to the university types. 72.7% of the private university instructors believe that their universities succeeded in shifting online education effectively and smoothly. The proportion of the instructors working at state universities (65.7%) is lower than that of private university instructors. Besides, 21.8% of state university instructors do not decide on this point. There is a statistically significant difference between private and state universities in terms of this question ($\chi2$=7.350, df=2, P=.02).

Another item that shows a statistically significant difference is that the university made proper decisions related with online education on time. The result can be seen in Table 6 below:

Table 6. *The university made proper decisions related with online education on time*

	Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Total		df	χ2	P
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Private	10	30.3	2	6.1	21	63.6	33	100.0	2	8.496	.014
State	11	10.9	18	17.8	72	71.3	101	100.0			
Total	21	15.7	20	14.9	93	69.4	134	100.0			

There is a statistically significant difference between private and state universities in terms of this question ($\chi2$=8.496, df=2, P= .014). While 63.6% of private university instructors believe that their universities made proper decisions related to online education on time, 71.3% of the state university instructors think positively for their universities. The proportion of the instructors who think negatively about their universities in terms of this question is 30.3% for private universities and 10.9% for state universities.

The fourth research question searches the ideas of state and private university instructors about their learners during the emergency remote teaching. To shed light on this point, 1st, 31st, 32nd, 33rd, 34th, 35th,36th,37th, and 39th questions are chosen from the questionnaire. The findings about learners are given in Table 7.

Table 7. *Instructors' ideas about learners during the emergency remote teaching*

Questions about learners	Private $\overline{X}$±Sd	State $\overline{X}$±Sd	Total $\overline{X}$±Sd
Before Covid-19, I believed that students could perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting.	2.45± .971	2.29±1.013	2.33±1.002
The students' improvement of English speaking skills was satisfactory.	2.94±1.223	2.86±1.049	2.88±1.090
The students' improvement of English listening skills was satisfactory.	3.27±1.153	3.07±1.042	3.12±1.069
The students' improvement of English reading skills was satisfactory.	3.39± .998	3.30± .975	3.32± .978
The students' improvement of English writing skills was satisfactory.	3.64±1.141	3.01±1.054	3.16±1.105
The students' improvement of English grammar was satisfactory.	3.52±1.093	3.59± .992	3.57±1.014
The students' improvement of English vocabulary was satisfactory.	3.45±1.034	3.53± .996	3.51±1.002
My online students' overall performances were as satisfactory as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.	2.73±1.098	2.60±1.078	2.63±1.180
My online students attended, participated the online classes as much as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.	2.36±1.084	2.21±1.275	2.25±1.229

Both private (2.45) and state university instructors (2.29) disagree with the idea that their students could perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting. The item that the students' improvement of English speaking skills was satisfactory is answered negatively by private (2.94) and state university instructors (2.86). For the improvement of students for listening, reading, writing, grammar and vocabulary, private university instructors (respectively 3.27, 3.39, 3.64, 3.52, and 3.45) and state university instructors (respectively 3.07, 3.30, 3.01, 3.59, and 3.53) neither agree nor disagree with the idea that their students were successful. The item which compares online students' overall performance to that of face-to-face students has a negative point as well. In other words, both private (2.73) and state university instructors (2.60) disagree with this idea. When it comes to attendance of the students, the result is negative again. Private (2.36) and state university instructors (2.21) disagree with the idea that students attended and participated in the online classes.

The item that the students' improvement of English writing skills was satisfactory shows a statistically significant difference between private and state university instructor as presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *The students' improvement of English writing skills was satisfactory*

	Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Total		df	χ2	P
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Private	6	18.2	5	15.2	22	66.7	33	100.0	2	9.156	.01
State	32	31.7	32	31.7	37	36.6	101	100.0			
Total	38	28.4	37	27.6	59	44.0	134	100.0			

As can be seen from the table that 66.7% of the private university instructors agree with the idea of their students' improvement in writing skills. The ratio of state university instructors (36.6%) is quite low compared to that of private university instructors. Besides, the ratio of state university instructors who disagree with this idea (31.7%) and who is neutral (31.7%) is quite high unlike the one that belongs to private university instructors. This results in a statistically significant difference between private and state university instructors in terms of this item (χ2=9.156, df=2, P= .01).

The last research question is about online teaching of instructors during the emergency remote teaching. The items that are supposed to give information about this point are 9th, 20th,21st,22nd,23rd,24th,25th,26th,27th,28th,29th,30th,38th, and 40th items of the questionnaire.

