A Retrospective Look at the Perceptions and Attitudes of Turkish Students towards Learning English Online: Experiences (Findings) From the Pandemic Period.

Lara Ibrahim A. Alhashash

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
February 2023
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan
Chair, Department of Foreign Language Education

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. İsmail Erkan Arkın

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Aman Rassouli

ABSTRACT

Inclusion of technology and integrating technology-based tasks in ELT and in education in general has not been considered a new topic, and it has always been investigated to improve the quality of teaching and enhance the learning process. Since the outbreak of Covid-19, classes have been immediately changed to the virtual environment, and implementing ICT has been considered unavoidable.

This rapid transformation has severely impacted the teaching process and affected teachers and learners' emotionally and academically. Hence, researchers have started investigating learners' opinions regarding online learning to find the challenges that hinder them from achieving their learning goals.

Hence, this study is a retrospective study, was conducted in North Cyprus to determine Turkish and Turkish Cypriot learners' attitudes and perceptions of online learning during the Pandemic at EMU. Turkish and Turkish Cypriot learners who have experienced learning English or content in English online (as a medium of instruction) were surveyed using a 5-point questionnaire of 28 attitude statements. Moreover, the merits and demerits of the online experience were identified according to their perspectives.

Findings revealed mixed opinions; some learners were not satisfied with the online activities, considered them boring, not matching their preference, and needed more objectives' clarification. They also encountered interaction issues, health issues, lack of resources, and ill-equipped technical knowledge. However, it was flexible for some

learners who reviewed the sessions and studied at their speed. In light of the results, some recommendations and implications have been suggested.

Keywords: Distance Education, ICT, Digital Competence, Online Learning, E-learning, Asynchronous, Synchronous, Hybrid Learning, Tech-based Learning, Knowledge Construction, Perception, Attitude, ERT.

ÖZ

Teknolojinin İngiliz Dili Öğretimine ve genel anlamda eğitime dahil edilmesi, teknoloji tabanlı görevlerin İngiliz Dili Öğretimine entegre edilmesi yeni bir konu olarak görülmemiş ve öğretim kalitesini artırmak, öğrenme sürecini geliştirmek amacıyla her zaman araştırılmıştır. Covid-19'un patlak vermesinden bu yana sınıflar hızlı bir şekilde sanal ortama dönüştürüldü ve Bilgi ve İletişim Teknolojilerinin uygulanması kaçınılmaz görüldü.

Bu hızlı dönüşüm, öğretim sürecini ciddi şekilde etkilemiş, öğretmenleri ve öğrencileri ise duygusal ve akademik olarak etkilemiştir. Bu nedenle araştırmacılar, öğrenme hedeflerine ulaşmalarını engelleyen zorlukları bulmak için öğrencilerin çevrimiçi öğrenmeye ilişkin görüşlerini araştırmaya başladılar.

Bu çalışma retrospektif bir çalışmadır, Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesindeki Türk ve Kıbrıslı Türk öğrencilerin çevrimiçi öğrenmeye yönelik geçmiş tecrübelerini, Pandemi sırasında çevrimiçi öğrenmeye yönelik tutum ve algılarını belirlemek amacıyla yapılmıştır. İngilizce'yi (bir eğitim aracı olarak) çevrimiçi öğrenmeyi deneyimlemiş olan Türk ve Kıbrıslı Türk öğrenciler, 28 tutum ifadesinden oluşan 5 puanlık bir ankete tabi tutulmuştur. Ayrıca, çevrimiçi deneyimin yararları ve zararları, onların bakış açılarına göre belirlenmiştir.

Bulgular karışık görüşleri ortaya çıkardı; bazı öğrenciler çevrimiçi etkinliklerden tatmin olmadı, onları sıkıcı, tercihleriyle eşleşmeyen olarak gördü ve hedeflerin daha fazla açıklığa kavuşturulmasına ihtiyaç duydular. Ayrıca etkileşim sorunları, sağlık sorunları, kaynak eksikliği ve yetersiz teknik bilgi ile karşılaştılar. Buna rağmen,

oturumları sonradan gözden geçiren ve kendi hızlarında çalışan bazı öğrenciler için çevrimiçi öğrenme esnekti. Elde edilen sonuçlar ışığında bazı öneriler ve çıkarımlar yapılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dans Eğitimi, BİT, Dijital Rekabet, Çevrimiçi Öğrenme, E-Öğrenme, Eşzamansiz, Senkron, Hibrit Öğrenme, Teknoloji Tabanli Öğrenme, Bilme Yapisi, Algi, Tutum, ERT.

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Firstly, I am so grateful for my professor: Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam, who has been guiding me since the beginning of this journey. I could have done nothing without his patience, supervision, valuable recommendations.

I dedicate this study to my supportive family, who have allowed me to travel to Cyprus to accomplish my study and have always been encouraging and supportive. I am so grateful for my mother and family who opened up a new horizon for me in life to study MA at this age in one of the best universities under the supervision of such competent professors. Thanks to my brother, Mahmoud Hashash, who has always supported me and tolerated my ups and downs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

COI	Community of Inquiry
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease of 2019
CP	Cognitive Presence
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELL	English language Learner
ELT	English Language Teaching
ERT	Emergency Remote Teaching
EMI	English as a Medium of Instruction
E-learning	Electronic Learning
GT	Grammar Translation Method
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IWB	Interactive Whiteboard
OL	Online Learning
SP	Social Presence
SOV	Subject Object Verb
SVO	Subject Verb Object
TP	Teaching Presence
WTC	Willingness to Communicate

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

This chapter begins with a background of the study. Followed by the aim of the study, the research statement, research design, and limitations, delimitations, implications and finally the definitions of the key terms.

Many different instructional approaches have been used in English language programs to improve students' academic competency and literacy in English (Coryell & Chlup, 2007). *Information and Communication Technology (*ICT, thereafter), which refers to various technologies, including electronic mechanisms like radios, televisions, and projectors, has not to be considered a recent development. Under the terms '*computer-based'* or '*computer-managed learning'*, online techniques were created in the 1980s to support remote and distant delivery learning. These methodologies used tools including mail, bulletin board, computer-mediated conferencing, text-based communication, audio graphics, and video conferencing which will help in the delivery of instructions in synchronous and asynchronous environments (Keller & Cernerud, 2002; Fu, 2013).

The term *E-learning (electronic learning*) is related to the use of ICT and digital tools in education. While instruction can take place in or outside classrooms, E-learning's critical element is using the computer and the internet (Maatuk, Elberkawi,

Aljawarneh, Rashaideh, & Alharbi, 2022). E-learning refers to *internet-based, digital, interactive, or web-based learning and computer-assisted instruction*. It is primarily a web-based educational system that uses technology to give students knowledge or skills (Maatuk et al., 2022). Moreover, E-learning can be used to refer to *M-learning, blended, virtual, distance, and online learning* (Dahan et al., 2022).

Nowadays, universities have adapted E-learning courses to reach countless learners who cannot attain or access higher education. Consequently, E-learning has been considered a motivational strategy for self-learning language pedagogy for digital learners. That is in line with Zamari's (2012, as cited in Hazaymeh, 2021) study, which revealed that learners were eager to carry out online activities even without assessment (Hazaymeh, 2021). Online education varies from traditional or face-to-face learning, which requires no classroom presence physically. Some students lose opportunities to communicate face-to-face unless they are self-assured and can reply promptly. However, online learning has provided learners flexibility and an engaging learning environment (Rojabi, 2020). Moreover, it offers learners unique options for engaging learning settings, authoring tools, rubrics, feedback, chat conversation, providing comments, submitting assignments, and sharing documents are just a few distinctive characteristics of virtual learning (Rojabi, 2020).

Most E-learning activities focus more on the creation of materials and resources. It has been argued that effective E-learning experiences include learners' experiences, learning settings or contexts, teachers' tactics, and planning (Alexander, 2001). Therefore, technical delivery methods must be prioritized. Nevertheless, teachers' conceptions of learning significantly impact how courses are planned, teaching methods are developed, and what learners have been taught accordingly (Alexander,

2001). In the literature, several articles suggested practical frameworks for implementing successful E-learning experiences. Teachers are strongly recommended to have a look at them and rethink their pedagogy.

It has been mentioned that enhancing social interaction and collaborative communities is crucial in an online session. On the other hand, constructing an online community is challenging for online students. Therefore, stakeholders should be responsible for motivating students to collaborate and interact to create a more successful online environment. Moreover, learning objectives can be achieved through more learner-centered classes and by applying the most effective learning approaches and technologies (Nartiningrum & Nugroho, 2020).

This study presented learners' attitudes and perceptions. Oppenheim (2000) describes *attitude* as a state of preparedness, a react in a particular way when faced with particular stimuli. However, perception is a closely related concept to attitude. Pickens (2005) defined *perception* as how living things arrange and interpret their senses to have meaningful experiences of the outside world. For instance, when a circumstance or a stimulus is presented to a person, the person transforms the input into something meaningful for them based on past experiences. However, what a person interprets or perceives could differ significantly from reality (Pickens, 2005). It has been claimed that learning outcomes will result from positivity in the learners' attitudes. In contrast, a negative attitude will affect their motivation and may lead to lower achievements. Consequently, tutors should look for new methodologies to ensure learners' satisfaction (Cinkara & Bağçeci, 2013). The way students view E-learning is essential since it significantly decreases students' motivation and unfavorable impressions about online learning (Kauffman, 2015, as cited in Bast, 2021).

Several studies in the literature discussed many factors to be taken into consideration that affect the success of online learning, to mention some. Baber (2020) investigated factors affecting learners' perceptions in India and South Korea. Findings revealed that (i) interaction; (ii) motivation; (iii) course design; and (iv) teachers' knowledge is positively related to learners' satisfaction. Moreover, according to Saputra et al. (2021), there are various factors influencing learners' satisfaction with online learning, the quality of the online services, especially (i) the characteristics of the online teachers; (ii) the online materials; (iii) the design of the online content; and (iv) the social interaction and communicating with the online community in the social context. In addition, Moorhouse (2020, as cited in Saputra et al., 2021) mentioned factors such as (i) motivation; (ii) managing time; (iii) convenience with technology; and (iv) the design of the materials and suggested designing courses using synchronous and asynchronous methods. Furthermore, prior research has identified several important factors that affect online learning from learners' points of view, such as personal computers, gender, consistent teachers' instructions, and instant feedback, belonging to the online community, getting support from their families, managing their time, the subject matter of the curriculum and the design qualities as well as the overall sense of quality (Bast, 2021). Therefore, planning online materials, interaction, and motivation are essential to achieve learners' satisfaction in online courses.

Some studies have been conducted to focus on students' perceptions and attitudes toward E-learning. For example, Pinto-Llorente, Sánchez-Gómez, García-Peñalvo, and Casillas-Martín (2017) explored 358 learners' opinions of technological tools in blended learning programs. They reported that their grammatical competency in English had been improved along with being more autonomous in learning and can perform self-assessment. Similarly, Zamari, Adnan, Idris, and Yusof (2012) reflected

in their study that English skills were enriched by using technological tools in the academic setting, and learners showed more cooperation.

The beginning of E-learning integration in education has emerged due to the rapid advances in technology and the internet, and it has always been investigated to improve learning. However, the worldwide pandemic of Covid-19 has suddenly forced classes to be conducted online without planning, which has considerably impacted the education system globally (Nartiningrum & Nugroho, 2020).

Digital learning resulting from Covid -19 was not planned and has resulted in *Emergency Remote Teaching* (ERT). Consequently, researchers started exploring instructors' and learners' attitudes and perceptions toward the new system, which has caused a total change in the teaching methodologies and numerous challenges.

This swift changeover from face-to-face instructions to ERT, which is an obligatory short-term solution for continuing education in times of crisis instead of cancellation in the form of hybrid or online sessions (Erarslan, 2021), was associated with many issues. First of all, although ERT differs from conventional classes, instructors all over the world frequently conducted *synchronous* or *asynchronous* sessions in a similar way to face-to-face instructions. Teachers were unprepared to face that new situation and were attached to their previous pedagogies, making it hard to adjust their teaching practices (Aboagye, Yawson, & Appiah, 2021). Additionally, although effective E-learning is strongly rooted in planning based on theories and models, ERT teaching strategies adopted by instructors were only applied to content delivery without considering E-learning theories (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020) which sparks the question of evaluating the quality of education (Dhawan, 2020). In addition, despite the merits

and demerits of implementing ICTs in education, ERT has necessitated ICT integration in academic institutions globally regardless of learners' and instructors' *digital competence*, which has led to more technological obstacles. Moreover, in terms of interaction, ERT has decreased the opportunity to make comprehensible input due to less verbal and non-verbal interaction in a virtual environment contrasted with a face-to-face environment (Sayer & Braun, 2020, as cited in Akbana, Rathert, & Ağçam, 2021). Therefore, in their definition of ERT, Bozkurt et al. (2020, as cited in Akbana et al., 2021) emphasized that ERT differs from planned online or distance learning and their other derivations.

Furthermore, the inequalities between nations and societies have made it difficult for students to obtain the technology they need to take online classes, making it hard for teachers to connect with them. Therefore, it can be argued that even after the pandemic, unequal contextual factors would continue to challenge the successful delivery of online courses (Erarslan, 2021). Research usually revealed that ERT resulted in contextual issues regarding infrastructure matters, especially internet connectivity, using the computer or smartphones, planning the lessons, and information technology (IT) support and guidance. Accessibility to the internet and using computer devices or intelligent phones was considered the biggest obstacle to delivering beneficial online sessions (Erarslan, 2021). In line with his study, Aboagye and his colleagues mentioned that when comparing the industrialized world to developing nations, it was discovered that the latter were struggling with issues, including insufficient content development, poor internet access, and limited ICT competence. For example, in underdeveloped nations, many instructors still learn to deliver information through video and other apps. This new tendency calls for improved technology and a shift in the workplace culture among instructors (Aboagye et al., 2021)

Erarslan (2021) reviewed 69 pieces of research carried out during the first year of COVID-19 globally to explore its impact on teaching. ERT, which had resulted from the pandemic, caused more challenges than benefits because of internet connectivity issues and problems related to accessibility. Moreover, conflicting findings have been revealed regarding learners' and teachers' perceptions, mixing results regarding the affective, motivational, and cognitive components and the effect of ERT on improving learners' English language (Erarslan, 2021). According to the findings, ERT was inadequate in achieving the desired outcomes because of pedagogical aspects related to unpreparedness, lack of planning, digital literacy, and lack of knowledge of the content (Erarslan, 2021). While most teachers and learners considered it a hindrance to language improvement, some found it an opportunity to develop their digital literacy skills in online learning (Erarslan, 2021).

In addition, Aguilera-Hermida et al. (2021) compared 1009 learners' perceptions of emergency online learning in different settings, including Mexico, the United States of America, Turkey, and Peru. Results disclosed that applying the same approach in all contexts is impossible. The learners' perceptions differed depending on the technological infrastructure, socio-economic factors, and individual issues. Moreover, unequal educational opportunities might cause a digital divide, lack of resources, or digital skills.

In 2021, Hazaymeh carried out a study. Findings showed that EFL learners showed a positive stance towards E-learning as this learning environment helped them to improve various skills, including problem-solving, decision-making, critical thinking, language fluency, and interaction and collaboration skills. However, they mentioned

some drawbacks, like technical issues and physical communication (Hazaymeh, 2021).

Despite the challenges learners encountered during that difficult period, ERT opened more opportunities for learners, as mentioned in some articles. To mention, Adedoyin and Soykan (2020) in their study named "Covid-19 Pandemic and Online Learning: The Challenges and Opportunities", mentioned that when teaching transferred to ERT, instructors made the best use of the opportunities provided by the pandemic by making use of the online devices. ERT has led to global acceptance of E-learning in the global market. Moreover, researchers took advantage of E-learning as an opportunity for advancement in research to find solutions for the recent E-learning obstacles (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020). Additionally, Mbiydzenyuy (2020), in the African context, reported improving digital literacy to keep up with modernity despite the low competence of the stakeholders at the beginning of the experience. Moreover, it has been considered a remedy or 'Panacea' to continue teaching during difficult times of crisis (Dhawan, 2020).

Hence, due to COVID-19 and the swift and sudden transformation in the learning process, learners and teachers have encountered various challenges that affected the online sessions' progress and the quality of learning. As a result, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot learners' opinions and experiences regarding learning English and/or content in English online were investigated to discover the obstacles that hindered them from achieving their learning goals in a retrospective look.

1.2 Aim of the Study

Since the COVID outbreak, traditional classes have been shifted to online classes, which has impacted the education sector worldwide. This has affected our students emotionally and academically. Therefore, researchers started to evaluate the quality of education from the student's perspectives and experiences to highlight the most common themes that can be taken into consideration for future recommendations. Moreover, success factors for such a new teaching pedagogy should be inquired regarding instructors' roles, curriculum design, teaching methodologies, learners' roles, motivation and readiness to use the ICT, and the learning environment.

As a result, this research aims to discover the beliefs of the Turkish and Turkish Cypriots from different departments who have already experienced learning English and/or subjects in English (as a medium of instruction) online during the pandemic at Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU). The study is based on a '***retrospective****'* look at the students' beliefs about online education experiences in the English as a medium of instruction (EMI) context.

Research Statement

The study is a *retrospective* one aiming to find out the feelings, perceptions, and previous attitudes of students who have had online education, in the EMI context.

In this respect, this study will be carried out by the following research questions:

i. What were the students' perceptions and attitudes towards learning English and/or content in English online?
ii. What were the strengths of online classes from the student's point of view?

iii. What were the weaknesses and challenges of online learning from the student's perspective?

Note: all research questions are in a *retrospective* look.

1.3 Research Design

1.3.1 Methodology

A Quantitative approach was employed to explore the students' attitudes and perceptions toward online learning through an online questionnaire which consisted of 28 attitude statements. In addition, very little qualitative explanation was provided. Moreover, it is *retrospective* research in which a researcher looks back in time to examine events that have already occurred.

1.3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

The questionnaire was composed of close-ended questions based on perception and attitude theories. The first battery was related to background information about Turkish and Turkish Cypriot students (age, gender, English proficiency level, and cyber skills). The second battery of the questionnaire sought to find out participants' perceptions and attitudes towards learning English and/or subjects in English online during the pandemic period in a *retrospective* look.

To analyze the quantitative data that has been gathered through the questionnaire, Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 29 was utilized for evaluations.

1.3.3 Participants

102 University Turkish and Turkish Cypriot students studying at Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), which is an English-medium university, took part in this study. The students were carrying out their education in their departments in

English. Some of the participants were attending English at preparatory school, and the rest were studying courses in English at their departments. The number of participants attending different departments or prep schools was not classified because the context is EMI. Therefore, they have experienced learning English and/or content in English online during the pandemic at Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU) in Cyprus.

The informed consent has been sent to them for the research ethics considerations to provide honest communication between the researcher and the participants.

More details about the methodology, the participants, and the data collection instruments have been clarified in chapter three.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study is *retrospective*. It aimed to find out if there have been any changes in learners' attitudes from the past. There have been many studies carried out during the Covid-19 period. Nevertheless, since it is almost over, and since the students and teachers are back in the class, this study seeks to determine the evaluation of their experiences based on attitudes and perceptions.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

Since only a little research has been carried out in a *retrospective* look, the findings may be first in their nature. Furthermore, as the sample size is small and investigating Turkish and Turkish Cypriot learners aged (18-30) focusing on Turkish and Cypriot cultural background only, generalization might be difficult! Thus, the results of the study might not be generalized, but tendency may be stated.

1.6 Delimitation of the Study

In order to have more information (rather than structured scale items), an open-ended section was provided so that students may expand their thoughts. In addition, the study can be replicated in different contexts.

1.7 Possible Implications of the Study

Firstly, the findings favor solving some problems related to teaching methods in ELT and education. Moreover, integrating technology into the curriculum and using it correctly provides learners with a more dynamic and collaborative atmosphere, thus enhancing their motivation, performance, and achievement. Furthermore, ICT training programs must be conducted for the pre-service university teachers to apply more engaging activities that promote a higher level of learning in their classes.

1.8 Definition of the Related Terms

1. Distance Education: is the process of educating students who are not physically present using satellite, video, audio, graphic, computer, and multimedia technology (Alghamdi & Ali, 2021).
2. ICT: technological tools teachers can use to innovate and make their lessons more engaging, such as computers, cell phones, radios, televisions, satellite systems, and other communication tools (Rachamalla, 2021).
3. Digital Competence/ literacy: Digital literacy refers to the ability to understand, read, write, and produce new information utilizing various processes and ICT tools (Ginting, 2020, as cited in Mardiani, Anis, & Hermawan, 2021). Digital literacy is a skill that can extract knowledge from electronic media and can be constructed to work well in increasingly more complicated communication scenarios (Mardiani et al., 2021). Digital Competence is a combination of skills, experiences, and attitudes required to use ICT and digital tools to carry

out tasks like problem-solving, information management, and cooperation (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020).

4. Online Learning is the delivery of instruction via a digital device to promote learning (Ferri, Grifoni, & Guzzo, 2020). Online learning is a process that gives students freedom, responsibilities, flexibility, and decision. It goes beyond just downloading instructional materials. To successfully establish a learning environment, a complicated process must be undertaken, including proper planning, designing, and goal determination (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020). Using the internet and technological tools for learning, where various students can interact with the instructors and other students depending on the time and place they are available (Abudaqa, Hilmi, AlMujaini, Alzahmi, & Ahmed, 2021).
5. E-learning: using various ICTs and electronic tools in the classroom (Maatuk et al., 2022; Nartiningrum & Nugroho, 2020).
6. Asynchronous vs. Synchronous: synchronous environment: the environment is set up so that students participate in class sessions, teachers and students communicate in real-time, and there is a chance for immediate feedback (Littlefield, 2018, as cited in Dhawan, 2020).

   Conversely, an asynchronous environment lacks sufficient organization. Learning materials are available through various learning forums rather than live class sessions or seminars. In such setting, timely feedback is unavailable (Littlefield, 2018, as cited in Dhawan, 2020).
7. Hybrid Learning is a mixture of online learning with in-person (conventional) classes in the classroom setting (Rachmadtullah et al., 2020).
8. Tech-Based Learning: using electrical technology in the education process (Zhang, 2022). It relies on the internet and other necessary tools to create

educational content, instruct students, and manage courses (Maatuk et al., 2022).

9. Knowledge Construction: the procedure through which students interact with their teacher and peers to develop and apply new perspectives that tackle problems (Koohang, Paliszkiewicz, Gołuchowski, & Nord 2016). Knowledge Acquisition: means the process of gaining new knowledge and expanding on it when a new one is generated (Al-Emran & Teo, 2020).
10. ERT: an alternate and temporary action to reliably access education in emergencies that happen suddenly without prior planning (Erarslan, 2021).

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 ICT and Online Language Education

2.1.1 Past Trends/ Methods in ELT

Many ways and methods have been used in teaching foreign languages throughout the history. There was no theoretical foundation for language learning that could serve as a foundation for language teaching in the early days of language education (Brown & Lee, 2015).

Many consider the end of the 1800s to be the beginning of modern foreign language instruction due to a shift in language teaching philosophy. There were various approaches: For instance, the *Direct Approach,* the *Audiolingual Method*, and other methods like the *Grammar Translation Method* (GT) (Rodinadze & Zarbazoia, 2012). Due to the GT Method's failure to develop students' communicative competence, researchers started experimenting with alternative methods of language instruction. Educators started aiming to teach foreign languages akin to learning a first language. It included methods intended to cover all the bases left unaddressed by Grammar Translation, including oral communication, more spontaneous language use, and fostering the capacity to think in the target language (Rodinadze & Zarbazoia, 2012).

The *Direct Technique*, also known as the *Natural Method*, only uses the target language and avoids using the learners' native tongue. The target language and proper

pronunciation are stressed heavily in this strategy. It emphasizes teaching oral skills at the expense of every conventional goal of language teaching and instead advocates focusing on teaching oral talents (Rodinadze & Zarbazoia, 2012). The *Audio-lingual Method* is also well-liked. This method brought the first recordings that allowed language learners to imitate native speakers by repeating and drilling (Rodinadze & Zarbazoia, 2012).

However, two critical components to learning a language effectively are what takes place inside and outside classes. Although language teaching has always been to prepare students for lifelong learning outside of the classroom, most of the attention in the past has traditionally focused on classroom-based instruction or getting ready for specific assessments (Richards, 2015). The drawbacks of traditional classroom instruction have also been well recognized. Time constraints and unfavourable class sizes are among them. The school curriculum might only allow a few hours of learning English each week. Other problems could be related to poor teaching materials, English instructors who need to be proficient in English, and a test-driven syllabus. In some countries, classes of 50 or more students are expected. This makes opportunities for authentic communication challenging. Because of this, the classroom's learning opportunities or "affordances" are highly constrained, consisting of a narrow variety of discourse activities (Richards, 2015).

Nevertheless, with the booming expansion of media technology in all spheres of society, "*Digital literacy*"—the capacity to manage information by using technological devices—seems to be an inseparable element of students' day-to-day existence. Learning technologies have shifted educational paradigms in the current

appearance of online learning, hybrid learning, and collaborative learning models (Liton, 2015).

