

## 70. Emergency remote teaching: EFL instructors' satisfaction with teaching online

Eda TAYŞI<sup>1</sup>

Nuray ALAGÖZLÜ<sup>2</sup>

**APA:** Tayşı, E. & Alagözlü, N. (2023). Emergency remote teaching: EFL instructors' satisfaction with teaching online. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, (34), 1199-1216. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.1317426.

### Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate English language instructors' satisfaction with teaching online in an emergency remote teaching context. A mixed-method approach was used for data collection in which both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. While the quantitative data of this study were collected through the Online Faculty Satisfaction Survey (OFSS) with the participation of 205 instructors, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 16 instructors to collect qualitative data. The quantitative data were analysed through descriptive statistics. The qualitative data from semi-structured interviews were analysed through content analysis. The findings indicated that the instructors were not satisfied with teaching online. Although the convenience and flexibility of online education created a sense of satisfaction among the instructors, students' low levels of motivation, participation and attendance in online classes, the lack of face-to-face contact and interaction with the students, and students' lack of technological equipment and internet connection problems were the most significant causes of the instructors' dissatisfaction with online teaching.

**Keywords:** Satisfaction with teaching online, emergency remote teaching, online distance education, online language learning

## İngilizce öğretim görevlilerinin çevrimici öğretimden memnuniyetlerinin acil durum uzaktan öğretili bağlamında incelenmesi

### Öz

Bu çalışma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten öğretim görevlilerinin çevrimici öğretimden memnuniyet düzeylerini acil durum uzaktan öğretili bağlamında arařtırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın katılımcılarını, Türkiye'de 12 farklı üniversitede görev yapan İngilizce öğretim görevlileri olmuştur. Veri toplamak için hem nicel hem de nitel yöntemlerin kullanıldığı karma yöntem yaklaşımı uygulanmıştır. Nicel veri, 205 öğretim görevlisine uygulanan Çevrimici Fakülte Memnuniyet Ölçeği ile toplanırken, nitel veri 16 öğretim görevlisiyle gerçekleştirilen yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yoluyla elde edilmiştir. Nicel veri betimsel istatistikler, nitel veri ise içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular, öğretim görevlilerinin çevrimici öğretimden memnun olmadıklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Çevrimici öğretimin sağladığı esneklik katılımcılarda memnuniyet hissi yaratsa da, öğrencilerin çevrimici derslerde motivasyon, katılım ve devam

<sup>1</sup> Öğr. Gör., Munzur Üniversitesi, Tunceli Meslek Yüksekokulu, Uygulamalı İngilizce ve Çevirmenlik (Tunceli, Türkiye), edsoylemez@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1670-3977 [Arařtırma makalesi, Makale kayıt tarihi: 07.04.2023-kabul tarihi: 20.06.2023; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.1317426]

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Dr., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi (Ankara, Türkiye), nurayalagozlu@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9868-4399

düzeylerinin düşük olması, öğrencilerle yüz yüze temas ve etkileşimin olmaması ve öğrencilerin teknolojik donanım eksikliği ve internet bağlantısı sorunları, katılımcıların çevrimiçi öğretimden memnuniyetsizliklerinin en önemli nedenleri olarak saptanmıştır.

**Anahatar kelimeler:** Çevrimiçi öğretimden memnuniyet, acil durum uzaktan öğretimi, çevrimiçi uzaktan öğretim, çevrimiçi dil öğrenimi

## 1. Introduction

Online learning and teaching opportunities, which have already been developing in recent years, have been widely used in all areas of education all over the world since the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic in Spring 2020. Protocols were made to shut down buildings including schools, universities, and other educational institutions with a view to preventing the spread of the virus (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020). As a result, educational institutions had to switch to an online mode of instructional delivery.

This sudden shift from face-to-face education to online learning environments out of necessity, which is called emergency remote teaching (ERT), brought about certain challenges for both educators and students. As this migration process of universities to online mode of delivery was the result of a crisis, most institutions could not employ effective online education theories and models, which might account for some of the difficulties students and educators encountered through the ERT process (Adodeyin & Soykan, 2020).

Although many educational institutions returned to face-to-face education practices after the Covid-19 pandemic was brought under control, the decision to reintroduce remote teaching in Turkish universities after the devastating earthquakes in Turkey in February 2023 has shown that online education is still a viable option that can be applied in emergency situations. However, the overwhelmingly negative public reaction to this decision has brought about the necessity of analysing experiences of and opinions on online instruction processes.

Previous studies provide sufficient evidence of foreign language teachers' experiences and perspectives on well-planned and well-designed distance online teaching practices. However, there is a scarcity of studies conducted in the quickly planned or even unplanned and obligatory ERT situations. Therefore, this study aims to investigate online teaching satisfaction among Turkish instructors teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) in an emergency remote teaching context. Given that language teaching requires a great deal of interaction with students, foreign language teachers unavoidably found it more difficult to sustain their remote teaching practices than teachers from other fields. The following research question is addressed in this study: How satisfied are the instructors with teaching online overall and regarding student-related, instructor-related, and institution-related factors?

This study makes several original contributions to the literature. First, this study provides an opportunity to gain an in-depth understanding of the multiple factors that affect language instructors' satisfaction with online teaching. Understanding instructors' satisfaction with working in a very unfamiliar environment and the factors affecting this will undoubtedly have a considerable impact on improving online teaching processes. An examination of the ERT process from the language teacher's point of view, in order to identify and compensate for the problems, will be a valuable insight into future online teaching practices, especially in Turkey. This is because each year, an increasing number of

universities worldwide start offering online programmes. Therefore, it is an undeniable fact that online education will continue, albeit partially, even after the pandemic crisis is over.