Table 9. *Instructors' ideas about their online teaching during the emergency remote teaching*

Questions about their online teaching	Private X̄±Sd	State X̄±Sd	Total X̄±Sd
I had a more tolerant, flexible approach, style towards my students than I had before Covid-19.	3.85± .972	3.68±1.039	3.72±1.022
The technical problems (video –audio- voice quality of online classes, connection, difficulties in uploading digital materials etc.) affected the flow of lessons negatively.	3.42±1.032	3.35±1.153	3.37±1.121
My online course had measurable, appropriate objectives.	4.00± .829	3.73± .720	3.80± .754
The offered online course content was qualified.	3.79±1.111	3.78± .743	3.78± .844
My online course met the students' individual interests.	3.58±1.032	3.17± .917	3.27± .959
My online course met the students' existing needs related with English.	3.88± .857	3.41± .918	3.52± .924
My online course included equal number of activities suitable for pair, group, and individual work.	3.03±1.334	2.59±1.226	2.70±1.263
My online course included authentic examples of language and / or culture.	3.88± .960	3.72± .939	3.76± .943
My online course included opportunities for students to interact with me as the instructor.	3.73±1.153	4.02± .894	3.95± .968
My online course included opportunities for students to interact with one another.	3.00±1.414	3.28±1.176	3.21±1.239

Questions about their online teaching	Private X̄±Sd	State X̄±Sd	Total X̄±Sd
My online course gave the students the opportunity to use and reflect their language knowledge.	3.64±1.141	3.50± .901	3.54± .963
My online course was more learner-centered than my face-to-face classes.	2.30±1.075	2.62±1.085	2.54±1.087
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.	2.94±1.088	2.87±1.214	2.89±1.180
The reading, writing, listening, speaking skills and vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation language systems were well balanced in my online course.	2.88±1.166	3.10±1.153	3.04±1.156

The item that asks if they had a more tolerant, flexible approach, style towards their students than before is answered in the same way by both private (3.85) and state university instructors (3.68). For the question if the technical problems affected the flow of lessons negatively, both private (3.42) and state university instructors (3.35) are neutral. Private university instructors (4.00) agree with the idea that their online course had measurable, appropriate objectives. Whereas the state university instructors (3.73) and the whole research group (3.80) neither agree nor disagree with this item. When they are asked if the offered online course content was qualified, both private (3.79) and state university instructors (3.78) did not say anything positive or negative. While private university instructors (3.03) neither agree nor disagree with the idea that their online course included equal number of activities suitable for pair, group and individual work, state university instructors (2.59) and the whole group (2.70) disagree with this item. Both private (3.88) and state university instructors disagree with the idea that their online course included authentic examples of language and culture. For the item that asks if their online course included opportunities for students to interact with them as the instructor state university instructors (4.02) give positive answer. Whereas private university instructors (3.73) and the whole research group (3.95) neither agree nor disagree with this idea. Both private (3.00) and state university instructors (3.28) neither agree nor disagree with the item that the students had opportunities to interact with one another. For the question that asks if their online course gave the students the opportunity to use and reflect their language knowledge, both private (3.64) and state university instructors (3.50) are neutral. When it comes to the question that inquires if their online course was more learner- centered than before, both private (2.30) and state university instructors (2.62) gave negative answers. Private (2.94) and state university instructors (2.87) report that they are not pleased with the communication, rapport, and interaction with their students during online teaching. While private university instructors (2.88) believe that their online course has not a

well- balanced content in terms of language skills and components, state university instructors (3.10) and the whole group (3.04) do not give a positive or a negative answer for this item.

The only item that presents a statistically significant difference between the instructors is that the offered online course content was qualified. The chi square result is demonstrated in Table 10.

Table 10. *The offered online course content was qualified*

	Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Total		df	χ2	P
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Private	6	18.2	3	9.1	24	72.7	33	100.0	2	6.988	.03
State	5	5.0	20	19.8	76	75.2	101	100.0			
Total	11	8.2	23	17.2	100	74.6	134	100.0			

9.1% of private university instructors and 19.8% of state university instructors are neutral for this question. 18.2% of private and 5.0% of state university instructors disagree with this item. Although the ratio of state university instructors (75.2%) and that of private university instructors (72.7%) are quite near, there is a statistically significant difference between private and state university instructors in terms of this item (χ2=6.988, df=2, P= .03).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

