PERSPECTIVES OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS ON POPULAR LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND SOFTWARE

Dr. Zulal AYAR
ORCID: 0000-0002-9029-7164
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Izmir Katip Celebi University
Izmir, TURKIYE

ABSTRACT

With the sudden outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, the education sector adopted distance and online learning through several web-based systems. Then, considerations of educational practitioners concerning these systems would be of pivotal significance for revealing the quality of online language education. Moreover, the challenges they encountered while conducting e-lessons and proposed solutions would lead to improvement in the systems and encourage other shareholders in the school system to determine a new route map in light of the results. To that end, 28 volunteer English language instructors from 14 universities were recruited to attend the interviews. Accordingly, negative considerations of the instructors about exploiting the systems in foreign language classes were detected. As conclusive results regarding the challenges and suggestions of the participants cannot be reported through a system-based analysis, system-independent offers were presented to policymakers and researchers. Finally, the researcher has drawn out a set of implications for future implementations.

INTRODUCTION

As in distinct fields of the current era, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has reshaped teaching and learning with the coalescence of several technologies for educational purposes. Moreover, the sector of education has had to adapt to an immense and unexpected shift from frontal instruction to digital instruction in the early spring of 2020. After widespread Covid-19 turned into a universal pandemic, the council of Higher Education obligated universities to deliver education via web-based platforms. Thus, various systems came to the fore to be utilized in online teaching, such as Massive Open Online Course (MOOC), virtual classroom software, Learning Management System (LMS), and other cloud-based classroom management systems. Even though e-learning practices were already maintained as an inseparable part of education within blended, hybrid, or flipped classes in many universities in developed countries even before the pandemic, developing countries, such as Turkiye which mostly based their education system on the on-site mode of instruction were unprepared for such an outbreak. Therefore, an urgent step for online learning programs with the rapid implementation of advanced technology was taken with the help of these systems.

At first sight, the platforms were generalized as efficient in alleviating workload, presenting and sharing some resources, and using time effectively with the guidance of the system, and hence this would instigate teachers to devote themselves to the profession and online implementations with all heart. Put differently, at the beginning of the pandemic, these systems were in general regarded as savers owing to connecting faculty members and students, allowing them to keep teaching and learning in a unified setting by forming a virtual relationship without the restriction of space or time. As a result, the institutions assumed all of them to be real-time portals designed to provide interaction and a high-quality educational experience. However, along with the prior difficulties within language education, the challenges these systems accompanied have levelled

up in the pandemic, such as the appearance of multiple crack-ups in online education with detrimental effects on students' performance and teachers' well-being. It reached such a point that even the selection of systems, the core assets of e-teaching, turned out to be a tedious process demanding a long list of items to be considered, such as the needs and expectations of all stakeholders. Within this scope, overall considerations of educational practitioners related to these systems would shed light on the efficacy of the portals and educational practices (Farid et al., 2015). Even though faculty members were at the forefront of education, a niche has been detected in the literature with the limited number of research about their overall perspectives toward the systems depending on the user experiences. Instead, related studies seemed to abound in appraising or revealing learners' points of view (Demir et al., 2021; Guoyan et al., 2021; Mohammadi et al., 2021). Accordingly, the impetus behind the operationalization of this study was to explore the considerations of instructors of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Turkish state and foundation universities with regard to using virtual education systems to teach the target language.

BACKGROUND

LMSs and Video Conferencing Software with Their Use

The ease of use of LMSs has been generally associated with some of their essential characteristics in the paradigm of language teaching, such as presenting learning material, managing course catalogues, holding examinations, organizing the materials, and keeping system records (Al-khresheh, 2022; Bradley, 2021). LMS has been often deemed to enable multi-faceted communication, and it has been featured in language education principally given this function (Demir et al., 2021). Moreover, the systems have come forth with their facility to provide different types of feedback (e.g., private, public, or formative) to learners (Rubin et al., 2010). Though some researchers regarded LMS to be more effective after the determination of the audience and their needs (Trisiana, 2020), some considered them unsuccessful in the language teaching context thanks to the lack of support from management officials (Dhawan, 2020), or falling behind in both presenting real-life learning environments (e.g., Brady et al., 2010) and respecting personal values (e.g., Cigdem & Topcu, 2015). For instance, Algethami (2022) and Manegre and Sabiri (2020) touched upon the varied manners of teachers toward using LMSs thanks to the lack of opportunities for technical training. Yet, Snoussi (2019) directly reflected on the thoughts of teachers about limited facilities for gaining technical literacy, and the incompatibleness between LMSs and academic programs. In addition to addressing this trouble as Guoyan et al. (2021), Almanthari et al. (2020) also handled the negative beliefs and self-incompetence issues and put them down to teachers' lack of knowledge and self-confidence, or previous bad experiences within e-learning platforms. Overall, these studies not only called for improvements in technical or financial support but also the need for abounding the practices of teacher education and professional development to increase e-learning awareness of teachers. Otherwise, as Meriem and Youssef (2019) noted, the other shareholders might encounter the vexed issue of teachers' resistance to change to online education.

Considering the aforementioned studies that resulted in different findings, before referring to the appraisals of LMSs through the eyes of teachers systematically, it would be worth listing some of the recently common LMSs with their typical characteristics. To begin with, Blackboard Collaborate (BBC), which was founded to bring innovations in education everywhere and increase efficiency, provides the preparation and management of training content (Liaw, 2008). Furthermore, it allows educational organizations to build vibrant online communities and improves data flow. It also enables to storing, sharing, and organizing of digital content so that electronic portfolios can be employed to assess student progress (Tsang et al., 2007). Mohsen and Shafeeq (2014) have incorporated BBC into their research design to examine the perceptions of teachers on its use in English classes. The researchers detected their positive attitudes toward blackboard applications mostly due to supporting the interaction between teachers and students. Likewise, Hakim (2020) has revealed the positive manner of teachers in adopting BBC in language teaching. On the other hand, West et al. (2006) have reported the discontent of teachers with BBC owing to the tools and some features complicating its use. In the same vein, Khafaga (2021) has confirmed the doubts of teachers in terms of conducting reliable evaluations of learners in exams although teachers perceived its use to be as efficient as face-to-face instruction, which was related to their incompetence to exploit it thoroughly.

Another LMS, Moodle is open-source code education management system software. Besides the fact that Moodle is completely free, academic staff can easily operate it via Windows and Linux systems. Most educators utilize Moodle without any programming and database experience. Since it is an open-source system, closing security vulnerabilities is much faster than commercial systems, and a large number of new features are constantly being developed and distributed free of charge. Teachers can easily manage material sharing and create forums or chats. Moodle also helps teachers prepare online quizzes aside from providing information exchange among users all around the world (Alkhateeb & Abdalla, 2021). Almarashedeh (2016) and Hsu (2012) have corroborated the fact that teachers were satisfied with Moodle in the general sense. Moreover, Al-Ajlan (2012) has featured the superiority of Moodle considering its quality and facilities of additional tools over BBC and Sakai. Similarly, Cavus and Zabadi (2014) have affirmed that Moodle was respected by teachers for being user-friendly with regard to presenting materials and sharing documents, unlike Sakai. In fact, as described by Girgin et al. (2022), Sakai is a web-based, platform-independent application with open resource codes and educational features in addition to being free and appealing to a large number of language learners. This application has many common features of the course management systems besides containing information or document distribution, assignment transfer, online assessment, and grade book and live chat modules. Despite these listed characteristics, the lack of credibility, accessibility, and additional advantages Sakai can provide teachers in different settings might have come into play regarding the results of the studies by the foregoing scholars (Wright et al., 2014). As for Microsoft Teams, researchers have predominantly found that teachers viewed it as productive in course preparation, implementation, and learner evaluation (Rahman, 2022). By the same token, Saranya (2020) has focused on its ease of use during the debates in the lesson and the evaluation procedure aside from the user-interface trait. Finally, Rojabai (2020) has mentioned its benefits for teachers in terms of facilitating communication, downloading files or records easily, and assigning new roles to users. Similar results were also reached for Google Meet by Siang and Mohamad (2022) who discovered that a clear majority of the teachers had a positive manner toward the employment of this system.

