

A survey of students' perceptions of communicative language learning online and in the classroom.

Brian GAYNOR

オンラインと教室でのコミュニケーション型言語学習に対する学生の認識に関する調査。

ブライアン ゲイナー

Abstract: This paper presents the results from a study focused specifically on EFL classes that used a communicative language teaching (CLT) approach. The aim of the survey was to explore students' attitudes to both online and in-classroom communicative English language learning, and subsequently consider what implications these would have for student learning and teacher pedagogy. This survey undertook an investigation of students' attitudes to various aspects of communicative language learning in both classroom and online settings. A sample of 327 non-English major students at a science and engineering university completed a Likert scale-based questionnaire measuring their attitudes in five categories: English study; Online learning; Learning environment; Lesson activities; and Teacher engagement. Analysis of the survey data show that students clearly prefer in-class language learning. Students considered the classroom-based pedagogy to be more effective, particularly in terms of peer involvement and interaction. Findings from the survey have significant implications for how students experience communicative language learning and how teachers can best enhance this experience.

Keywords: Communicative language teaching; online learning; student survey; academic genius

1. Introduction

The unprecedented outbreak and swift spread of Covid 19 in January 2020 has had global ramifications for all aspects of modern society, effects that are still being felt today. This is particularly the case in education where national lockdowns necessitated a sudden switch to intensive online education¹. Although different forms of online education had been used for some time, the sudden

¹ A note about terminology. 'online learning', 'E-learning', 'blended learning', 'hybrid learning', and 'distance learning' are all terms, often used (erroneously) as synonyms to refer to the practice of teaching and learning online. For the purpose of this paper, I will follow Hockly's definition (2015) of online learning (in the specific context of English as a foreign language education) as, "language learning that takes place fully online via the internet with no

onset of the pandemic resulted in an unprecedented adoption of different forms of pedagogy delivered via the internet. Almost overnight, educational institutions and teachers had to reorganise their classes to a format suitable for online teaching. Simultaneously, students had to move from a classroom-based, socially interactive, peer-sharing learning environment to one of physical isolation, all contact mediated through an aptly named electronic 'screen'.

The results of this enforced experiment in online teaching and learning are still being teased out, but a growing body of research (Duong & Nguyen, 2021; Moorhouse & Kohnke, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021) suggests that online education works best as a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, classroom-based education. Teachers encountered issues and problems in the sudden switch to online education. Among these were problems with adapting pedagogical techniques to an online environment (Moorhouse & Kohnke, 2021); the myriad of technical challenges they faced in trying to master various digital formats for transmitting lessons (Li, 2021); and the lack of immediate and continuous feedback (both explicit and implicit) throughout lessons so as to guide their real-time, in-lesson pedagogical choices.

From the perspective of the students, Octaberlina and Muslimin (2020) found that the effectiveness of online learning was undermined by students' unfamiliarity with the technical and psychological demands of e-learning. They found that technical issues, particularly poor internet connections, and the mental effects of isolation were detrimental influences on what and how students learned. Similarly, Chakraborty et. al. (2020) found that students perceived online education as more difficult than traditional in-person education, and this in turn had a detrimental effect on their health and social lives.

Inequality was also a factor in determining how students' education progressed during the pandemic. Variable access to technology, such as broadband, computers, and smartphones, also resulted in disparate learning experiences (Alhumaid et al., 2020; Ezra et al., 2021; Shin & Hickey, 2021), especially in developing countries (Tadesse & Muluye, 2020).

Of particular note is how online learning obscured students' heterogeneity. In the classroom, students' individuality may manifest itself to differing degrees; online, students became an amalgamated mass, often faceless², the technology enforced anonymity also overlaying them with an unwanted assumption of sameness. They became students, plural. Issues such as learner diversity, learning styles, and individual motivation became submerged in sameness.

To give voice to students so that these issues could be investigated, the author undertook a small-scale survey of non-English majors at a Japanese university. The study focused specifically on English

face-to-face component" (p.1).