When all the items are concerned in the 1st research question, it can be said that neither private nor state university instructors have positive ideas about online education. They do not think that online education is suitable for learning and teaching English. Although online education offers more varied activities, materials and learning opportunities, instructors do not seem to benefit from them. Furthermore, instructors do not look happy with online teaching. This may result from the sudden complete change in their teaching style, and they find it difficult to adapt to this new type of instruction. This result is consistent with Nugroho et al. (2021) who believe because of being unfamiliar with using online platforms, teachers found remote teaching challenging. They think that they do not develop anything in their teaching career except their technological skills. Instructors tried to do their best during the pandemic. However, they are not content with what they are doing. The teaching environment was not as fruitful as they got used to and they would like to go back to face-to-face education again. All instructors from both types of universities have similar perspectives for online education because this process must have the same effect on them. In accordance with this finding, Erarslan (2021)

specifies that teachers who lack of experience in online education had difficulties in teaching English during the pandemic.

When it comes to 2nd research question, which is about their adaptation to online education, the points of view of the instructors turn into positive. Although they did not find the adaptation process easy, they managed to use the online platform easily and effectively. They were able to follow different teaching strategies, approaches and to conduct different activities. For all the questions in this group, the attitudes of instructors for the adaptation period are similar. They tried to reach their students in online setting and fulfil their teaching responsibilities.

The 3rd research question is about university support. Instructors do not say anything positive or negative for most of the questions. For example, they do not consider that their universities provided sufficient support for their instructors. Unlike this finding, Collazos & Burbano (2021) state that teachers felt more confident when they were given support and training. They cannot state that their shift to online education was effective and smooth. Their university did not make proper decisions on time. The only question which gets a positive answer from both university instructors is about the university support during their problems. For the question that asks if the university was to shift online education effectively and smoothly, there is a statistically significant difference between private and state university instructors. The ratio of private university instructors for "agree" answer (72.7%) is higher than that of state university instructors (65.7%). For "disagree" answer, the ratio of private university instructors (24.2%) is higher again. The ratio of state university instructors for "neutral" answer is higher. These results show that most of the instructors find the transfer from face-to-face education to online one effective and smooth. However, some other instructors do not believe it was effective and smooth. A large number of instructors in state universities do not make a decision on this issue. Another item that shows a statistically significant difference between both groups of instructors is that the university made proper decisions related to online education on time. The proportion of state university instructors for "agree" answer (71.3%) is higher than that of private university instructors (63.6%). For "disagree" answer, the proportion of private university instructors (30.3%) is higher than that of state university instructors (10.9%). This result shows that state university instructors are more positive for their university decisions, and they do not have many objections.

4th research question is about learners during the emergency remote education. This group includes items which have the lowest points. Similarly, learner-related

problems are the most mentioned theme in some other studies (Altınpulluk, 2021; Cantürk & Cantürk, 2021; Moser et al., 2021; Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020). The items about their students' language performance, speaking improvement, attendance, and participation have "disagree" answers for both university instructors. The item about attendance and participation is rated as the lowest point by the whole research group (2.25). This indicates that students' attention and participation is the main problem during the pandemic process. This finding is compatible with the findings of other studies related to emergency remote teaching (Altınpulluk, 2021; Cantürk & Cantürk, 2021; Moser et al., 2021; Müller et al., 2021). Both private and state university instructors do not say anything good or bad for their students' improvement of listening, writing, grammar, and vocabulary. Yet, the findings of Karakaş and Tuncer (2020) indicate that students improved their writing thanks to given assignments. Although both university instructors think similarly for writing, there is a statistically significant difference between the instructors of both types of universities in terms of students' improvement of writing skills. The ratio of private university instructors for "agree" answer (66.7%) is nearly double of the ratio belongs to state university instructors (36.6%). As opposed to this, for "disagree" answer the ratio for state university instructors (31.7%) is higher. Private university instructors may have got the chance to make their students write and improve their writing. The low ratio of "agree" answer and the high ratio of "disagree" answer indicate that state university instructors may have not made their students write in online setting. This finding is compatible with the finding of Karakuş et al. (2020) about the inadequacy of teaching 4 language skills online.