Similar to LMS, some virtual classroom software (also known as video conferencing software) for e-teaching (e.g., Zoom) must be investigated to clarify their outstanding items. As a case in point, Adobe Connect, a virtual course, or content preparation-publishing platform has synchronous and asynchronous learning modules. Adobe Connect, which can appeal to students' different learning styles and provide a virtual classroom environment, also allows the content design to attract the attention of students. It also resembles the features of formal education in sharing desktop, file, and web addresses, whiteboard applications, and chat with video and audio (Yilmaz & Aktug, 2011). Moreover, Caliskan et al. (2020) have reported Adobe Connect as an acceptable lecture program serving as satisfactory support by enhancing the interaction between teachers and learners. However, Khanlari et al. (2022) have stated that though Adobe Connect was identified as the most adopted system in their investigation, it took the lowest rate in teachers' satisfaction levels. Hence, these implementations have seemed to act as stimulatory for further studies to be conducted in the field to reach conclusive results about the use of Adobe Connect. Similar to Adobe Connect, BigBlueButton (BBB) is an open-source web conferencing system frequently used in the online learning-teaching process that can operate on Linux, Windows, and MacOSX. BBB includes eminent features, such as audio and video sharing, desktop sharing, uploading and presenting documents, whiteboard applications, and instant messaging (Basar & Ganefri, 2019). Nevertheless, Ukoha (2022) has displayed the view of educators on the complexity of BBB owing to its inability to support learning. In parallel, Rehn et al. (2017) have presented the concerns of teachers using BBB in that lecturing via this system would require detailed planning, and entail professional development practices they could fulfill with the additional support of colleagues. Finally, through Perculus, teachers can control the images and sound with the webcam or microphone, besides sharing, working on documents, or making presentations. Perculus also offers simple start-up live sessions, sends invitations to attendees, and presents user management capabilities with easy management interfaces (Durak et al., 2022). It has also been pointed out that Perculus was the most utilized platform like Advancity's LMS following Adobe Connect in Turkish universities due to the liability of teachers in storing data in cloud systems in the country context (Kacan & Gelen, 2020). Yet, Camlibel-Acar and Eveyik-Aydin (2022) have reported that Perculus was noted to be limited particularly in speaking activities, and hence would be replaceable with another LMS. Overall, the literature posed several study results reflecting on distinct LMS types with different characteristics from the perspectives of teachers. In so doing, the literature also indicated that there was a pressing need for more comprehensive and deeper analyses in the field.

Challenges in Utilizing the Systems throughout E-Lessons

After searching for studies mainly on the overall challenges of online language education through the lens of teachers based on their digital instruction experiences, it has been discovered that the majority of the research was carried out specifying one particular system or its features to uncover the difficulties faced by faculty staff. Therefore, this limited number of studies has been directly involved herein to discuss the issue at length. Accordingly, Bouhnik and Marcus (2006) have found less efficient learning practices in online settings due to the lack of vibes between teachers and students. Aside from reaching the same result, Rahman (2020) has also highlighted the problem of learner motivation which seemed to be badly influenced by this web-based learning experience. Likewise, Algethami (2022), Gacs et al. (2020) and Hakim (2020) have realized that drawing learners' attention to the course was one of the biggest hurdles besides their low internet access. Almanthari et al. (2020) and Vershitskaya et al. (2020) have referred to this poor internet connection problem and furthered that the infrastructure of the platforms must be repaired to have lessons without any disruptions. Dhawan (2020) has supported this claim and underlined the digital divide stemming from the unequal distribution of ICT tools, which would then bring about low-quality education. Similar to Almaiah et al. (2020) who have addressed the technical troubles required to be handled then and there in electronic settings, Algethami (2022) has emphasized the same difficulty for online exams raising doubts about the evaluation process due to the credibility issue. In this way, he has also called for a high level of ICT assistance to overcome this challenge (Alqahtani & Rajkhan, 2020).

Meriem and Youssef (2019) have noted that teachers indicated a lack of school culture in sharing, poor skills of learners in the use of computers despite being labelled as digital natives, and handicaps in communication. Aldowah et al. (2019) have reported teachers' views by concentrating on the delicate subject of course content and design. In the same vein, Almanthari et al. (2020) have revealed that teachers complained about the inconsistency between e-learning and the contents in the textbooks. As a result, teachers have felt compelled to prepare extra-curricular instructional materials that could be easily adapted to e-courses, which would require an additional workload. Finally, Snoussi (2019) has alluded to the lack of self-discipline of learners in virtual systems based on the fact that they underestimated the significance of online learning by being engaged with irrelevant tasks throughout the lessons. Correlatively, Alqahtani and Rajkhan (2020) have signified the necessity of increasing the awareness of students toward e-learning by forming strong interaction ties with the teachers.

Taken together, most of the prior research in the field has predominantly centred upon teachers' well-being, self-efficacy, and commitment (Guoyan et al., 2021), particular factors influencing the use of LMS (Kaewsaiha & Chanchalor, 2020), the assessment of specific LMSs according to the functionality, user experience and satisfaction (Demir et al., 2021), students' perceptions about their use (Taat & Francis, 2020; Thongsri et al., 2020, among others), teacher attitudes (Savolainen et al., 2012; Zhang & Chen, 2022, to name a few), or the effects of these systems on learner outcomes (Rubin et al., 2010). Surprisingly, to the best of our knowledge, no studies with a solid and cumulative base have been carried out yet to examine the standpoints of teachers, as moderating the course work, concerning the use of distinct virtual education systems while giving lessons on the target language. In addition, no extant literature has been detected to scrutinize the overall challenges the instructors faced during English lessons according to ten different virtual education systems. To put it another way, the current research will help us gain a deeper understanding of the overall views of EFL instructors about the systems instead of reflecting their stances toward a specific aspect of web-based portals or e-teaching practice. Hence, it will also provide new insight for future studies and contribute to the literature. To that end, the following research questions were posed as follows:

1- What are the English language instructors' considerations about virtual education systems to teach the target language?

2- What challenges do the instructors encounter while conducting English lessons on virtual education systems and are their suggestions to overcome these troubles?

METHOD

Participants

This qualitative study was conducted on 28 EFL instructors affiliated with schools of foreign languages of 14 distinct state and foundation universities located in 12 cities in Turkiye (i.e., Ankara, Batman, Kutahya, Nevsehir, Erzurum, Bursa, Izmir, Bartin, Sivas, Malatya, Karabuk, and Isparta). Two instructors from each institution were selected to be incorporated into the research according to the convenience sampling method. Though one of the random sampling techniques was intended to be employed, as schools utilizing the included 10 distinct systems may not be reached in this way, the researcher was obliged to refer to non-probability sampling.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data was gathered with 7 open-ended questions through semi-structured interviews, and it took nearly two and half months for the researcher to have interviews with the participants on Zoom in 2021. Considering the preliminary phases of the study (e.g., the formal correspondence among the universities for ethical approval, inviting attendees, and arranging appointments for each instructor according to their schedules), it took five months to complete the data collection process thoroughly. The interview was prepared in light of the research questions after meticulously reviewing the literature, and being acquainted with similar research designs and the scope of their interviews. Having obtained the expert views of three associate professors in the field, the researcher put the questions in the final form and posed them to volunteer participants in their mother tongue. Accordingly, the questions centred upon the convenience of the systems to language teaching, the sharpest differences between online lessons via these systems and face-to-face education, their advantages and disadvantages, capacity, and problematic sides, the must-have feature of the systems, and the suggestions of the participants on the way to enhance these systems for English education.

Initially, each instructor's answers to all questions were typed in the form of verbatim to generate transcripts. Afterwards, they were all translated from Turkish to English. Accordingly, transcripts consisting of a total of 19.258 words were created from 309.11 minutes of recordings of all participants. Content analysis technique was used in the analysis of open-ended questions in the interview by respecting the principles generated by Braun and Clarke (2006) and George (1959) (Table 1). Then, a theme-category-code list of the data was created.

Table 1. Data analysis flowchart

Phase 1: Familiarization with data
Phase 2: Independent generation of the first coding
Phase 3: Independent sorting of codes into categories and themes
Phase 4: Meeting to compare categories and themes and check inter-coder reliability
Phase 5: Revision and finalization of categories and themes
Phase 6: Frequency counts

While referring to the opinions or quotes of the instructors who participated in the study, a number was given to each of them and an 'I' representing the expression of the instructor was prefixed with it. To avoid misinterpretations, the researcher took into account whether the participants using two or more systems reported their considerations according to one specific system (e.g., the one they favour or formally have to adopt) or for all of them during the data analysis. The lists of codes were checked by another researcher with a PhD degree in English Language Teaching (ELT) to ensure inter-rater reliability. In the end, with a rate of 0.81, they were reported to reach a perfect agreement (Cohen, 1960).

THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER

As Greenbank (2003) highly stresses, to demonstrate their competence in the administration of the study, the qualitative researchers must discuss relevant parts of themselves, including any prejudices and presumptions, goals, or past experiences. In this context, the researcher was not biased in shaping the findings of the analysis. Accordingly, s/he acted as an objective observer from the outside by embracing the *etic* approach to interpret the responses impartially (Punch, 1998). To elicit more profound aspects of the dialogues, the researcher first asked general inquiries, listened, thought, and then asked more probing questions via semi-structured interviews. In brief, in light of the suggestions of Denzin and Lincoln (2003), the researcher aimed to see the big picture by combining concepts and ideas from an extensive spectrum of resources.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, 14 categories and 41 codes were created under 2 themes in total, and each research question was discussed in separate tables. As Table 2 reads, the researcher created 20 codes, 7 categories, and 1 theme to examine the general considerations of English language instructors about adopting e-learning systems in their courses. To begin with, the convenience of these systems was gauged and the results were displayed under three codes. Accordingly, only 5 attendees positively regarded the relevancy of the platforms with language education. Similarly, 6 instructors using Sakai, BBB, BBC, Zoom, and Perculus reflected their partial appropriateness. To illustrate, the view of I20 was as follows:

> On the one hand, students became more autonomous via online education. It encouraged them to think critically, and reflectively, and take responsibility for their learning. I think we try to control everything in face-to-face lessons and teacher talk happens to predominate over student talk. In addition, the current situation turns out to be an advantage for part-time learners who have to work and attend the course. On the other, the interfaces of the system do not seem to be compatible with language education.

Nevertheless, 17 participants reported the inestimable value of on-site teaching rather than a virtual setting. For instance, I8 expressed that:

> I have been teaching for 25 years, and I must see the students in person only then do I think that it is a fruitful and healthy education.

Table 2. Appraisals of instructors about the systems

Theme	Categories	Codes	Examples	Systems and the number of participants stating them in their explanations
The consideration of English language instructors about e-learning systems	Appropriateness of the systems for language teaching	Appropriate	I think it's appropriate to give English lessons	Teams & Edmodo (N:2)
				Zoom (N:1)
				Google Meet (N:1)
				BBB (N:1)
				Total: 5
		Partially appropriate	Despite not being as much as face-to-face education, the system is convenient	Sakai (N:1)
				BBB (N:1)
				BBC (N:1)
				Zoom (N:1)
				Perculus (N:2)
				Total: 6

		Inappropriate	No type of online education system can replace face-to-face education	Teams (N:3)
				Perculus (N:5)
				Zoom & Teams (N:2)
				Google Meet (N:1)
				Zoom (N:1)
				Zoom & Teams & E-course (N:1)
				Sakai (N:1)
				BBC (N:1)
				Adobe Connect (N:2)
				Total: 17
	Satisfaction with the system	Satisfying	Thanks to education platforms, we have compensated for the difficulties	Teams (N:2)
				Perculus (N:1)
				Teams & Edmodo (N:2)
				Sakai (N:2)
				Zoom (N:2)
				Google Meet (N:1)
				Zoom (N:1)
				BBB (N:1)
				Total: 12
		Partially satisfying	In such kind of a circumstance, we can say that it is the best of a bad lot	Teams & Zoom (N:1)
				BBB (N:1)
				BBC (N:2)
				Perculus (N:2)
				Teams (N:1)
				Total: 7
		Dissatisfying	It is far below my expectations in terms of language teaching	Perculus (N:6)
				Google Meet (N:1)
				Adobe Connect (N:2)
				Total: 9
	The efficiency of the lessons	Efficient	We can concretely teach English with funny lessons	Teams (N:2)
				Sakai (N:2)
				BBB (N:2)
				Google Meet (N:1)
				Total: 7
		Partially efficient	The stress caused by course records reduces interaction and pushes students to write	Zoom (N:3)
				BBC (N:1)
				Google Meet (N:1)
				Teams (N:2)
				Adobe Connect (N:2)
				Total: 9
		Inefficient	Online lessons are inefficient compared to face-to-face	Teams & Perculus (N:1)
				Perculus (N:7)
				Teams & Zoom (N:1)
				Google Meet (N:1)
				Zoom & Teams & E-course (N:1)
				BBC (N:1)
				Total: 12

Benefits of on-site teaching	Digital skills	It not only teaches students language learning but digital literacy and correspondence	Teams (N:1)	
			Teams & Edmodo (N:2)	
			Total: 3	
	Relief	The peer pressure has relieved and encouraged students to attend the class more	Perculus (N:1)	
			Zoom (N:1)	
			Google Meet (N:1)	
			Total: 3	
Weaknesses against on-site teaching	The lack of real interaction	The lack of real communication inevitably creates shyness and anxiety in students in terms of participating in the lesson	Teams (N:2)	
			Teams & Perculus (N:1)	
			Teams & Zoom (N:2)	
			Sakai (N:2)	
			Perculus (N:6)	
			Google Meet (N:2)	
			Zoom (N:1)	
			BBC (N:1)	
			Adobe Connect (N:2)	
			BBB (N:1)	
			Total: 20	
	The lack of real classroom dynamics	We need to incorporate more than one platform into the course since one e-system alone is not enough	Zoom & Teams (N:2)	
			Perculus & Zoom (N:1)	
			Perculus & G.Meet (N:1)	
			Zoom & Moodle & CLMS & hybrid education (N:1)	
			Perculus & Zoom (N:1)	
			Perculus & Teams (N:1)	
			Teams & Moodle & Perculus (N:1)	
			BBC & Teams (N:1)	
			Adobe Connect & Moodle (N:1)	
			BBB & e-campus (N:2)	
			Total: 12	
	The tension of being recorded	The fact that the lessons are recorded causes them to experience the stress of making more mistakes	Zoom (N:1)	
			Perculus (N:1)	
			Total: 2	
	The fear of internet disruptions	The fear of being warned by the administration if homework or exams cannot be gathered due to internet problems	BBC (N:1)	
			Total: 1	

Bureaucratic and administrative issues	Inflexibility in system selection due to official decisions	There are more effective programs other schools prefer but we have to continue our lessons in one common platform	Teams & Zoom (N:1)
			Perculus (N:4)
			Adobe Connect (N:2)
			Total: 7
	Personal data protection law	Due to personal data protection law, we cannot force students to open cameras	Teams & Zoom (N:2)
			Zoom (N:2)
			Perculus (N:1)
			Adobe Connect (N:2)
			BBB (N:1)
			Total: 8
	The lack of training	I could have used it more effectively in lessons, yet a comprehensive training program has not been provided	BBB (N:1)
			Perculus (N:1)
			Zoom (N:1)
			Teams & Zoom (N:1)
			Total: 4
	Budget (corporate deal)	The university needs to allocate funds to these platforms, otherwise, we will still experience network failures or limited usage	Perculus & Zoom (N:1)
			Zoom (N:2)
			Moodle (N:1)
			Perculus (N:1)
			Total: 5
Professional concerns	Digital incompetence	We cannot associate the problems only with the systems, in addition, we are not used to giving online lessons; we are not competent enough, indeed	Perculus (N:1)
			Google Meet (N:1)
			Total: 2

Note: Cambridge Learning Management System (CLMS), E-campus (A university-based LMS)

In the same vein, I17 referred to the divergence of digital instruction on the portals from in-class teaching:

> *Making live lessons herein means sharing videos or reflecting the books onto the screen in the simplest form. It is certainly insufficient as it stands.*

Taking into account these comments and the rates in the table for the first category, as in the work by Brady et al. (2010), the majority of the instructors appeared to have run counter to web-based language teaching. Moreover, they seem to have overgeneralized these platforms without specifying either their functions or their potential benefits to English teaching and learning. This is because the same system (e.g., Zoom) was found to be reported in three different codes in the table by the attendees working in the same school. However, similar to the findings by Khanlari et al. (2022), Perculus and Adobe Connect can be notably regarded as the least appropriate programs for language classes by respecting the ratios in Table 2.