2.1.2 Contemporary Trends in ELT and ICT Innovation

The focus of research, theory, and practice has typically been on how the classroom, teachers, students, and learning tools, can create the ideal environment for learning. Consequently, in the last century, there has been much emphasis on the design of curricula, instructional strategies, and materials, as well as on preparing teachers to fully utilize the classroom as a source of both meaningful inputs and chances for authentic interaction and language use (Richards, 2015).

ICT integration in ELT classes has changed English from a ‘knowledge subject’ for passing an exam to learning it as ‘a skill’ (Chhabra, 2012). Over the years, language learning generally and ELT particularly has seen a significant transformation. When English became a required topic in the school curriculum, it presented difficulty for English language teachers to instruct foreign pupils. However, they did so by teaching English as a knowledge subject for passing the test rather than a skill for long-term learning (Chhabra, 2012). The proper application of ICT can help to broaden the professional landscape and improve ELT's applicability in today’s digital workplace. Additionally, they can improve the effectiveness of educational activities by making them more relevant to real-world situations and interesting (Basnet, 2021).

Fortunately, these past trends and methods in teaching English have vanished and been replaced by the innovation of technology integration ICT in ELT. Consequently, ‘learning to learn’ is an ongoing learning process that includes developing the information and skills necessary for lifelong learning. Hence, teachers must shape the

learning to meet their students' needs (Chhabra, 2012). This would be achieved via E-learning tools (modern technologies).

2.1.3 What Is E-learning?

Finding an inclusive definition for E-learning is crucial for the following reasons: (i) creating models and strategies for using it; (ii) identify the essential factors for successful practices and experiences. Then it will be urgent to develop 'context-driven' frameworks suitable for the organizational culture (Sangrà, Vlachopoulos, & Cabrera, 2012).

Online instructions referred to the 1970s to assist distant learners (Cinkara & Bağçeci, 2013). In the literature, E-learning has been always related to distance learning (Keller & Cernerud, 2002) and has been regarded as an evolution and logical development of distance learning, which has always benefited from the most recent technological tools to enhance learning. In other words, it has been described as a current generation of distance learning. However, this concept is confusing: This term has been replaced by different concepts, such as *computer-based learning* or *training* and *technology-based training*. In addition, it has been confused with *virtual* or *online learning*, which has been considered part of the E-learning process but does not describe it completely (Sangrà et al., 2012).

E-learning has emerged during the 1980s and in the course of time its definition has changed constantly. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2005, as cited in Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015) argued that E-learning could be called applying ICTs in education to improve learning. That can be achieved either via using technology as a supplement to conventional classes, learning totally online, or even combining the two modes of learning 'Hybrid Learning'. According to Liu and Wang

(2009, as cited in Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015), technological advancement, significantly the internet, has changed distance education into new E-learning. Therefore, E-learning basically depends on the internet for sharing; network classes facilitate flowing of information; and finally, studying with more flexibility from any place and at any time (Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015). E-learning is a range of electronic tools and platforms skilled teachers might employ to enhance education. These stimulate learners' interest, motivation, and a sense of purpose in studying. These tools have been regarded as potentially effective for educational transformation and reform (Chhabra, 2012). Furthermore, Eldeeb (2014) described E-learning, often known as *tech-based education*, as delivering educational resources electronically to distant students over a computer.

In addition, more recent research, Sangrà, et al. (2012) reviewed the articles and books before 2005, trying to find an inclusive definition based on common characteristics of E-learning in education. (i) using technology and electronic media, (ii) easy access to learning resources, (iii) communication and interaction, and (iv) aids to enhance the learning process. Moreover, they highlighted that although E-learning appears after using computers in education, the term E-learning does not include only technology. On the contrary, it focuses more on the 'learning quality' and the new learning paradigm (Sangrà, et al., 2012).

2.1.4 E-learning Pedagogy

ICT is affecting every facet of education. The main impact is not on how simple it is to obtain information or how frequently educational software is used; instead, it is on how well it supports the social production of new knowledge and fosters its development through widespread Participation. ICT, therefore, cares more about '*quality*'. This supports the idea that giving students the skills and methods they need

to prepare them for lifelong learning should be the objective of modern education (Aparicio, Bacao, & Oliveira, 2016).

First of all, in terms of learning activities, ICT fosters an environment where effective autonomous learning, the progress of thinking critically, and continuing lifelong, independent learning are essential to each learner's success (Garrison & Anderson, 2003). Furthermore, Wellington (2004) highlighted the importance of ICT in fostering group work, facilitating problem-solving, modelling, classifying, sorting, questioning, and discovering patterns in data. Furthermore, Holmes and Gardner (2006) mentioned that E-learning can evaluate learners while learning and extend their learning opportunities via community education-suitable involvement, globalization, cultural variety, and removing time and place boundaries.

Above all, since the learner in the E-learning will be responsible for his/her education, more profound knowledge takes place, and the emphasis in this method is on 'knowledge construction' rather than just 'knowledge acquisition'. This approach teaches learners how to learn (Aparicio et al., 2016). Hence, E-learning offers interactive and constructive approaches to learning rather than the contemporary passive approaches. 'Electronic learning pedagogy' in education goes beyond providing easy access to content. It is more about the context and the learning quality-how instructors design the learning experiences, including the interaction founded in COI (Community of Inquiry). A community where individual experiences and viewpoints will be discussed according to societal information, norms, and values. Moreover, this community includes autonomy and collaboration which are considered vitally essential elements (Garrison, 2016).

On the other hand, the challenges to design and create a collaborative E-learning setting, which aligns with the academic goals and objectives and reinforces both cognitive and social presence mentioned in the COI community, have been considered the core for achieving quality and in-depth E-learning. Assertion of the COI community encourages E-learners to approach their education more critically and process knowledge in a deeper and more meaningful way (Garrison, 2016).

In addition, turning electronic knowledge into human information has been viewed as a social challenge rather than a technological issue resolved by integrating meaningful learning approaches and innovative technologies to build COI context. Academic design and what learners should do in academic settings are paramount. Besides, the degree of communication is essential to get the desired outcomes (Garrison, 2016). However, these communication technologies have positive and negative sides. The issue is that educators need to understand the communication technologies like multimedia and text-based communication. Therefore, they must be familiar with the E-learning medium's characteristics to avoid adverse outcomes (Garrison, 2016).

2.1.5 E-learning Framework

2.1.5.1 The Conceptual Community of Inquiry (COI) Model: Guideline for a Quality E-learning Experience

It is a model undertaken by Garrison, Anderson, and Archer (2000). It creates a virtual environment that supports discourse reflection and thinking critically. In this learning community, group collaboration and the construction of meaning are essential for a practical online learning experience. Learners should take responsibility for their learning, negotiate meaning, and diagnose misinterpretations to achieve deep and desired learning outcomes (Ramsden, 1988, as cited in Garrison & Anderson, 2003).

Rubin, Fernandes, and Avgerinou (2013, as cited in Garrison & Anderson, 2003) declared that an effective online class could be only created if interaction occurs among learners, teachers, and the learning materials to produce the desired information and skills. Garrison and Akyol (2013) claimed that this framework is crucial as it provides beneficial guidelines for instructors to maintain successful online learning settings. It provides guidance and assessment for E-learning strategies and techniques. This framework claims that community of practice/ E-learning community will only happen if we have three essential connections: social, teaching, and cognitive presences (Garrison & Anderson, 2003). Therefore, learners' satisfaction with their E-learning experience will be as a result of the integrating of the three presences to promote critical thinking and reflection and if any element is ignored, the learning quality will be affected negatively. For instance, learners will not take part in discussion classes, if these classes are not well prepared and structured.

This community involves reconceptualization of the teaching approaches which requires redefinition and adjustment of instructors' and learners' roles; For example: communication skills, analysing knowledge all lead to better educational outcomes (Garrison, & Cleveland-Innes, 2004).

2.1.5.1.1 Core Elements of (COI) to Deliver and Plan a Quality E-learning Experience

2.1.5.1.1.1 Social Presence (SP)/ the Affective Aspect

Vygotsky (1978, as cited in Chamorro, 2018) viewed education as a social aspect; mutual communication and good relationships between teachers and learners must be available during online classes to support a sense of community and belonging (Chamorro, 2018). It mainly aims to support the cognitive presence by a group of learners, who will introduce themselves to a real community (Garrison, Anderson, &

Archer,1999). Therefore, this indirectly, on one hand will affect education (motivation & strategy use) and outcomes (Garrison & Cleveland-Innes, 2005). Moreover, on the other hand will enhance higher-order learning and critical thinking, which are necessary for the foundation of the community of inquiry. Therefore, it can be considered as crucial factor for a useful learning experience for many reasons: Firstly, not only does it construct social relations, but also it generates a trustful setting in which learners can freely express their feelings and views and learn collaboratively. Moreover, once learners enjoy interacting in the group, they will continue working with their group on their online tasks which will lead to learning (Garrison et al., 1999).

2.1.5.1.1.2 Cognitive Presence (CP)

It has been regarded as the key to success. It refers to create meaning during continuous communication (Garrison et al., 1999). Cognitive presence stresses higher-order learning processes rather than specific individual learning outcomes, such as creative thinking and problem-solving. These thinking abilities are required for pupils to prosper in a globally and digitally connected environment in the twenty-first century (Garrison, 2016).

Arbaugh, Bangert, & Cleveland-Innes (2010) summarized the types of cognitive activities in their survey items in a clear way. Such activities include motivation in exploring materials, appreciation of different perspectives during the online discussion, respond to questions by combining knowledge, applying the new knowledge at work and outside the class, solving problems skills, reflecting on materials and discussions, using web-based resources for exploring and seeking relevant knowledge (Arbaugh et al., 2010).

2.1.5.1.1.3 Teaching Presence (TP)

According to Senior (2010, as cited in Chamorro, 2018), current teaching might be categorized into three parts: (i) designing the course, (ii) facilitator instead of knowledge provider (iii) the instruction director. Rossman (1999, as cited in Anderson, Liam, Garrison, & Archer, 2001) supported this classification after analysing 300 learners' evaluations and their responses grouped around the three categories. However, an outstanding learning experience will be achieved if there is a balance among these three aspects in an online academic community (Chamorro, 2018).

Designing curriculum materials, mainly implementing lectures and reading in a learning system, planning more group and individual activities, setting time restrictions (deadlines), and offering organizational guidance are all part of this phase (Anderson et al., 2001). The setting up of the online course might affect the students' perception of the virtual class (Chamorro, 2018).

Additionally, for the TP to be successful, teachers should facilitate and increase SP and CP to get the desired learning outcomes (Garrison et al., 1999). For example, the significance of the teacher's engagement in discussing topics should be emphasized while facilitating instructional presence, reading and commenting on students' comments continually. According to Anderson and his colleague (2001), for instance, teachers must recognize agreement/disagreement to lead the debate toward a higher learning experience; instructors may also emphasize students' contributions, create a learning environment and initiate and keep discussions forward as well (Anderson et al., 2001). Furthermore, instructors should offer instructional assistance, sharing and communicating the deep knowledge of the content, applying scaffolding or guide on

the side and promote students' discovery to achieve the learning goals (Anderson et al., 2001).

This model constructs the personal and social aspects for the E-learning in building knowledge with collaboration and interdependence to progress learning to a higher level. Hence, it is connected with the constructivism and social constructivism.

2.1.6 Teachers' Roles

Teachers' satisfaction with the use of technical tools affects their enthusiasm and motivate positively and the online challenges become easier to overcome. This attitude can be spread to learners, as well. In line with this view, Stickler and Hampel (2015) mentioned that teachers should modify their conventional methods and acquire new teaching skills and techniques for the new teaching transformational pedagogy rather than employing new technology with the old teaching methods. That focus on the technical issues can be seen in the previous researches in the CPD sessions and trainings. As Hamilton (2022) reported, the teacher's use of instructional technology is more significant than the equipment employed. The exercises should improve previous knowledge, mimic an activity, read, illustrate, resolve problems, investigate, revise the information, react to an idea, and involve learners in critical thinking.

Additionally, Sebastianelli (2015, as cited in Rojabi, 2020) reveals that the learning material is an essential element for both comprehended learning and student satisfaction. Moreover, teachers must understand that the student's actions are more significant than their own. Materials and learning activities in online learning platforms should be helpful, useable, attractive, discoverable, accessible, trustworthy, and valuable to create a meaningful and beneficial user experience (Rojabi, 2020).

However, teachers should be able to solve troubleshooting problems and modify the online resources and assessments easily.

Furthermore, EFL lecturers give students integrated skills, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing, by employing various approaches and strategies to boost students' participation and enthusiasm in the academic process. English language instruction at university aims to improve students' oral and written communication skills (Rojabi, 2020).

Moreover, the most crucial step in building an online learning environment is determining the learning objectives and meeting the suitable students' learning needs. All learning objectives, instructional techniques, classroom materials, and examinations stated in the syllabus are included in the objectives (Rojabi, 2020). Moreover, Palloff and Pratt (1999, as cited in Liaw, Huang, & Chen, 2007) stressed that E instructors should facilitate communication and create a collaborative environment by applying innovative teaching methods. Teacher-student interaction and communication among learners are core factors for an effective online outcome. Additionally, they suggested more research to find innovative ways for developing autonomy and teacher-learners interaction, designing multimedia curricula to enhance the E-learning quality in an online environment (Liaw et al., 2007).

Moreover, Owston (1997, as cited in Huang, 2002) proposed a manageable sample of 15-20 students studying in an online group for a successful online interaction. This will ensure quick feedback and responses from the online teachers and less workload (Huang, 2002). Furthermore, an online instructor should create a sense of community by observing who is participating and performing in the group (Rojabi, 2020).

Therefore, more up to date strategies and frameworks should be taken into account like the Community of Inquirey (COI) to enhance and empower online education/ teaching and learning process (Chamorro, 2018).

2.1.7 Learners' Roles

Roles for learners shift from passive learners to active. Their independent learning entails content evaluation, knowledge retrieval, searching for knowledge in global databases, interacting with others, exploring information, immersing themselves in virtual environment, storing and reviewing previously learned materials. Therefore, an E-learner should be a decision maker who is familiar with information-seeking approaches to initiate and find the required knowledge easily (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2003). Moreover, instead of *verbal learning* that states learners receive the final content and rote it, E-learners usually follow *meaningful/ deep learning* which requires more exploration, problem solving skills, and find connections among concepts-the old and the new ones. Hence, learners will shift the learning process from surface into deep as they connect knowledge critically rather than storing it in isolation (Rourke & Kanuka, 2009). Furthermore, reconceptualization of learners' differences based on learning approaches is a factor of great importance for learners' self-management, learning how to learn and support their interaction with their teachers (Garrison et al., 2003).

Additionally, learners should be autonomous and take responsibility for their education. They should be independent and be self-directed, which means learners can start learning on their own, with or without help from peers or others. These learners are usually independent, initiative, have discipline, confident, eager to study to achieve their goals and manage their times and plans (Cercone, 2008). Furthermore, online learners should have intrinsic motivation and be initiative to overcome distractions at

home. Besides, they have to seek interaction with their instructors and inquire for clarification if it is needed. Especially their communication with their instructors and the content valued more than learner-learner communication for motivation and positive perception (Chamorro, 2018).

2.2 Previous Research on Learners' Perceptions and Attitudes towards E-learning in L2

2.2.1 What Are Attitudes and Perceptions in L2?

Learning a new language is very important in this competitive world. Being competent at L2 and a good communicator has been regarded the main dream of L2 learners for ages. Therefore, researchers have been investigating learners' attitudes and perceptions regarding L2 and the factors that might hinder the learning process. Towards this stance, language learners are human beings with emotions, identities, and ideas about L2 (Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011). Learners differ and show differences in learning a second/foreign language because of two factors. (i) individual differences (internal aspects) in learning a language include age, attitude, motivation, personality like anxiety, self-confidence, taking risk, and the like; (ii) social (external elements) mentioned in the literature, such as economic and some factors related to culture or politics (Sun, 2019). On the other hand, learners ought to be aware of and accept their differences. When learners cannot succeed, they should continue learning gradually and discover the reasons for failure rather than being overly concerned or stopping. Possessing a positive attitude entails approaching and adapting an individual learning style and actively resolving learning problems (Sun, 2019).

An attitude, like other affective factors based on psychology, according to Smith (1971), attitude is an arrangement of ideas/beliefs that are almost persistent about a

thing or a circumstance, leading one to behave/act in a particular way. Regarding L2, the ideas and beliefs about the L2 might lead to either a positive or a negative attitude. It can be learned, taught, and altered; nobody is born to like or dislike a foreign language (Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011). A more extensive and up-to-date definition by Wenden (1991, as cited in Karahan, 2007) proposes that attitude involves three elements: (i) cognitive (beliefs and perceptions); (ii) affective (emotions: bad or good)/evaluative; and (iii) behavioural (acting out: participating, doing HW, completing the study, drop out, communication). Any component can measure attitude to get the required information about it as its components are interrelated (Al-Tamimi & Shuib, 2009).

Smith (1971) has mentioned that learners enter their classes with initial attitudes. These attitudes might turn to be negative or positive according to many factors, such as teachers' influence, parents, peers, the learning setting and the society (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, as cited in Sun, 2019). Getie (2020) has mentioned more factors that might affect learners' attitudes, including the educational variables, such as learning contexts and outcomes, personality variables mainly confidence, anxiety and social variables, such as family, peers, the community, culture, parents, native speakers and also sex and age. For example, when learners enter their classes with favourable or neutral views towards the target language, the circumstances, teachers, school, curriculum, and assignments will impact on their attitudes. Moreover, if they dislike the instructor or the learning process, they generalize it to the whole setting. Hence, to increase students' effectiveness in learning a new language, positive attitudes and feelings are required. However, unfavourable attitudes can be transformed into good ones to achieve the learning goals (Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011).

Attitude is a vitally important factor in learning a second language in many ways: Firstly, language attitudes have a direct impact on language learning (Starks & Paltridge, 1996, as cited in Karahan, 2007). Weinburgh (1998, as cited in Getie, 2020) proclaimed that attitudes are connected with achievement. Stern (1987, as cited in Getie, 2020) claimed that learners' attitude toward L2 positively correlates with their academic outcomes. Stern (1983, as cited in Getie, 2020) proposed that the affective elements are more critical in L2 than the cognitive components as they lead to success in learning. Favourable attitudes towards the target language or its speakers help in learning that language (Gardner, 1985, as cited in Getie, 2020). Secondly, motivation has been recognized a more crucial factor in learning a second/ foreign language than the social aspects. Promoting positive attitudes by applying effective methodologies in classes will motivate learners (Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011). Gardner (1985, as cited in Al-Tamimi & Shuib, 2009) claims that attitude is part of motivation, which consists of effort, desire/ will to achieve the aim of learning and a positive attitude. The attitude should be combined with the motivation to achieve better attainment (Al-Tamimi & Shuib, 2009). According to Gardner (1985, as cited in Karahan, 2007), learners' characteristics, especially their attitudes towards the foreign language and its speakers, will motivate them to learn a second language and take part actively in the learning activities. Less gifted but highly motivated pupils are better at learning a second language, while demotivated ones will make less effort to learn, which might lead to low achievements (Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011; Sun, 2019). Moreover, Gardner and Lambert (1972, as cited in Getie, 2020) proposed that motivation to acquire L2 was based on a favourable attitude to interact, communicate and value the L2 group and community (Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994). On the contrary, an unfavourable attitude demotivates learners and limits input and communication with the target

population, decreasing attainment and proficiency in L2 (Despagne, 2010; Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011). Moreover, Ellis (1994, as cited in Getie, 2020) states that having a positive stance will help learners to overcome challenges faced by L2.

Research revealed that lower attitudes among dropout learners compared with better attitudes to their counterpart learners who completed the course (Smith, 1971). However, the characteristics of an excellent L2 learner can be described as acquiring intake in L2 with a less affective filter to get the input (Krashen, as cited in Getie, 2020). On the contrary, the opposite type does not acquire or learn the L2 (Getie, 2020). Smith (1971) asserted that low achievement is related to the negative attitude of learners who dislike the language. He has mentioned some of their characteristics. Mention some of these learners might encounter problems because of the aptitude factor. For example, they might be good at phonetic or grammar competence and face problems learning new vocabulary or inferring patterns. Another issue connected with negativity towards L2 is the curriculum, teaching all as one and ignoring learners' peculiarities, learners with low patience to learn L2 because of no interest, proficiency level in L2, personality, especially learners who possess high or low anxiety, and positive attitude connected with praise instead of blaming or punishing (Smith, 1971). Brown (1994, as cited in Getie, 2020) highlighted the importance of studying these affective factors and described them as the primary stones of learning methods and strategies.

Oroujlou and Vahedi investigated numerous articles and websites in 2011 and reported that overlooking the attitude and motivational elements of learning might lead to difficulties in learning a foreign language. Research has revealed that even gifted learners who lacked desire and a positive attitude made slight improvements in

learning. Thus, instructors should adapt their teaching approaches and strategies to ensure the complete immersion of their pupils in the learning process (Oroujlou & Vahedi, 2011).

Karahan in 2007 addressed an important point in discussion after parents and teachers complained about Turkish learners who could not achieve the desired English proficiency level despite all the efforts made and intensive English classes. The answer to this issue might be reflected in the connection between learning a language and the attitudes towards that language. Hence, he inquired 190 Turkish learners about their attitudes toward learning English via a questionnaire in a primary school. Results revealed that learners showed mildly favourable, not completely high, attitudes towards learning English and its culture; however, they do not show high readiness/orientation towards learning it or being tolerant to their classmates when they speak in English (Karahan, 2007). According to him, this issue of having low proficient Turkish learners in English despite the time and effort spent at schools has been debatable for a long time. He referred the debate to the focus of the research on the teaching strategies rather than discussing the contextual elements (the differences between the two languages). For instance, (i) language factors: Turkish is an SOV while English is an SVO, proficiency level at the mother tongue, and the amount of information and exposure to the other language and attitudes; (ii) learners' factors: include learning needs and aims, peer discussion, and the age of learning the language; and (iii) learning factors: different styles and strategies in learning, learners' engagement, motivation, and communication in the class (Karahan, 2007).

Moreover, Gardner and Lambert (1972, as cited in Getie, 2020) mentioned that a favourable attitude promotes proficiency. Learner' interaction in L2 depends on

learners' feelings about L2. Swain and Lapkin (2002, as cited in Altunel, 2021) assumed that learning a second language would require interactive communication. Therefore, factors that enhance EFL learning, mainly readiness in using L2 in an authentic /pragmatic setting called *willingness to communicate* (WTC), should be investigated. Altunel (2021) explored factors affecting 12 Turkish learners' WTC in L2 in online classes. Semi-structured interview findings indicated that they were unwilling to communicate because of personality reasons of being shy to communicate as they did not meet their classmates. Also, they were afraid of being judged if they made mistakes. Secondly, they felt that their linguistic competence/background in English was not enough to be ready to speak in a discourse. Additionally, they could not participate enough as they could not turn on their microphones whenever they wanted as they were under their instructors' control. Therefore, teachers should provide equal and sufficient speaking opportunities for learners. In addition, instructors must construct a stress-free setting for the shy and less confident learners and consider students' differences. Instructors must initiate exciting and engaging dialogues and conversations with learners to motivate them to speak. In addition, they should utilize a wide range of communication strategies, such as group, pair, and class work, to promote interaction in L2 (Altunel, 2021).

Additionally, *perception* is a paramount factor in L2. Riley (1989, as cited in Despagne, 2010) assumes that learners' attitudes/behaviours will be a result of beliefs or perceptions about the second language - Stereotypes may result from media and other not reliable sources about the others' culture; they are growing from childhood from parents' or peers' attitudes. In other words, *perceptions* refer to what they think of English while learning it. Then, learners will behave accordingly. Therefore, it can be assumed that perceptions will impact the learners' motivation, creating positive or

negative attitudes/behaviours (Despagne, 2010). In other words, attitudes will be changed according to learners' perceptions of speakers, situations/context, and their background experiences. Consequently, it is highly advisable for teachers to recognize the origin of the unfavourable perceptions among learners and analyse and discuss them in class contexts to overcome the fear and eliminate the barrier towards the L2. Learners' awareness can transform their attitudes toward learning the language as they can distinguish between their learning and perception of the language that will be learned (Despagne, 2010).

Wesely (2012) reviewed the literature (2002-2012) about learning a foreign language in the USA. She stated that learners who showed positive attitudes and perceptions towards themselves got better outcomes like higher attainment, enjoying the learning process the most, and were less anxious. On the other hand, Despagne (2010) explored Mexican learners' perception of English. Learners perceived the language negatively as a result of political and cultural factors. In other words, they found difficulty learning the language because of the negative image of the US (the target country). Therefore, attitudes should be analysed based on social factors and the country's history, as this negativity will hinder learning. Similarly, another study by Chasan and Ryan (1995, Despagne, 2010) with 370 Mexican learners indicated that they had an unfavourable attitude toward English because of not being aware of the American culture (Despagne, 2010).