² Due to constraints on bandwidth capacity, many institutions – including the author's own – required students to turn off their cameras and microphones during online classes.

classes that used a communicative language teaching (CLT) approach. Students in these classes primarily followed a curriculum that emphasized the primacy of oral and aural practice for learning English. The aim of the survey was to explore students' attitudes to both online and in-classroom communicative English language learning, and subsequently consider what implications these would have for student learning and teacher pedagogy.

2. Interaction

According to Clandfield and Hadfield (2017), “interacting with others is one of the reasons people enjoy language classes so much” (p.3). In discussing ‘interaction’ the authors usefully distinguish between human-to-human interaction which they term ‘strong interaction’; and human-to-machine’ interaction which they call ‘weak interaction’. During the pandemic the use of communicative applications, such as Zoom and Skype, and learning platforms, such as Moodle and Google Classrooms, tried to maintain that strong, human-to-human interaction to various degrees. However, as Rahmawati et. al. (2021) found, the technology-constrained nature of interaction in online English as a foreign language (EFL) lessons led to a decrease in students’ vocabulary knowledge, increased pronunciation errors, and a corresponding reduction in speech fluency and verbal accuracy. These findings echo an earlier study by Croxton (2014) about online English EFL lessons. He found that the lack of both formal and informal interactive experiences resulted in compromised learning and widespread student dissatisfaction.

2.1 Communicative language teaching

Of particular concern for this paper is the effect of online learning on communicative language teaching (CLT) which, by its very nature, relies on successful interaction between students, and to a lesser extent, between students and their teacher, to ensure productive communication takes place. As a pedagogical approach CLT emphasizes implicit learning through doing, rather than explicit learning through understanding (Richards & Rogers, 2001). Communicative competency is as much socially as linguistically determined; communication occurs as an interactive process between individuals or groups. The focus is on the successful transmission, reception, and understanding of meaningful content. CLT prioritizes enabling learners to actually utilize their foreign language ability for need-driven communication (Carson, 2017).

Hence, CLT requires learners to participate in cooperative classroom activities rather than undertaking language learning as a socially unmediated, solitary activity whose aim is to suitably score on some form of institutionally mandated, test-based, narrowly defined proficiency assessment. What this means in terms of classroom practice is a sustained focus on meaningful interaction whereby “students must negotiate meaning, use communication strategies, correct misunderstandings, and work to avoid communication breakdowns” (Richards, 2005:14).

In a typical CLT focused classroom most of the communicative tasks are designed to be carried out in pairs or small groups; there is a shared emphasis on both linguistic and social interaction to enable students to effectively communicate with each other. The teacher's role is primarily as a facilitator; she determines the tasks, provides the necessary linguistic input (e.g. vocabulary, lexical phrases, grammar patterns, pragmatic features, etc.), explains the tasks to the students, monitors their engagement in real time, and finally provides immediate feedback. Evaluation is implicit in the tasks; if students have successfully completed the task, then some form of mutually comprehensible meaning has been communicated, received, and understood. In short, effective communication has occurred.

2.2 Classroom-based instruction

The previously outlined classroom-based scenario has a number of readily apparent benefits: pair work and group work activities are easy to set up, easy to monitor, the teacher can provide immediate assistance if students encounter difficulties, and through her monitoring, the teacher can give immediate and specific feedback on the students' performance. In addition, the classroom facilitates face-to-face communication so that para-lingual cues (such as facial expressions, gestures, etc.) can also be used by students to ensure effective communication.

From a classroom management point of view, the teacher can quickly and efficiently reassign students to new pairs and groups which enables the student-to-student interaction to be more multidirectional. She can also ensure that students undertake the communicative tasks using English and that the use of L1 Japanese is kept to a minimum. Finally, there are no technical issues to grapple with; physical proximity means that visual and audio interference is minimal.

2.3 Online learning

Using technology to teach and learn remotely does have a number of benefits, the most important, according to Nilson and Goodson (2018), being the increased opportunities for flexible learning. With online learning students have more freedom in when they learn, how they learn, and their depth of learning. It also enables (should students be so inclined) the potential for self-directed learning (Reinders, 2012).