As for the second category, though the instructors cannot associate these platforms with the learning context thoroughly, they seem to appeal to the systems to neutralize the troubles throughout e-teaching and hence consider them satisfactory. The possible reason they took this stance must be they assumed the system as 'a saving grace'. To give a clear portrait of this issue, I2 exemplified:

> *In fact, this matter is beyond our satisfaction but a circumstance directly related to the consciousness or unconsciousness of the students toward online language learning as well as their learning habits.*

Despite the differences in their regards, Perculus and Adobe Connect came forth as the most disappointing systems out of all once again concerning the participants' satisfaction. This result was also in parallel with the efficacy rates in the third category. In other words, congruent with the studies by Bouhnik and Marcus (2006), and West et al. (2006), these two systems were not considered as either efficient or partly efficient by any of the instructors in the current research. However, notably, Perculus appeared in the segment of 'inefficient' as the most complaint system due to its potential weaknesses. In addition, the researcher made an inference about the effectiveness of these systems that they were the single platform of the school. Counter-intuitively, the instructors did not seem to prefer referring to multiple systems to support the e-learning process but would opt for exploiting only one platform integrated with all essential devices (Table 2). Similar to I25, I27 explained that:

> It turned out to be very advantageous to use a single corporate program upon making it official and to operate it from one hand.

As for the advantages and disadvantages of these web-based platforms, the table showed that their deficiencies (N:35) overwhelmingly exceeded the benefits (N:6). Though they were reported to make learners attain digital literacy or citizenship and offer a more comfortable atmosphere to encourage them to attend class (Snoussi, 2019), the systems were mostly counted as insufficient due to their non-overlapping characteristics with face-to-face settings. Upon concentrating on 'relief', as was shared at the beginning of the discussion part, the views of I20 reflecting the profit of Perculus in aiding learners to attain autonomy were detected not to correspond to I2 who declared the need for the improvement of Zoom for students to become autonomous. Considering that I20 was reluctant to use the system in general terms, whereas I2 was satisfied with Zoom and heard of the complaints of colleagues using Perculus, the participants assessed these systems majorly based on their subjective norms (Cigdem & Topcu, 2015) rather than the platforms themselves.

Despite being a typical problem of online education, a good number of instructors associated the trouble of lack of real interaction with the systems thanks to their failure to instigate learners to take the floor. Appertaining to this point, I18 stressed:

> We can assume the existence of classroom culture in real courses, and via that culture, students attempt to hold the floor and speak. I embolden them to speak more, but my struggle often ends up with asking and answering the questions on my own.

Correlatively, I2 underlined the significance of energy in traditional classes and addressed this lack in computer-generated platforms:

> In face-to-face education, you can use the dynamics of the classroom; in addition, as your gestures and facial expressions come into play, you can make eye contact with students.

These comments were not surprising considering the third and ninth codes with the examples in the first and third categories, which foreshadowed the emergence of those judgments. Moreover, the systems listed under 'the lack of real classroom dynamics' seem to have met on the same ground in that they were all adopted with other platforms to cater to the requirements of a real class, though their combination was not favoured by the instructors. Put differently, these platforms would not offer a learning environment as in a real classroom setting even when combined. Finally, Perculus was ranked first again considering these two foregoing codes in the category of their weaknesses. I9 clarified it similarly:

> Even the student who really wanted to listen to the lecture was unhappy with Perculus.

As to the following code, despite being referred to as an advantage of these systems in the above-mentioned category, some instructors (N:2) reported stress of learners due to being recorded throughout the lesson. However, recalling the first comment at the beginning of the discussion and respecting the remarks below, the anxiety of being recorded seemed to be a minor challenge. Similar to I11, I15 expressed:

> My students, who remain silent in the classroom presuming that they should not utter a word for the fear of how their faces would look, managed to show themselves herein by speaking or writing.

Dissimilar to this fear, one of the instructors shared the tension of losing the Internet connection at an improper time. This result alone signals the necessity of a new section entitled 'features of the systems' to be discussed at length in the following phases of the study. Overall, the researcher has so far investigated the five categories directly correlated with the systems utilized by the staff. Still, as some other issues that may not be directly related to the systems could affect the online course flow, they would also be worth examining in-depth.

The last two categories were generated as having an indirect liaison with the systems. Firstly, the researcher stated some bureaucratic issues that the majority of the participants (N:24) mentioned, such as the identification of the systems by principals without getting the opinions of instructors, which would hence make them feel like laypeople (Alqahtani & Rajkhan, 2020; Dhawan, 2020). Moreover, they highlighted their feeling of a dead end with the personal data protection law which they regarded as a barrier to forcing learners to turn on their cameras (Aldowah et al., 2019). By the same token, some attendees complained about the disruptions due to not allocating the budget to buy the official program (Almaiah et al., 2020; Vershitskaya et al., 2020). Only then did they assume to be able to maintain the lessons without network failures or Internet outages. The last code in this group goes hand in hand with the last category of the theme. That is, professional development opportunities provided by the school would enhance teacher competence in parallel (Rehn et al., 2017). Nonetheless, the schools with which the participant instructors were affiliated seemed to underestimate the weight of teacher education as is seen in Table 2. As a case in point, I7 put down her failure to use the whiteboard applications on BBB effectively in the lessons due to the lack of training provided by the school on this subject. Therefore, it cannot be regarded as unpredictable to detect professional concerns of the staff about the lack of digital competence. One of the instructors touched upon the absence of training on how to adapt face-to-face education pedagogy to online teaching. I4 and I17 dealt with the delicate balance between synchronous and asynchronous lessons (see Jeffrey et al., 2014) and I4 explained:

> *One day, a professor with some studies in this field came from another university to provide us with training. S/he said that if we get prepared for asynchronous lessons with comprehensive content, it can be much more efficient than synchronous. That is, s/he emphasized that it would not be wise to conduct the live lesson during the Covid-19 crisis. S/he then furthered that we must keep it at an equal rate while planning the synchronous and asynchronous courses.*

This remark also accentuates the importance of organizing activities about teacher education and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) by schools to improve the digital skills of the instructors (Algethami, 2022). All in all, the researcher disclosed the negative considerations of the instructors about exploiting the systems in foreign language classes despite having some profits for learners and instructors (cf. Hakim, 2020; Rahman, 2020). Furthermore, Adobe Connect and especially Perculus were discovered not to meet instructors' satisfaction and requirements of the e-lectures (see Camlibel-Acar & Eveyik-Aydin, 2022, for further discussion). Thus, they must be only considered as complimentary applications of the other systems (cf. Caliskan et al., 2020). Moreover, Moodle, which was incorporated into the study thanks to the instructors keeping both the lessons and other tasks through this system, only appeared as a supplementary platform in the analysis of the fifth category. Finally, BBB seemed to be popular among the systems in the first half of the analysis.

Taken together, the scholar addressed the first research question to understand the overall opinions of the instructors regarding the systems during the days at the peak of the pandemic. To cast light on the difficulties the instructors encountered during the e-courses, an in-depth investigation of the systems must be continued as the second research question of the study. To that end, the researcher created another table with 7 categories, and 21 codes centred on 1 theme by respecting both the challenges and suggestions of the participants. According to the codes, and the research question which scoped the examination to the in-class experiences of the instructors, the second phase of the study was maintained with a systems-based analysis.