On the other hand, some research showed no relationship between the positive attitude and the learners' proficiency level. When students perceive English as crucial, their attitude will be positive. A study carried out by Jaliyya and Idrus (2017) showed that learners who were aware of the importance of English, tried hard for improving their

English but this effort did not guarantee they are proficient in English. Likewise, Herwiana & Laili (2021) measured learners' attitudes toward English via a questionnaire. Findings reflected that although learners showed positivity towards L2, their English competence was low. They referred this to issues related to the curriculum or the delivery methods. Similarly, Al-Tamimi and Shuib (2009) measured 81 petroleum engineering Yemeni learners' motivations and attitudes towards English. Questionnaires and interviews' results reflected that low competency and performance in English were because of the subjects' motivation and attitude; in other words, their motivation in learning English is influenced by their attitudes and orientations towards English/ the language. On the other hand, even though learners showed positivity towards English, the course duration (one year) was not enough for them to get the desired proficiency level. Therefore, curriculum designers and instructors should rethink their syllabus and methodology. Likewise, Getie (2020) proclaimed that low grades among 103 high school Ethiopian learners, their lack of WTC, and their preference to use their L1 (Amharic) were associated with their problem stance towards ESL. However, findings showed that learners showed positivity towards ESL, and they appreciated its value and status. Therefore, other factors might be an issue for them, such as clarity of instructions, lack of encouragement and motivation, and fewer examples provided by instructors. In other words, absence of qualified teachers, so they showed negativity. Moreover, their attitudes towards the learning environment were negative, including the setting up of the classroom and its cleanliness (Getie, 2020). Additionally, previous knowledge and proficiency level from childhood (background issues) has an impact too. In line with them, Elham (2012, as cited in Jaliyya & Idrus, 2017) mentioned that there is not always a relation between favourable attitudes and proficiency in the target language. Many factors affect learners' outcome/

proficiency rather than attitude, like anxiety, cognitive factors, perceptual elements, linguistics and social. However, analysing learners' attitudes and desires in L2 will be vital (Jaliyya & Idrus, 2017).

Moreover, teachers' role and perception of English/ the language has a significant impact on learners' acceptance of the topic and acquiring positive attitudes and enthusiasm about learning (Jaliyya & Idrus, 2017). Students' attitudes can be harmful or good feelings towards using the target language or its value. It has been recognized that learners' competence cannot be improved despite changing the curriculum and the teaching resources and conducting up-to-date training programs for teachers. The reason behind that was not evaluating the local learning context/ environment. Therefore, investigating learners' attitudes will be paramount in these contexts (Ahmed, 2015).

2.2.2 Studies on Using Technological Tools in L2

Numerous studies assert that using technology will improve the learning quality; nevertheless, according to Clark (1994, as cited in Liaw et al., 2007), it is still uncertain/debatable if technology will impact the learning process. Only favourable attitudes towards such tech can affect the standards of education, not the usage of tech itself. Hence, by comprehending users' attitudes about it, we may improve learning's effectiveness (Liaw et al., 2007).

Regarding the *Mobile-learning tool* (podcasting technology), Bamanger and Alhassan (2015) conducted a study to shed some light on how lectures delivered via podcasts may be used to teach writing to English language learners. The goal of that research was to investigate how podcast lectures affected the writing abilities of EFL students. The findings demonstrated that students who heard audio lectures besides joining the

classes outperformed those who only attended regular classes. Moreover, they expressed satisfaction with audio lectures and agreed that they helped them learn vocabulary and grammar in English (Bamanger & Alhassan, 2015).

Likewise, Başoğlu and Akdemir (2010) stated that Turkish EFL learners found learning English vocabulary via mobile tools more effective than conventional tools and the image visualizations made the words easier to recall. In line with them, (Seferoğlu, Çağiltay, & Saran, 2008) conducted a study in which learners were delighted and motivated to use the instructional materials on their mobile phones and satisfied with this learning experience.

Additionally, Şimşek in 2008 examined Turkish learners' attitudes towards ICTs integration in a reading course in Ankara. Unexpectedly, despite their challenges, learners were satisfied with the new learning environment and teaching methods. However, learners got an orientation session about using the computer and the internet in advance, so they had the necessary skills to access their curriculum on the internet, send their assignments, and get emails from and to their teachers and peers. These ICT reading courses were encouraging as they had their own pace and time for individual learning. Moreover, ICTs courses encouraged them to take part in the courses (Şimşek, 2008). Nevertheless, they reported that they also needed conventional face-to-face communication, and web courses cannot entirely substitute it. In terms of the exams, they felt more comfortable with paper and pencil assessments as online ones resulted in anxiety. Overall, it was a valuable and enjoyable experience for them (Şimşek, 2008).

Öz (2014) investigated EFL Turkish students' perceptions of applying interactive whiteboards (IWBs) to learn English. Learners perceived IWB technology positively and said it had been considered an effective tool for learning a foreign language. In addition, it was discovered that students' views changed positively when they used IWBs more frequently. Nevertheless, in Toscu (2013, as cited in Öz, 2014) study, IWB technology alone does not significantly contribute to fostering L2 classroom engagement, and instructors' preparation for IWBs must be prioritized depending on educational pedagogies. Moreover, according to Digregorio and Sobel-Lojeski (2010, as cited in Öz, 2014), although IWB technology might not improve the learners' linguistic outcomes, it might promote learners' motivation in the L2 language classroom. In the same line of thought, Malone and Lepper (1987) investigated pupils who played video games as they proposed that learning and intrinsic motivation might be related (Schwabe & Göth, 2005).

Hence, utilizing technology helps students and teachers to learn English language. Students' motivation and linguistic awareness will be increased when technological tools have been utilized. Luckily, in the era of digitalization, the younger generation is skilled at using technology. They all use technical instruments and are thus involved in the target language. However, traditional methods of instruction no longer engage students and make learning fun. Additionally, ICTs increase learners' motivation due to using computers in a stress-free environment to learn a foreign language (Çakıcı, 2017).

2.2.3 Studies on E-learning in L2

Empirical results showed mixed opinions of positive and negative attitudes. However, despite the findings' inconsistency, some common aspects shared frequently in literature by the E-learners, like instructors' support, motivation, and the learning

materials (Mason & Weller, 2000; Sharpe & Benfield, 2005). Furthermore, learners' views on online education should be evaluated from many factors. For example, personal factors may impact how students perceive E-learning in higher education. Besides, factors such as age and gender, qualities like prior computer skills, acceptance of tech, and personalized education style might have an effect, too (Keller & Cernerud, 2002).

Furthermore, the context significantly affects how students perceive their learning activities and, as a result, the learning strategies they use (Ramsden, 1988, as cited in Garrison & Anderson, 2003). Three contextual elements have been noticed to affect learners' perception and strategies: (i) assessment; (ii) curriculum; and (iii) teaching (Garrison & Anderson, 2003). Firstly, the assessment includes testing and grading, shaping learners' learning approach. It might have a significant impact on academic techniques. In other words, evaluation is a powerful message about what matters to pupils and how to approach learning (Garrison & Anderson, 2003). Secondly, curriculum, specifically the workload or the amount of material that must be learned within a set amount of time. No matter the student's innate preferences or intelligence, the excessive content of the curriculum will lead to a surface-level approach to learning. On the other hand, greater freedom in content selection is a crucial requirement for a deep approach to learning (Garrison & Anderson, 2003).

Finally, in terms of teaching, instructors will shape the educational environment and outcomes. Moreover, they should determine the learning goals, content, and assessment process. Also, they foster an in-depth approach to learning while learners apply high-order cognitive processes, critical thinking, and self-directed process in their learning (Garrison & Anderson, 2003). That is in with them Sharpe & Benfield

(2005) stressed the importance of explicitly explaining the aims and objectives of the online course to achieve the desired results.

Keller and Cernerud (2002) conducted a study in which two-thirds of the population were dissatisfied with their online experience. This negative attitude might result from the beginning of online emergence. Findings revealed that the methods implemented in E-learning were more critical for learners than their background characteristics. Moreover, they did not see accessibility to resources as an advantage. Surprisingly, male learners and learners with better cyber skills showed less satisfaction toward E-learning with no impact of age on their perspectives. In fact, 60 percent of innovators (who have good computer skills) showed negative attitudes. In other words, learners' previous cyber knowledge does not guarantee positivity to E-learning.

On the other hand, Cinkara and Bağçeci (2013) investigated the attitudes of A1 learners who have a mandatory intensive asynchronous English course at a preparatory school in Turkey. The online lessons have been video recorded and accompanied by weekly interactive resources. However, learners must complete online assignments, midterms, and final exams. Contradictory to Keller and Cerneruds' (2002) study, the findings showed that students who considered themselves proficient computer users tended to have more favourable opinions toward the online language course, and as a result, scored higher. In line with this study, another study by Kobayashi (2002, as cited in Cinkara & Bağçeci, 2013) claimed that students with better computer literacy skills exhibited more favourable attitudes towards online learning. Moreover, findings revealed that 51.56 percent of the learners were satisfied with the web-based language course. However, more than 10% of the participants in the course expressed a disliking of learning English online (Cinkara & Bağçeci, 2013). Likewise, in 2019, Cabi and

Kalelioglu investigated 266 Turkish learners' readiness towards E-learning through a distant education delivery mode via Moodle. They utilized live sessions with videos along with presentations, summaries, notes, and offline activities. They concluded that learners' ability to use the computer (computer literacy) would impact learners' readiness and perception towards E-learning. In other words, it was found that students' preparation levels directly influence learners' motivation and indirectly influence how they view their E-learning (Topal, 2016; Cabi & Kalelioglu, 2019). Furthermore, the target population found many things advantageous for them; what they liked the most was tutor-student interaction, taking part in online sessions without suffering from time and place constraints and easy access to learning materials (Queiros & de Villiers, 2016; Cabi & Kalelioglu, 2019). On the other hand, they reported dissatisfaction with the challenging assignments and some interaction issues.

Similarly, Huang (2002) highlighted that computer skills/familiarity with technological tools are prerequisites for online learning success. Various studies in literature showed a positive link between positive attitudes towards using computers and learners' success in the subjects they learned and the usage of communication technologies (Coffin & MacIntyre, 1999). Therefore, evaluating the learner's technological skills is highly recommended before starting any online course. Undoubtedly, possessing the required digital skills will help learners to interact successfully during the online sessions to ensure learners' motivation and readiness, gain self-directed skills, more autonomy in learning, completing their online tasks, proper communication and submission of the assignments and tasks efficiently and correctly. Furthermore, previous research has proved the importance of autonomy in promoting dependent work, such as exploring new resources, setting plans, and being more engaged in activities. In addition, it enhances *interdependence* which means

learner-to-learner communication and taking part in group discussions as well (Huang, 2002).

Additionally, Alberth (2011) stressed that learners' characteristics impact their perceptions, which might affect their academic performance; for example, being unable to sit in front of a computer's screen, preferring books rather than online materials, and believing that conventional classes are better than online. He referred that to the reason that some learners might be independent learners or have better cyber skills than others which might lead to better satisfaction with online learning (results supported by all the aforementioned research except for Keller & Cernerud, 2002).

Regarding the gender variable, in agreement with Keller and Cernerud's (2002) study, Upton and Adams (2005) reported that the same learning outcomes have been achieved by both genders despite the belief in the masculinity of technology. However, according to Bulter (2000), the effect of gender requires further investigation (Upton & Adams, 2005).

Besides, considering time as an essential factor, Smart and Cappel's (2006) study showed that 30 percent of the target population complained about the length of the online courses and assignments and inquired about a shorter course or at least providing more time for completing and comprehending the virtual courses and tasks.

Moreover, Sharpe and Benfield reviewed the literature before 2005. Their study indicated that there is a consistency in the perceived results towards online learning: Learners tended to perceive their online access to the course positively (opposing to Keller & Cernerud's findings). Moreover, they addressed the emotions of learners like

frustrations and worrying about the time expressed by online learners. On the other hand, collaboration and tutors' roles are perceived inconsistently. Results showed that learning differences impacted learners' understanding of their courses and tasks. Therefore, they should be considered essential factors which opposed Keller and Cernerud's (2002) results that these factors did not impact the E-perception (Sharpe & Benfield, 2005).

In addition, some researchers investigated the perceived learning/ satisfaction in different E-learning environments/learning modes. For example, Sweeney, O'Donoghue, and Whitehead (2004, as cited in Sharpe & Benfield, 2005) interviewed 12 learners regarding blended/hybrid learning in which contradicting results have been revealed. Some learners participated without being scared of being criticized by peers, while others were worried about being judged and called for learner-teacher interaction. Some enjoyed collaborating with their classmates, whereas others were looking for ideal answers. In other words, some learners believed that online discussion enhanced their outstanding skills and encouraged them to speak freely. By contrast, others found it difficult and time-consuming. Moore and Aspden (2004, as cited in Sharpe & Benfield, 2005) commented on the contradicting findings by arguing that a positive attitude to E-learning refers to learners' understanding of the learning goals and objectives of the online tasks and being aware of their responsibilities in advance (Sharpe & Benfield, 2005). Likewise, opposite results have been shown by Mason & Weller (2000), who collected information carefully about learners' satisfaction regarding their online experiences; unexpectedly, some learners appreciated working in groups while others did not like it. Others were satisfied with the content, whereas some were disappointed (Mason & Weller, 2000).

Another mode of learning/ environment ‘asynchronous’ was explored by Karen and Swan (2001, as cited in Perveen, 2016). In this experience, learners appreciated the design’s clarity, communication with tutors, and interactivity of the discussion with their peers. Besides, a study by McBrien, Cheng, and Jones (2009, as cited in Perveen, 2016) revealed that synchronous mode benefited distant students. Therefore, Perveen (2016) carried out a study in which learners’ responses inspired him to propose a *blend/ eclectic* mode of both methods to overcome the limitations of each mode. For instance, learners had enough time to think about their answers in an asynchronous environment, while they should have responded quickly but had the chance to be monitored in the synchronous one. The problem can be solved by synchronous mode for discussing issues related to the curriculum, like crucial concepts. In contrast, reflection ensures having enough time to respond can be done asynchronously. On the other hand, teachers are highly recommended to analyse the students’ needs to know their preferred learning methods and interests. Moreover, learners should be informed about the synchronous vs asynchronous environment to feel comfortable in the learning context, as each mode has different teaching strategies and styles (Perveen, 2016).

Moreover, Liaw et al. (2007) investigated the attitude of 168 learners, and they suggested different angles to determine students’ attitudes towards E-learning to get a complete diagnostic image based on the three elements of attitude’s definition. (i) the social view or instructors’ support of learning (teacher-learner communication), (ii) affective/emotions, and (iii) cognitive, and (iv) behavioural aspects. In their study, they stated essential elements and guidelines for an effective online environment : (i) using multimedia (pictures, videos, and animation) for online instructions, (ii) encouraging learners’ autonomy/self-based (construct my learning and information, digital instructions promote my motivation, being involved in active discussions with my

peers and exploring knowledge quickly in the online environment) , (iii) teacher-led online environment (his voice, instructions, suggestions, help/assistance, and image) and teacher-learner communication-both synchronous or asynchronous, and (iv) thriving E-learning environment (cognitive skills like problem-solving and critical thinking among others) (Liaw et al., 2007).

2.2.4 Studies on E-learning during the Pandemic 'Emergency Remote Teaching' (ERT)

The COVID-19 situation highlights how crucial technology and the internet are in our life, including the teaching and learning sector. The globe was shocked by the rapid emergence of the deadly Covid-19 sickness by the end of 2019. Many global academic institutions were forced to shift to the online teaching-learning system after being unwilling to modify their traditional pedagogical style (Dhawan, 2020). Unluckily, they needed to be more prepared for such a quick change from traditional classroom instruction to entirely online or hybrid education. As a result of this, this pandemic has resulted in *digital transformation*, which refers to using digital tools effectively to adapt to new conditions, transforming the conventional instructions based on objectivists methods that focused on teachers to online or blended modes using technologies to promote constructivist, collaboration, and classes that focus more on learners than teachers (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020).

Online education, which is defined by Fry (2001, as cited in Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020) as the process of creating educational resources, delivering teaching, and managing programs using the internet and other key technology, is firmly grounded in appropriate planning and designing of lessons utilizing tremendous theories; on the other hand, the migration to ERT as a result of the pandemic characterized by the lack of proper planning and designing which has led to more obstacles and changes in

attitudes (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Hodges, Moore, Lockee, Trust, & Bond, 2020). Since ERT focused on using educational techniques to survive in situations of crisis and utilize all the resources, including offline and online education, it was seen as a requirement rather than an option (Bozkurt et al., as cited in Mbiydzenyuy, 2020).

In addition, the quick and sudden transition to online instruction in such circumstances without benefiting from digital affordances has led to a negative stance towards the low-quality online learning (Hodges et al., 2020). In this new context, few articles and studies have been found in the literature investigating students' beliefs on this topic. Expectedly, there were many obstacles because of the swift change and the unpreparedness.

Adedoyin and Soykan (2020) mentioned some challenges faced by learners during ERT. The pandemic resulted in panic and anxiety, racial and economic issues have led to lower performance and scores. Moreover, teachers needed more time to prepare high-quality lessons. Additionally, poor learners who encountered less socioeconomic status were behind in their learning and could not access the internet easily or afford a good broadband connection. Besides, learners were distracted by their pets or families when they studied at home. In addition, lacking the necessary digital competence/ computer skills that helped learners use ICT tools effectively and ethically was also a crucial factor. For instance, learners were filmed dressing up unconsciously during the classes because they needed to gain the required digital competency in using the educational platforms, or they were not able to fully take advantage of the digital libraries to do the required research or assignment (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020).

Furthermore, ICT-based evaluation has led to cheating and was not considered a reliable assessment educational tool. In literature theories regarding the testing are numerous, while there is less on planning and items written by teachers (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020). Ayu (2020) reported that even though the effectiveness of the multimedia resources for learners and the usefulness of the recorded lessons, some suggested that they needed the slides to be downloaded and provided with scripts, more presentations, addressing technical concerns with loudness, voice clarity, and speed to ensure having a better-quality online class.

In the Middle East Context, Almahasees, Mohsen, and Amin (2021) surveyed 280 Jordanian students. They found that the online experience was helpful for them, and they agreed on its flexibility and cost-effectiveness; however, they complained about difficulties completing their online tasks, less contact between learners and their instructors, lack of motivation, accessibility, internet connectivity issues, and technical problems. More importantly, they mentioned that face-to-face instructions were more effective and cannot be replaced by online learning (Almahasees et al., 2021). In addition, Hamouda (2020, as cited in Alahmadi & Alraddadi, 2020) stated that 35 Saudi participants improved their speaking skills, including pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, and grammar, since the experience was exciting and they got instant feedback and did not face accessibility issues. Likewise, Zboun and Farrah (2021), in their study called "Students' Perspectives of Online Language Learning During Corona Pandemic: Benefits and Challenges" surveyed 82 students regarding their perceptions of online learning in Hebron. The learners faced various challenges, so they preferred conventional classes. They reported more demerits of online learning than its merits. Drawbacks include connectivity issues, lack of interaction and motivation, and less engagement and comprehension of the resources. On the contrary,

the merits of accessibility and convenience for exam revision have been indicated. Similarly, Barzani and Jamil (2021), in their study titled "Students' Perceptions Towards Online Education During COVID-19 Pandemic: An Empirical Study" stated that Kurdish learners had negative opinions and could not meet their goals due to problems with concentration, electricity issues, turning their cameras on, sudden internet disconnection, and inability to manage their time effectively. Likewise, Syahrin and Salih (2020) conducted a study in Oman; learners showed negativity because online learning focused on receptive skills while learners did not get the chance to produce the language (Syahrin & Salih, 2020). Conflicting findings and challenges have been indicated in the Middle East region in different countries depending on contextual and local aspects. For example, Saudi learners did not face accessibility issues and they had a positive attitude to E-learning, while learners who lived in Palestine, Kurdistan, and Jordan had accessibility and internet issues and had a negative perception.

In the Turkish Context, Evişen, Akyilmaz, and Torun (2020) in their article called "A Case Study of University EFL Preparatory Class Students' Attitudes Towards Online Learning during Covid-19 in Turkey" proclaimed that Turkish learners challenged by the lack of communication, quick pace, distractions because of home responsibilities, time management issues, repeated and boring activities. In the same vein, Karadağ and Yücel (2020) carried out a study named "Distance Education at Universities During the Novel Coronavirus Pandemic: An Analysis of Undergraduate Students' Perceptions" mentioning that learners were not satisfied with the digital materials. Furthermore, Kürtüncü and Kurt (2020), in their study called "Problems of Nursing Students in Distance Education in the Covid-19 Pandemic Period" investigated 516 learners studying nursing. Learners were not satisfied with the experience and

highlighted its inconvenience in teaching whether theoretical or applied courses. Problems with infrastructure, lack of quality teaching, anxiety in conducting online tests, and psychological issues accompanying the pandemic were reported. In addition, Gürler, Tuğçe, and Daştan (2020), in their study in Turkey named "Evaluation of Distance Learning from Student Perspective in Covid-19 Pandemic" surveyed 2371 Turkish university learners studying at various faculties about their online experience during COVID-19. Findings showed that males and learners with lower grades were more satisfied and interested in the course content. However, they complained that it was not convenient for exams besides lacked technical support once required. In terms of accessibility, all learners easily accessed the online resources. On the other hand, despite the challenges faced by learners in Turkey, it seems that improving the institutions' infrastructure and the online resources and contents would improve the teaching quality (Gürler et al., 2020).

In the European Context, Al-Mawee, Kwayu, & Gharaibeh (2021) conducted research at an American university. They surveyed 420 graduate and undergraduate learners' perspectives on E-learning during the initial period of COVID-19. The first-year students lacked interaction with peers and instructors due to the sudden transition to online learning, while it has less negativity among graduate learners. Moreover, undergraduate learners expressed more negativity about academic improvement. The reasons were related to less preparedness and the absence of best practices. On the other hand, they showed positivity towards time and place flexibility. Most learners had internet and a personal device, while only a minority did not (Armstrong-Mensah, Ramsey-White, Yankey, & Self-Brown, 2020; Al-Mawee et al., 2021). Moreover, the first-year students showed more positivity to face-to-face or blended online sessions to enhance class interaction, while graduates showed a positive attitude towards online.

Ferri, Grifoni, & Guzzo (2020) analysed online discussions from various sectors to determine the challenges during the COVID-19 experience. Findings revealed (i) technological challenges, such as internet connectivity and insufficient devices; (ii) pedagogical challenges, mainly lack of digital competency and the absence of well-designed content despite the availability of online resources. Moreover, learners were demotivated and less active; and (iii) social challenges, significantly less instructor-learner interaction, and less interaction among learners. In addition, insufficient physical space for learners at home with the absence of parents' support as they were working remotely at the same time with the learners and in the same place.

Consequently, ERT has created inequalities and socioeconomic challenges. To illustrate, insufficient resources, especially the inability to access the internet and technological tools; (ii) inadequate space available for poor learners at home; and (iii) the inability of their parents to help them academically in learning has led to less academic achievements among disadvantaged learners as seen in India (Ferri et al., 2020; Panda, 2021). In developing countries / low- and mid-income nations like Ghana and Malaysia, the inability to access the internet and a suitable learning environment were the most pronounced challenges (Ferri et al., 2020). Moreover, in low-income countries like Africa, as mentioned by Mbiydzenyuy (2020) in his study called "Teaching and Learning in Resource-Limited Settings in the Face of the COVID-19 Pandemic" indicated that learners lacked access to the internet and did not have enough digital devices. Most learners used mobile phones rather than smartphones, so they could not get audio-visual access. In addition, infrastructure issues include electricity, poor users, and computer availability issues.

Furthermore, there was no modification of traditional curricula into E-learning instruction, and the academic environment operated in conventional patterns (Mbiydzenyuy, 2020). In line with him, Maatuk et al. (2022) mentioned that when compared to industrialized nations, it was shown that developing nations have numerous obstacles to implementing E-learning, such as a lack of a good internet connection, inadequate knowledge of ICT, and inadequate content production (Aung & Khaing, 2015, as cited in Maatuk et al., 2022). Even in developing countries, the availability of information like video and cutting-edge software is still a novel concept for many teachers (Maatuk et al., 2022). On the contrary, most learners had access to the internet and digital devices in developed countries like the USA. However, they experienced challenges, such as inadequate interaction and poorly-structured lessons.

2.2.5 Merits of E-learning

E-learning systems have led to better communication between and among learners, as well as between students and staff. They offer more chances for collaboration and offer instructors several ways to get in touch with learners and give them feedback immediately (Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015).

Regarding its flexibility, the adoption and use of E-learning allows impaired educators to pursue their education from any region. Also, it provides students with a significant level of freedom regarding the delivery or reception of knowledge anywhere and at any moment (Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015; Almahasees et al., 2021). Asynchronous mode allows learners to study at their speed. Consequently, it reduces anxiety. In fact, unique learner characteristics are typically taken into consideration. For instance, some pupils prefer to concentrate on particular course components, whereas others are eager to cover the entire curriculum (Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015).

In particular, its interactive media function enables learners to review the learning materials and hear lecturers as needed. E-learning allows students to access knowledge and the target language's culture via movies, journals, chat sessions, and web forums (Duff & Uchida, 1997). With the aid of these tools, students can access more native speakers as well.