The last research question is about the instructors' online teaching. The table reflects that the answers are not positive. They either disagree with the idea or are neutral about it. As they are all qualified and experienced teachers, the online course they gave during the pandemic did not live up to their expectations. They do not believe that they show all their teaching skills in the online setting. As they were not ready and technologically qualified for online teaching, they felt limited although they tried to do their best. They do not consider that they were successful as English instructors. They were aware that everything was different even their students. Mishra et al. (2020) support this finding by emphasizing the difficulty of teaching online practical classes in their study. The item that asks if the offered online course content was qualified shows a statistically significant difference between private and state university instructors. The ratio of state university instructors for "agree" answer (75.2%) is higher than that of private university instructors (72.7%). However, 18.2% of private university instructors disagree with this idea. The ratio of state

university instructors for "disagree" answer (5.0%) is incredibly low. This indicates that state university instructors may be content with the online course content offered.

The results of the study made it clear that both institution types similarly experienced the process of Covid-19. The present study reveals that both private and state instructors are satisfied with neither learning practices, the improvements of language skills nor learning outcomes. Similarly, Moser et al. (2021) state that perceived outcomes of remote teaching were less than expected although language teachers tried to do their best to support online teaching. Both university types had an unanticipated transition to remote education with the breakout of the Corona virus. The unplanned virtual programme could be the point behind the dissatisfying classroom activities, unbalanced practice or acquisition of language skills and systems. The switch suddenly happened in the middle of the 2019-2020 academic year which started as a face-to-face programme for both private 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. The similarity between the results of these institution types in terms of learners lets the researchers 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 to neither continue their education nor improve their learning during the process. To conclude, it can be said that emergency remote education does not prove to be adequate compared to face-to-face education in many aspects.

4.1. Pedagogical Implementations and Suggestions for Future Research

The present study revealed that both private and state university English language instructors think that the universities they have been working for tried to manage the process. Moreover, it was found out that the instructors do not believe that learners have had an effective learning experience during the process. Following these very brief results, one can foresee that the integration of technology into educational practices will be more innovative and creative, and the role of autonomy will be emphasised. The fact that emergency remote education has increased the use of technology in education has shown the significance of interaction in language education and it has switched the focus to different modes of delivering the instruction. It is better for foreign language instructors to adapt to the new way of

instruction as early as possible and to look for more technology-driven, autonomy-oriented, and interactive language acquisition practices. Some suggestions for further research by presenting the limitations and objectives of the present study might be put forward as follows:

- This study adopted the survey design of the quantitative research methodology. In further studies, designs of qualitative research methodology can be utilised so a deeper view of the case can be obtained.
- 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. Future studies can find out the effectiveness of online emergency education by testing the students' language performance.
- This study attested that the instructors' views on emergency remote education did not differ by their institution type. Bearing it in mind, further studies can design for other demographic characteristics of the participants.

References

Akbana, Y. E., Rathert, S., & Ağçam, R. (2021). Emergency remote education in foreign and second language teaching. *Turkish Journal of Education*, *10*(2), 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.

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

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. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/auad/issue/56247/773769

Brereton, P. (2021). Emergency remote training: Guiding and supporting teachers in preparation for emergency remote teaching. *Language Research Bulletin*, *35*, 1-13.

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), 1-37. https://doi.org/10.35452/caless.2021.1

Collazos, Y. D., & Burbano, N. A. D. (2021). Foreign language teachers' experiences about the transition from face- to- face instruction to emergency remote teaching from a narrative perspective. *Revista Boletin Repide*, *11* (2), 355-365. https://doi.org/10.36260/rbr.v11i2.1689

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Erarslan, A. (2021). English language teaching and learning during Covid- 19: A global perspective on the first year. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, *4*(2), 349-367. 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*, 2396. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.549653

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., &Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (10th ed.) Pearson Education, Inc.

Giacosa, A., Salusso, D., & Zaccone, M. C. (2021, April). *Using OERs in emergency distance language learning: A case study* [Paper Presentation]. MOOCs, Language learning and mobility, design, integration, reuse, Online Conference, Italy. https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03216427/document

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

Hazaea, A. N., Bin-Hady, W.R.A., & Toujani, M. M. (2021). Emergency remote English language teaching in the Arap league countries: Challenges and remedies. *Computer- Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, 22(1), 201-222.