Table 3. Challenges of the instructors in e-classes

Theme	Categories	Codes	Examples	Challenging systems	Suggested Systems
The features of e-learning platforms	Communication and interaction tools	User-user messaging	Improvements can be made to the interfaces to see the messages in the chat box on the same screen without interrupting the course flow.	Perculus, Teams	Zoom, Edmodo
		Synchronous communication	We experience some problems blocking synchronous interaction, such as having to invite students to speak and sometimes being rejected.	Perculus, Teams, Google Meet & Perculus	Teams, Zoom
		Whiteboard applications	At first sight, there seems to be no options menu on the whiteboard. The system needs to be planned more neatly. As there are so many features, everything turns out to be complicated.	BBB	Google Meet, Perculus, Teams
		Online note-taking	You have to exit the screen to write a note on BBB.	BBB	Perculus, Teams
		Announcements			Teams, Edmodo
		File transfer operations	It should be easier for students to share files; when necessary, they should be able to transfer the files with our permission. Sharing different files concurrently in each breakout room should be also feasible.	Google Meet, Zoom	Perculus, BBB, Moodle, Google Drive, e-campus
	Collaboration tools	Group work	I do not think it is efficient in terms of group work.	Google Meet	Teams, Zoom, BBC
		Web 2.0 tools	We cannot encourage students enough to participate in the course and enhance learning due to the problem of integrating Web tools.	Perculus	Teams, Google Meet, Zoom

Management tools	Recording	The course records have been kept only for twenty days, thus I download the link and upload it to the university's own system right after I finish the lesson.	Perculus, e-campus, Zoom	Google Meet, Teams
	Storage capacity	It has a limited capacity; we cannot upload extra materials but a few videos.	Perculus	Teams
Assessment process	Exam management	The exam unit brings the questions into the appropriate format. We transfer the answers to the e-campus system with the support of the exam unit since we cannot directly get the answers from Zoom right after the exam.	E-campus, Perculus	Zoom, Teams, BBB
	Online grading tools			Teams, Adobe Connect, Moodle
	Tracking learner performance or assignments	We cannot see the details of which student did what, when, where, how, etc. on the system. Yet, we should provide the chance to give a voice to all students, especially the shy ones.	Perculus	Teams, Google Meet, e-campus
	Feedback	I could not give feedback because sometimes they write the answers in the chat box, but I cannot feel assured that they would pronounce the expressions correctly.	Google Meet, Edmodo	Teams, Google Meet
	Exam preparation	The content of exam or quiz preparation can be improved; m o r e o v e r , the variety of question types needs to be increased.	Perculus, Teams	Sakai
Content development tools	Sharing content (re-use)			Moodle, Zoom, e-campus
	Lesson Templates			Perculus

Software/ hardware	Web browser compatibility	As a BBC infrastructure problem, the more you record or share something, the lower the quality (sound, video) you will get.	BBC, Connect	Adobe Moodle
	Time restriction	One of Zoom's limitations is that it restricts the lesson to 40 minutes.	Adobe Connect, Zoom, BBB	Google Meet
	Database compatibility	Due to database problems, some colleagues could not get used to implementing activities on Teams.	Teams, Perculus, Zoom	Zoom
Reporting tools	Class reports	We cannot take class attendance reports on Zoom.	Zoom	Teams, Google Meet, BBB, e-campus

Table 3 illustrates that the participants concentrated on the communication, collaboration, and interaction issues a lot in the interviews while speaking of the difficulties they encountered during the use of systems in e-language classes and their proposed solutions accordingly (Demir et al., 2021). Firstly, as is seen in the example, the interfaces of the systems and the interferences in the course were tackled and the problem was mostly imposed on Perculus and Teams. Surprisingly, I21 compared the two and indicated that Perculus seemed to be more practical than Teams in terms of screen sharing. However, I10 and I22 expressed that trying to liken communication to face-to-face classes through chatting was quite time-consuming on Perculus, and also the lessons were to fit on a small screenshot while you continued the instruction on the main screen on Teams. As I2 alluded to the powerful interfaces of Zoom in the interview, this system could make up for their failure at that point and hence can be offered as an alternative to these two. I19 also shared that Edmodo resembles a social media program, especially as an interface. Therefore, Edmodo enabled instructors to write students a private message or, create a discussion part about the topic they dealt with in class as an after-task activity thereby students would share comments below it. As for 'synchronous communication' that stands out as one of the most debated points, the deficiencies of Perculus, Teams, and Google Meet herein were listed on the top. I4 and I9 elucidated that on the Perculus system, they experienced a serious problem with the sound transmission due to echoes, and it also took time to determine that this problem was caused by students. Moreover, as less than five students can turn on the microphone, or camera or activate the sound system simultaneously after being invited to the course, it was not possible to get instant answers as in on-site teaching. This challenge with speaking activities was also criticised by I24 in that instructors wasted time while giving the floor to learners, which disrupted the flow of the lesson. Accordingly, concerning the connection problem and the tedious process Perculus caused in speaking practices, I21 reported as a suggestion based on their experiences that they turned on the cameras or microphones on Teams when Perculus was active behind concurrently and thus conducted a more fluid speaking lesson. Finally, I15 phrased that they did not find it very efficient to assign students to separate rooms on Google Meet, and wished to have more alternatives concerning rooms as on Zoom.

Despite not being directly addressed in the interviews a lot, the severe criticism of the whiteboard applications was made by I7 with the use of BBB as illustrated by the example in the table. As a solution, I15 stressed the ease of use of Google Meet in that when students composed writing on a common text and the instructors provided feedback, the system would allow them to correct the text altogether by providing a lot faster use than a standard class board. Furthermore, I7 referred to the need for exiting from the main screen to write a note on BBB. S/he then furthered that Teams was dissimilar to BBB since it would provide users with sharing both the source and the necessary notes on the same screen (Rojabai, 2020). Additionally, I4 suggested

Perculus while giving synchronous lectures in that it enabled them to take notes on the screen without any interruptions. In what follows, though the fifth code was not declared as a challenge by any participants, the 'announcements' were generated considering their remarks about the prominent features of the systems. As a case in point, I2 and I17 mentioned that they were contented with Teams for announcements (Tsai, 2018). Similarly, I5 and I19 clarified the same function of Edmodo in making general announcements. Finally, I12, I15, and I16 introduced the obstacle of file transfer on Google Meet, and Zoom. This difficulty of use was suggested to be recovered via Moodle or Google Drive (Al-Ajlan, 2012; Cavus & Zabadi, 2014). I20 highlighted the support of the e-campus system while sending the assignments easily, and sharing the documents of students through this channel. Moreover, I21 made further comments that they can give written or video project assignments and ask students to upload them on Perculus by arranging a speaking exam. By the same token, I27 addressed the same drawback on Zoom and added that they had to upload supplementary resources and install some devices to the system on their own; only then they could send these materials to students. Hence, this process on Zoom was announced to be a little more laborious and time-consuming than BBB.

Similar to the above-mentioned tools to enhance the communicative practices of learners in virtual settings, collaborative appliances would also be worth mentioning to investigate the features of the systems in-depth through the lens of the instructors. To begin with, I15 notified Google Meet was incomplete in terms of arranging group work activities. As a suggestion, I5 accounted for Teams with its new chat-room applications and said that it updated the Rooms, which allowed them to divide students into as many groups as they wished similar to the breakout rooms on Zoom. Moreover, I13 and I25 presented the appropriateness of BBC on group work activities for learners despite the limited management of rooms by instructors. As to one of the hotly-debated codes, Web 2. tools were highly underscored in the interviews due to their considerable amount of support on language teaching, particularly during the pandemic. Initially, Perculus was noted as a leading challenge for instructors since it did not supply a setting conducive to integrating Web 2. tools. Then, I1 featured the use of educational tools with Teams, such as Kahoot, Padlet, Google Docs, and Google Slides, which aid them in compensating for the difficulties of online lessons. I18 reinforced this view and added Jamboard, Miro, and MindMeister to the list of these tools in terms of providing ease of use and practical applications. Furthermore, I5 and I19 referred to Flipgrid to be integrated into Teams, I15 addressed different tools, such as Nice to e-meet you and Padlet to strengthen Perculus and Google Meet, I3 pointed out Quizlet and Google Slide in e-campus, and finally, I9 alluded to Newport and Hypersay via Zoom to enrich the course.

While discussing the recording of the systems, e-campus, Perculus, and Zoom took a lot of stick. For instance, apart from the explanation in Table 3 concerning e-campus, I1 cited that things would get really tricky while sharing videos of the lectures on Zoom. I11 approved this view and added that one of the biggest shortcomings of Zoom was recording only the main room, yet considering that students could understand their errors when watching it later, s/he required this problem to be repaired at hand. Accordingly, I18 suggested the use of Teams; otherwise, when the lessons were given on Zoom, the recording would be saved on the computer; hence it would be necessary to transfer this record to Google Drive or a Cloud environment for students to access its link. Likewise, I1 added that s/he found the way out on Teams with its automatic cloud-saving feature, thereby they did not even press a record button every time since it would save all lessons to the cloud at the time. In the same vein, I12 noted to opt for Google Meet since the lessons were saved on the drive automatically, and would not be an extra workload. Similar to the recording, Perculus seemed to stand out again while discussing the issue of storage. I1, I2, and I18 signified Teams at that point and revealed that they did not experience any restrictions concerning saving and uploading on the system.