In addition, animation and multimedia can reinforce concepts more realistically. According to the learning theories, outcomes can be fostered when: (1) students participate in the class, (2) tasks mirror real-life situations, and (3) activities encourage deep thinking. Therefore, it promotes analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of knowledge using real-world tasks (Smart & Cappel, 2006).

Besides, it has been emphasized that the sound effects of online learning on academic ethics because of the following motives: First of all, its tolerant environment provides equality to the digital world regardless of where the learners are located, their age, race, or culture (Khan, 2005, as cited in Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015). Secondly, it motivates students to depend on themselves since professors are not the sole source of information. In other words, self-reliance is achieved. It additionally aids in society's readiness for intercultural communication on a global scale (Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015).

More crucially, the COVID outbreak offers another justification for E-learning as it might be utilized at these times (Dhawan, 2020; Almahasees et al., 2021). Table 1 below summarizes some of the strengths/ affordances of ERT during COVID-19 from the learners' point of view.

Table 1: Previous Studies' Results: Strengths/ Merits/Affordances of ERT/ Online Classes from the Perceptions of the Participants

Strengths/ Affordances of ERT	
Flexibility	• Learners can study at their own pace/ time flexibility (Mbiydzenyuy, 2020; Rojabi, 2020; Al-Mawee et al., 2021). • Learners do not want to travel/ place flexibility (Shahzad et al., 2020, as cited in Akbana et al., 2021). • Disabled learners can join classes (Svalina & Ivić, 2020, as cited in Akbana et al., 2021; Almahasees et al., 2021). • Convenience for exam revision (Zboun & Farrah, 2021). • It can be a solution/panacea in times of crisis (Dhawan, 2020; Erarslan, 2021; Almahasees et al., 2021).
Focusing on Learners rather than Activities	• Matching various learning styles • Providing a wide range of activities/ enjoy the activities • Enhancing collaboration without time and space constraints • Opening the door for innovation and recent pedagogies in learning. • Watching the recorded materials (Mbiydzenyuy, 2020). • Learners who praised the instructional methods/ practices outweighed those who indicated the contrary (Akbana et al., 2021). • More studies indicated that instructors in ERT provide pupils with enough instructional support (Akbana et al., 2021).

Enhancing Learning Skills	• Learners' creativity, independent learning, self-directed education, participation, solving problems and autonomy (Akbana et al., 2021). • Improving digital literacy to keep up with modernity (Mbiydzenyuy, 2020). • Global acceptance of E-learning • Advancement in research
Ethics	• Equality to the digital World (Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015)

2.2.6 Drawbacks and Challenges of E-learning

Present E-learning theories and practices are neither straightforward nor consistent, which implies that this approach was implemented irregularly, at random, and with varying degrees of success. Despite academics and teachers' enthusiasm and devotion, there is still a lot of disengagement, uncertainty, and doubt among students concerning E-learning (Ayu, 2020). On top of that, the sudden transition from conventional classrooms to E-learning environments has occurred as a result of instructors modifying their whole pedagogical methods to address new trends and adapt to shifting conditions. Therefore, delivering high-quality schooling was not the main worry at this challenging time; instead, it was how educational colleges and universities could carry out web-based learning on massive scales (Dhawan, 2020; Sharin, 2021). Owing to the pandemic, the sudden transformation from conventional learning to virtual education is associated with many obstacles (Crawford et al., 2020). ERT situation is different from the typical virtual system because schools were compelled to use E-learning techniques despite the lack of funding and supply of educational resources. Less current research has looked into the difficulties and possibilities of online learning during pandemics (Mailizar, Abdulsalam, & Suci, 2020).

Therefore, researchers were examining the merits and drawbacks of the current E-learning programs from the perspectives of many stakeholders. According to Mailizar et al. (2020), learners' perspectives are vital in addressing this issue; further research is required to understand learners' challenges when using online learning to meet their learning goals (Mailizar et al., 2020).

Ayu (2020) declared that although most people acknowledge that online learning can improve educational experiences on all levels, many believe that the current flaws are still too significant to do so much. To begin with, students must apply what they learned to get successful outcomes. Digital content occasionally tends to be theoretical, which makes it challenging for learners to practice the knowledge in some courses. Moreover, Students supposed that the absence of community, technical challenges, and problems comprehending the learning objectives are the primary obstacles to digital education (Song, Singleton, Hill, & Koh, 2004).

In fact, it has been discovered that pupils were ill-equipped for various online skills and are not well-prepared regarding technological challenges (Parkes, Stein, & Reading, 2014, as cited in Dhawan, 2020). For example, some obstacles include difficulties with downloading, installation, login, audio-visual troubles, and other aspects of contemporary technology. Furthermore, some learners might find virtual instructions tedious and laborious (Dhawan, 2020). Table 2 below summarizes the weaknesses/challenges/drawbacks of ERT from the learners' point of view.

Table 2: Previous Studies' Results: Weakness/ Challenges/Drawbacks of ERT/ Online Classes from the Perceptions of Participants

Challenges of ERT	
Social Challenges	• Lack of social presence: Less instructor-learner interaction (Ferri et al., 2020; Saputra, et al., 2021; Almahasees et al., 2021). • Less learner-learner interaction/ peer support/ less team work (Saputra, et al., 2021). • Lack of interaction (Nartiningrum & Nugroho, 2020; Evişen et al., 2020; Zboun & Farrah, 2021; Vivoni-Suarez, 2021; Hazaymeh, 2021; Almahasees et al., 2021). • Absence of physical space (learners were studying while parents working remotely) (Ferri et al., 2020). • Insufficient parents' support (Ferri et al., 2020; Panda, 2021).
Economic Issues	• (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Saputra, et al., 2021). • Infrastructure (Kürtüncü & Kurt, 2020).
Lower Achievement	• Academic achievement might be affected by racial, economic and various resources (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Erarslan, 2021). • Less academic achievement among disadvantaged learners (Ferri et al., 2020; Panda, 2021).
Skills	• Negativity because it focused on receptive skills while learners did not get the chance to produce the language (Syahrin & Salih, 2020). • Problems with attitudes including, self-discipline (Bao ,2020), lack of motivation • Inability to manage their times (Evişen et al., 2020; Barzani & Jamil, 2021).
Learning Resources' Issues	• Unsuitable learning resources (Bao, 2020). • Insufficient resources (Ayu, 2020; Karadağ & Yücel, 2020; Mailizar et al., 2020; Aguilera-Hermida et al., 2021; Aboagye et al., 2021; Maatuk, 2022).

	• Inability to understand the resources (Saputra, et al., 2021; Zboun & Farrah, 2021). • Overloaded with online assignment rather than online activities • Insufficient explanation (Saputra, et al., 2021). • Lack of knowledge in the subject matter (Erarslan, 2021) **Lack of cognitive presence:** • Absence of well-designed/ structured materials (Ferri et al., 2020; Erarslan, 2021). • Inability to teach practical courses like medicine (Ayu, 2020; Kürtüncü and Kurt, 2020). • Inability to provide instant feedback (Ferri et al., 2020). • Assessment integrity (Mbiydzenyuy, 2020). • Low quality teaching (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020). • learning environment (Bao, 2020). • Boring activities (Evişen et al., 2020; Saputra et al., 2021; Almahasees et al., 2021).
Technological Constraints	**Insufficient internet/ internet connectivity/ accessibility issues:** • (Ferri et al., 2020; Mbiydzenyuy, 2020; Saputra, et al., 2021; Akbana et al., 2021; Aboagye et al., 2021; Almahasees et al., 2021; Zboun & Farrah, 2021; Barzani & Jamil, 2021; Maatuk, 2022). • Lack or insufficiency in digital literacy (Ferri et al., 2020; Dhawan, 2020; Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Akbana et al., 2021; Erarslan, 2021; Maatuk, 2022). **Devices' Issues:** • Types of devices: Mobile phones do not have access to audio visual lessons (Mbiydzenyuy, 2020).

	• Lack or insufficient devices (Altunay, 2019; Ferri et al., 2020; Mbiydzenyuy, 2020; Adedoyin and Soykan, 2020; Vivoni-Suarez, 2021).
Psychological Issues	• Anxiety and stress and isolation (Daniel, 2020; Yan, 2020; Kufi, Negassa, Melaku, & Mergo, 2020; Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Sharin, 2021; Heng & Sol, 2021). • Stress and anxiety to use platforms to learn and in examination (Mbiydzenyuy, 2020; Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Kürtüncü & Kurt, 2020). • Distraction and lack of concentration (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Evişen et al., 2020; Barzani & Jamil, 2021; Vivoni-Suarez, 2021).
Ethical Issues	• Copying and privacy issues (Ferri et al., 2020). • Cheating in exams (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020).
Pedagogical issues	• Using platforms without paying attention to online pedagogy/ lack of planning (Crawford et al., 2020, as cited in Mbiydzenyuy, 2020; Dhawan, 2020; Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Kürtüncü & Kurt, 2020; Aboagye et al., 2021; Erarslan, 2021). • Lack of motivation/ less active (Ferri et al., 2020; Almahasees et al., 2021; Zboun & Farrah, 2021).

2.3 Summary

Positive attitudes among students have been shown to increase students' outcomes in language acquisition. At the same time, it has also been established that negative attitudes lower students' motivation, which impedes successful language learning. Language instructors must therefore be conscious of their students' attitudes toward language study. If they have negative stance, they must look for various ways to motivate and assist them in developing positive attitudes (Cinkara & Bağçeci, 2013).

Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methodology and tools adopted in the current study. First of all, it explains the research design and the rationale behind it. Next, it provides an overview of the research context. After that, the study is followed by the research questions, participants, data collection tools, procedures, data analysis, and finally, the ethical considerations.

3.1 Research Design

This research investigated the perceptions and attitudes of Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU) Turkish and Turkish Cypriot learners from different departments who have experienced learning English and/or content in English (as a medium of instruction) online during the pandemic. In other words, the study was a *retrospective*, in which a researcher looks back in time to examine events have already occurred (online learning experience during the pandemics). Furthermore, the study aimed at identifying the positive and negative sides of online learning from the students' perspectives. As well as, the drawbacks and challenges of online learning.

The research was based on the quantitative method. That is the findings of the questionnaire were analysed by means of a package program called SPSS. By means of the application of the quantitative method in deciphering the findings, it was intended to obtain well defined and without any bias on the results.

Quantitative research approach is a means that aims to understand a phenomenon by gathering numerical information and analysing these facts by using statics (Creswell, 1994, as cited in Sukamolson, 2007). For example, in order to obtain data about students' attitudes towards a course, a questionnaire will be used with attitudes' statements to rate their attitudes towards the course. Moreover, Sukamolson (2007) states that quantitative approach is the mathematical description and interpretation of data in order to describe and interpret a phenomenon (Sukamolson, 2007).

The utilization of quantitative research at this point in the study aids in examining the EMI participants' perceptions and attitudes towards online learning that they had during COVID-19. As was mentioned several times in different chapters, the study is a retrospective one. In other words, by using this methodology, the researcher learned about online learning experiences from the participants. By doing this, the study strengthened and better reflected the actual circumstances of virtual learning that the learners had experienced for further considerations and improvements. Consequently, as this study employed a questionnaire for data collection, it used a quantitative research approach.

3.2 Research Context

This study was carried out at the Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU) in North Cyprus, in Famagusta. This university offers one hundred forty-one programs, including research and undergraduate and postgraduate degrees. It has been considered a cosmopolitan nation with a diverse population of international learners searching for a good education standard. Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU) is a governmental institution that the Times Higher Education classified it among the top (1000) universities in the World and was ranked the second in Turkey (EMU Is Among

the World's Top 600 Universities, 2021). It provides a range of programs in many faculties, including those for medicine, engineering, arts and sciences, tourism, and communication, among others. Moreover, the institution provides associate, bachelor, master's, and Doctoral levels, among other academic achievements (Programs | Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), Cyprus, n.d.). The context is EMI. Those who wish to study must verify their language competency through International English Language Testing System Exam (IELTS) or Test of English as a Foreign Language Exam (TOFFEL).

3.3 Research Questions

This study aims to find answers to these three research questions at a *retrospective* frame:

- What were the students' perceptions and attitudes towards learning English and/or content in English online?
- What were the strengths of online classes from the student's point of view?
- What were the weaknesses and challenges of online learning from the student's perspective?

3.4 Participants

To achieve the aims of this study, 102 EMI Turkish and Turkish Cypriot students at EMU in North Cyprus were surveyed about their perceptions and attitudes towards their experience regarding learning English and/or content in English as a medium of instruction online during the Pandemic. Yamane (1967) suggested that a sample size of 100 can be sufficient to represent a population to be targeted. Consequently, 102 EMU students were selected through convenience sampling. Some of them were prep school students and the others from different departments. In this respect, we did not do any classifications since the context was EMI.

This study includes non-probability sampling: convenience and purposive sampling. The sample has been considered a convenience for the following reasons: First, it is easily accessible to the researcher. Moreover, it is a quick and cost-effective method as well. According to Merriam (1998), when we choose a sample based on factors such as time, cost, place, availability, and agreement, it will be a convenience sample. In comparison, purposive sampling is an instinctive sampling technique that selects participants from around the World based on their potential to provide insights into a specific concept, theme, or phenomenon (Robinson, 2014).

3.5 Data Collection Tools

Data were gathered from the EMI participants through an online survey questionnaire (See Appendix B). Questionnaires are convenient tools for data collection for many reasons, primarily because they can be translated into the native language; therefore, low-proficient participants in English will never skip a question and ensure an effective data collection procedure.

For the structured or closed questions, a 5-point Likert scale was utilized with the primary goal of rating the EMI participants' opinions regarding the online sessions during the Pandemic. The Likert scale was effective in this context for many motives. Firstly, it makes it easier for the researchers to capture an insight into attitudes, thoughts, and perceptions by changing these qualitative attributes into quantitative data. In other words, it involves changing the abstract experience regarding online learning during the pandemic into items or statements about the study under investigation (Joshi, Kale, Chandel, & Pal, 2015). Moreover, it will add to the validity and reliability of the attitudes research if the items are developed with care and logic and easily comprehended and understood (Krosnick, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2018).

The EMI participants were expected to express their agreement or disagreement with the 28 particular attitude statements by selecting a number ranging from one to five. On this scale, one reflects "*Strongly Disagree*", two reflects "*Disagree*", three reflects "*Neutral/ Not Sure*", four reflects "*Agree*", and five reflects "*Strongly Agree*".

3.6 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was designed according to "Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement" by Oppenheim (2000). It consists of two batteries: (i) the first battery, battery A, was designed to get some background information about the target participants namely their gender, age, nationality, English proficiency level (A1-A2-B1-UB1), and familiarity with technology; and (ii) the second battery, battery B, on the other hand, consists of three sections to cover the three research questions and have statements which intend to measure the perception of the participants. The items of the questionnaire were clustered around each of the research questions. Each cluster had an anchor item.

In survey responses, there is an approach called '*anchoring*' and '*adjusting*' (cross checking- supporting items which are consistent or related information to the anchor). This will help in grouping the items to ensure respondents will focus on the topic as this strategy will provide anchor (first information with first cognitive load) and adjust/ supporting (less cognitive effort on the subsequent related items). Therefore, respondents will recall information easier which will increase the accuracy and reliability of the research as a result (Gehlbach & Barge, 2012).

RQ1: "*What were the students' perceptions and attitudes towards learning English and/or content in English online?*" Anchor items: [Item 1, "The learning objectives

were clear"]; [Item 3, "Teachers encouraged online discussions"]; [Item 7, "Online resources were useful"]; [Item 10, "The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me"].

RQ2: "*What were the strengths of the online classes from the student's point of view*?*"* Anchor item [Item 12, "Online education was more flexible than face to face learning"].

RQ3: "*What were the weaknesses and challenges of online learning from the student's perspective*?" Anchor items: [Item 15, "Technology has always been important (in education)"]; [Item 20, "EMU had limited amount of online resources"]; [Item 22, "Online learning was boring"]; [Item 25, "Online learning made me feel more distracted"].

The first cluster of the questionnaire was related to students' attitude towards online learning which sought to answer the first research question. The clustered items were [Items 1-11]. To answer this question, it was necessary to explore learners' perceptions and attitudes in terms of four subsections: (i) the role of the online instructor items [Item 1, "The learning objectives were clear"]; [Item 2, "Learning activities were designed to meet different students' learning styles"]; (ii) interaction and communication items [Item 3, "Teachers encouraged online discussions"]; [Item 4, "Teachers made sure that students are active in class during online sessions"]; [Item 5, "Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates"]; [Item 6, "Teachers provided immediate feedback"]; and (iii) learning resources items [Item 7, "Online resources were useful"]; [Item 8, "Interactive video

feature allowed me to review all my classroom activities and lessons"]; [Item 9, "It provided easy access to massive amount of knowledge related to my topic"]; and (iv) the learning environment items [Item 10, "The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me"]; [Item 11, "I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic"].

The second clustered items of the questionnaire were related to the strengths of online classes from the students' point of view in a retrospection which were like its flexibility which sought to answer the second research question. The clustered items were [Items 12-14]. [Item 12, "Online education was more flexible than face to face learning"]; [Item 13, "Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily"]; [Item 14, "I could study on my own speed; therefore, I was stress-free"].

The third clustered items were related to the weaknesses/ flaws and challenges of online learning faced by learners which sought to answer the third research question. The clustered items were [Items 15-28]. After reading the literature review regarding this issue, this section was categorized into four subsections: (i) technical issues [Item 15, "Technology has always been important (in education)"]; [Item 16, "There was insufficient engagement"]; [Item 17, "There was a lack of contact with teachers"]; [Item 18, "There was a lack of contact with peers"]; [Item 19, "Poor technological skills were problem in online education"]; (ii) financial infrastructure [Item 20, "EMU had limited amount of online resources"]; [Item 21, "Students did not have enough gadgets"]; (iii) learning environment [Item 22, "Online learning was boring"] ; [Item 23, "It gave a sense of loneliness to me"]; [Item 24, "There was a lack of active

participation in academic activities"]; and (iv) health issues [Item 25, "Online learning made me feel more distracted"]; [Item 26, "Online learning environment was so tiring for me"]; [Item 27, "I had backache sitting for long time in front of my screen"]; [Item 28, "I had eye issues when I focused more"].

The Questionnaire items were adapted from identical studies with almost no modifications except shortening them. Two faces of the questionnaire were carried out. Firstly, it was piloted with a group of 15 students and checked if the students were clear with the items. Later, little or no modifications were done accordingly except for changing the word pupils- as the word was vague for a participant-into students in Item 13 from ["Full time and part time pupils were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily"] to ["Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily"]. In addition, participants were confused about the demographic question "*Have you ever studied English language online?*" thinking that the study was carried out only for learners who attended English courses; consequently, this question has been modified for clarification to include EMI context in the research to "*Have you ever studied any course in English online during COVID-19*?".

Then, the Cronbach's alpha value of the 28 items was calculated of 0.810, indicating fairly high internal consistency among the items. Finally, data were collected from the 102 participants.

3.7 Validity and Reliability

Content validity has been done, which involved extensive reading of the literature regarding the topic, followed by the judgment of my supervisor and two experts in the

field. They evaluated the newly constructed content and ensured the presence of the most critical items that covered the research questions, and removed the unnecessary or repeated ones. In other words, the questionnaire was checked by my supervisor and two experts to go through; then, it was redesigned to ensure both face and content validity.

After that, a pilot study was conducted with 15 learners who resembled the desired population to make the necessary changes. A pilot study is advantageous for the following reasons: It was undertaken as a pre-test to evaluate the wording of the questionnaire, follow the proper order, or even identify crucial issues that should be considered for further modifications, such as ambiguities. This method added to the reliability and validity of the study (Edwin & Hundley, 2002).

Moreover, the questionnaire was translated into Turkish to obtain quality data as this study investigated the perceptions of the EMI Turkish and Turkish Cypriot learners.

3.8 Data Collection Procedures

For the study, a quantitative method was adapted. The primary data were collected from the EMI Turkish and Turkish Cypriot students enrolled at EMU university studying in different departments (experienced English as the medium of instruction online during the Pandemic) and/or prep. school. The means of data collection were a questionnaire which includes 28 closed-ended questions. Nevertheless, in this *retrospective* research, the secondary data were gathered from different articles, theses, and books about the same topic. In fact, the findings of them were summarised at the end of the literature review chapter (See Tables 1 and 2).

Data were collected via online survey that has English and Turkish versions. Notably, they signed the consent form before starting to complete the survey. The online survey was created on Google forms for the time and place convenience. The link was available to the participants via a QR Code (See Appendix A). The online survey included a cover page explaining the study's goal, what is expected from the target population, and the researchers' contact information which had the information when needed it. Moreover, besides the cover page, an online participant consent form was also sent to be signed for ethical satisfaction procedures. Finally, a pilot test was done for the validity and reliability issues of the questionnaire.

3.9 Data Analysis

The quantitative data from the 28 closed-ended questions regarding the students' perceptions and attitudes towards online learning were processed statistically through SPSS Version 29. For the reliability issue, a specialist was asked for help to ensure the appropriate input 'coding of the items' and analysis. Cronbach's alpha in SPSS was utilized for checking the reliability of the newly constructed questionnaire, and it was regarded reliable because the coefficient of the internal consistency of the 28 items indicated 0.810.

3.10 Ethical Principles

Regarding this topic, many issues took into consideration:

Firstly, the researcher prepared a thesis proposal form and submitted it to the Eastern Mediterranean University Graduate Education and Research Institute to decide the appropriateness of the subject and methodology. Secondly, after approving it, an application was written to the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Board (BAYEK) for ethical approval permission (See Appendix C). Finally, the process of collecting quantitative data started after getting all the approval sheets.

In addition, before asking the target population to fill in the questionnaire, an informed consent form was sent to them, which included: (i) the purpose of the research; (ii) the way of data collection; (iii) the time it could take to be completed ;(iv) their participation was voluntary ‘not obligatory’ and they had the absolute right to withdraw; (v) these data were confidential and secured for the aim of the study; (vi) their identities were anonymous; and (vii) information about the researcher for any queries, such as her/his name, address, email, phone number was provided as well.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

4.1 Introduction

This chapter analyses and deciphers the quantitative data obtained through the questionnaire, which was distributed to the 102 EMI participants who have experienced learning English language and/or content in English (as a medium of instruction) online during the pandemic period at EMU.

Therefore, the three research questions were interrogated: (i) what were the students' perceptions and attitudes towards learning English and/or content in English online?; (ii) what were the strengths of online classes from the student's point of view?; (iii) what were the weaknesses and challenges of online learning from the student's perspective?

As it was pointed out several times, the study had a "***retrospective***" feature. SPSS version 29 was used for the analysis of the questionnaire data and descriptive statistics and T test were used as well. Finally, the findings were presented in tables.

4.2 Findings of the Quantitative Data

The attitude questionnaire consisted of two batteries/ sections. The first battery/ section A collected demographic data about the target population, while the second battery/section B comprised of 28 attitude and perception statements that covered the three research questions. Battery B had 9 anchor items/ the main items to explore

learners' attitudes and perceptions towards learning English and/or subjects in English (as a medium of instruction) online during COVID-19; as well as sub-items (19 in total) to verify and support the anchor items. In this way, the reliability of the findings was fortified.

4.2.1 Section A: Demographic Information

Table 3 below shows the background data regarding the EMI 102 Turkish and Turkish Cypriot students who have completed the survey.

Table 3: Demographic Information about the Participants

Item	Sub Item	Observation Number	Percentage (%)
Total Observation	-	102	100%
Gender	Male	37	36%
	Female	65	64%
Age	18-20	44	43%
	21-30	58	57%
Nationality	Turkish or Turkish Cypriot	102	100%
English Level	A1	7	7%
	A2	16	16%
	B1	41	40%
	UB1	38	37%
Technology Competency	Advanced	41	40%
	Medium	57	56%
	Poor	4	4%

A total sample of 141 EMI learners who have experienced learning English and/or content in English online during the pandemic were surveyed about their perceptions and attitudes towards online learning. Thirty-four participants were cut out as they

disagreed with the question asking, "*Have you ever studied any course in English online during Covid19*?" and six other nationalities (2 Pakistani, an Indian, an Iranian, a Kenyan, and a Moroccan) were excluded from the study as well. Consequently, 39 participants were eliminated as one of them was from another nationality, and he/she did not attend online classes in English.

Therefore, the study was left with 102 EMI Turkish and Turkish Cypriot learners who have experienced either learning English language and/or the subject matter in English (EMI) online during COVID-19, of which 36 % more than a third were males, while 64 %, almost two-thirds, were females (See Table 3). 43%, just over two-fifths of the target population aged between 18-20, whereas 57%, slightly over three-fifths aged between 21-30. In terms of their English proficiency level, 7 %, a tiny proportion were A1; 16%, a small minority, were A2; the highest proportion of the participant, 40%, exactly two-fifths, were B1, and almost the same proportion, 37% were upper B1. This means 77 %, roughly three-quarters or a vast majority of the target population in this study, had good English (B1 and UB1) in contrast to 23% (A1 and A2). Moreover, the target population possessed good technological skills, with 40% two-fifths of them were advanced and 56% more than half were medium. Consequently, 96 % of the participants, the majority were good at using technology, whereas only 4% considered themselves poor users.