## 2. Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT)

As stated earlier, educational institutions switched to online instruction mode in the spring semester of 2020. However, what they actually provided was not online teaching, but emergency remote teaching (Schlesselman, 2020). Although ERT benefits from the opportunities of online education, it is crucial to understand the key distinctions between these two terms.

Firstly, it is known that online education programmes are developed through a process of careful designing and planning. However, ERT “is a temporary shift of instructional delivery to an alternate delivery mode due to crisis circumstances” (Hodges et al. 2020, p.7). In ERT, face-to-face instruction is still the favoured method and digital technologies are used as back-ups or stopgaps to compensate for its lack (Schwartzman, 2020). As opposed to that, quality online education does more than just covering the course content and it aims to engage students with the content through realistic practice, real-world contexts and feedback; to foster collaboration between learners, and to create a sense of community between students and with teachers (Schlesselman, 2020). Therefore, one might infer that ERT is only used to compensate for the lack of face-to-face instruction and that it is beyond the purpose of ERT to design and develop a carefully planned online curriculum from scratch.

The second significant difference between ERT and online education is related to how students are involved in the educational process. According to Bozkurt and Sharma (2020), ERT is an obligation for students whereas online education provides them with a flexible option. In other words, students who are enrolled into an online education programme are free to take the courses they are interested in without time and place constraints. On the contrary, ERT students are usually subject to more fixed class schedules with predetermined compulsory courses and exams to take (Schlesselman, 2020).

According to Murphy (2020), despite being an appropriate solution to maintain education in times of crisis, removing face-to-face education from the realm of normal discourse would definitely bring about a cost. Much of the literature on ERT focuses on the challenges stemming from this imperative shift to online environments.

### 2.1 Previous Studies on Emergency Remote Teaching

Studies investigating learners’ ERT experiences have found that unreliable internet connection, lack of necessary electronic devices, work overload, lack of interaction with peers and instructors, vague and unstructured learning contexts, and negative feelings such as stress, despair, and anxiety have been the most reported challenges students had to cope with through the ERT (Ferri et al.,2020; Sharma et al.,2020; Stewart & Lowenthal, 2021; Rotas & Cahapay, 2020; Tumen Akyildiz, 2020a). Another study conducted with Chinese students (N=3430) and teachers (N=311) revealed that tools used for online classes, teachers’ digital skills, students’ satisfaction of teachers and their own learning, and teachers’ satisfaction with their own teaching effectiveness were the factors that contributed to the effectiveness of ERT (He & Xiao, 2020). It was also found that the advantages of online classes as described by teachers were no time-space restrictions, sharing resources, playing back courses, strengthening a new way of interaction, no class size limitation, and the possibility of reusing class materials (He & Xiao, 2020).

A number of studies yielded that teachers and faculty members tended to perceive ERT practices quite negatively due to such reasons as lack of digital skills, unstable and poor internet connection, cost, work overload, lack of devices, and insufficient data plans and infrastructure (Trust & Whalen, 2020; Pete & Soko, 2021; Liyanagunawardena & Williams, 2021). A small-scale qualitative study conducted by Durak and Cankaya (2020) in Turkey with 18 faculty members showed that using an appropriate online platform which enabled instructors to give live lectures, to use several tools, to interact with students increased their satisfaction with teaching online.

It is possible to infer that the studies conducted with language teachers and students did not reveal different results from the studies mentioned above. Talidong (2020) found out that although Philippine teachers of English language working in an ERT context believed in the benefits of online teaching for students, they still encountered problems regarding ERT such as internet connection, technical problems, overloading of conferencing tools, and passive learners. Another qualitative study investigating the challenges language instructors (N=19) face while teaching their emergency remote classes revealed that in low-tech Arabic countries like Yemen and Libya, the education process has almost stopped due to the lack of technical infrastructure. However, in high-tech Arabic countries ERT is applied despite some problems such as students' and teachers' digital illiteracy, lack of resources, and assessment issues (Hazaea et al., 2021).

A study into Vietnamese vocational English teachers' (N=45) attitudes to online teaching during Covid-19 pandemic showed that although the teachers' attitudes to online teaching were usually positive, they still had to face a number of challenges, including their digital skills and online classroom management skills, heavy workload, and students' technology competence and technical support (Tue & Hanh, 2021). The findings of another study conducted in Vietnam shed light on some significant points regarding the remote teaching practices of tertiary level English teachers (Linh et al., 2021). It was reported that Gmail and Google classroom were the most preferred platforms to make announcements to their online students, while Zoom and Google Meet were used more frequently than other tools to deliver live online lessons. The popularity of these tools among the participants might stem from their functionality and practicality as well as teachers' level of digital skills and the appropriateness of the lesson contents (Linh et al., 2021).

Turegun Coban and Kuyumcu Vardar's study (2021), which aimed to examine Turkish EFL student teachers' and their instructors' perspectives into emergency remote education showed that the participants had both positive and negative opinions about the process. While the problems encountered were mainly due to technical problems, applied courses, low motivation and participation of the students, heavy workload, lack of social interaction, and assessment and evaluation, the positive aspects of remote teaching were reported as sharing a wide range of resources, flexibility in time and space, affordability, comfort, and the opportunity to review the recorded online classes (Turegun Coban & Kuyumcu Vardar, 2021). In a similar vein, Tumen Akyildiz's (2020b) qualitative study found that Turkish EFL teachers (N=6) needed more training in using technology for teaching English remotely and in how to adapt communicative and interactional language teaching methods to remote education.