Another significant issue identified after the analysis of the transcripts was the assessment procedure of students on these systems (Algethami, 2022; Khafaga, 2021). The related problems caused by the two systems seemed to be e-campus and Perculus, as Table 3 reads. Accordingly, I21 dealt with this trouble over Perculus and reported that even when it was concurrently active behind, they had to appeal to Teams for the speaking exam due to the connection problem. Though Teams appeared as a suggested platform, any instructors adopting Teams did not highlight its profit in this respect; on the contrary, I19 mentioned the necessity of increasing precautions in the exams on that system. Moreover, I20 and I22 touched upon the insufficiency of e-campus in accommodating a good number of students, which resulted in the crash of the whole school

system in the exams. As discussed in the first question, I22 also underlined the programs were procured from publishing houses to be integrated into the system. Yet, as these were a bit costly, the school was to allocate a budget to the tools and applications. In addition, these instructors cited its lack of support to detect students' cheating in midterm and final exams. Therefore, I20 noted to have applied to Zoom for student control, their login to the system, identity control, and the implementation of exams. However, neither I4 nor I9 did remark any challenge with the exam management in spite of employing the same system with I20 and I22. Regarding this matter, I27 remarked that they resorted to BBB herein again as in each phase of online education due to its user-friendliness. Still, respecting that I27 thought e-teaching was more practical than traditional classes, s/he might have overgeneralized the functions of BBB without specifying its efficiency in preventing cheating. This was also in parallel to I15 who considered virtual classes on Google Meet more fruitful than on-site teaching, yet the instructor did not state any experience with exam management.

Aside from its use as an online grading tool, I8 mentioned integrating some programs, such as Turnitin into Teams, and detecting the plagiarism of the uploaded written assignments, which also served as a suggestion for the instructors experiencing difficulties with cheating. Furthermore, similar to Hsu (2012) and Almarashedeh (2016), I26 distinguished Moodle in that it eased evaluating students via quizzes on the system. Finally, I28 detailed that via Adobe Connect, they can assess students from different aspects and reveal which questions students answer more easily or have difficulty with. As for exam preparation, I3 and I10 disclosed their dissatisfaction with Perculus in that the exam setting, supervision, and evaluation phases needed improvement. I24 noted the difficulty of preparing exams and other similar assessment forms on Teams due to typing the questions and options one by one into the system. At that point, Sakai can be cited as a suggestion by I6 and I23 owing to easing the process of online education thoroughly (cf. Cavus & Zabadi, 2014).

Having scrutinized the exam procedure in online education, observation of learner performance and the feedback issue must be discussed in detail as the last codes of that category. As a response to I9 concerning the challenge of using Perculus in the given example in Table 3, I5, I18, and I19 advised Teams since it enabled them to track homework without keeping a list on the system since it already recorded who has submitted and who did not with the numbers. I2 also emphasized the efficacy of this system while gathering portfolios without keeping physical files to prevent workload. Similarly, I15 suggested Google Meet, and I20 gave prominence to e-campus for the management of portfolios within these systems. Finally, when the answers leading the researcher to create 'feedback' were examined, Google Meet first appeared with the written example by I11 in the table. In addition, I5 added Edmodo to this list with the explication that students could neither see each other's videos after uploading to the system nor share feedback, which eliminated the opportunity to provide peer feedback. To address this disadvantage of the system, I2 referred to Teams and furthered that s/he felt comfortable while providing feedback to students since they could see the notification readily after the corrections were completed on the same file shared by the students (Tsai, 2018). Interestingly, I12 accented the use of Google Meet to encourage instructors to give feedback to learners aside from allowing students to view all homework and texts on the system. However, this was completely in contrast with the view of I11 about the efficacy of Google Meet on feedback. Although both of these instructors adopted Google Meet in online education, their clash of ideas signals that they may not know the features of the system well, they did not utilize the platform in online classes different from their statements in the dialogues, or they gave an interview with hearsay information.

Regarding content development tools, the advantage of integrating Moodle, and Zoom was first presented by I14 in that the students can view and click on the weekly course schedule, and then they would follow what they need to do in line with the curriculum (Alkhateeb & Abdalla, 2021). Moreover, I3 highlighted the benefit of e-campus on students since when staff uploaded weekly materials, contents, and programs to the system; they would read them all therein. As for the software and hardware of the systems, BBC was on the blacklist due to requiring high-tech Internet speed despite offering ease of use in general. In parallel, I26 and I28 handled the same problem on Adobe Connect particularly owing to the insufficiency of this system during the speaking exams. They also detailed that due to the net problems, they were obliged to reschedule some lessons taking them to the weekend. Nevertheless, after applying to Moodle to make exams regularly, they deemed it worth recommending to colleagues. Concerning the database complexity, I1 furthered the explanation in the example (Table 3) that as Teams had complex software unlike Zoom, it had a high

potentiality to slow down the computers. On the contrary, I11 underlined that in addition to plans A and B, there must be also C and D against unexpected disruptions based on the database of Zoom. This divergence between I1 and I11 showed similarity with the above-discussed problem of feedback due to the same impetus behind that trouble. Returning to the subject of the database, I21 stated that Perculus was poor in terms of technological equipment. Though they were notified when a student opened a tab, s/he complained that they were not authorized to block the access of some tabs to students. Finally, time limitation was debated on Zoom, Adobe Connect, and BBB with 75 minutes. Accordingly, I12 stressed that different from Zoom with a 40-minute time limit, the advantage of Google Meet was not exposing users to time restrictions. In contrast, I13 specified that at the end of 40 minutes on Zoom, the lesson was automatically over, yet on BBC, they had to arrange the time themselves, which she called an extra responsibility. This fact alone reveals that apart from the features of the systems, the characteristics of the instructors, their personal values, and their beliefs must have had a tremendous impact on their responses to the interview questions.

As for the last category, the researcher addressed the class reports and detected the failure of Zoom at this point. As a way of solution, I15 specified Google Meet and declared it as a platform that improved with add-ons, such as taking attendance. Likewise, I20 and I21 regarded the e-campus system as advantageous for the attendance of students. The instructor also added that it was uncomplicated to check how many minutes they attended the class or what time they left the course thanks to the 'download data' section. Furthermore, I18 and I27 addressed Teams and BBB and reported that they itemized the attendance on Excel, and showed when the student entered and left the courses, and how long they stayed in the course at which time, respectively. Overall, with a systems-based analysis according to the codes and themes, the researcher recorded distinct findings from the investigations of the first research question. For instance, Perculus was discovered to be listed in the proposed solutions despite being also covered in the challenges. Similarly, though the instructors highly suggested Teams, it was included in the list of trouble as well at the end of this examination. The researcher also revealed the advantages of using Google Meet dissimilar to the first analysis. However, some problems were identified with the system of BBB, hence contrary to the prior exploration, it turned out not to be completely ideal in some aspects as highlighted by Ukoha (2022). In congruent with Khanlari et al. (2022), and West et al. (2006), BBC and Adobe Connect were reported to cause some challenges due to the software or hardware. Furthermore, Moodle always appeared in the suggestion list, and Sakai came forth in terms of feedback.

As is seen, the difficulties that the participants faced were reported meticulously in Table 3. Nonetheless, the researcher could not reach a conclusive result regarding the challenges and suggestions after conducting a system-based analysis in light of the codes. As each classroom was a unique and complex setting, neither the instructors nor their judgments about the platforms could have helped to identify the impeccability of those systems in online education. All the same, the participants were detected to be prejudiced against the systems in general, have some sensitive points about the platforms (i.e., time restriction), opt for a neutral stance due to their incompetence (e.g., I6, I23), simply oppose the change (e.g., I8) or come out against online language teaching (e.g., I16, 125). Thus, the result overlapped with the research by Algethami (2022), Meriem and Youssef (2019), and Rehn et al. (2017). To give a clear portrait of the consequence of this issue, in line with Brady et al. (2010), and Meriem and Youssef (2019), the researcher highlighted that the majority of the instructors (i.e., I1, I2, I3, I5, I7, I9, I10, I13, I14, I16, I17, I20, I21, I26, and I28) depicted interaction, communication, and collaboration as the cornerstone of online language teaching, thus enjoyable, game-based activities based on group or pair work must be incorporated apart from the school system. Finally, some instructors (i.e., I4, I12, and I21) alluded to Canvas and Schoology and stated their willingness to try them in online lessons at least once with the courtesy of the school.