Hence, the following Tables (4, 6, 7 and 8) summarize the impact of these factors (gender, age, cyber skills, and English proficiency level) on E-learning by highlighting the core trends that have been noticed from the cross-tab findings.

4.2.1.1 E-Learning and Gender

Table 4: Findings of E-learning and Gender

Items/ Gender	Males	Females
Teachers' Roles [Items 1 and 2]	42%	35%
Interaction and Communication [Items 3-6]	57%	43%
Online Environment [Items 10 and 11]	58%	40%
Technical Issues [Items 15-19]	45%	46%
Environment Issues [Items 22-24]	40%	55%
Health Issues [Items 25-28]	42%	58%

According to Table 4, when [Items 1 and 2] were analysed, it can be seen that the male participants were more satisfied with the teachers' roles. The percentage was 42 compared to 35 of the female participants. In addition, when [Items 3-6] were analysed, it can be noticed that the male participants interacted more than the female participants during the online classes with 57 percent indication of the male participants in comparison with only 43 percent indication of the female participants. Moreover, when [Items 10 and 11] were analysed, it can be indicated that the online environment was more enjoyable for the male participants. The percentage was 58 compared to only 40 of the female participants. Furthermore, regarding the challenges, according to [Items 15-19], the female participants faced more technical challenges. Moreover, according to [Items 22-24] and [Items 25-28] they also faced more

environmental and health obstacles. The percentage was 46, 55, 58 respectively of female participants compared to 45, 40, 42 in order of the male participants.

Furthermore, Table 5 below indicates the P value (the statistical significance) of gender in relation to the items of the survey.

Table 5: T Test Findings of Gender

Statements	**Significance/ P value of Gender**
Item 1, “The learning objectives were clear.”	.32
Item 2, “Learning activities were designed to meet different students’ learning styles.”	.75
Item 3, “Teachers encouraged online discussions.”	.60
Item 4, “Teachers made sure that students are active in class during online sessions.”	.52
Item 5, “Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates.”	.74
Item 6, “Teachers provided immediate feedback.”	.11
Item 10, “The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me.”	.50
Item 11, “I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic.”	.01
Item 15, “Technology has always been important (in education).”	.79
Item 16, “There was insufficient engagement.”	.69
Item 17, “There was a lack of contact with teachers.”	.50
Item 18, “There was a lack of contact with peers.”	.64
Item 19, “Poor technological skills were problem in online education.”	.97

Item 22, “Online learning was boring.”	.84
Item 23, “It gave a sense of loneliness to me.”	.56
Item 24, “There was a lack of active participation in academic activities.”	.24
Item 25, “Online learning made me feel more distracted.”	.20
Item 26, “Online learning environment was so tiring for me.”	.16
Item 27, “I had backache sitting for long time in front of my screen.”	.21
Item 28, “I had eye issues when I focused more.”	.91

When Table 5 was analysed, it can be seen that there is not a statistically significant difference between the male group and the female group in all the above-mentioned items as the P value is more than 5% (except for Item 11) (See Appendix E).

4.2.1.2 E-learning and Age

Table 6: Findings of E-learning and Age

Items/ Age Groups	**Age 18-20**	**Age 21-30**
Learning Environment [Items 10 and 11]	40%	51%
Flexibility	51%	56%
Learning Environment/ Challenges [Items 22-24]	55%	45%
Health Issues [Items 25-28]	57%	48%

When Table 6 was analysed, it was seen that two age groups were compared: (i) (18-20) and (ii) (21-30). When [Items 10 and 11] were analyzed, it was seen that the learning environment was more enjoyable and more relaxing for clarifying the concepts for the older age group (21-30). The percentage was 51 compared to only 40 of the younger age group. Therefore, when [Items 22-24] were analysed, the younger group faced more environment challenges. The percentage was 55 compared to only 45 percent of the older group. Moreover, when [Items 25-28] were analysed, younger group also faced more heath issues. The percentage was 57 in contrast with only 48 percent of the older group. In addition, participants aged between (21-30) found the online experience more flexible for them compared to the participants aged between (18-20). The percentage was 56 of the former while it was only 51 of the later.

4.2.1.3 E-learning and Familiarity with Technology

Table 7: Findings of E-learning and Technology Competency

Items/ Technology Competency	**Advanced**	**Medium**	**Poor**
Learning Resources [Items 7-9]	47%	51%	42%
Technical Issues [Items 15-19]	48%	43%	75%
Learning Environment [Items 22-24]	47%	49%	75%
Health Issues [Items 25-28]	48%	54%	75%

Based on Table 7 above, when [Items 7-9] were analysed, it was seen that advanced and medium users stated that they benefited from the online resources. The percentage was 47 and 51 respectively, while it was only 42 percent of the poor users. Moreover,

when [Items15-19] were analysed, it was recognized that advanced and medium users faced less technical challenges. The percentage was 48 and 43 in order compared to 75 percent of the poor users who had more technical challenges and therefore communicated less. Furthermore, when [Items 22-24] and [Items 25-28] were analysed, poor users stated that they had more learning environment issues and health issues. The percentage in both issues was 75.

4.2.1.4 E-learning and English Proficiency

Table 8: Findings of E-learning and English Proficiency Level

English Proficiency Level	A1	A2	B1	UB1
Item 2, "Learning activities were designed to meet different students' learning styles."	43%	25%	20%	29%
Item 3, "Teachers encouraged online discussions."	43%	50%	46%	53%
Item 4, "Teachers made sure that students are active in class during online sessions."	29%	44%	54%	53%
Item 5, "Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates."	14%	44%	39%	42%
Item 6, "Teachers provided immediate feedback."	29%	63%	59%	47%
Item 10, "The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me."	14%	63%	39%	42%

This paragraph related the English proficiency level of the subject to their perceptions and attitudes. Even though teaching a second/ foreign language is challenging for teachers running conventional classes, it is even more challenging when learners are studying a second language online and/ or a subject in English online with the absence

of teachers/ no visibility; in addition to less preparation and utilizing old pedagogical methodologies that were no longer fit into that situation.

According to Table 8, when [Item 2, "Learning activities were designed to meet different students' learning styles"] was analysed, 25 percent of A2, 20 percent of B1 and 29 percent of UB1 were less satisfied with the educational activities in contrast with 43 percent of A1. On the other hand, when [Item 3, "Teachers encouraged online discussions"] was analysed, it was seen that 50 percent of A2, 46 percent of B1, and 53 percent of UB1 got more encouragement from their teachers to discuss different topics contrasted with only 43 percent of A1. Moreover, when [Item 4, "Teachers made sure that students are active in class during online sessions"] was analysed, it was noticed that 44 percent of A2, 54 percent of B1 and 53 percent of UB1 were active in class contrasted to only 29 percent of A1. Additionally, when [Item 5, "Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates"] was analysed, results revealed that 44 percent of A2, 39 percent of B1, and 42 percent of UB1were good communicators compared to only 14 percent of A1. In addition, when [Item 6, "Teachers provided immediate feedback"] was analysed, it was seen that 63 percent of A2, 59 percent of B1 and 47 percent of UB1 got direct reflection on their tasks compared to only 29 percent of A1. Moreover, according to the findings of [Item 10, "The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me"], it was seen that 63 percent of A2 enjoyed their online experience compared to only 14 percent of A1.

4.2.2 Section B: Research Questions

The attitude towards online learning during COVID-19 has been evaluated by asking the target population to express their intensity of agreement or disagreement on a

Likert scale which had 28 attitude and perception statements. They selected a number ranging from 1-5 on a 5-point Likert scale: "*One Strongly Disagrees*" while "*Five Strongly Agree*".

The following Table 9 summarizes the anchor items validated by the sub-items across the questionnaire. Moreover, Table 10 represents the findings (percentages and mean scores) of the anchor items of the three research questions.

Table 9: Research Questions with Anchor and Supporting Items of the Questionnaire

Research Question	**Sub-sections**	**Anchor item**	**Supporting/sub-items**
(i) What were the students' perceptions and attitudes towards learning English and/or content in English online?	(i) the role of the online instructor [Items 1 and 2]	Item 1	Sub-item 2
	(ii) interaction and communication [Items 3-6]	Item 3	Sub-items [4-6]
	(iii) learning resources [Items 7-9]	Item 7	Sub-items [8 and 9]
	(iv) the learning environment [Items 10 and11]	Item 10	Sub-item 11
(ii) What were the strengths of online classes from the student's point of view?	flexibility	Item 12	Sub-items [13 and 14]
(iii) What were the weaknesses and challenges of online learning from the student's perspective?	(i) technical issues [Items 15-19]	Item 15	Sub-items [16-19]
	(ii) financial infrastructure [Items 20 and 21]	Item 20	Sub-item 21
	(iii) learning environment [Items 22-24]	Item 22	Sub-items [23 and 24]
	(iv) health issues [Items 25-28]	Items 25	Sub-items [26-28]

When Table 9 was analysed, RQ1 investigated the participants' perceptions and attitudes towards online learning by inquiring learners about four subsections: (i) the role of the online instructor [Items 1 and 2]; (ii) interaction and communication [Items 3-6]; (iii) learning resources [Items 7-9]; and (iv) the learning environment [Items 10 and11]. RQ2 explored the strengths of the online classes by asking the participants three items about flexibility [Items 12-14]. Furthermore, RQ3 investigated the weaknesses and challenges of the online learning by inquiring the particpants about four subsections: (i) technical issues [Items 15-19]; (ii) financial infrastructure [Items 20 and 21]; (iii) the learning environment [Items 22-24]; and (iv) the health issues [Items 25-28].

When Table 10 below was analysed, it was seen that RQ1 had 4 Anchor items/ main items that investigated learners' attitudes and perceptions towards learning English and/or content in English online. Anchor 1[Item 1, "The learning objectives were clear."]; Anchor 2 [Item 3, "Teachers encouraged online discussion."]; Anchor 3 [Item7, "Online resources were useful."]; and Anchor 4 [Item 10, "The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me"]. RQ2 had only one Anchor item [Item 12, "Online Education was more flexible than face to face learning."]. RQ3 had 4 Anchor items that explored the challenges of the online learning from the students' perspectives. Anchor 6 [Item 15, "Technology has always been important in education."]; Anchor 7 [Item 20, "EMU had limited amount of online resources]; Anchor 8 [Item 22, "Online learning was boring."]; and Anchor 9 [Item 25, "Online learning made me feel more distracted."].

Table 10: Findings of the Anchor Items of the Three Research Questions

Research Question	Anchor item	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree or Agree	Mean	SD
(i) What were the students' perceptions and attitudes towards learning English and/or content in English online?	Anchor 1 Q1: The learning objectives were clear.	14%	36%	50%	3.50	1.05
	Anchor 2 Q3: Teachers encouraged online discussions.	28%	23%	49%	3.23	1.25
	Anchor 3 Q7: Online resources were useful.	21%	25%	54%	3.48	1.07
	Anchor 4 Q10: The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me.	25%	32%	42%	3.31	1.30
(ii) What were the strengths of online classes from the student's point of view?	Anchor 5 Q12: Online education was more flexible than face to face learning	24%	25%	52%	3.47	1.41
(iii) What were the weaknesses and challenges of online learning from the student's perspective?	Anchor 6 Q15: Technology has always been important (in education).	7%	15%	78%	4.22	0.97
	Anchor 7 Q20: EMU had limited amount of online resources	31%	30%	38%	3.11	1.21
	Anchor 8 Q22: Online learning was boring	24%	25%	52%	3.48	1.33
	Anchor 9 Q25: Online learning made me feel more distracted	16%	32%	52%	3.65	1.17

4.2.2.1 Learners' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Learning English and/or Content in English Online

The first study question was addressed to deal with students' attitudes and perspectives regarding online learning. The cluster's components were [Items 1-11]. This can be achieved by analysing the findings of the four anchor items illustrated in Table 11 below.

Table 11: Anchor Items of the First Research Question (i) "What Were the Students' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Learning English and/or Content in English Online?"

Subsections	Strongly Disagree Or Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree or Agree	M	SD
Anchor 1 Q1: The learning objectives were clear.	14%	36%	50%	3.50	1.05
Anchor 2 Q3: Teachers encouraged online discussions.	28%	23%	49%	3.23	1.25
Anchor 3 Q7: Online resources were useful.	21%	25%	54%	3.48	1.07
Anchor 4 Q10: The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me.	25%	32%	42%	3.31	1.30

(M) Mean (SD) Standard Deviation

When Table 11 was analysed, it was seen that, "online resources" [Item 7] were rated the highest satisfaction among the participants with a mean score of 3.48 and 1.07 SD. On the other hand, participants were less satisfied with the "online learning environment" [Item 10], according to the findings, only 42% of the participants found it enjoyable with a lower mean score of 3.31 and 1.3 SD.

Note: according to relatively high percentage of neutrality, which almost ranges between a quarter to a third, it might reflect the participants means either were unsure about their answers or were confused, as each attitude's item might have more than an answer depending on many factors (the course, the instructor, methods, among others). For example, the same participant might have enjoyed a course and might have felt bored in another course depending on the curriculum, activity, or the instructor, as that was supported by the qualitative findings of one of the participants stated that "*an experience that varies according to the teachers*".

Table 12 below shows the mean and standard deviation of the first anchor item of the first research question (i) "*What Were the Students' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Learning English and/or Content in English Online?"*

4.2.2.1.1 Instructors' Role

Table 12: Anchor Item 1 of RQ1/The First Subsection "The Role of the Online Instructor"

Anchor Item	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
1-The learning objectives were clear.	14%	36%	50%	3.50	1.05

When Table 12 was analysed, it was seen that "learning objectives" [Item 1] were clearly indicated by the instructors/teachers with a mean score of 3.5/5.0 together with 50% indication of the participants. Furthermore, the SD (standard deviation) 1.05 clearly highlighted that the population/participants reflected "unity" or "homogeneity" in their answers.

Table 13: Crosscheck Item of Anchor Item 1 Related to RQ1

Crosscheck Item	Strongly Disagree Or Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree or Agree	M	SD
2-Learning activities were designed to meet different students' learning styles.	40%	34%	25%	2.82	1.12

When "learning activities" [Item 2] were analysed in Table 13, according to the findings, only 25% of the participants were happy/satisfied with a lower mean score of 2.82 and 1.12 SD. Therefore, when Table 13 was evaluated within the numerical findings (descriptive), it can be appropriate to state that the design and implementation of the "learning activities" should be reconsidered.

4.2.2.1.2 Interaction and Communication

Table 14: Anchor Item 3 of RQ1/The Second Subsection "Interaction and Communication"

Anchor Item	Strongly Disagree Or Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree or Agree	M	SD
3-Teachers encouraged online discussions.	28%	23%	49%	3.23	1.25

When Table 14 was analysed, it was indicated that "online discussions" [Item 3] were encouraged by the teachers with the mean score of 3.23/5.0 with 49 percent indication of the participants. Moreover, the SD 1.25 expressed unity among the participants.

Table 15: Crosscheck Items of Anchor Item 3 Related to RQ1

Crosscheck Items	Strongly Disagree Or Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree or Agree	M	SD
4-Teachers made sure that students are active in class during online sessions.	27%	23%	50%	3.29	1.27
5-Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates.	33%	27%	39%	3.07	1.31
6- Teachers provided immediate feedback.	20%	27%	53%	3.44	1.10

When "participation in class" [Item 4] was analysed in Table 15, according to the results, 50% of the population/participants were active during the online sessions with the mean score of 3.29 and 1.27 SD. When "online options for communication" [Item 5] were analysed in Table 15, only 39 % of the participants were satisfied with a lower mean score of 3.07 and 1.31 SD. Furthermore, coming to [Item 6] regarding "Teachers provided immediate feedback", 53% of the participants agreed that they received quick responses from their instructors with a higher mean score of 3.44 and 1.10 SD.

4.2.2.1.3 The Learning Resources

Table 16: Anchor Item 7 of RQ1/The Third Subsection "The Learning Resources"

Anchor Item	Strongly Disagree Or Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree or Agree	M	SD
7-Online resources were useful.	21%	25%	54%	3.48	1.07

When Table 16 was analysed, it can be understood that “online resources” [Item 7] were useful for 54% of the participants with the mean score of 3.48. Furthermore, the SD 1.07 indicated unity in the participants’ answers.

Table 17: Crosscheck Items of Anchor Item 7 Related to RQ1

Crosscheck Items	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
8-Interactive video feature allowed me to review all my classroom activities and lessons.	17%	33%	50%	3.48	1.06
9- It provided easy access to massive amount of knowledge related to my topic.	23%	34%	43%	3.29	1.17

Moreover, when “interactive videos” [Item 8] were analysed in Table 17, according to the findings, 50% of the participants benefited from these videos to review their lessons with the mean score of 3.48 and 1.06 SD. Nevertheless, the numerical findings in Table 17 regarding “E-learning provided accessibility to massive amount of knowledge” [Item 9], indicated that only 43% of the participants were able to access much knowledge with a lower mean score of 3.29 and 1.17 SD.

4.2.2.1.4 The Learning Environment

Table 18: Anchor Item 10 of RQ1 /The Fourth Subsection “The Learning Environment”

Anchor Item	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
10-The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me.	25%	32%	42%	3.31	1.30

Based on Table 18 above, it was seen that the “learning environment” [Item 10] was an enjoyable experience for only 42% of the participants with the mean score of 3.31/5.0 and 1.30 SD.

Table 19: Crosscheck Item of Anchor Item 10 Related to RQ1

Crosscheck Item	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
11-I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic.	29%	21%	50%	3.27	1.35

According to Table 19, when Item 11 which stated that [“I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic”] was analyzed, 50% of the participants agreed that they felt comfortable asking questions with a lower mean score of 3.27 and 1.35 SD.

To summarize, among the eleven attitude statements [Items 1-11], which aimed to investigate learners’ perceptions about (i) the role of their instructors, (ii) interaction and communication during the online sessions, (iii) the online learning resources, and (iv) the online environment, there was a moderate tendency towards agreement with mixed results of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

4.2.2.2 Strengths of E-learning from the Student's Point of View

Table 20: Anchor Item of the Second Research Question (ii) "What Were the Strengths of the Online Classes from the Student's Point of View?"

Anchor Item of the Second Research Question	Strongly Disagree Or Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree or Agree	M	SD
12- Online education was more flexible than face to face learning.	24%	25%	52%	3.47	1.41

When Table 20 was analysed, it was seen that the anchor item [Item 12] regarding the benefits of the online learning during COVID-19 about "online education was more flexible than face to face learning.", according to the findings, 52% or slightly over a half of the participants agreed that it was more flexible than the conventional classes with a mean score of 3.47. Furthermore, the SD 1.41 indicated that the participants showed unity in their responses.

Table 21: Crosscheck Items of Anchor Item 12 Related to RQ2

Crosscheck Items	Strongly Disagree Or Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree or Agree	M	SD
13- Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily.	14%	35%	51%	3.66	1.12
14- I could study on my own speed; therefore, I was stress-free.	21%	21%	59%	3.65	1.26

When Table 21 was analysed, it was seen that, 51% of the participants agreed with the statement "Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses

from anywhere easily." [Item 13] with a higher mean score of 3.66 and 1.12 SD. Moreover, in Item 14, "I could study on my own speed; therefore, I was stress-free", a significant proportion of the participants stated that they studied at their own speed with a stress-free environment. The percentage was 59% with a lower mean score of 3.65 and 1.26 SD.

To conclude, according to the attitude statements [Items 12-14], which aimed to explore the strengths of the online classes from the learners' perspectives, participants conveyed high agreement to its benefits. To make it clear, it seemed that online learning was a flexible choice for more than half of the participants weather they were working full or part time jobs and they managed to study at their own speed.

4.2.2.3 Weaknesses and Challenges of E-learning from the Student's Perspective

The last research question focused on the drawbacks and difficulties associated with studying online. The cluster's components were [Items 15-28]. Table 22 below presents the results of the anchor items of the third research question.

Table 22: Anchor Items of the Third Research Question (iii) "What Were the Weaknesses and Challenges of Online Learning from the Student's Perspective?"

Subsections	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
Anchor 6 Q15: Technology has always been important (in education).	7%	15%	78%	4.22	0.97
Anchor 7 Q20: EMU had limited amount of online resources	31%	30%	38%	3.11	1.21
Anchor 8 Q22: Online learning was boring	24%	25%	52%	3.48	1.33

Anchor 9 Q25: Online learning made me feel more distracted	16%	32%	52%	3.65	1.17

Based on Table 22, Anchor 6 [Item 15 "Technology has always been important (in education)"] was perceived the highest obstacle among the online challenges with 78 percent indication of the participants with the highest mean score of 4.22 and 0.97 SD. On the other hand, Anchor 7 [Item 20 "EMU had limited amount of online resources"] was rated the least obstacle among the challenges with only 38 percent indication of the participants and a lower mean score of 3.11 and 1.21 SD.

Table 23: Anchor Item 15 of RQ3/The First Subsection "Technical Issues"

Anchor Item	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
15- Technology has always been important (in education).	7%	15%	78%	4.22	0.97

When Table 23 was analysed, it was seen that "Technology in Education" Anchor [Item 15] has been always crucial with the mean score of 4.22 with 78% indication of the participants. Furthermore, the SD 0.97 strongly highlighted that the population expressed homogeneity in their answers.

Table 24: Crosscheck Items of Anchor Item 15 Related to RQ3

Crosscheck Items	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
16- There was insufficient engagement.	21%	43%	36%	3.23	1.10
17-There was a lack of contact with teachers.	35%	39%	25%	2.93	1.08
18- There was a lack of contact with peers.	25%	32%	42%	3.30	1.24
19-Poor technological skills were problem in online education.	25%	26%	48%	3.32	1.21

When Table 24 was analysed, it was seen that "insufficient engagement" [Item 16] was agreed by 36% of the participants with the mean score of 3.23 and 1.10 SD. Furthermore, when "lack of contact with teachers" was analysed [Item 17], according to the findings, only 25% of the participants approved it with a lower mean score of 2.93 and 1.08 SD, while 42% of the participants lacked contact with their peers [Item 18] with a higher mean score of 3.30 and a 1.24 SD. Moreover, "Poor technological skills" [Item 19] was perceived as the top obstacle with 48% indication of the participants and the highest average mean score of 3.32 and 1.21 SD.

Table 25: Anchor Item 20 of RQ3/ The Second Subsection "Financial Infrastructure"

Anchor Item	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
20- EMU had limited amount of online resources.	31%	30%	38%	3.11	1.21

When Table 25 was analysed, it was seen that “EMU online resources” [Item 20] were limited for 38% of the participants with the mean score of 3.11. Furthermore, the SD 1.21 highlighted unity among the participants’ answers.

Table 26: Crosscheck Item of Anchor Item 20 Related to RQ3

Crosscheck Item	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
21-Students didn’t have enough gadgets.	28%	30%	41%	3.25	1.22

Based on Table 26, it was indicated that “personal gadgets” [Item 21] were not enough for 41% of the participants with the mean score of 3.25 and 1.22 SD.

Table 27: Anchor Item 22 of RQ3/The Third Subsection “Learning Environment Issues”

Anchor Item	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
22-Online learning was boring.	24%	25%	52%	3.48	1.33

According to Table 27, the numerical findings revealed that “online learning” [Item 22] was boring for 52% of the participants with the mean score of 3.48 and 1.33 SD.

Table 28: Crosscheck Items of Anchor Item 22 Related to RQ3

Crosscheck Items	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
23-It gave a sense of loneliness to me.	28%	25%	46%	3.25	1.45
24-There was a lack of active participation in academic activities.	22%	28%	50%	3.49	1.21

When Table 28 was analysed, it was indicated that “a sense of loneliness” [Item 23] was felt by 46% of the participants with the mean score of 3.25 and 1.45 SD. However, when “active participation” [Item 24] was analysed, according to the results, 50% of the participants lacked active participation in academic activities with a higher mean score of 3.49 and 1.21 SD.

Table 29: Anchor Item 25 of RQ3/ The Fourth Subsection “**Health Issues**”

Anchor Item	**Strongly Disagree Or Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Strongly Agree or Agree**	**M**	**SD**
25-Online learning made me feel more distracted.	16%	32%	52%	3.65	1.17

When Table 29 was analysed, it was seen that “distraction” [Item 25] was felt by the participants during their online classes with the mean of 3.65 /5.0 with 52% indication of the participants and1.17 SD.

Table 30: Crosscheck Items of Anchor Item 25 Related to RQ3

Crosscheck Items	Strongly Disagree Or Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree or Agree	M	SD
26-Online learning environment was so tiring for me.	31%	27%	41%	3.15	1.41
27-I had backache sitting for long time in front of my screen.	16%	22%	63%	3.80	1.30
28- I had eye issues when I focused more.	25%	23%	52%	3.51	1.32

When Table 30 was analysed, “online learning environment was so tiring for me” [Item 26], it was understood that 41% of the participants agreed with a lower mean score of 3.15. Moreover, when “having backache” [Item 27] was analysed, according to the findings, 63% of the participants suffered from backache due to prolonged sitting in front of the screen with a higher mean score of 3.80 and 1.30 SD. Furthermore, results showed that “eye issues” [Item 28] were highly indicated by 52% of the participants who focused more during the online sessions with the mean score of 3.51 and 1.32 SD.