In terms of language students' perspectives into ERT, one study conducted with 101 Chinese university students using a mixed-method approach showed that online English learning was mainly driven by extrinsic motivation, which is not different from face-to-face learning. In addition, the findings indicated that ERT provided students with more opportunities for interaction with peers and instructors, whereas collaboration among students was limited (Huang & Yang, 2021). Regarding students' preferences of

digital platforms during ERT, Amin and Sundari (2020) found out that while students preferred to use Cisco WebEX, a video conferencing platform, for its authenticity and meaning focus, WhatsApp was mainly preferred due to its learner fit, positive impact, and practicality. The findings of another qualitative study conducted with Turkish secondary level EFL students (N=30) in Turkey revealed that although the students thought online language learning has several advantages, they still preferred a face-to-face mode of delivery for their language studies due to technical, economical, and individual problems (Tumen Akyildiz et al., 2021). It was also reported by the participants that their teachers emphasized the two receptive skills, reading and listening rather than the productive skills speaking and writing (Tumen Akyildiz et al.,2021).

### 3. Methodology

This section presents the details about research design, participants and setting, data collection instruments and methods, and the procedure of data analysis.

#### 3.1 Research Design

As stated earlier, the purpose of this study was to explore Turkish EFL instructors' satisfaction with teaching online in an emergency remote teaching context. Considering the purpose of this study, a mixed-methods approach, which combine quantitative and qualitative methods, was used. Although considered systematic, rigorous, focused, and controlled with data that is reliable and generalizable to a larger population, quantitative research falls short of capturing the subjective variability within individuals (Dornyei, 2007). On the other hand, qualitative research procedures can help understand complex phenomena by answering the question "why" through an in-depth examination of the experiences of a small sample of participants (Dornyei, 2007). Therefore, using a mixed-methods research design fits the purpose of this study as it aims to reveal not only participants' satisfaction with teaching online, but also to provide an in-depth understanding of the factors that affect language instructors' satisfaction with online teaching.

Quantitative data collected through the online faculty satisfaction survey (OFSS) (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009) provided a general of picture of how satisfied the instructors were with teaching online. On the other hand, the qualitative data obtained through semi-structured interviews helped identify the reasons they attributed to their satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Therefore, one might conclude that using a mixed-methods research design contributes to the reliability and the validity of the findings as it enables the researcher to "get richer, fuller data and/or to help confirm the results of the research" (Wilson, 2014, p.74).

#### 3.2. Participants

205 EFL instructors from 12 state universities in Turkey participated in the quantitative part of this study. The participants were determined based on convenience. Participants in a convenience sample are determined based on certain criteria "such as geographical proximity, availability at a certain time, easy accessibility, or the willingness to volunteer" (Dornyei, 2007, p.99). Although geographical proximity did not pose a problem in terms of accessibility of the respondents as the questionnaires were sent electronically, voluntariness was a significant determinant of the participants of this study.

While female participants constitute 64% of the sample, this percentage was 36% with male participants. The average age of the survey participants was 38,8. While 26,4 % of the survey participants held a BA

degree, 18,1% of them had a PhD degree. Just over half of the participants (55,6 %, N=96) had an MA degree. At the time they responded to the surveys, the instructors had an average of 20 months of online teaching experience while their face-to-face teaching experience was an average of 15 years.

For the qualitative phase of this study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 16 (Male=6, Female=10) instructors. Like the quantitative phase, participants for the interviews were determined by convenience sampling method. The instructors interviewed were selected from among the survey respondents who volunteered to take part in the interviews. The ages of the interviewees ranged between 29 and 48. They had an average of 20 months of online teaching experience, while the average of their face-to-face teaching experience was 10 years. Most of the participants (N=11) had an MA degree. While three of them held a BA degree, only two of them had a PhD degree.

### 3.3 Data Collection

This study, which aims to explore Turkish EFL instructors' satisfaction with teaching online, employs a mixed method approach in which both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection were used. While quantitative data were collected through online faculty satisfaction survey (OFSS) developed by Bolliger and Wasilik (2009), qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with volunteer participants.

First, the survey was sent to the administrations of participating universities for approval. After the university administrations approved the implementation of the questionnaires, they distributed the questionnaires electronically, via the electronic document management system or by email, to the instructors of English at their institutions.

In the last part of the online form containing the survey items, the participants were asked to indicate whether they would like to participate in the interviews for the qualitative phase of the study. Participants who volunteered to be interviewed were asked to write their contact information in the relevant place and they were free to provide any contact information they preferred (email or telephone). The interview participants were contacted by the researcher through their contact information and the interviews were conducted at predetermined dates and times via videoconferencing and recorded with the approval of the participants. The interviews took 40-45 minutes on average.

### 3.4 Instruments

As stated earlier, the online faculty satisfaction survey (OFSS) developed and validated by Bolliger and Wasilik (2009) was used to measure how satisfied EFL instructors in this study were with teaching online. Bolliger and Wasilik (2009) created an item pool by reviewing the relevant literature at the beginning of the scale development process. The initial items were analysed by a content expert and a psychometrician. As a result, several changes were made. The survey was administered to 102 instructors who taught online at a small research university in the United States. The results of a confirmatory factor analysis conducted by Bolliger and Wasilik (2009) indicated a three-factor structure with a total of 28 items: student-related (15 items), instructor-related (7 items), and institution-related (4 items) factors. The OFSS survey has two items (item 9 and item 18) which measure general satisfaction with teaching online.