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online teaching. *Educause Review*, 1-15. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning

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

Karakuş, N., Ucuzsatar, N., Karacaoğlu, M. Ö., Esendemir, N., Bayraktar, D. (2020). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının uzaktan eğitime yönelik görüşleri. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (19), 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

King, F., Young, M., Drivere- Richmond, K., & Schrader, P. (2001). Defining distance learning and distance education. *Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education Review*, *9*(1). 1-14. https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/17786/

Kurnaz, E. & Serçemeli, M. (2020). Covid-19 pandemi döneminde akademisyenlerin uzaktan eğitim ve muhasebe eğitimine yönelik bakış açıları üzerine bir araştırma. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Akademi Dergisi*, *2*(3), 262-288. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/usbad/issue/55116/745914

Lie, A., Tamah, S. M., Gozali, I., Triwidayati, K. R., Utami, T. S., & 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., & Galven, K. (2011). E- learning, online learning, and distance learning environments: Are they the same? *The Internet and Higher Education, 14*(2), 129-135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.10.001

Moore, M., & Kearsley, G. (2012). *Distance Education: A system view of online learning* (3rd ed.) 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

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), 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

Potyrala, K., Demeshkant, N., Czerwiec, K., Jancarz- Lanczkowska, B., Tomczyk, L. (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

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. https://dx.doi.org/10.22038/fmej.2021.53412.1367

Saykılı, A. (2018). Distance education: Definitions, generations, key concepts and future directions. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, *5*(1), 2-17. https://ijcer.net/index.php/pub/article/view/50/32

Tsai, S., & Machado, P. (2002). E- learning, online learning, web-based learning, or distance learning: unveiling the ambiguity in current terminology. *ELearn Magazine*.

https://campus.fundec.org.ar/admin/archivos/2%20elearning%20essay%20.pdf

Appendix. Emergency Remote English Education Evaluation Questionnaire

Section 1. Demographic Information

Your age:

Your Native Language:

Your Teaching Experience:

Your Institution: a) State University   b) Private University

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

a) Yes, fully online   b) Yes, hybrid   c) No

Section 2.

This section of the survey will explore your opinion about the emergency remote education process during the pandemic. Please tick the one that suits your idea.

		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1	Before Covid-19, I believed that students could perform equally well in online language education as in a face-to-face setting.					
2	Online education is a suitable learning environment for learning & teaching English language.					
3	Online education offers more varied activity types, materials and learning opportunities.					
4	I was able to adapt online teaching easily.					
5	I would be interested in teaching online again in the future.					
6	Online teaching helped me to gain new pedagogical skills.					
7	Online teaching helped me to gain new technological skills.					
8	I used different teaching strategies, approaches, activity types during Covid-19 process because of the different nature of online setting.					
9	I had a more tolerant, flexible approach, style towards my students than I had before Covid-19.					
10	The university I have been working for provided sufficient orientations – seminars - workshops on online education (how to use the online platform etc.).					
11	The university was able to shift online education effectively and smoothly.					
12	The university made proper decisions related with online education on time.					
13	The university supported the instructors frequently. (keeping in touch, informing, leading with announcements, schedules, rubrics, online meetings, etc.)					
14	When I had a problem during the process, I was able to receive support from the university easily.					
15	The university provided flexibility to the instructors during online education (deciding on class hours, pacing, using extra materials, etc.)					
16	The university expected the instructors to change the teaching objectives, prepare different or modified curriculum, materials special for online education.					
17	The online platform, learning management system or video conferencing tool (Zoom, Teams, Sakai, Google Meet etc.) determined by the university was an appropriate choice.					
18	The online platform was easy for me to use.					
19	I was able to use the online platform effectively.					
20	The technical problems (video –audio- voice quality of online classes, connection, difficulties in uploading digital materials etc.) affected the flow of lessons negatively.					
21	My online course had measurable, appropriate objectives.					
22	The offered online course content was qualified.					
23	My online course met the students' individual interests.					
24	My online course met the students' existing needs related with English.					
25	My online course included equal number of activities suitable for pair, group and individual work.					
26	My online course included authentic examples of language and / or culture.					
27	My online course included opportunities for students to interact with me as the instructor.					
28	My online course included opportunities for students to interact with one another.					
29	My online course gave the students the opportunity to use and reflect their language knowledge.					
30	My online course was more learner-centered than my face-to-face classes.					
31	The students' improvement of English speaking skills was satisfactory.					
32	The students' improvement of English listening skills was satisfactory.					
33	The students' improvement of English reading skills was satisfactory.					
34	The students' improvement of English writing skills was satisfactory.					
35	The students' improvement of English grammar was satisfactory.					
36	The students' improvement of English vocabulary was satisfactory.					
37	My online students' overall performances were as satisfactory as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.					
38	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.					
39	My online students attended, participated the online classes as much as my face-to-face students that I had before Covid-19.					
40	The reading, writing, listening, speaking skills and vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation language systems were well balanced in my online course.					