To sum up, according to the attitude statements [Items 15-28], aimed to investigate the negative impact of the online classes including the technical, financial, learning environment and the health issues. Participants perceived the technical issues, especially the poor technical skills as the top challenge, whereas financial issues were perceived the least obstacle. In addition, there was a high tendency towards agreement regarding the health issues accompanying the prolonged online sessions.

4.3 Findings of the Qualitative Data

From the 102 participants, only 5 responses were received regarding the open-ended question: “If you would like to express anything related to your online experience, please use the space provided.”

R1: “Online education was not for me, while most people could pass the classes easily, I had a hard time because I needed a classroom environment for me to learn. In online education, the smallest thing could distract me. And since online education was not efficient for me, it caused my school to get longer because I did not understand the lessons at all because a real learning could not be provided.”

Another participant said, R2: “I remember about 15% of the content of most of the courses I took during the online education period. No matter how efficient the online education process was, a sudden system change, even if it could be productive, the conditions of the pandemic period adversely affected the efficiency I got from the learning and education process.”

R3: “both good and bad.”

R4: “It was very beneficial for me that our teachers constantly encouraged us to try something. Previously, I was afraid of making mistakes, but now I feel more confident and I learn faster. Our teachers’ words [don’t be afraid to make mistakes] became more meaningful to me when I came to the end of the preparation.”

R5: “An experience that varies according to the teacher.”

Although almost 5 percent responded to the online open-ended sector, still some key themes arose from their data. The answers varied and contradicting: (i) some had good experience (was encouraged, more confident, learned faster); (ii) bad experiences (I needed a classroom environment, distracted, not efficient, no real learning, I did not understand remembered 15% of the content, online education was not for me, the conditions of the pandemic adversely affected the efficiency.); and (iii) two of them had conflicting results and were undecided/ neutral “this experience depends on the instructors.”; “ both bad and good.”, as neutrality was common in all statements.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

5.1 Discussion of the Findings

In light of the findings, the interesting results regarding sections A (background Information) and B (the three research questions with the open-ended question) were discussed and evaluated within the framework of the relevant literature.

5.1.1 Discussion of the Findings of the Demographic Information

Within the findings of the questionnaire delivered to the 102 participants, the first notable finding is that online education may suit males more than females due to interaction, motivation, boring environment, and health issues. This finding may be regarded as a support to the masculinity of technology, as was claimed by Bulter (2000, as cited in Upton & Adams, 2005).

On the other hand, results call for more engaging activities when designing the online materials for females. The initial finding is in accordance with (Nistor, 2013; Cinkara & Bağçeci, 2013; Gürler et al., 2020) in which males conveyed positivity, while contradicts (Keller & Cernerud, 2002; Richardson & Woodley, 2003; Dabaj, 2009) in which females showed more positivity than males. Consequently, because of the mixed findings in the literature, Yu (2021) claimed that studies about gender's impact on E-learning needed to be more consistent.

When we look at the results of age-related analysis, it can be said that participants aged between 18-20 found the experience tedious and interacted less, whereas participants aged between 21-30, the older ones, expressed more pleasure, found it more relaxing and were more satisfied with the tasks.

In light of the findings of technology literacy, it can be stated that participants' poor literacy skills may impact their learning outcomes. To make it clear, they communicated less with teachers and classmates and were isolated from the online community. Literacy in technology will lead to better interaction, motivation, and more satisfaction with E-learning. That is consistent with (Huang, 2002; Kobayashi, 2002; Cinkara & Bağçeci, 2013; Mbiydzenyuy, 2020).

Finally, learners' low English proficiency level (A1/ complete beginners) may hinder their ability to have quality communication, both written and verbal. Furthermore, they may need to be more knowledgeable to ask for clarifications about their topics or might not have even comprehended the English instructions, which might have led to poor communication, less motivation, joy, and output.

5.1.2 Discussion of the Findings of the Three Research Questions with the Open-Ended Question

The first research question, "***what were the students' perceptions and attitudes towards learning English or content in English online***?" has revealed conflicting results of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Half of the participants (50%) found the learning objectives clear. Almost half of the participants were encouraged by their teachers to discuss topics, were active during their classes and received instant feedback from their teachers. The online materials were useful for 54% or more than

half of the participants while only 42% or over two-fifths of the participants enjoyed their online lessons with almost a third remaining undecided.

Moreover, the online learning environment (enjoyable) was perceived the less satisfactory item among the participants. In addition to, the instructors' roles, especially the design of the online activities (which did not match the participants' learning style) was perceived negatively.

Moving to the second research question, "***what were the strengths of online classes from the student's point of view***?" more than half of the participants agreed that the online courses were more flexible and could study at their speed. The findings are supported by previous research (Arkorful & Abaidoo, 2015; Mbiydzenyuy, 2020; Almahasees et al., 2021; Shahzad et al., 2021). Moreover, according to the qualitative findings, one participant praised his/her teachers' encouragement to participate and stated that "It was very beneficial for me that our teachers constantly encouraged us to try something. Previously, I was afraid of making mistakes, but now I feel more confident, and I learn faster. Our teachers' words [do not be afraid to make mistakes] became more meaningful to me when I came to the end of the preparation."

Therefore, one more advantage might be added to E-learning which is motivating and encouraging learners to speak, participate and be more confident, especially shy learners.

Concerning the last research question, "***what were the weaknesses and challenges of online learning from the student's perspective***?", learners faced many challenges due to ERT resulted from the sudden swift. In other words, to start with, (i) the anchor Item

15 [“Technology has always been important in education.”] was perceived by a large majority of the population as the top challenge “Technical Challenges” with poor skills were rated the highest among the technical challenges with 48% indication of the participants. Moreover, learner-learner communication was rated the second highest challenge with 42% indication of the participants; (ii) regarding the financial infrastructure, 41 % of the participants did not have enough gadgets; (iii) in terms of the online environment, more than half perceived it boring and they felt lonely, isolated and did not participate; and (v) in respect of the health issues, they have perceived them negatively including fatigue, vision and back problems, and being distracted.

Moreover, qualitative findings revealed that ERT has led to lower achievement and inability to comprehend the sessions because of the virtual environment and absence of teachers and classmates, which caused more distraction: “online education was not for me, while most people could pass the classes easily, I had a hard time because I needed a classroom environment for me to learn. In online education, the smallest thing could distract me. Furthermore, since online education was not efficient for me, it caused my school to get longer because I did not understand the lessons at all because a real learning could not be provided.” Another participant reported, “I remember about 15% of the content of most courses.”

Despite the perceived advantages of the online classes (flexibility and motivation) for most of the participants, mixed findings in this study have been revealed, which are in line with (Erarslan, 2021; Saputra et al., 2021). It might be inferred that there is still a percentage who perceived E-learning negatively and did not suit them because of many factors, such as (i) personality characteristics (willingness to communicate), acceptance of technology and familiarity with the online education (first semester or

second)/ attendance; (ii) teachers, curriculum, methods' applied or departments; (iii) contextual factors (EMU, North Cyprus, distraction/location, number of learners in the class); and (iv) economic factors (gadgets and financial infrastructure of the institution).

Different factors that affected learners' perceptions of ERT were mentioned by (Baber, 2020; Moorhouse, 2020; Aguilera-Hermida et al., 2021; Saputra et al., 2021; Bast, 2021), and it is confirmed by the qualitative findings of this study from a participant's response, R5 "an experience that varies according to the teacher."

Furthermore, as mentioned previously in this study in the literature review, ERT has led to more obstacles for learners due to the sudden transition to online mode without any previous preparedness, which consequently has affected the learning-teaching quality as well (Erarslan, 2021; Zboun & Farrah, 2021; Al-Mawee et al., 2021). The participants recognized the negative effect of the sudden change to ERT on the quality of teaching and its psychological effect on their readiness to learn, as it was reported by one of the participants in the qualitative findings "no matter how efficient the online education was, a sudden system change, even if it could be productive, the conditions of the pandemic period adversely affected the efficiency I got from the learning and education process."

These obstacles were highlighted in the current study's findings in the quantitative and qualitative results. As was pointed out/highlighted in chapter 2 (See Table 2), the challenges of the ERT from the participant's point of view can be summarized as follows. After the summary, the recent findings of this study may be

crosschecked/compared with previous studies carried out (2019-2021) during the pandemic period.

When the statistical findings found in this study were contrasted with the findings of the previous research in the field (ERT [2019-2021]), common themes of challenges were highlighted since the beginning of the pandemic.

Table 31: Crosschecked Findings of Previous Studies with the Current Study: Challenges of ERT from the Perceptions of the Participants

Challenges of ERT from previous Studies (2019-2021)	Current Study's Findings
Social Challenges Lack of social presence: • Less instructor-learner interaction. • Less learner-learner interaction/ peer support/ less team work. • Absence of physical space (learners were studying while parents working remotely). • Insufficient parents' support.	**Social Challenges** Lack of social presence: • Less instructor-learner interaction. • Less learner-learner interaction.
Economic Issues	**Economic Issues/ Financial Infrastructure** • Lack of gadgets. • Limited resources.
Lower Achievement • Academic achievement might be affected by racial, economic and various resources. • Less academic achievement among disadvantaged learners.	**Lower Achievement** • is supported by the qualitative findings.

Skills • Negativity because it focused on receptive skills while learners did not get the chance to produce the language. • Problems with attitudes including, self-discipline and lack of motivation.	**Health Issues** • Backache. • Vision issues. • Fatigue. • Distraction.
Learning Resources' Issues • Unsuitable learning resources. • Inability to understand the resources. • Overloaded with online assignment rather than online activities. • Insufficient explanation. **Lack of cognitive presence** • Absence of well-designed/ structured materials. • Inability to teach practical courses like medicine. • Inability to provide instant feedback. • Assessment integrity. • Low quality teaching. • Learning environment. • Boring activities.	**Learning Resources' Issues** • Not enough and not useful. • Inability to understand the resources as was reported in the qualitative findings. **Lack of cognitive presence** • Lack of well-designed/ structured materials (learning activities did not match learner's learning style; not clear learning objectives). • Inability to provide instant feedback for some learners. • Learning environment issue with boring activities. • Low quality teaching.
Technological Constraints • Insufficient internet/ internet connectivity/ accessibility issues. • Lack or insufficiency in digital literacy. **Devices' Issues**	**Technical Constraints** • Lack of digital literacy. • Insufficient devices.

• Types of devices: Mobile phones do not have access to audio visual lessons. • Lack or insufficient devices.	
Psychological Issues • Anxiety and stress and isolation. • Stress and anxiety to use platforms to learn and in examination. • Distraction.	**Psychological Issues** • Learners felt lonely and isolated. • Not engaged. • Distraction.
Ethical Issues • Copying and privacy issues.	
Pedagogical Issues • Using platforms without paying attention to online pedagogy.	**Pedagogical Issues** • Lack of well-designed/ structured materials.

Some challenges have resulted from the ERT in this study is incongruent with some studies in the literature:

(A) Learning Environment Issues:

(i) ***lack of social presence/interaction and communication*** (Nartiningrum & Nugroho, 2020; Evişen et al., 2020; Zboun & Farrah, 2021; Vivoni-Suarez, 2021; Hazaymeh, 2021; Almahasees et al., 2021; Ferri et al., 2020; Saputra, et al., 2021); **(ii)** ***boring activities*** (Evişen et al., 2020; Saputra et al., 2021; Almahasees et al., 2021); **(iii)** ***insufficient resources*** (Ayu, 2020; Karadağ & Yücel, 2020; Mailizar et al., 2020; Aguilera-Hermida et al., 2021; Aboagye et al., 2021; Maatuk, 2022); **(iv)** ***lack of cognitive presence/pedagogical issues/ absence of well-designed materials*** (Crawford, 2020, as cited in Mbiydzenyuy, 2020; Dhawan, 2020; Adedoyin & Soykan,

2020; Kürtüncü & Kurt, 2020; Ferri et al., 2020; Erarslan, 2021; Aboagye et al., 2021); and **(v)** ***lack of motivation/ less activ***e (Ferri et al., 2020; Almahasees et al., 2021; Zboun & Farrah, 2021).

(B) Psychological Issues/Distraction and Lack of Concentration

(Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Evişen et al., 2020; Barzani & Jamil, 2021; Vivoni-Suarez, 2021).

(C) Technological Constraints/ Economic:

(i) ***lack or insufficiency in digital literacy*** (Ferri et al., 2020; Dhawan, 2020; Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Akbana et al., 2021; Erarslan, 2021; Maatuk, 2022); ***(ii) lack or insufficient devices*** (Altunay, 2019; Reboyras & Torres, 2020; Ferri et al., 2020; Mbiydzenyuy, 2020; Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Vivoni-Suarez, 2021); and **(iii)** ***infrastructure issues*** (Kürtüncü & Kurt, 2020).

(D) Lower Achievement

(Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Erarslan, 2021).

Table 31 is one of the important reflections of the study. It summarizes the findings of the present research and refers to the previous studies' findings which are parallel. This meant even though some time has passed over COVID 19, the impact on the participants (students) has been significant. Therefore, a retrospective study, did not reflect any changes in the thought of the participants.

5.2 Conclusion and Implications

In this present research, based on the findings, it can be concluded that mixed results of satisfaction and dissatisfaction have been revealed. Although almost half of the participants positively perceived the online tasks 'clear objectives', timely feedback, interaction, and the online resources. Most of the learners were not satisfied with designing of the tasks 'did not match their learning style' and the activities were not

enjoyable for them. In addition, more than a half of the participants found E-learning more flexible compared to conventional learning and showed a high tendency towards agreement as it offered them a less stressful environment and they could study at their own pace without commuting to university regularly.

On the other hand, as ERT has resulted from the sudden swift from the conventional methods without any preparedness or modifying the resources, it has accompanied with various struggles and obstacles. To make it clear, technical issues were rated the highest among the challenges, especially the poor literacy skills; followed by lack of interaction with peers. Moreover, the online environment was perceived dull, boring and accompanied with isolation and loneliness that resulted in less participation and engagement. Furthermore, the majority complained about health issues, especially fatigue, eye strain, backache and distraction.

The previous mentioned challenges have resulted in a lower achievement as was confirmed in the qualitative findings. This study is somehow incongruent with studies in the Turkish context that faced the same challenges during the pandemic (Kürtüncü & Kurt, 2020; Gürler et al., 2020). Furthermore, as it was mentioned by Gürler et al. (2020) the teaching quality could be improved by improving the infrastructure and online resources. Also, it is consensus with Almahasees et al. (2021).

As our primary concern in this study is the quality of education, in light of the previous results, some implications might be useful for university instructors.

These findings, on the one hand, shed light on the role of the teachers “the teaching presence mentioned in the COI”: (i) as the structure/design of the online activities were

rated the least satisfactory among the participants, university instructors should prepare activities and tasks that match the learning styles of the participants and explicitly clarify the objectives.

Alsadhan, Alhomod, & Shafi (2014) stressed the paramount designing and implementing of multimedia resources that should address a wide range of learning styles to get an interactive online experience which will guarantee learners' involvement in E-activities as it was considered a barrier in some studies like Cinkara and Bağceci (2013) and somehow this study as well; (ii) teachers should encourage discussion and create more centred classes and give instant feedback; (iii) online teachers should explain the online options or affordances for communication like chats, emails, video chats, and (iv) teachers should upload the online resources and be sure they are enough and helpful, and learners know how to access them as it was suggested by the participants of Ayu's (2020) study.

In addition, as communication and interaction were perceived negatively "the social presence mentioned in the COI", teachers are recommended to look for more engaging methods to ensure peer communication during the classes, more learner-centred classes and negotiation of meaning to achieve profound learning/ multimedia activities. According to Ramsey (2003), learners should be encouraged to reflect and comment on their classmates' work. Learning a language needs communication and association for its internalization. Krashen claimed meaningful interaction is required for acquiring a foreign/second language when learners deliver a message clearly rather than focusing on forms. Moreover, Haynes (2005, as cited in Vivoni-Suarez, 2021) suggested that peer communication is a good strategy for using the language in a cooperative community with peers to produce an output as they will attempt many

expressions until their output is comprehensible. To sum up, competency in a language result from social communication through collaboration (Vygotsky, 1986, as cited in Vivoni-Suarez, 2021). Findings coincide with Vivoni-Suarez's (2021) study, which claimed that content interaction is the highest online while peer and teacher interaction is lower. Contrary to conventional classes in which peers' and instructors' interaction is the top (Altunay, 2019). Moreover, his study indicated that learners improved their listening the most during the pandemic as learners were listeners to their teachers, which resulted in fewer learners' output and interaction instead of more guiding and monitoring, which is also in line with this study; less learner-learner contact while more teacher-learner contact.

As a consequence, we should shed some light on the importance of creating opportunities for learners to interact and communicate during the virtual classes as this is the main aim of the COI that calls for collaboration, primarily due to the lack of face-to-face and boy language, this will be more challenging and requires more attention and planning from the instructors.

Therefore, the instructor's significance is increasing in E-learning, and they should devote more time to adjusting to new learning contexts as teachers' availability, interaction, and feedback impacted E-learning (Yengin, Karahoca, Karahoca, & Yücel, 2010; Al-Mawee et al., 2021).

Moreover, as poor skills were rated the highest among the technical challenges, learners should be equipped with the necessary literacy digital skills to perceive the E-learning positively and be ready for the upcoming crisis. Moreover, poor literacy skills in this study might be the reason for less communication with peers and teachers.

Additionally, ICT in service training programs for teachers of diverse fields including language teachers as well should be provided by specialists in technology. A kind of center should be in service for those who need any sort of guidance.

Furthermore, this study added more challenges to be considered in times of crisis, mainly the health issues accompanying the prolonged online classes, including distraction, fatigue, vision, and back problems. Hence, university instructors should consider the duration of conducting the online sessions and break their objectives into comprehensible chunks to ensure the safety of learners.

More importantly, university instructors should treat learners as human beings with emotions and feelings and are suggested to constantly investigate their attitudes to explore the negative points that might affect the learning quality from the learners' views; consequently, teachers and stakeholders will be able to modify the curriculum and the teaching methods accordingly.

5.3 Future Research

Based on the findings from this study, some modifications are suggested when the study is replicated in the future. Firstly, because of the scarcity of studies investigating learners' perceptions and attitudes towards online learning in EMU in North Cyprus in the literature, further research is recommended to be carried out in the same context. In addition, data is recommended to be collected from a larger sample and/or from international EMI learners. Moreover, data can be gathered from different universities to compare/ evaluate EMU EMI learners' attitudes. Furthermore, more variables are suggested to be taken into account such as learners' attendance/punctuality to classes, familiarity with online learning, motivation, attendance location, working and studying at the same time, perception of international teachers, and qualification of

teachers (years of experience). Furthermore, observations are recommended to evaluate the quality of teaching and the types of activities conducted online.

REFERENCES

Aboagye, E., Yawson, J. A., & Appiah, K. N. (2021). Covid-19 and e-learning: the challenges of students in tertiary institutions. *Social Education Research, 2*(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.37256/ser.212021422

Abudaqa, A., Hilmi, M. F., AlMujaini, H., Alzahmi, R. A., & Ahmed, G. (2021). Students' perception of e-learning during the covid pandemic: a fresh evidence from United Arab Emirates (UAE). *Journal of E-Learning and Knowledge Society, 17*(3), 110-118. https://doi.org/10.20368/1971-8829/1135556

Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments,* 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180

Aguilera-Hermida, A. P., Quiroga-Garza, A., Gómez-Mendoza, S., Del Río Villanueva, C. A., Avolio Alecchi, B., & Avci, D. (2021). Comparison of students' use and acceptance of emergency online learning due to covid-19 in the USA, Mexico, Peru, and Turkey. *Education and Information Technologies, 26*(6), 6823-6845. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10473-8

Ahmed, S. (2015). Attitudes towards English language learning among EFL learners at UMSKAL. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(18), 6-16. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079681.pdf

Akbana, Y. E., Rathert, S., & Ağçam, R. (2021). Emergency remote education in foreign and second language teaching. *Turkish Journal of Education, 10*(2), 97-124. https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.865344

Alahmadi, N., & Muslim Alraddadi, B. (2020). The impact of virtual classes on second language interaction in the Saudi EFL context: a case study of Saudi undergraduate students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 11*(3), 56-72. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no3.4

Alberth, A. (2011). Critical success factors in online language learning. *TEFLIN Journal, 22*(1), 16-33. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v22i1/16-33

Alghamdi, S., & Ali, M. (2021). Pharmacy students' perceptions and attitudes towards online education during covid-19 lockdown in Saudi Arabia. *Pharmacy, 9*(4), 169. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy9040169

Al-Emran, M., & Teo, T. (2020). Do knowledge acquisition and knowledge sharing really affect e-learning adoption? an empirical study. *Education and Information Technologies, 25*(3), 1983-1998. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-10062-w

Alexander, S. (2001). E-learning developments and experiences. *Education+ Training, 43*(4-5), 240-248.

Almahasees, Z., Mohsen, K., & Amin, M. O. (2021). Faculty's and students' perceptions of online learning during covid-19. *In Frontiers in Education, 6,* 1-10. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.638470

Al-Mawee, W., Kwayu, K. M., & Gharaibeh, T. (2021). Student's perspective on distance learning during covid-19 pandemic: a case study of Western Michigan University, United States. *International Journal of Educational Research Open, 2*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100080

Alsadhan, A. O., Alhomod, S., & Shafi, M. M. (2014). Multimedia based e-learning: design and integration of multimedia content in e-learning. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 9*(3), 26-30. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v9i3.3308

Al-Tamimi, A., & Shuib, M. (2009). Motivation and attitudes towards learning English: a study of petroleum engineering undergraduates at Hadhramout University of Sciences and Technology. *GEMA: Online Journal of Language Studies, 9*(2), 29-55. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/11491379.pdf

Altunay, D. (2019). EFL students' views on distance English language learning in a public university in Turkey. *Studies in English Language Teaching, 7*(1), 121-134. https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v7n1p121

Altunel, İ. (2021). Insights into EFL learners' willingness to communicate in online English classes during the covid-19 pandemic: a case study from Turkey. *Language and Technology, 3*(1), 13-20.

Anderson, T., Liam, R., Garrison, D. R., & Archer, W. (2001). Assessing teaching presence in a computer conferencing context. *JALN, 5*(2),1-17.

Aparicio, M., Bacao, F., & Oliveira, T. (2016). An e-learning theoretical framework. *Educational Technology & Society, 19*(1), 292-307. Retrieved from http://www.ifets.info/journals/19_1/24.pdf

Arbaugh, J. B., Bangert, A., & Cleveland-Innes, M. (2010). Subject matter effects and the community of inquiry (COI) framework: an exploratory study. *The Internet and Higher Education, 13*(1-2), 37-44.

Arkorful, V., & Abaidoo, N. (2015). The role of e-learning, advantages and disadvantages of its adoption in higher education. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, *12*(1), 29-42.

Armstrong-Mensah, E., Ramsey-White, K., Yankey, B., & Self-Brown, S. (2020). Covid-19 and distance learning: effects on Georgia state university school of public health students. *Frontiers in Public Health, 8*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.576227

Ayu, M. (2020). Online learning: leading e-learning at higher education. *The Journal of English Literacy Education: The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language, 7*(1), 47-54. https://doi.org/10.36706/jele.v7i1.11515

Baber, H. (2020). Determinants of students' perceived learning outcome and satisfaction in online learning during the pandemic of covid-19. *Social Science ResearchNetwork. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID3679489_code4342299.pdf?abstractid=3679489&mirid=1*

Bamanger, E. M., & Alhassan, R. A. (2015). Exploring podcasting in English as a foreign language learners' writing performance. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(11), 63-74. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1081725.pdf

Bao, W. (2020). Covid -19 and online teaching in higher education: a case study of Peking university. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2*(2), 113–115. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.191

Barzani, S. H. H. & Jamil, R. J. (2021). Students' perceptions towards online education during covid-19 pandemic: an empirical study. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies, 8*(2), 28-38. https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v8i2p28

Basnet, K. (2021). *Perceptions and practices of ICT tools in ELT* (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of English Education).

Başoğlu, E. B., & Akdemir, O. (2010). A comparison of undergraduate students' English vocabulary learning: using mobile phones and flash cards. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, *9*(3), 1-7. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ898010.pdf

Bast, F. (2021). Perception of online learning among students from India set against the pandemic. *In Frontiers in Education, 6*, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.705013

Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to corona virus pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education, 15*(1), i-vi. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3778083

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Pearson Education ESL.

Cabi, E., & Kalelioglu, F. (2019). A fully online course experience from students' perspective: readiness, attitudes and thoughts. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 20*(3), 165-180.

Çakıcı, D. (2017). The use of ICT in teaching English as a foreign language. *Participatory Educational Research, 4*(2), 73-77. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/778411

Cercone, K. (2008). Characteristics of adult learners with implications for online learning design. *AACE Review (Formerly AACE Journal), 16*(2), 137-159. Retrieved from http://distance.uvic.ca/pdfs/instructors/Characteristics-of-Adult-Learners.pdf

Chamorro, M. L. M. (2018). *Comparing online English language learning and face-to-face English language learning at El bosque university in Colombia*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Virginia Commonwealth University. Richmond, Virginia

Chhabra, P. (2012). Use of e-learning tools in teaching English. *International Journal of Computing & Business Research, 3*, 2229-6166.