In this study, the participants responded to the questionnaire items on a four-point Likert scale with four intervals from 1 to 4. As they read the items, they had to indicate how much they agreed with each

statement on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). In this study, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the total scale (.87) and for the student-related factors (.85) were found to be high. However, institution-related (.59) and instructor-related factors (.58) had a moderate level of internal consistency. According to Bolliger and Wasilik (2009), this might be due to the interplay between some of the instructor-related and institution-related issues as well as the lower number of questions on these two dimensions compared to the student dimension.

In this study, semi-structured interviews consisting of 5 questions were used to collect qualitative data from volunteer participants. The validity of the interview questions was established through expert opinion. Two faculty members in the field of language education, one of whom has research on emergency remote teaching, revised the questions. They concluded that the interview questions had content validity and made some minor suggestions on the wording of some questions. In order to ensure the reliability of the interview data, two researchers coded the interview data. The results acquired separately by the two researchers showed a high degree of agreement, which may be used as evidence for the reliability of the interviews.

### 3.5 Data Analysis

In this study, while the quantitative data collected through the OFSS were analysed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 24.0 programme, the qualitative data from semi-structured interviews were analysed through content analysis. Descriptive statistics (M and SD) supported with content analysis of the interviews were used to find out how satisfied the instructors were with teaching online regarding instructor-related, student-related, and institution-related factors.

Content analysis refers to analysing contents of the qualitative data from interviews to identify the main themes that stand out from participants' responses (Kumar,2011) According to him, there are four main steps of the qualitative content analysis process: identifying the main themes, assigning codes to the main themes, classifying responses under main themes, and integrating themes and responses into the text of report (Kumar, 2011). Prior to content analysis, the interviews were transcribed by the researcher. After the transcription process was completed, this four-stepped content analysis method was followed by the two researchers who analysed the interview data in this study. The themes that emerged from the content analysis were reported in the findings section along with example responses.

## 4. Findings

Quantitative data collected by the OFSS were analysed using descriptive statistics (M, SD) to explore how satisfied the instructors were with teaching online in general and in terms of student, instructor, and institution-related factors. As stated earlier in the methodology section, the participants responded to the questionnaire items on a four-point Likert scale with four intervals from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The initial findings are displayed in Table 1 below:

**Table 1** Descriptive statistics for the instructors' satisfaction with teaching online

	M	SD	N
Overall	2.14	.41	205
Student-related	2.21	.47	205
Instructor-related	2.61	.51	205
Institution-related	2.44	.62	205

The mean values illustrated in Table 1 above clearly show that the instructors who took part in this study were not very satisfied with online teaching in general ( $M=2.14$ ,  $SD=.41$ ). The mean values of each participant's overall satisfaction teaching online ranged from 1.43 to 3.43. The findings obtained from the analysis of qualitative data supported this finding. Eight of the 16 interviewees stated that they were not much satisfied with teaching online. While four of the interviewees stated that they were satisfied with teaching online, the other four participants reported not being satisfied with teaching online at all.

When student-, instructor-, and institution related factors were analysed separately, it was found that the student-related items got the lowest mean value ( $M=2.21$ ,  $SD=.47$ ). In other words, student-related factors led to more dissatisfaction with online teaching among the instructors compared to institutional ( $M=2.44$ ,  $SD=.62$ ) and individual factors ( $M=.2.61$ ,  $SD=.51$ ). This finding was confirmed by the results obtained from a series of paired-samples t-test, which showed that the mean value of student-related factors was significantly higher from that of individual factors ( $p=.00$ ), but only slightly different from the mean value of institutional factors ( $p>.05$ ).

#### 4.1 Student-Related Factors

Table 2 below presents the results of the descriptive statistics for each student-related item.

**Table 2**

Descriptive statistics for student-related factors

Items	M	SD	N
Item1.The level of my interactions with students in the online course is higher than in a traditional face-to-face class.	1.63	.67	205
Item 2. The flexibility provided by the online environment is important to me.	3.13	.90	205
Item 3. My online students are actively involved in their learning.	2.30	.93	205
Item 7.I miss face-to-face contact with students when teaching online.*	1.47	.75	205
Item 10. My students are very active in communicating with me regarding online course matters	2.36	.95	205
Item 11. I appreciate that I can access my online course any time at my convenience.	3.22	.82	205
Item 12. My online students are more enthusiastic about their learning than their traditional counterparts.	1.63	.69	205
Item 16. I am satisfied with the use of communication tools in the online environment (e.g., chat rooms, threaded discussions, etc.).	2.91	.91	205
Item 17. I am able to provide better feedback to my online students on their performance in the course.	2.39	.93	205
Item 19. My online students are somewhat passive when it comes to contacting the instructor regarding course related matters.*	1.98	.90	205
Item 20. It is valuable to me that my students can access my online course from any place in the world.	3.58	.61	205
Item 21. The participation level of my students in the class discussions in the online setting is lower than in the traditional one.*	1.75	.94	205
Item 25. Not meeting my online students face-to-face prevents me from knowing them as well as my on-site students.*	1.72	.87	205
Item 27. Online teaching is gratifying because it provides me with an opportunity to reach students who otherwise would not be able to take courses.	2.71	.97	205
Item 28. It is more difficult for me to motivate my students in the online environment than in the traditional setting.*	1.86	.90	205

Overall: 2.21 .47 205

Note: \*Recorded scale item.