According to the overall, system-independent suggestions of the participants, the issues of accessibility and ease of use (Wright et al., 2014), improvements in the interfaces (Durak et al., 2022; Saranya, 2020), sound system, and screen sharing were mostly handled. By the same token, more dynamic breakout rooms for teachers to observe the class (Rahman, 2020; Tsai, 2018), the balance between the synchronous and asynchronous lessons for blended learning (Jeffrey et al., 2014), variety in Web 2. tools (Al-Ajlan, 2012), and physical and infrastructure problems (Alqahtani & Rajkhan, 2020; Dhawan, 2020; Vershitskaya et al., 2020) were addressed. That is, the attendees reported that both technical matters and the operationalization of the course should be considered. Additionally, some instructors noted the necessity of applying platforms

through which direct verbal feedback can be given and visual platforms based on a separate video technique for students to develop their speaking and communication skills. In what follows, aside from finding ways to ensure their active participation in the lesson, it was also among the suggestions that the system should not allow students to log in to the platform who exceeded absenteeism.. Likewise, as curriculum, syllabus, and course-maps limit instructors, they reported needing flexible hours to take more initiative and build resilience. Different from the others, some participants implied the need for the flipped learning technique in online education to be employed for giving feedback and important reminders (Long et al., 2017). As a couple of instructors supported hybrid education, they demanded to continue to utilize these systems with applications and tools in face-to-face education. Moreover, some participants emphasized the pressing need for training on how to activate several functions of the systems, and how to attract students to online education different from face-to-face courses. Finally, they stated that these platforms should be redesigned by taking into account the students who need special educational support due to their serious illnesses, such as dyslexia.

CONCLUSION

The research concentrated on the significance of EFL instructors' general considerations about virtual education systems and the difficulties they had while applying these systems in e-classes. Accordingly, 28 instructors who adopted various web-based platforms and affiliated with schools of foreign languages of 14 foundation and state universities from different regions were recruited for the study. It concluded with the disclosure of instructors' negative considerations concerning the systems in foreign language classes despite some of their advantages for learners and faculty members. Moreover, both technical matters and the operationalization of the course were suggested to be considered in order to conduct a fruitful lesson through these e-platforms. That is, supplying the quality of the systems would matter to have successful digital educational experiences in the end (Guoyan et al., 2021). Depending on these findings, the researcher will draw a set of implications for language teaching practices.

The education sector was in a muddle when the pandemic struck the world. Despite being in the post phase nowadays, some restrictions may appear against any waves or variants, and accordingly, we may be compelled to apply to online platforms again in a new crisis. Considering that students did not attend classes in March 2021 as much as in the first days of March 2020 in Covid-19 pandemic, in other saying, the number of students participating in the class decreased at the end of the semester, the school team must be prepared to find ways to draw learners to the systems. Therefore, this study alarms all educational practitioners, policymakers, researchers, and teacher trainers in the higher education context to take precautions against possible outbreaks in the near future and extend their knowledge on the implementations of several virtual education systems throughout the pandemic and afterwards. Moreover, regarding the considerations of teachers, this study gains importance in that it shall cast light on which aspects the platforms must develop, and stress the need for the professional development unit to provide opportunities for CPD to the teachers. Hence, it also serves as a reviver to software companies by signalizing the points requiring updates.

As for the suggestion for further studies, the quantitative data collection instruments can be included in the study to triangulate the data. Furthermore, comparisons with the demographic information of the instructors as dependent variables can pave the way for reaching more striking results. School principals, deputy principals, and the CPD unit can also be invited to partake in the interviews to perform multiple analyses and broaden the scope of the research. Additionally, considering that quantitative data can be included, the number of participants needs to be increased. Finally, as the discussed literature has exposed, the credibility of the assessment methods would be worth examining considering the grading not only as a means of reflecting learners' success but also its indirect impact on the education system.

BIODATA and CONTACT ADDRESSES of AUTHOR

Dr. Zulal AYAR is currently an assistant professor at Izmir Katip Celebi University, Turkiye. Dr. Ayar received her B.A., M.A, and Ph.D. in English Language Teaching (ELT). Some of her professional interests include EFL, continuing professional development (CPD), curriculum design, using literature in ELT, language teacher education, and teacher development. She has over than 10 journal articles published in international indexes, 3 international book chapters, and other national and international articles along with papers submitted to international meetings. She is offering English language and literature courses to learners at tertiary-level education.

Zulal AYAR

English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Address: Izmir Katip Celebi University, 35620, Izmir, Turkiye
Phone: +90232 3293535 (8557)
E-mail: zulal.ayar@ikc.edu.tr

REFERENCES

Al-Ajlan, A. S. (2012). A comparative study between e-learning features. In E. Pontes, A. Silva, A. Guelfi, & S. T. Kofuji (Eds.), *Methodologies, tools and new developments for e-learning* (pp.191-214). IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/29854

Al-khresheh, M. H. (2022). Revisiting the effectiveness of Blackboard learning management system in teaching English in the era of COVID-19. *World Journal of English Language, 12*(1), 1-14.

Aldowah, H., Al-Samarraie, H., & Ghazal, S. (2019). How course, contextual, and technological challenges are associated with instructors' individual challenges to successfully implement e-learning: A developing country perspective. *IEEE Access, 7*, 48792-48806. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2910148

Algethami, G. (2022). Teachers' perspectives towards teaching English online at the tertiary level in Saudi Arabia. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) 2nd Special Issue on Covid-19 Challenges, 2*, 317-328. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid2.21

Alkhateeb, M. A., & Abdalla, R. (2021). Factors influencing student satisfaction towards using learning management system Moodle. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education (IJICTE), 17*(1), 138-153. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJICTE.2021010109

Almaiah, M. A., Al-Khasawneh, A., & Althunibat, A. (2020). Exploring the critical challenges and factors influencing the E-learning system usage during COVID-19 pandemic. *Education and Information Technologies, 25*(6), 5261-5280. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1063 9-020-10219-y

Almanthari, M., Maulina, A., Bruce, S., & Sandra, B. (2020). Secondary school mathematics teachers' views on e-learning implementation barriers during the COVID-19 pandemic: The case of Indonesia. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 16*(7), em1860. https://doi.org/10.29333/EJMSTE/8240

Almarashedeh, I. (2016).Sharing instructors' experience of learning management system: A technology perspective of user satisfaction in distance learning course. *Computers in Human Behavior, 63*, 249-255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.013

Alqahtani, A. Y., & Rajkhan, A. A. (2020). E-learning critical success factors during the covid-19 pandemic: A comprehensive analysis of e-learning managerial perspectives. *Education Sciences, 10*(9), 216. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10090216

Basar, A. R., & Ganefri, W. M. R. (2019). Learning of laboratory project based learning (LIPBL) on subject of hardware basic computer cloud server real time communication video conference based on BigblueButton. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research, 8*(9), 1763-1766.

Bouhnik, D., & Marcus, T. (2006). Interaction in distance-learning courses. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 57*(3), 299-305.

Bradley, V. M. (2021). Learning Management System (LMS) use with online instruction. *International Journal of Technology in Education (IJTE), 4*(1), 68-92. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.36

Brady, K., Holcomb, L., & Smith, B. (2010). The use of alternative social networking sites in higher educational settings: A case study of the e-learning benefits of Ning in education. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 9*(2), 151-170.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Caliskan, S., Kurbanov, R. A., Platonova, R. I., Ishmuradova, A. M., Vasbieva, D. G., & Merenkova, I. V. (2020). Lecturers views of online instructors about distance education and Adobe Connect. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET), 15*(23), 145-157. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i23.18807

Cavus, N., & Zabadi, T. (2014). A comparison of open source learning management systems. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 143*, 521-526.

Cigdem, H., & Topcu, A. (2015). Predictors of instructors' behavioral intention to use a learning management system: a Turkish vocational college example. *Computers in Human Behavior, 52*, 22-28.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*(1), 37-46. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104

Camlibel-Acar, Z., & Eveyik-Aydin, E. (2022). Perspectives of EFL teacher trainers and pre-service teachers on continued mandatory distance education during the pandemic. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 112*, 103635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103635

Demir, F., Bruce-Kotey, C., & Alenezi, F. (2021). User experience matters: Does one size fit all? Evaluation of learning management systems. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning 27*, 49–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-021-09518-1

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. (2003). *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *49*(1), 5-22.