Cinkara, E., & Bağçeci, B. (2013). Learners' attitudes towards online language learning; and corresponding success rates. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 14*(2), 118-130. https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.82980

Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language learning, 44*(3), 417-448. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01113.x

Coffin, R. J., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Motivational influences on computer-related affective states. *Computers in Human Behavior, 15*(5), 549-569. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0747-5632(99)00036-9

Coryell, J. E., & Chlup, D. T. (2007). Implementing e-learning components with adult english language learners: vital factors and lessons learned. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 20*(3), 263-278. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220701489333

Crawford, J., Butler-Henderson, K., Rudolph, J., Malkawi, B., Glowatz, M., Burton, R., ... & Lam, S. (2020). Covid-19: 20 countries' higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching, 3*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2020.3.1.7

Dabaj, F. (2009). The role of gender and age on students' perceptions towards online education case study: Sakarya university, vocational high school. *Online Submission, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1074663

Dahan, N. A., Al-Razgan, M., Al-Laith, A., Alsoufi, M. A., Al-Asaly, M. S., & Alfakih, T. (2022). Metaverse framework: a case study on e-learning environment (ELEM). *Electronics, 11*(10), 1616. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11101616

Daniel, S. J. (2020). Education and the covid-19 pandemic. *Prospects, 49*(1), 91-96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09464-3

Despagne, C. (2010). The difficulties of learning English: perceptions and attitudes in Mexico. *Comparative and International Education, 39*(2), 55-74. https://doi.org/10.5206/cie-eci.v39i2.9154

Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: a panacea in the time of covid-19 crisis. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 49*(1), 5-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520934018

Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *Tesol Quarterly, 3*, 451-486.

Edwin, v. T., & Hundley, V. (2002). The importance of pilot studies. *Nursing Standard (through 2013), 16*(40), 33–36.

Eldeeb, R. A. (2014). Students' perceptions to e-learning. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME), 4*(3), 33-36.

EMU is among the world's top 600 universities. (2021, September 2). Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), Cyprus.

https://www.emu.edu.tr/en/news/news/emu-is-among-the-worlds-top-600-universities/1206/pid/3782

Evişen, N., Akyilmaz, Ö., & Torun, Y. (2020). A case study of university EFL preparatory class students' attitudes towards online learning during covid-19 in Turkey. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 4*(2), 73-93.

Erarslan, A. (2021). English language teaching and learning during covid-19: a global perspective on the first year. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning, 4*(2), 349-367. https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.907757

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

Fu, J. (2013). Complexity of ICT in education: a critical literature review and its implications. *International Journal of Education and Development Using ICT, 9*(1), 112–125. http://ijedict.dec.uwi.edu/viewarticle.php?id=1541

Garrison, D. R. (2016). *E-learning in the 21st century: a community of inquiry framework for research and practice*. New York: Routledge.

Garrison, D. R., & Akyol, Z. (2013). *The community of inquiry theoretical framework. in handbook of distance education*. Routledge.

Garrison, D. R., & Anderson, T. (2003). *E-learning in the 21st century: a framework for research and practice*. London and New York: Routledge, https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203166093

Garrison, D. R., & Cleveland-Innes, M. (2004). Critical factors in student satisfaction and success: facilitating student role adjustment in online communities of inquiry. *Elements of Quality Online Education: Into the Mainstream, 5*, 29-38.

Garrison, D. R., & Cleveland-Innes, M. (2005). Facilitating cognitive presence in online learning: interaction is not enough. *The American journal of distance education, 19*(3), 133-148. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15389286ajde1903_2

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (1999). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2*(2-3), 87-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1096-7516(00)00016-6

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2003). A theory of critical inquiry in online distance education. *Handbook of Distance Education, 1*(4), 113-127.

Gehlbach, H., & Barge, S. (2012). Anchoring and adjusting in questionnaire responses. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 34*(5), 417-433.

Getie, A. S. (2020). Factors affecting the attitudes of students towards learning english as a foreign language. *Cogent Education, 7*(1), 1-37. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2020.1738184

Gürler, C., Tuğçe, U. S. L. U., & Daştan, I. (2020). Evaluation of distance learning from student perspective in covid-19 pandemic. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 24*(4), 1895-1904. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1291751

Hamilton, B. (2022). *Integrating technology in the classroom: tools to meet the needs of every student*. International Society for Technology in Education.

Hazaymeh, W. A. (2021). EFL students' perceptions of online distance learning for enhancing english language learning during covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(3), 501-518. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14329a

Heng, K., & Sol, K. (2021). Online learning during covid-19: key challenges and suggestions to enhance effectiveness. *Cambodian Journal of Educational Research, 1*(1), 3-16.

Herwiana, S., & Laili, E. N. (2021). Students' attitude towards English language learning. *Journal of Educational Method and Technology, 2*(3), 89-97. https://doi.org/10.36412/jemtec.v2i3.1026

Holmes, B., & Gardner, J. (2006). *E-learning: concepts and practice*. London: SAGE, https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446212585

Hodges, C. B., Moore, S., Lockee, B. B., Trust, T., & Bond, M. A. (2020). *The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning* [PDF].

Retrieved from https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning

Huang, H. M. (2002). Toward constructivism for adult learners in online learning environments. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 33*(1), 27-37. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8535.00236

Jaliyya, F., & Idrus, F. (2017). EFL students' attitudes and perception towards English language learning and their English language proficiency: a study from Assa'adah Islamic boarding school, Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Learning, 11* (3), 219-228. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v11i3.4621

Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert scale: explored and explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology, 7*(4), 396. https://doi.org/10.9734/bjast/2015/14975

Karadağ, E., & Yücel, C. (2020). Distance education at universities during the novel coronavirus pandemic: an analysis of undergraduate students' perceptions. *Yuksekogretim Dergisi, 10*(2), 163-180. https://doi.org/10.2399/yod.20.730688

Karahan, F. (2007). Language attitudes of Turkish students towards the English language and its use in Turkish context. *Çankaya University Journal of Arts and Sciences, 1*(7), 73-87. Retrieved from http://jas.cankaya.edu.tr/gecmisYayinlar/yayinlar/jas7/07-FIRDEVSKARAHAN.pdf

Keller, C., & Cernerud, L. (2002). Students' perceptions of e-learning in university education. *Journal of Educational Media, 27*(1-2), 55-67. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358165020270105

Khan, M. A., Nabi, M. K., Khojah, M., & Tahir, M. (2020). Students' perception towards e-learning during covid-19 pandemic in india: an empirical study. *Sustainability, 13*(1), 57.

Kobayashi, Y. (2002). The role of gender in foreign language learning attitudes: Japanese female students' attitudes towards English learning gender and education. *Gender and Education, 14*(2), 181-197. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250220133021

Koohang, A., Paliszkiewicz, J., Gołuchowski, J., & Nord, J. H. (2016). Active learning for knowledge construction in e-learning: a replication study. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 56*(3), 238-243. https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2016.1153914

Kufi, E. F., Negassa, T., Melaku, R., & Mergo, R. (2020). Impact of corona pandemic on educational undertakings and possible breakthrough mechanisms. *BizEcons Quarterly, 11*(1), 3-14.

Kürtüncü, M. & Kurt, A. (2020). Problems of nursing students in distance education in the covid-19 pandemic period. *Eurasian Journal of Researches in Social and Economics (EJRSE), 7*(5), 66-77.

Krosnick, J. A., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2018). *The measurement of attitudes. in the handbook of attitudes.* Routledge.

Liaw, S. S., Huang, H. M., & Chen, G. D. (2007). Surveying instructor and learner attitudes toward e-learning. *Computers & Education, 49*(4), 1066-1080. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2006.01.001

Liton, H. A. (2015). Examining students' perception & efficacy of using technology in teaching English. *International Journal of Education and Information Technology, 1*(1), 11-19.

Maatuk, A. M., Elberkawi, E. K., Aljawarneh, S., Rashaideh, H., & Alharbi, H. (2022). The covid-19 pandemic and e-learning: challenges and opportunities from the perspective of students and instructors. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 34*(1), 21-38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-021-09274-2

Mason, R., & Weller, M. (2000). Factors affecting students' satisfaction on a web course. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 16*(2), 173-200. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1830

Mailizar, A., Abdulsalam, M., & Suci, 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 & Technology Education, 16*(7), 1-9. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/8240

Mardiani, F., Anis, M. Z. A., & Hermawan, M. D. (2021). Digital literacy in the transformation of historical learning in the time of covid-19. *Socius: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial, 10*(2), 1. https://doi.org/10.20527/jurnalsocius.v10i2.11198

Mbiydzenyuy, N. E. (2020). Teaching and learning in resource-limited settings in the face of the covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning, 3*(3), 211-223. https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.732077

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Case study research in education: a qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Moorhouse, B. L. (2020). Adaptations to a face-to-face initial teacher education course 'forced' online due to the covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 46*(4), 609–611. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1755205

Nartiningrum, N., & Nugroho, A. (2020). Online learning amidst global pandemic: EFL students' challenges, suggestions, and needed materials. *English Franca: Academic Journal of English Language and Education, 4*(2), 115-140. https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v4i2.1494

Nistor, N. (2013). Stability of attitudes and participation in online university courses: gender and location effects. *Computers & Education, 68*, 284–292.

Oppenheim, A. N. (2000). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Oroujlou, N., & Vahedi, M. (2011). Motivation, attitude, and language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 994-1000. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.333

Öz, H. (2014). Teachers' and students' perceptions of interactive whiteboards in the English as a foreign language classroom. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 13*(3), 156–177. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1034243.pdf

Programs | Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), Cyprus. (n.d.). Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), Cyprus. https://www.emu.edu.tr/en/programs/695

Panda, D. S. (2021). Online teaching and learning process in covid-19 pandemic: current trends and issues. *International Journal of English, Literature and Social Science, 6*(4), 262-265. https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.64.40

Perveen, A. (2016). Synchronous and asynchronous e-language learning: a case study of virtual university of Pakistan. *Open Praxis, 8*(1), 21-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.8.1.212

Pickens, J. (2005). *Attitudes and perceptions. Organizational Behavior in Health Care, 4*(7), 43-76.

Pinto-Llorente, A. M., Sánchez-Gómez, M. C., García-Peñalvo, F. J., & Casillas-Martín, S. (2017). Students' perceptions and attitudes towards asynchronous technological tools in blended-learning training to improve grammatical

competence in English as a second language. *Computers in Human Behavior, 72*, 632-643. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.071

Queiros, D., & de Villiers, M. (2016). Online learning in a south African higher education institution: determining the right connections for the student. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*: *IRRODL, 17*(5), 165-185. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i5.2552

Rachamalla. S. A. (2021). Usage of 'ICT' in English language teaching. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Science and Engineering, 7*(11), 22-25.

Rachmadtullah, R., Marianus Subandowo, R., Humaira, M. A., Aliyyah, R. R., Samsudin, A., & Nurtanto, M. (2020). Use of blended learning with Moodle: study effectiveness in elementary school teacher education students during the covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology, 29*(7), 3272-3277

Ramsey, C. (2003), Using virtual learning environments to facilitate new learning relationships, *International Journal of Management Education, 3*(2), 31-41. https://doi.org/10.3794/ijme.32.62

Richards, J. C. (2015). The changing face of language learning: learning beyond the classroom. *Relc Journal, 46*(1), 5-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214561621

Richardson, J. T., & Woodley, A. (2003). Another look at the role of age, gender and subject as predictors of academic attainment in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 28*(4), 475–493. https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507032000122305

Robinson, R. S. (2014). Purposive sampling. In: A.C. Michalos (ED.), *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Springer, Dordrecht.

Rodinadze, S., & Zarbazoia, K. (2012). The advantages of information technology in teaching English language. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, *3*(5), 271-275.

Rojabi, A. R. (2020). Exploring EFL students' perception 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

Rourke, L., & Kanuka, H. (2009). Learning in communities of inquiry: a review of the literature. *International Journal of E-Learning & Distance Education/Revue Internationale du E-Learning et la Formation à Distance, 23*(1), 19-48.

Sangrà, A., Vlachopoulos, D., & Cabrera, N. (2012). Building an inclusive definition of e-learning: an approach to the conceptual framework. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 13*(2), *145-159. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v13i2.1161*

Saputra, W. N. E., Wahyudi, A., Supriyanto, A., Muyana, S., Rohmadheny, P. S., Ariyanto, R. D., & Kurniawan, S. J. (2021). Student perceptions of online learning during the covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia: a study of phenomenology. *European*

Journal of Educational Research, 10(3), 1515-1528. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.10.3.1515

Schwabe, G., & Göth, C. (2005). Mobile learning with a mobile game: design and motivational effects. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 21*(3), 204-216. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2005.00128.x

Seferoğlu, G., Çağiltay, K., & Saran, M. (2008). Use of mobile phones in language learning: developing effective instructional materials. *In Fifth IEEE International Conference on Wireless, Mobile, and Ubiquitous Technology in Education*, 39-43. https://doi.org/10.1109/wmute.2008.49

Sharin, A. N. (2021). E-learning during covid-19: a review of literature. *Journal Pengajian Media Malaysia, 23*(1), 15-28. 15–28. https://doi.org/10.22452/jpmm.vol23no1.2

Sharpe, R., & Benfield, G. (2005). The student experience of e-learning in higher education. *Brookes EJournal of Learning and Teaching, 1*(3), 1-9.

Şimşek, C. S. (2008). Students' attitudes towards integration of ICTs in a reading course: a case in Turkey. *Computers & Education, 51*(1), 200-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2007.05.002

Smart, K. L., & Cappel, J. J. (2006). Students' perceptions of online learning: a comparative study. *Journal of Information Technology Education, 5*(1), 201-219. https://doi.org/10.28945/243

Smith, A. N. (1971). The importance of attitude in foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 55*(2), 82–88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1971.tb00916.x

Song, L., Singleton, E. S., Hill, J. R., & Koh, M. H. (2004). Improving online learning: student perceptions of useful and challenging characteristics. *The Internet and Higher Education, 7*(1), 59-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2003.1

Stickler, U., & Hampel, R. (2015). Transforming teaching: new skills for online language learning spaces. *Developing online language teaching: Research-based pedagogies and reflective practices*, 63-77. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137412263_5

Sukamolson, S. (2007). Fundamentals of quantitative research. *Language Institute Chulalongkorn University, 1*(3), 1-20.

Sun, Y. (2019). An analysis of the factors affecting second language acquisition and its implications for teaching and learning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 10*(5), 1018-1022. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1005.14

Syahrin, S., & Abdalla Salih, A. (2020). An ESL online classroom experience in Oman during covid-19. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 11*(3), 42-55. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no3.3

Topal, A. D. (2016). Examination of university students' level of satisfaction and readiness for e-courses and the relationship between them. *European Journal of Contemporary Education, 15*(1), 7-23. https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2016.15.7

Upton, D., & Adams, S. (2005). Individual differences in online learning. *Psychology Learning & Teaching, 5*(2), 141–145. https://doi.org/10.2304/plat.2005.5.2.141

Vivoni-Suarez, J. (2021). *Students' perceptions on the effectiveness of online interaction strategies in English as a second language teaching: study on higher education Puerto Rican students during the covid-19 pandemic* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras (Puerto Rico).

Wellington, J. (2004). Multimedia in science teaching. *Teaching Secondary Science with ICT*, 87-102.

Wesely, P. M. (2012). Learner attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs in language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(s1), s98 s117. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01181.x

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: an introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Yan, Z. (2020). Unprecedented pandemic, unprecedented shift, and unprecedented opportunity. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2*(2), 110–112. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.192

Yengin, İ., Karahoca, D., Karahoca, A., & Yücel, A. (2010). Roles of teachers in e-learning: how to engage students & how to get free e-learning and the future. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 5775-5787. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.942

Zamari, Z. M., Adnan, A. H. M., Idris, S. L., & Yusof, J. (2012). Students' perception of using online language learning materials. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 67*, 611–620. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.367

Zboun, J., & Farrah, M. (2021). Students' perspectives of online language learning during corona pandemic: benefits and challenges. *Indonesian EFL Journal (IEFLJ),7*(1), 13-20. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v7i1.3986

Zhang, W. (2022). The role of technology-based education and teacher professional development in English as a foreign language classes. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.910315

APPENDICES

Appendix A: QR Code

Appendix B: Online Survey

Student Questionnaire (Oğrenci Anketi)

Dear Students,

I am a master candidate of English Language Teaching at Eastern Mediterranean University in North Cyprus. The aim of the current study is to make a retrospective investigation of students' perceptions and attitudes towards leaning English online in EMU at the pandemic period . If you take part in the study, I assure you that information will be kept anonymous for the purpose of this study only. Moreover, you have the chance of withdrawing from the research at any time during this research. It will take only 10-15 minutes to respond to this questionnaire. If you have any queries regarding this questionnaire, you can definitely contact the researcher via her phone or email, Finally, I would be so grateful for your collaboration.

Sevgili Öğrenciler,

Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi'nde İngilizce Öğretmenliği yüksek lisans adayıyım. Bu çalışmanın amacı, pandemi döneminde DAÜ'de çevrimiçi İngilizce öğrenmeye yönelik öğrencilerin algı ve tutumlarının retrospektif olarak incelenmesidir. Araştırmaya katılırsanız, bilgilerin yalnızca bu çalışmanın amaçları doğrultusunda gizli tutulacağını temin ederim. Ayrıca bu araştırma süresince istediğiniz zaman araştırmadan çekilme şansınız bulunmaktadır. Bu anketi yanıtlamak sadece 10-15 dakikanızı alacaktır. Bu anketle ilgili herhangi bir sorunuz varsa, araştırmacıyla telefon veya e-posta yoluyla kesinlikle iletişime geçebilirsiniz. Son olarak, işbirliğiniz için çok minnettar olurum

MA Researcher:
Lara Ibrahim Al-Hashash.
Lara.hashash@emu.edu.tr
05338882725
Gulseren, North Cyprus

Thesis Supervisor:
Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam
Necdet.osam@emu.edu.tr
Dept. Of Foreign Language Education
Eastern Mediterranean University

I have already read the information mentioned above and I would agree to participate in this scientific study

Yukarıda belirtilen bilgileri zaten okudum ve bu bilimsel çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum

◯ Yes (evet)

Battery A: Background Information (Arka Plan Bilgileri)

A Retrospective Look at the Perceptions and Attitudes of Turkish Students towards Learning English Online: Experiences (Findings) from the Pandemic Period.
Battery A: Background Information: Please answer the following background information:

Türk Öğrencilerin Çevrimiçi İngilizce Öğrenmeye Yönelik Algılarına ve Tutumlarına Retrospektif Bir Bakış: Pandemi Döneminden Deneyimler (Bulgular).
Pil A: Arka Plan Bilgileri: Lütfen aşağıdaki arka plan bilgilerini yanıtlayın:

1- Your gender: *
1- senin cinsiyet:

- ◯ Female (kadın)
- ◯ Male (erkek)

2- Your age: *
2- yaş:

- ◯ 18-20
- ◯ 21-30

3- Your nationality: *
3- senin uyruğun:

- ◯ Turkish (Turk)
- ◯ Other: _____

4- Your English level: *
4- İngilizce seviyeniz:

- ◯ A1
- ◯ A2
- ◯ B1
- ◯ UB1

5- Have you ever studied any course in English online during covid19 ? *
5- Covid 19 sırasında hiç çevrimiçi olarak herhangi bir İngilizce ders aldiniz mı?

- ◯ Yes (evet)
- ◯ No (hayır)

6- How is your familiarity of technology and skills required: *
6- Teknolojiye aşinalığınız ve becerileriniz nasıl gerekli?:

- ◯ Poor (zayif)
- ◯ Medium (orta)
- ◯ Advanced (ileri)
- ◯ Other: _____

Back Next Clear form

Battery B: Research Question (Araştırma soruları)

A Retrospective Look at the Students' Perceptions and Attitudes toward Learning English Online

Battery B: Kindly, circle the number that reflects your opinion on the statements provided below:

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

Öğrencilerin Çevrimiçi İngilizce Öğrenmeye Yönelik Algılarına ve Tutumlarına Retrospektif Bir Bakış

Pil B: Lütfen aşağıda verilen ifadelerle ilgili görüşünüzü yansıtan sayıyı yuvarlak içine alınız:

1 = Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
2 = reddetmek
3 = doğal
4 = kabul etmek
5 = Kesinlikle katılıyorum

1- The learning objectives were clear. *
1- Öğrenme hedefleri açıktı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

2- Learning activities were designed to meet different students' learning styles. *
2- Öğrenme etkinlikleri, farklı öğrencilerin öğrenme stillerine uygun olarak tasarlanmıştır.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

3- Teachers encouraged online discussions. *
3- Öğretmenler çevrimiçi tartışmalara teşvik etti.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

4- Teachers made sure that students were active in class during online sessions. *
4- Öğretmenler, çevrimiçi oturumlar sırasında öğrencilerin sınıfta aktif olmalarını sağladı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

5- Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates. *
5- Çevrimiçi öğrenme, öğretmenler ve sınıf arkadaşlarıyla iletişim kurmak için birçok seçenek sağladı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

6- Teachers provided immediate feedback. *
6- Öğretmenler anında dönut verdi

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

7- Online resources were useful. *

7- Çevrimiçi kaynaklar kullanışlıydı

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

8- Interactive video feature allowed me to review all my classroom activities and lessons. *

8- Etkileşimli video kullanimi, sınıf ici etkinlikle ve dersleri gözden geçirmeme olanak verdi

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

9- It provided easy access to massive amount of knowledge related to my topic. *

9- Çevrimiçi Kaynaklarin coklugu konu alanimla ilgili bircok bilgiye ulasmami sağladı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

10- The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me. *

10- Çevrimiçi Öğrenme ortamı benim için iyi bir tecribe oldu

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

11- I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic. *
11- Konumla ilgili sorularimi çevrim içi ortamda rahatlikla sorabıldım

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

12- Online education was more flexible than face to face learning. *
12- Çevrimiçi eğitim, yüz yüze eğitimden daha esnekti.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

13- Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily. *
13- Tam zamanlı ve yarı zamanlı öğrenciler, üniversite derslerine her yerden kolayca katılabildiler.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

14- I could study on my own speed; therefore, I was stress-free. *
14- Çevrimiçi Kendi hızımda çalışabildım; bu nedenle stressizdim.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

15- Technology has always been important (in education). *
15- Teknoloji (eğitimde) her zaman önemli olmuştur.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

16- There was insufficient engagement. *
16- Derste yeterınce ınteraksyon yoktu

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

17- There was a lack of contact with teachers. *
17- Öğretmenlerle iletişim eksikliği vardı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

18- There was a lack of contact with peers. *
18- Akranlarla iletişim eksikliği vardı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

19- Poor technological skills were problem in online education. *
19- Çevrimiçi eğitimde zayıf teknolojik beceriler sorundu.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

20- EMU had limited amount of online resources. *
20- DAÜ'nün sınırlı miktarda çevrimiçi kaynağı vardı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

21- Students didn't have enough gadgets. *
21- Öğrencilerin yeterli teknolojık aleti yoktu.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

22- Online learning was boring. *
22- Çevrimiçi öğrenme sıkıcıydı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

23- It gave a sense of loneliness to me. *
23- Bana bir yalnızlık duygusu verdi.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

24- There was a lack of active participation in academic activities. *
24- Akademik faaliyetlere aktif katılım eksikliği vardı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

25- Online learning made me feel more distracted. *
25- Çevrimiçi öğrenme, dikkatimin daha dağılmış hissetmeme neden oldu.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

26- Online learning environment was so tiring for me. *
26- Çevrimiçi öğrenme ortamı benim için çok yorucuydu.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

27- I had backache sitting for long time in front of my screen. *
27- Uzun süre ekran karşısında oturduğum için sırtım ağrıyordu.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

28- I had eye issues when I focus more. *
28- Daha fazla odaklandığımda göz sorunlarım vardı.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Strongly agree (Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

Note: If you would like to express anything related to your online experience, please use the space provided.
Not: Deneyiminizle ilgili herhangi bir şey ifade etmek isterseniz, lütfen sağlanan alanı kullanın.

Your answer

Back Submit Clear form

Appendix C: Application for Ethical Approval

FACULTY OF EDUCATION ETHICS SUB-COMMITTEE

Reference No: ETK00-2023-0004 11.01.2023

Subject: Application for Ethical Approval

Dear: Lara ALHASHASH (20500160)

Your application regarding your master's thesis on **"A Retrospective Look at the Perceptions and Attitudes of Turkish Students towards Learning English Online: Experiences (Findings) from the Pandemic Period"** under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Necdet OSAM at Eastern Mediterranean University has been examined and approved in the meeting, dated 03 January 2023 and numbered 2023/129, by the Faculty of Education Ethics Sub-Committee at Eastern Mediterranean University.

I wish you success in your work.