It is evident that, in a preset interval between 1 and 4, the reversed item 7 “I miss face-to-face contact with my students when teaching online” resulted in the lowest mean value (M=1.47, SD=.75). In a similar vein, it can be seen from Table 2 above that Item 1 “The level of my interactions with students in the online course is higher than in a traditional face-to-face class” (M=1.63, SD=.67) and Item 12 “My online students are more enthusiastic about their learning than their traditional counterparts” (M=1.63, SD=.69) had very low mean values.

The findings in Table 2 make it clear that item 20 “It is valuable to me that my students can access my online course from any place in the world” (M=3.58, SD=.61), item 11 “I appreciate that I can access my online course any time at my convenience” (M=3.22, SD=.82) and item 2 “The flexibility provided by the online environment is important to me” (M=3.13, SD=.90) resulted in much higher values than the other student-related factors. Therefore, it can be assumed that the convenience and flexibility provided by online education created a sense of satisfaction among the instructors participating in this study.

The qualitative data analysis revealed four main themes in terms of issues related to students. Table 3 below presents the student-related themes and the frequencies:

**Table 3** Student-Related Factors Affecting Satisfaction with Teaching Online

Factor	Themes	f
Student-Related	Lack of interaction	12
	Low motivation	9
	Low attendance to online classes	8
	Lack of technological equipment and internet connection problems	8

The results shown in Table 3 above indicated that the instructors (N=12) were extremely dissatisfied with teaching online due to the lack of student-student and student-teacher interaction in online environments. Talking about this issue, some interviewees said the following:

*...And interaction... If some rules are not set in advance, interaction can be a problem. And interaction is a must for teaching English. If students do not switch on their cameras or switch off their microphones, interaction is definitely a problem. (Instructor 12)*

*I like being in the classroom. Our profession requires us to be eye to eye with the students. When I didn't see the students, I realised that I was repeating myself many times when I watched my lessons. Because I can't get a reaction. If I was in the classroom, they wouldn't need to talk. They don't want to talk here either. The need to constantly get approval made it very difficult for me in this respect. This is one of the difficulties, not being able to see the students and not getting a reaction. (Instructor 5)*

Another obvious concern for the instructors appeared to be that students weren't motivated for the online classes. For example, one interviewee said:

*In face-to-face education, you can motivate the students to attend the class and keep their attention. But in online education, unfortunately, students who are not interested in the lesson,*

*who want to break away from the lesson, can see online education as an opportunity. Because in the lessons we have done online so far, students are not obliged to turn on the camera and speak. It is enough for the student to appear online in many lessons. Therefore, it is difficult to ensure the student's motivation for the lesson in online education. (Instructor 6).*

Another interviewee put it as in the following:

*I think the biggest negative factor about students is that they are so unmotivated for online classes. It's easier to motivate them face-to-face. They see you in flesh and blood. You walk around the classroom; you can easily give feedback. You look into their eyes, and they are more motivated when they get your energy. What challenges me the most is definitely low motivation. Because the student does not want to participate in the lesson. (Instructor 16)*

The excerpts above make it clear that the instructors had difficulty in motivating students in the online environment, which may be due to a lack of face-to-face connection. Another significant reason for the teachers' dissatisfaction (N=8) was that students did not attend online classes as frequently as they did face-to-face classes.

More than half of those surveyed said attendance at online classes must be compulsory in order to ensure the quality and maintenance of online classes. Some examples are given below:

*As the attendance was not compulsory, many of them preferred not to attend. They thought they could learn on their own. They thought that they could somehow cover their deficits. Of course, it was impossible. But no matter how much we explained this, somehow they could not get involved. It was difficult for them to be involved in that learning process. (Instructor 7)*

*Attendance is not compulsory according to the current legislation. I believe this is an important problem. Having to read the assignments of people who did not attend at my lectures made me very upset and angry (Instructor 14).*

*You are prepared for a lesson with enthusiasm because you believe many students will come. But you end up with only 1-2 students. For example, you say, "Ali, you tell me", and you see and he is online, but he is not there. Yes, this bothered me a lot because attendance was not compulsory. He seems to be there, but he is not. (Instructor 10).*

Another important finding emerged from the interview data was that the lack of access to computers for most students and a steady internet connection hindered online education (N=8). One participant stated:

*However, there are many people who do not have access to computers, especially people living in rural areas. For example, I had a student, a sweet girl. She was constantly having connection problems because the place she lived in was a farm in a village. Even if students are hardworking, when there is a constant connection problem, they lose their motivation. And I wonder what she did in the exams, I mean, how did she solve the disconnection problem? (Instructor 14)*

Another interviewee commented:

*Many students do not have stable internet connection, they do not have tablets. They don't have computers. They try to follow the lesson from a small screen with a mobile phone. And of course, this is not very effective. (Instructor 5)*

Overall, these findings indicate that students' low levels of motivation, participation and attendance in online classes, the lack of face-to-face contact and interaction with the students, and the lack of the required electronical devices and internet connection problems were the most significant student-related causes of the instructors' dissatisfaction with online teaching.

#### 4.2 Instructor-related Factors

Using the data in Table 4 below, the instructor-related factors that cause satisfaction and dissatisfaction with online teaching can be explained:

**Table 4** Descriptive statistics for instructor-related factors

Items	M	SD	N
Item 4. I incorporate fewer sources when teaching an online course as compared to traditional teaching. *	3.02	.89	205
Item 5. The technology I use for online teaching is reliable.	3.24	.93	205
Item 8. I do not have any problems controlling my students in the online environment.	2.58	1.05	205
Item 13. I have to be more creative in terms of the resources used for the online course. *	1.81	.82	205
Item 14. Online teaching is frustrating because of the technical problems. *	2.41	.99	205
Item 22. My students use a wider range of resources in the online setting than in the traditional one.	2.60	1.62	205
Item 23. Technical problems do not discourage me from teaching online.	2.64	1.07	205
<b>Overall:</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>.51</b>	<b>205</b>

Note: \*Recorded scale item.