Durak, G., Cankaya, S., Demir, O. A., & Cevre, C. (2022). Handbook of research on managing and designing online courses in synchronous and asynchronous environments. In G. Durak & S. Cankaya (Eds.), *Integrated systems in distance education: Comparison of popular systems* (pp. 77-95). IGI Global.

Farid, S., Ahmad, R., Niaz, I. A., Arif, M., Shamshirband, S., & Khattak, M. D. (2015). Identification and prioritization of critical issues for the promotion of e-learning in Pakistan. *Computers in Human Behavior, 51*, 161-171.

Gacs, A., Goertler, S., & Spasova, S. (2020). Planned online language education versus crisis-prompted online language teaching: Lessons for the future. *Foreign Language Annals*, *53*(2), 380-392. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12460

George, A. L. (1959). Quantitative and qualitative approaches to content analysis. In I.D.S. Pool (Eds.), *Trends in content analysis* (pp.7-32). University of Illinois Press.

Girgin, M., Ildiz, D., & Ozluk, N. (2022). Evaluation on solfeggio-dictation-theory, harmony and composition courses conducted through the Sakai learning management system. *ASOS Journal (The Journal of Academic Social Science), 10*(124), 192-214. http://doi.org/10.29228/ASOS.54899

Greenbank, P. (2003). The role of values in educational research: the case for reflexivity. *British Educational Research Journal, 29*(6), 791-801.

Guoyan, S., Khaskheli, A., Raza, S. A., Khan, K. A., & Hakim, F. (2021). Teachers' self-efficacy, mental well-being and continuance commitment of using learning management system during COVID-19 pandemic: A comparative study of Pakistan and Malaysia. *Interactive Learning Environments*. http://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.1978503

Hakim, B. (2020). Technology integrated online classrooms and the challenges faced by the EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia during the Covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *9*(5), 33-39. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.9n.5p.33

Hsu, H. H. (2012). The acceptance of Moodle: An empirical study based on UTAUT. *Creative Education, 3*, 44-46.

Jeffrey, L. M., Milne, J., Suddaby, G., & Higgins, A. (2014). Blended learning: How teachers balance the blend of online and classroom components. *Journal of Information Technology Education, 13,* 121-140.

Kacan, A., & Gelen, I. (2020). Turkiye'deki uzaktan egitim programlarina bir bakis. *Uluslararasi Egitim Bilim ve Teknoloji Dergisi, 6*(1), 1-21.

Kaewsaiha, P., & Chanchalor, S. (2020). Factors affecting the usage of learning management systems in higher education. *Education and Information Technologies, 26,* 2919–2939. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10374-2

Khafaga, A. F. (2021). The perception of blackboard collaborate-based instruction by EFL majors/teachers amid COVID-19: A case study of Saudi universities. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(2), 1160-1173.

Khanlari, P., Lorestani, T., Ghasemi, F., Oveisi, E., & Rezayi, A. (2022, October 5). *Assessment of online education platforms in terms of satisfaction, usability, and performance*. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4238225

Liaw, S. (2008). Investigating students' perceived satisfaction, behavioural intention, and effectiveness of e-Learning: A case study of the Blackboard system. *Computers & Education, 51*(2), 864-873. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2007.09.005

Long, T., Cummins, J., & Waugh, M. (2017). Use of the flipped classroom instructional model in higher education: Instructors' perspectives. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 29*(2), 179-200. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-016-9119-8

Manegre, M., & Sabiri, K. A. (2020). Online language learning using virtual classrooms: An analysis of teacher perceptions. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *35*(5-6), 973-988. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1770290

Meriem, B., & Youssef, A. M. (2019). Exploratory analysis of factors influencing e-learning adoption by higher education teachers. *Education and Information Technologies, 25*(3), 2297-2319. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-10075-5

Mohammadi, M. K., Mohibbi, A. A., & Hedayati, M. H. (2021). Investigating the challenges and factors influencing the use of the learning management system during the Covid-19 pandemic in Afghanistan. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26, 5165-5198. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10517-z

Mohsen, M. A. & Shafeeq, C. P. (2014). EFL teachers' perceptions on Blackboard applications. *English Language Teaching, 7*(11), 108-118. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n11p108

Punch, K. F. (1998). *Introduction to social research: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Sage Publications.

Rahman, I. A. (2022). *The implementation of Microsoft Teams as media for EFL e-learning: A case study at SMAN 2 blitar* [Master thesis, Universitas Islam Malang]. Institutional Repository. http://repository.unisma.ac.id/handle/123456789/5094

Rahman, M. (2020). Challenges and solutions of teaching English as a foreign language online during a global pandemic like COVID-19: Saudi EFL teachers' perspectives. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, *55*(6), 1-9.

Rehn, N., Maor, D., & McConney, A. (2017). Navigating the challenges of delivering secondary school courses by videoconference. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 48*(3), 802-813.

Rojabai, A. (2020). Exploring EFL students' perceptions of online learning via Microsoft Teams: University level in Indonesia. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 3*(2), 163-173. https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v3i2.2349

Rubin, B., Fernandes, R., Avgerinou, M. D., & Moore, J. (2010). The effect of learning management systems on student and faculty outcomes. *Internet and Higher Education, 13*(2), 82-23.

Saranya, A. K. (2020). A critical study on the efficiency of Microsoft Teams in online education. In R. Gayathri (Eds.), *Efficacy of Microsoft Teams during COVID-19* (pp. 310-323). Bonfring Publication.

Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P., Nel, M., & Malinen, O-P. (2012). Understanding teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy in inclusive education: Implications for pre-service and in-service teacher education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 27,* 51-68.

Siang, W. E. W., & Mohamad, M. (2022). Factors affecting the behaviour in integrating Google Meet among Malaysian primary ESL teachers during Covid-19 pandemic. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 12*(3), 565-576. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1203.17

Snoussi, T. (2019). Learning management system in education: Opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 8(12S), 664-667. https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.l1161.10812s19

Taat, M. S., & Francis, A. (2020). Factors influencing the students' acceptance of e-learning at teacher education institute: An exploratory study in Malaysia. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(1), 133-141. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n1p133

Thongsri, N., Shen, L., & Bao, Y. (2020). Investigating academic major differences in perception of computer self-efficacy and intention toward E-learning adoption in China. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 57(5), 577-589. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1585904

Trisiana, A. D. (2020). *The use of integrated learning management system (LMS) in EFL classroom: Teachers' considerations and challenges* [Master thesis, State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya]. Digital Library. http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/44981/

Tsai, P. (2018, December 10). *Business chat apps in 2018: Top players and adoption plans*. Spiceworks. https://community.spiceworks.com/blog/3157-business-chat-apps-in-2018-topplayers-andadoption-plans%0A

Tsang, P., Kwan, R., & Fox, R. (2007). *Enhancing learning through technology*. Mainland Press.

Ukoha, C. (2022). As simple as pressing a button? A review of the literature on BigBlueButton. *Procedia Computer Science, 197*, 503-511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.12.167

Vershitskaya, E. R., Mikhaylova, A. V., Gilmanshina, S. I., Dorozhkin, E. M., & Epaneshnikov, V. V. (2020). Present-day management of universities in Russia: Prospects and challenges of e-learning. *Education and Information Technologies*, 25(1), 611-621. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1063 9-019-09978-0

West, R. E., Waddoups, G., & Graham, C. R. (2006). Understanding the experiences of instructors as they adopt a course management system. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 55*(1), 1-26.

Wright, C. R., Lopes, V., Montgomerie, C., Reju, S., & Schmoller, S. (2014, April 21). *Selecting a learning management system: Advice from an academic perspective*. EDUCAUSE. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2014/4/selecting-a-learning-management-system-advice-from-an-academic-perspective

Yilmaz, E. O., & Aktug, S. (2011). Uzaktan egitimde cevrimici ders veren ogretim elemanlarinin uzaktan egitimde etkilesim ve iletisim uzerine gorusleri. *XIII. Academic Informatics Conference Proceedings, Turkiye, 469.*

Zhang, M., & Chen, S. (2022). Modeling dichotomous technology use among university EFL teachers in China: The roles of TPACK, affective and evaluative attitudes towards technology, *Cogent Education, 9*(1), 2013396. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.2013396.