Regards

Prof. Dr. Sıtkıye KUTER
Head of Faculty of Education Ethics Sub-committee

Appendix D: Cronbach's Alpha for survey result

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	102	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	102	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.810	28

Appendix E: T Test Findings of Gender

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
						Significance				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
1- The learning objectives were clear.	Equal variances assumed	.991	.322	-.098	100	.461	.923	-.021	.217	-.453	.410
	Equal variances not assumed			-.101	83.9	.460	.920	-.021	.209	-.437	.395
2- Learning activities were designed to meet different studentsâ€™ learning styles.	Equal variances assumed	.100	.753	2.157	100	.017	.033	.489	.227	.039	.939
	Equal variances not assumed			2.129	72.0	.018	.037	.489	.230	.031	.947
3- Teachers encouraged online discussions.	Equal variances assumed	.275	.601	.436	100	.332	.664	.113	.258	-.400	.625
	Equal variances not assumed			.441	77.6	.330	.660	.113	.256	-.396	.621
4- Teachers made sure that students were active in class during online sessions.	Equal variances assumed	.426	.515	.991	100	.162	.324	.259	.262	-.260	.779
	Equal variances not assumed			1.010	79.3	.158	.316	.259	.257	-.252	.771
5- Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates.	Equal variances assumed	.107	.744	.859	100	.196	.392	.232	.270	-.303	.766
	Equal variances not assumed			.870	77.7	.194	.387	.232	.266	-.299	.762
6- Teachers provided immediate feedback.	Equal variances assumed	2.660	.106	2.021	100	.023	.046	.453	.224	.008	.897
	Equal variances not assumed			2.124	86.4	.018	.036	.453	.213	.029	.877
7- Online resources were useful.	Equal variances assumed	.005	.943	1.596	100	.057	.114	.349	.219	-.085	.782
	Equal variances not assumed			1.603	76.0	.057	.113	.349	.218	-.084	.782
8- Interactive video feature allowed me to review all my classroom activities and lessons.	Equal variances assumed	1.162	.284	1.813	100	.036	.073	.391	.216	-.037	.820
	Equal variances not assumed			1.901	85.9	.030	.061	.391	.206	-.018	.801
9- It provided easy access to massive amount of knowledge related to my topic.	Equal variances assumed	.066	.798	.370	100	.356	.712	.090	.243	-.392	.571
	Equal variances not assumed			.379	80.7	.353	.706	.090	.237	-.381	.561
10- The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me.	Equal variances assumed	.468	.495	1.829	100	.035	.070	.483	.264	-.041	1.007
	Equal variances not assumed			1.833	75.4	.035	.071	.483	.264	-.042	1.008
11- I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic.	Equal variances assumed	7.142	.009	2.476	100	.007	.015	.672	.271	.133	1.210
	Equal variances not assumed			2.698	94.0	.004	.008	.672	.249	.177	1.166
12- Online education was more flexible than face to face learning.	Equal variances assumed	.574	.450	.376	100	.354	.708	.110	.292	-.470	.689
	Equal variances not assumed			.384	80.0	.351	.702	.110	.286	-.459	.678
13- Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily.	Equal variances assumed	.027	.871	1.421	100	.079	.159	.326	.230	-.129	.782
	Equal variances not assumed			1.410	73.4	.081	.163	.326	.231	-.135	.788
14- I could study on my own speed; therefore, I was stress-free.	Equal variances assumed	3.033	.085	-.153	100	.439	.879	-.040	.262	-.559	.479
	Equal variances not assumed			-.161	87.1	.436	.873	-.040	.248	-.533	.453
15- Technology has always been important (in education).	Equal variances assumed	.072	.788	.215	100	.415	.830	.043	.201	-.355	.442
	Equal variances not assumed			.212	71.5	.416	.833	.043	.204	-.364	.450
16- There was insufficient engagement.	Equal variances assumed	.158	.692	1.061	100	.146	.291	.240	.226	-.209	.688
	Equal variances not assumed			1.111	85.4	.135	.270	.240	.216	-.190	.669
17- There was a lack of contact with teachers.	Equal variances assumed	.461	.499	-2.426	100	.009	.017	-.528	.218	-.961	-.096
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.417	74.2	.009	.018	-.528	.219	-.964	-.093

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
						Significance				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
18- There was a lack of contact with peers.	Equal variances assumed	.223	.638	-2.601	100	.005	.011	-.647	.249	-1.140	-.153
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.528	68.8	.007	.014	-.647	.256	-1.157	-.136
19- Poor technological skills were problem in online education.	Equal variances assumed	.002	.966	.854	100	.198	.395	.213	.250	-.282	.709
	Equal variances not assumed			.853	74.8	.198	.396	.213	.250	-.285	.712
20- EMU had limited amount of online resources.	Equal variances assumed	.117	.734	.681	100	.249	.498	.170	.250	-.326	.666
	Equal variances not assumed			.683	75.6	.248	.497	.170	.249	-.326	.666
21- Students didnâ€™t have enough gadgets.	Equal variances assumed	.016	.901	-.407	100	.342	.685	-.103	.253	-.605	.399
	Equal variances not assumed			-.405	73.9	.343	.686	-.103	.254	-.610	.404
22- Online learning was boring.	Equal variances assumed	.043	.837	-1.047	100	.149	.298	-.287	.274	-.832	.257
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.027	70.7	.154	.308	-.287	.280	-.845	.271
23- It gave a sense of loneliness to me.	Equal variances assumed	.342	.560	-.343	100	.366	.732	-.103	.301	-.700	.493
	Equal variances not assumed			-.348	78.3	.364	.729	-.103	.296	-.693	.487
24- There was a lack of active participation in academic activities.	Equal variances assumed	1.416	.237	-2.845	100	.003	.005	-.684	.241	-1.162	-.207
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.886	78.3	.003	.005	-.684	.237	-1.156	-.212
25- Online learning made me feel more distracted.	Equal variances assumed	1.688	.197	-.341	100	.367	.734	-.082	.241	-.561	.396
	Equal variances not assumed			-.358	86.1	.361	.721	-.082	.230	-.539	.375
26- Online learning environment was so tiring for me..	Equal variances assumed	2.015	.159	-.355	100	.362	.723	-.104	.292	-.682	.475
	Equal variances not assumed			-.366	81.7	.358	.716	-.104	.283	-.667	.460
27- I had backache sitting for long time in front of my screen.	Equal variances assumed	1.619	.206	-2.742	100	.004	.007	-.710	.259	-1.224	-.196
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.667	68.9	.005	.010	-.710	.266	-1.241	-.179
28- I had eye issues when I focus more.	Equal variances assumed	.014	.907	-1.232	100	.110	.221	-.333	.271	-.871	.204
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.225	73.8	.112	.224	-.333	.272	-.876	.209

Appendix F: Findings of E-learning and Gender

		1- Your gender:	
		Female Column N %	Male Column N %
1- The learning objectives were clear.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	15.4%	10.8%
	Nutral	32.3%	43.2%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	52.3%	45.9%
2- Learning activities were designed to meet different studentsâ€™ learning styles.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	44.6%	32.4%
	Nutral	36.9%	29.7%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	18.5%	37.8%
3- Teachers encouraged online discussions.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	30.8%	24.3%
	Nutral	20.0%	27.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	49.2%	48.6%
4- Teachers made sure that students were active in class during online sessions.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	30.8%	21.6%
	Nutral	26.2%	16.2%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.1%	62.2%
5- Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	33.8%	32.4%
	Nutral	32.3%	18.9%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	33.8%	48.6%
6- Teachers provided immediate feedback.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	24.6%	10.8%
	Nutral	30.8%	21.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	44.6%	67.6%
7- Online resources were useful.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	23.1%	16.2%
	Nutral	26.2%	24.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	50.8%	59.5%
8- Interactive video feature allowed me to review all my classroom activities and lessons.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	21.5%	8.1%
	Nutral	32.3%	35.1%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	46.2%	56.8%
9- It provided easy access to massive amount of knowledge related to my topic.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	21.5%	24.3%
	Nutral	35.4%	32.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.1%	43.2%
10- The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	27.7%	21.6%
	Nutral	36.9%	24.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	35.4%	54.1%

		1- Your gender:	
		Female Column N %	Male Column N %
11- I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	38.5%	13.5%
	Nutral	18.5%	24.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.1%	62.2%
12- Online education was more flexible than face to face learning.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	26.2%	18.9%
	Nutral	20.0%	32.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	53.8%	48.6%
13- Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	13.8%	13.5%
	Nutral	43.1%	21.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.1%	64.9%
14- I could study on my own speed; therefore, I was stress-free.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	21.5%	18.9%
	Nutral	20.0%	21.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	58.5%	59.5%
15- Technology has always been important (in education).	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	4.6%	10.8%
	Nutral	18.5%	8.1%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	76.9%	81.1%
16- There was insufficient engagement.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	23.1%	16.2%
	Nutral	44.6%	40.5%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	32.3%	43.2%
17- There was a lack of contact with teachers.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	26.2%	51.4%
	Nutral	44.6%	29.7%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	29.2%	18.9%
18- There was a lack of contact with peers.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	15.4%	43.2%
	Nutral	35.4%	27.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	49.2%	29.7%
19- Poor technological skills were problem in online education.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	27.7%	21.6%
	Nutral	27.7%	24.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	44.6%	54.1%
20- EMU had limited amount of online resources.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	32.3%	29.7%
	Nutral	32.3%	27.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	35.4%	43.2%

		1- Your gender:	
		Female	Male
		Column N %	Column N %
21- Students didnâ€™t have enough gadgets.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	26.2%	32.4%
	Nutral	32.3%	27.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	41.5%	40.5%
22- Online learning was boring.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	23.1%	24.3%
	Nutral	20.0%	32.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	56.9%	43.2%
23- It gave a sense of loneliness to me.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	27.7%	29.7%
	Nutral	26.2%	24.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	46.2%	45.9%
24- There was a lack of active participation in academic activities.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	16.9%	29.7%
	Nutral	21.5%	40.5%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	61.5%	29.7%
25- Online learning made me feel more distracted.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	16.9%	13.5%
	Nutral	27.7%	40.5%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	55.4%	45.9%
26- Online learning environment was so tiring for me..	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	32.3%	29.7%
	Nutral	23.1%	35.1%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	44.6%	35.1%
27- I had backache sitting for long time in front of my screen.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	10.8%	24.3%
	Nutral	13.8%	35.1%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	75.4%	40.5%
28- I had eye issues when I focus more.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	23.1%	29.7%
	Nutral	21.5%	24.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	55.4%	45.9%

Appendix G: Findings of E-learning and Age

		2- Your age: :	
		18-20 Column N %	21-30 Column N %
1- The learning objectives were clear.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	13.6%	13.8%
	Nutral	38.6%	34.5%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	47.7%	51.7%
2- Learning activities were designed to meet different studentsâ€™ learning styles.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	36.4%	43.1%
	Nutral	34.1%	34.5%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	29.5%	22.4%
3- Teachers encouraged online discussions.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	34.1%	24.1%
	Nutral	22.7%	22.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.2%	53.4%
4- Teachers made sure that students were active in class during online sessions.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	27.3%	27.6%
	Nutral	20.5%	24.1%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	52.3%	48.3%
5- Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	34.1%	32.8%
	Nutral	15.9%	36.2%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	50.0%	31.0%
6- Teachers provided immediate feedback.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	22.7%	17.2%
	Nutral	22.7%	31.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	54.5%	51.7%
7- Online resources were useful.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	15.9%	24.1%
	Nutral	22.7%	27.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	61.4%	48.3%
8- Interactive video feature allowed me to review all my classroom activities and lessons.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	13.6%	19.0%
	Nutral	36.4%	31.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	50.0%	50.0%
9- It provided easy access to massive amount of knowledge related to my topic.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	22.7%	22.4%
	Nutral	38.6%	31.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	38.6%	46.6%
10- The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	25.0%	25.9%
	Nutral	38.6%	27.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	36.4%	46.6%

		2- Your age: :	
		18-20 Column N %	21-30 Column N %
11- I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	25.0%	32.8%
	Nutral	31.8%	12.1%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.2%	55.2%
12- Online education was more flexible than face to face learning.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	29.5%	19.0%
	Nutral	27.3%	22.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.2%	58.6%
13- Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	9.1%	17.2%
	Nutral	38.6%	32.8%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	52.3%	50.0%
14- I could study on my own speed; therefore, I was stress-free.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	25.0%	17.2%
	Nutral	18.2%	22.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	56.8%	60.3%
15- Technology has always been important (in education).	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	9.1%	5.2%
	Nutral	11.4%	17.2%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	79.5%	77.6%
16- There was insufficient engagement.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	20.5%	20.7%
	Nutral	45.5%	41.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	34.1%	37.9%
17- There was a lack of contact with teachers.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	34.1%	36.2%
	Nutral	38.6%	39.7%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	27.3%	24.1%
18- There was a lack of contact with peers.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	29.5%	22.4%
	Nutral	31.8%	32.8%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	38.6%	44.8%
19- Poor technological skills were problem in online education.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	27.3%	24.1%
	Nutral	31.8%	22.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	40.9%	53.4%
20- EMU had limited amount of online resources.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	34.1%	29.3%
	Nutral	27.3%	32.8%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	38.6%	37.9%

		2- Your age: :	
		18-20	21-30
		Column N %	Column N %
21- Students didnâ€™t have enough gadgets.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	29.5%	27.6%
	Nutral	34.1%	27.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	36.4%	44.8%
22- Online learning was boring.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	22.7%	24.1%
	Nutral	18.2%	29.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	59.1%	46.6%
23- It gave a sense of loneliness to me.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	25.0%	31.0%
	Nutral	25.0%	25.9%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	50.0%	43.1%
24- There was a lack of active participation in academic activities.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	18.2%	24.1%
	Nutral	27.3%	29.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	54.5%	46.6%
25- Online learning made me feel more distracted.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	13.6%	17.2%
	Nutral	34.1%	31.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	52.3%	51.7%
26- Online learning environment was so tiring for me..	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	25.0%	36.2%
	Nutral	27.3%	27.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	47.7%	36.2%
27- I had backache sitting for long time in front of my screen.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	11.4%	19.0%
	Nutral	22.7%	20.7%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	65.9%	60.3%
28- I had eye issues when I focus more.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	15.9%	32.8%
	Nutral	22.7%	22.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	61.4%	44.8%

Appendix H: Findings of E-learning and Technology Competency

		6- How is your familiarity of technology and skills required:		
		Advanced (ileri) Column N %	Medium (orta) Column N %	Poor (zayif) Column N %
1- The learning objectives were clear.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	14.6%	12.3%	25.0%
	Nutral	43.9%	33.3%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	41.5%	54.4%	75.0%
2- Learning activities were designed to meet different studentsâ€™ learning styles.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	48.8%	33.3%	50.0%
	Nutral	26.8%	42.1%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	24.4%	24.6%	50.0%
3- Teachers encouraged online discussions.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	29.3%	26.3%	50.0%
	Nutral	22.0%	24.6%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	48.8%	49.1%	50.0%
4- Teachers made sure that students were active in class during online sessions.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	24.4%	29.8%	25.0%
	Nutral	22.0%	24.6%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	53.7%	45.6%	75.0%
5- Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	43.9%	26.3%	25.0%
	Nutral	12.2%	38.6%	25.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.9%	35.1%	50.0%
6- Teachers provided immediate feedback.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	22.0%	17.5%	25.0%
	Nutral	24.4%	28.1%	50.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	53.7%	54.4%	25.0%
7- Online resources were useful.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	22.0%	15.8%	75.0%
	Nutral	31.7%	22.8%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	46.3%	61.4%	25.0%
8- Interactive video feature allowed me to review all my classroom activities and lessons.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	22.0%	10.5%	50.0%
	Nutral	29.3%	38.6%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	48.8%	50.9%	50.0%
9- It provided easy access to massive amount of knowledge related to my topic.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	24.4%	19.3%	50.0%
	Nutral	29.3%	40.4%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	46.3%	40.4%	50.0%
10- The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	24.4%	26.3%	25.0%
	Nutral	36.6%	31.6%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	39.0%	42.1%	75.0%

		6- How is your familiarity of technology and skills required:		
		Advanced (ileri) Column N %	Medium (orta) Column N %	Poor (zayif) Column N %
11- I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	26.8%	31.6%	25.0%
	Nutral	22.0%	19.3%	25.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	51.2%	49.1%	50.0%
12- Online education was more flexible than face to face learning.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	36.6%	14.0%	25.0%
	Nutral	14.6%	31.6%	25.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	48.8%	54.4%	50.0%
13- Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	7.3%	17.5%	25.0%
	Nutral	26.8%	42.1%	25.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	65.9%	40.4%	50.0%
14- I could study on my own speed; therefore, I was stress-free.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	22.0%	19.3%	25.0%
	Nutral	14.6%	26.3%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	63.4%	54.4%	75.0%
15- Technology has always been important (in education).	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	2.4%	10.5%	0.0%
	Nutral	17.1%	14.0%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	80.5%	75.4%	100.0%
16- There was insufficient engagement.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	19.5%	19.3%	50.0%
	Nutral	36.6%	50.9%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.9%	29.8%	50.0%
17- There was a lack of contact with teachers.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	39.0%	35.1%	0.0%
	Nutral	41.5%	38.6%	25.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	19.5%	26.3%	75.0%
18- There was a lack of contact with peers.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	31.7%	22.8%	0.0%
	Nutral	26.8%	38.6%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	41.5%	38.6%	100.0%
19- Poor technological skills were problem in online education.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	22.0%	28.1%	25.0%
	Nutral	24.4%	28.1%	25.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	53.7%	43.9%	50.0%
20- EMU had limited amount of online resources.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	39.0%	24.6%	50.0%
	Nutral	29.3%	33.3%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	31.7%	42.1%	50.0%

		6- How is your familiarity of technology and skills required:		
		Advanced (ileri) Column N %	Medium (orta) Column N %	Poor (zayif) Column N %
21- Students didnâ€™t have enough gadgets.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	34.1%	26.3%	0.0%
	Nutral	29.3%	33.3%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	36.6%	40.4%	100.0%
22- Online learning was boring.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	29.3%	17.5%	50.0%
	Nutral	19.5%	29.8%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	51.2%	52.6%	50.0%
23- It gave a sense of loneliness to me.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	41.5%	21.1%	0.0%
	Nutral	14.6%	35.1%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	43.9%	43.9%	100.0%
24- There was a lack of active participation in academic activities.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	26.8%	17.5%	25.0%
	Nutral	26.8%	31.6%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	46.3%	50.9%	75.0%
25- Online learning made me feel more distracted.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	19.5%	14.0%	0.0%
	Nutral	29.3%	33.3%	50.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	51.2%	52.6%	50.0%
26- Online learning environment was so tiring for me..	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	34.1%	29.8%	25.0%
	Nutral	29.3%	28.1%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	36.6%	42.1%	75.0%
27- I had backache sitting for long time in front of my screen.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	26.8%	8.8%	0.0%
	Nutral	19.5%	24.6%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	53.7%	66.7%	100.0%
28- I had eye issues when I focus more.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	24.4%	26.3%	25.0%
	Nutral	26.8%	21.1%	0.0%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	48.8%	52.6%	75.0%

Appendix I: Findings of E-learning and English Proficiency Level

		4- Your English level:			
		A1	A2	B1	UB1
		Column N %	Column N %	Column N %	Column N %
1- The learning objectives were clear.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	14.3%	12.5%	17.1%	10.5%
	Nutral	42.9%	25.0%	41.5%	34.2%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	62.5%	41.5%	55.3%
2- Learning activities were designed to meet different studentsâ€™ learning styles.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	28.6%	50.0%	43.9%	34.2%
	Nutral	28.6%	25.0%	36.6%	36.8%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	25.0%	19.5%	28.9%
3- Teachers encouraged online discussions.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	42.9%	31.3%	36.6%	15.8%
	Nutral	14.3%	18.8%	17.1%	31.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	50.0%	46.3%	52.6%
4- Teachers made sure that students were active in class during online sessions.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	57.1%	25.0%	22.0%	28.9%
	Nutral	14.3%	31.3%	24.4%	18.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	28.6%	43.8%	53.7%	52.6%
5- Online learning provided many options to communicate with teachers and classmates.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	42.9%	31.3%	34.1%	31.6%
	Nutral	42.9%	25.0%	26.8%	26.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	14.3%	43.8%	39.0%	42.1%
6- Teachers provided immediate feedback.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	42.9%	6.3%	22.0%	18.4%
	Nutral	28.6%	31.3%	19.5%	34.2%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	28.6%	62.5%	58.5%	47.4%
7- Online resources were useful.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	42.9%	6.3%	29.3%	13.2%
	Nutral	14.3%	31.3%	22.0%	28.9%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	62.5%	48.8%	57.9%
8- Interactive video feature allowed me to review all my classroom activities and lessons.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	28.6%	12.5%	19.5%	13.2%
	Nutral	28.6%	43.8%	36.6%	26.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	43.8%	43.9%	60.5%
9- It provided easy access to massive amount of knowledge related to my topic.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	28.6%	25.0%	34.1%	7.9%
	Nutral	42.9%	25.0%	34.1%	36.8%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	28.6%	50.0%	31.7%	55.3%
10- The learning environment was an enjoyable experience for me.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	28.6%	12.5%	29.3%	26.3%
	Nutral	57.1%	25.0%	31.7%	31.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	14.3%	62.5%	39.0%	42.1%

		4- Your English level:			
		A1	A2	B1	UB1
		Column N %	Column N %	Column N %	Column N %
11- I felt comfortable to ask online when I had a question about my topic.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	14.3%	37.5%	39.0%	18.4%
	Nutral	42.9%	25.0%	17.1%	18.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	37.5%	43.9%	63.2%
12- Online education was more flexible than face to face learning.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	0.0%	31.3%	26.8%	21.1%
	Nutral	42.9%	31.3%	14.6%	28.9%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	57.1%	37.5%	58.5%	50.0%
13- Full time and part time students were able to engage in their college courses from anywhere easily.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	0.0%	31.3%	9.8%	13.2%
	Nutral	57.1%	18.8%	39.0%	34.2%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	50.0%	51.2%	52.6%
14- I could study on my own speed; therefore, I was stress-free.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	14.3%	12.5%	19.5%	26.3%
	Nutral	28.6%	12.5%	19.5%	23.7%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	57.1%	75.0%	61.0%	50.0%
15- Technology has always been important (in education).	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	13.2%
	Nutral	28.6%	0.0%	14.6%	18.4%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	71.4%	100.0%	80.5%	68.4%
16- There was insufficient engagement.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	14.3%	31.3%	22.0%	15.8%
	Nutral	42.9%	37.5%	46.3%	42.1%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	31.3%	31.7%	42.1%
17- There was a lack of contact with teachers.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	42.9%	37.5%	29.3%	39.5%
	Nutral	28.6%	31.3%	48.8%	34.2%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	28.6%	31.3%	22.0%	26.3%
18- There was a lack of contact with peers.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	14.3%	37.5%	14.6%	34.2%
	Nutral	57.1%	25.0%	31.7%	31.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	28.6%	37.5%	53.7%	34.2%
19- Poor technological skills were problem in online education.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	14.3%	37.5%	22.0%	26.3%
	Nutral	0.0%	31.3%	19.5%	36.8%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	85.7%	31.3%	58.5%	36.8%
20- EMU had limited amount of online resources.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	28.6%	25.0%	31.7%	34.2%
	Nutral	42.9%	12.5%	29.3%	36.8%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	28.6%	62.5%	39.0%	28.9%
21- Students didnâ€™t have enough gadgets.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	28.6%	18.8%	24.4%	36.8%
	Nutral	14.3%	31.3%	24.4%	39.5%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	57.1%	50.0%	51.2%	23.7%

		4- Your English level:			
		A1	A2	B1	UB1
		Column N %	Column N %	Column N %	Column N %
22- Online learning was boring.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	28.6%	25.0%	24.4%	21.1%
	Nutral	42.9%	18.8%	22.0%	26.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	28.6%	56.3%	53.7%	52.6%
23- It gave a sense of loneliness to me.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	28.6%	37.5%	24.4%	28.9%
	Nutral	28.6%	12.5%	24.4%	31.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	50.0%	51.2%	39.5%
24- There was a lack of active participation in academic activities.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	14.3%	6.3%	22.0%	28.9%
	Nutral	42.9%	37.5%	29.3%	21.1%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	56.3%	48.8%	50.0%
25- Online learning made me feel more distracted.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	28.6%	12.5%	14.6%	15.8%
	Nutral	28.6%	37.5%	31.7%	31.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	42.9%	50.0%	53.7%	52.6%
26- Online learning environment was so tiring for me..	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	42.9%	50.0%	31.7%	21.1%
	Nutral	28.6%	25.0%	24.4%	31.6%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	28.6%	25.0%	43.9%	47.4%
27- I had backache sitting for long time in front of my screen.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	14.3%	25.0%	4.9%	23.7%
	Nutral	28.6%	12.5%	24.4%	21.1%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	57.1%	62.5%	70.7%	55.3%
28- I had eye issues when I focus more.	Strongly Disagree + Disagree	42.9%	37.5%	12.2%	31.6%
	Nutral	0.0%	12.5%	26.8%	26.3%
	Strongly Agree + Agree	57.1%	50.0%	61.0%	42.1%