It is apparent from Table 4 above that most of the participants believed that the technology they used for online teaching was reliable (M=3.24, SD=.93). Although they reported using fewer resources when teaching online in comparison to traditional teaching (M=3.02, SD=.89), they believed that they had to be more creative in using the resources available to them in the online environment (M=1.81, SD=.82). In addition to these, when the mean values of item 14 (M=2.41, SD=.99), and item 23 (M=2.64, SD=1.07) were examined, it can be inferred that technical problems moderately affected participants' satisfaction with online teaching.

The analysis of the interview data revealed four main themes in terms of instructor-related factors affecting satisfaction with teaching online:

**Table 5** Instructor-Related Factors Affecting Satisfaction with Teaching Online

Factor	Themes	f
Instructor-related	Saving time	7
	The difficulty of working at home	4
	Improvement in teachers' digital skills	5
	Health problems caused by excessive computer use	2

Almost half of the interviewees stated that online teaching saved them more time compared to face-to-face teaching. Some excerpts are provided below:

*One convenience is not to get ready and go to school. It takes me an hour to get ready because...well, for example, when I go to school, I have to change my clothes and do my hair. But when teaching online, I can blow my eyes and start the lesson. I am not a person who sleeps for a very long time, but if I want to sleep more, it saves me some time. (Instructor 1)*

*What is good about online education is that it is time saving. In other words, in face-to-face education, transportation, going to the institutions where we will give lectures, coming home back, especially if the city you live in is a big city, these can be difficult. In other words, in Istanbul, you may need to spare about 3 hours before the lesson. You may need to leave your home and spend 2 and a half to 3 hours until you are ready at your destination. In online education, you can use this time to get prepared for the lesson. Therefore, I am only satisfied with this part because it saves me time. (Instructor 6)*

Another recurrent theme in the interviews was a sense among interviewees that teaching online led to improvement in their digital skills. The extracts below highlight this improvement:

*...I mean, I realised we didn't know how to use a computer, we didn't know how to use technology. We were at the basic level, that is, just turning on the computer, looking at something on the internet, Word, PowerPoint, maybe that's all. But for example, in this online education process, I found maybe 50 different applications that could be an alternative to Powerpoint. I thought that it could attract students' attention more with much more visuals, more colours, and more animation. I mean, the pandemic actually gave us this opportunity. (Instructor 9).*

*One good thing about teaching online is that it has improved our technological knowledge. We searched and found lots of different tools and applications so that the students will not fall behind. I feel I made a lot of effort for this. (Instructor 16)*

Some participants (N=4) mentioned the problems that working at home posed for them:

*I don't like doing courses from home. There has to be an educational environment for me. If you ask some teachers, for example, they may say they feel more comfortable at home, and that it motivates them much more. But for me, this is not the case. I must be in a school environment. (Instructor 6)*

*Since we are at home, we do not have dress as we did in face-to-face education. And that's why, it is difficult to get motivated for working. This is a negative factor for me (Instructor 3).*

Another minor theme mentioned by two of the interviewees is the health problems due to excessive computer use. The following two quotations address this issue:

*Too much exposure to screen light gives me a headache. Sometimes I have to skip some parts in the lesson because of my headache. It's mentally exhausting. (Instructor 1)*

*For example, sitting at a desk for long hours has a negative effect on my health. Therefore, my health problems have increased. That's why I don't like it. (Instructor 10).*

In sum, the fact that online education saves time, creates improvement in instructors' digital skills, and the reliability of the technologies used affect the satisfaction of the instructors positively, the difficulties of working at home, the necessity to be more creative when using resources in online courses led to a great deal of dissatisfaction with teaching online.

### 4.3 Institution-Related Factors

Table 6 below shows the descriptive data outlining the participants' satisfaction with teaching online in terms of institution-related factors:

**Table 6** Descriptive Statistics for Institution-related Factors

Items	M	SD	N
Item 6. I have a higher workload when teaching an online course as compared to the traditional one.*	2.31	1.12	205
Item 15. It takes me longer to prepare for an online course on a weekly basis than for a face-to face course. *	2.45	1.06	205
Item 24. I receive fair compensation for online teaching.	2.53	.95	205
Item 26. I am concerned about receiving lower course evaluations in the online course as compared to the traditional one. *	2.46	.93	205
Overall:	2.44	.62	205

Note: \*Recorded scale item.

The close mean values given in Table 6 above indicate that instructors are moderately satisfied with teaching online in terms of organisational factors. For example, the mean value for item 24 (M=2.53, SD=.95) suggests that the instructors believed they were paid fairly. Moreover, the opinions that the online workload is heavier than the traditional environment (M=2.31, SD=1.12) and that it takes more time to prepare for online courses (M=2.45, SD=1.06) were not widely adopted.

Three major themes emerged from the analysis of the qualitative data, which are listed in the following table:

**Table 7** Institution-related Factors Affecting Satisfaction with Teaching Online

Factor	Themes	f
Institution-Related	Support provided by institutions to instructors	9
	Using the right platforms for online classes	7
	Ensuring the security of online exams	4

More than half of the interviewees (N=9) stated that they were satisfied with the support provided by their institutions during the difficult and chaotic transition to emergency remote education. Some of the sample statements regarding the positive effect of working in a supportive organisation on satisfaction with teaching online are given below:

*Last year, the tutorials recorded by our coordinator got us used to online education very easily. The videos he recorded and the fact that he constantly helped us is a factor that*

*positively affects me about the institution. Because I didn't have as much difficulty as I expected. It was easy. I thought online teaching would be very hard, but it was not. As he has such a command of technology, he did not leave any question unanswered. (Instructor 16)*

*...they were always helpful and available. They responded to the urgent questions asked even at 10 o'clock at night, without saying whether it was working hours or not. And they did this without any complaints. In that respect, I think they managed the process well. (Instructor 7)*

*In general, I can say I am positive about my institution. Because the institution I worked for followed everything very closely. For example, while we were teaching, a technical team was always ready at that moment. When there is a problem during the lesson, you can immediately write a message and the technical team can step in and provide the connection again. In other words, there is a technical team ready to follow you and support you all the time. In that respect, the process was good. (Instructor 6).*

Another recurring theme in the interviews was the use of a suitable platform for online courses (N=5). The importance of finding and using the right platform for instructors can be understood from the following statements:

*The positive thing is that we've switched to Zoom this year. Last year we were using the school's own online system. We couldn't even hear the students there. They were writing to us on chat. This was something positive for me. (Instructor 5)*

*If more specialised systems such as Zoom, Skype or Blackboard are used, I think this can lead students to success. As student motivation is the same in the classroom and online, what really matters is to find and integrate the right technology. (Instructor 4)*

It is understood from the excerpts above that using online platforms whose effectiveness is widely recognised was a reason for satisfaction among the instructors. Failing to ensure the security of online exams was another reason for dissatisfaction for the instructors. The extracts given below address this issue:

*Since we conduct the exams online, the students can cheat and we have no way to prove that. I am sure that there have been many cases of cheating that we unfortunately could not intervene. (Instructor 14).*

*We need to think about and figure out how we can better control students during online exams. (Instructor 10).*

Taken together, it can be inferred that the instructors were moderately satisfied with institution-related factors, on which the support they received from their institution had a positive impact. In addition, there was a common belief that using the right online tools and platforms increased the effectiveness of online teaching. Lastly, it was apparent from the qualitative data analysis that ensuring the security of online exams was a source of concern for the instructors.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusion

This study set out with the aim of investigating English language instructors' satisfaction with teaching online in an emergency remote teaching context. The analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data together showed that the instructors participated in this study expressed a lack of satisfaction with teaching online. Another important finding was that student-related factors led to greater dissatisfaction with online teaching among instructors compared to institutional and individual factors.

Student-related causes of instructors' dissatisfaction with teaching online were found to be students' low levels of motivation, participation and attendance in online classes, the lack of face-to-face contact and interaction with the students, and the lack of technological equipment and internet connection problems. These findings seem to match those revealed by earlier studies (Trust et al., 2020; Pete et al., 2021; Liyanagunawardena et al., 2021; Talidong, 2020; Turegun Coban, et al., 2021). As the instructors noted, students' low levels of motivation, participation and attendance in online classes might be attributed to their lack of devices and to internet connection problems which might explain to a large extent instructors' dissatisfaction with teaching online.

Surprisingly, the fact that they had to improve their digital skills during the remote teaching process was found to be a reason for satisfaction for the instructors. This finding does not support the findings of other studies which found that teachers' lack of digital skills was a significant obstacle for their ERT practices (Trust & Whalen, 2020; Pete & Soko, 2021; Liyanagunawardena & Williams, 2021; Hazaea et al., 2021; Tue & Hanh, 2021; Tumen Akyildiz, 2020b). However, this finding must be interpreted with caution because studies in which data were collected early in the ERT process may yield different results than studies in which data were collected later. If the data collected in the middle of the ERT process in this study had been collected at the beginning, their lack of digital skills could have emerged as a significant cause of dissatisfaction among the instructors.

Another important finding revealed by the present study was that the tools used to deliver online classes significantly affect the flow of the online classes. Using online platforms whose effectiveness and reliability is widely recognised was a reason for satisfaction among the instructors. This finding supports previous research (He & Xiao, 2020; Durak & Cankaya, 2020; Linh et al., 2021) which showed that the instructors preferred to use functional and practical tools that allow them to give online lectures and interact with students.

One unanticipated finding of this study was that having to work from home posed some difficulties for some of the participants. This novel result may be explained by the fact that participants in this study had little or no experience of working online before the pandemic and therefore they found it difficult to regulate their motivation when working at home.

The findings of this study also highlighted the importance of institutional support for the instructors in the remote education process. It was revealed that the support from their institutions positively affected the instructors in the ERT process. This finding is in agreement with Tue and Hanh's (2021) finding which showed that the lack of technical support was challenging for the instructors during the ERT process. Another significant issue raised by the participants was their concern that the security of online exams could not be ensured sufficiently. This accords with previous research (Turegun Coban & Kuyumcu Vardar, 2021; Hazaea et al., 2021) which found that assessment and evaluation issues posed a problem for the instructors during the ERT process.

The findings of this study have several important implications for future online education practice. Firstly, institutions planning to provide online education should try to offer a suitable physical working environment for instructors who, for various reasons, have difficulty in working at home. Secondly, in-service trainings should be provided to improve the techno-pedagogical knowledge of the educators. The results of this study showed that although the instructors improved their digital skills over time by experience, they failed in terms of interacting with and motivating students in the online environment. Therefore, in-service trainings provided to educators should move away from a purely technological context and emphasise the pedagogical and field-specific dimensions of online teaching such as promoting interaction and collaboration and using alternative ways of assessment such as portfolios and performance assessment in the online environment instead of traditional tests.

Thirdly, institutions should not be rigid in determining the platforms where online teaching will be carried out and should provide flexibility to instructors to use the platforms that are in harmony with their own digital skills and the learning needs of their students. And lastly, rules for the administration of online education, especially in terms of attendance in classes, should be standardised and haphazard practices should be eliminated.

Several limitations to this study need to be acknowledged. Firstly, a limited number of participants determined based on convenience participated in this study. Therefore, it is difficult to generalize the results of this study to the whole population. In addition, cause-and-effect relationships cannot be inferred from this study as the research design used was not experimental.

### References

- Adedoyin, O.B., & Soykan, E. (2020): Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180>
- Amin, F. M., & Sundari, H. (2020). EFL students' preferences on digital platforms during emergency remote teaching: Video Conference, LMS, or Messenger Application? *Studies in English Language and Education*, 7(2), 362-378.
- Bolliger, D.U., & Wasilik, O. (2009). Factors influencing faculty satisfaction with online teaching and learning in higher education. *Distance Education*, 30 (1), 103-116.
- Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R.C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to CoronaVirus pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 1-6.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Durak, G., & Çankaya, S. (2020). Emergency Distance Education Process from the Perspectives of Academicians. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(2), 159-174. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4303782>
- Ferri, F., Grifoni, P., & Guzzo, T. (2020). Online Learning and Emergency Remote Teaching: Opportunities and Challenges in Emergency Situations. *Societies*, 10(4), 86. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc10040086>
- Hazaea, A.N., Bin-Hady, W.R.A., & Toujani, M.M. (2021). Emergency Remote English Language Teaching in the Arab League Countries: Challenges and Remedies. *CALL-EJ*, 22(1), 201-222.
- He, W., & Xiao, J. (2020). The Emergency Online Classes During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Chinese University Case Study. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(2), 21-36. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4292664>
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The Difference Between Emergency Remote Teaching and Online Learning. *EDUCAUSE*,

- <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning>
- Huang, M., Shi, Y. & Yang, X. (2021). Emergency remote teaching of English as a foreign language during COVID-19: Perspectives from a university in China. *International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation (IJERI)*, 15, 400-418.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. Sage
- Linh, L. T. N., Lam, N.T., & Ngoc, N.H. (2021). Using E-Learning Platforms in Online Classes: A Survey on Tertiary English Teachers' Perceptions. *AsiaCALL Online Journal*, 12(5), 34-53.
- Liyanagunawardena, T. R. & Williams, S. A. (2021). Emergency remote education: Experience from Sri Lanka during Covid-19. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 16(1), 207-229. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4988349>
- Murphy, M.P.A. (2020). COVID-19 and emergency eLearning: Consequences of the securitization of higher education for post-pandemic pedagogy. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 41(3), 492-505. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2020.1761749>
- Pete, J., & Soko, J. (2020). Preparedness for online learning in the context of Covid-19 in selected Sub-Saharan African countries. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(2), 37-47. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4292688>
- Rotas, E. E., & Cahapay, M. B. (2020). Difficulties in Remote Learning: Voices of Philippine University Students in the Wake of COVID-19 Crisis. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(2), 147-158. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4299835>
- Schlesselman, L.S. (2020). Perspective from a Teaching and Learning Center During Emergency Remote Teaching. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 84(8), 1042-1044. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe8142>
- Schwartzman, R. (2020) Performing pandemic pedagogy. *Communication Education*, 69(4), 502-517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2020.1804602>
- Sharma, M., Onta, M., Shrestha, S., Sharma, M. R., & Bhattarai, T. (2020). The pedagogical shift during COVID-19 pandemic: Emergency remote learning practices in nursing and its effectiveness. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 16(1), 98-110. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4695275>
- Stewart, W. H., & Lowenthal, P. R. (2021). Experiences and perceptions of exchange students learning online during the COVID-19 pandemic in the Republic of Korea: An exploratory descriptive study. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 16(1), 119-140. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4782878>
- Talidong, K.J.B. (2020). Implementation of emergency remote teaching (ERT) among Philippine teachers in Xi'an, China. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 196-201.
- Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should Teachers be Trained in Emergency Remote Teaching? Lessons Learned from the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 28(2), 189-199.
- Tue, H. N., & Hanh, L.D. (2021). Vocational English Teachers' Challenges on Shifting Towards Virtual Classroom Teaching. *AsiaCALL Online Journal*, 12(3), 58-73.
- Tumen Akyıldız, S. (2020a). College students' views on the pandemic distance education: A focus group discussion. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science (IJTES)*, 4(4), 322-334.
- Tumen Akyıldız, S. (2020b). Pandemi döneminde yapılan uzaktan eğitim çalışmalarıyla ilgili İngilizce öğretmenlerinin görüşleri (bir odak grup tartışması). *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, (21), 679-696. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.835811>
- Tumen Akyıldız, S., Çelik, V., & Ahmed, K.H. (2021). The Impact of Covid-19 Pandemic on EFL Classes through the Lenses of Secondary Learners. *International Journal of Education*, 9 (4), 389-406.
- Turegun Çoban, B., & Kuyumcu Vardar, A. (2021). Evaluation of distance English language teaching education during COVID-19 pandemic from the perspectives of ELT student teachers and their

instructors. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 5(3), 198-220.

<https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.2021371746>

Wilson, V. (2014). Research Methods: Triangulation. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 9(1), 74-75.