Gloriez (2022) found that her students' speaking skills improved during her online courses. She cites several CLT activities that contributed to her students' improvement such as jigsaw activities, storytelling, pictures series, information-gap activities, debate, and group discussion. However, as she notes, these were higher level students who were intrinsically motivated to improve their English. Kalanzadeh et al. (2013), in their study of students with low English proficiency enrolled in mandatory online language courses, found that there was a distinct resistance to class participation and a lack of motivation to communicate.

Sun (2011), in her review of her Chinese language classes, made the pertinent point that "In

reality, students do not seem to consider it [the online classroom] a ‘classroom’, and teachers in fact have little control over it being used or not, let alone have ‘regular’ classes there” (p.436). Interestingly, she found that a small group of two to four students was the most comfortable size for effective interaction in the online classroom, echoing the findings by Brown and Adler (2008) that students working in small groups learn more than those who work on their own.

The proof of the effectiveness of such an individual or small-group focused approach can be observed in the private foreign language education sector. In recent years there has been a surge in for-profit online English language instruction programs. These predominantly use some form of video-conferencing platform that feature one-on-one paired speaking instruction with native English-speaking teachers interacting virtually with EFL learners (Qi Qi et al., 2021). In such situations, there are clear benefits to online education and the small size of participating students would indeed make classrooms unnecessary. This, however, is a very different experience to courses run by accredited universities where class sizes preclude this sort of individual tuition.

Harsch et al. (2021) make an important distinction between ‘carefully planned’ online courses and ‘unprepared emergency remote teaching’, the situation that prevailed at the start of the pandemic. In established online courses instructors are typically well-prepared to teach online and have the necessary technology and institutional support to aid their instruction (Walter and Schenker, 2022). In contrast, the ‘unprepared emergency remote teaching’ that occurred during much of the pandemic was not chosen by either instructors or students; this resulted in a series of challenges and problems that were not always successfully resolved. Hence, remote pandemic language education cannot be easily compared to planned online language classes.

3. Research Questions

This study aims to investigate students’ attitudes to remote online and classroom language learning in the specific context of oral and aural (communicative) language learning. Furthermore, the study seeks to identify factors impacting students’ learning satisfaction in an effort to better inform future decisions about (online) language education.

The current study was guided by the following research questions:

R1: Do students perceive face-to-face classes or online classes as more effective for communicative language learning?

This involved examining issues such as student interaction, learning motivation, and perceived difficulty (both linguistic and practical) of undertaking the various communicative tasks.

R2: Does classroom or online education better facilitate language learning?

This involved focusing on students' perceived level of involvement in language practice activities and levels of interaction.

R3: *Are feedback and teacher support more accessible in the classroom or online?*

This involved examining the types of feedback students sought, the effectiveness of such feedback; the opportunity to ask the teacher questions; and opportunities for individual support during the lesson.

4. Methodology

This study was undertaken at a national university in northern Japan. It is a science and engineering university, so students do not major in English. However, all undergraduate students must take mandatory English language courses in order to fulfil their degree requirements. One of these courses is English Communication, which is taken by all second-year undergraduate students.

The study was undertaken at the end of the first term in August 2021. At the start of the term in April, the university mandated that all courses should be taught online. However, during the term this policy changed and from the beginning of June, some courses could be taught in the classroom. In effect this meant that for the fifteen-week English Communication class, the students were taught online for weeks one to eight (a total of 8 weeks); and then in the classroom for the remaining weeks nine to fifteen (a total of 7 weeks).

This presented a serendipitous opportunity to compare students' attitudes towards online and classroom teaching over the duration of a single fifteen-week course.

4.1 Survey

The survey was based on a literature review of EFL online education and communicative language teaching. The survey was initially written in English, peer-reviewed, then translated into Japanese. The initial Japanese version was also peer-reviewed, and then translated back into English to check for consistency with the English original. After editing, the Japanese translation process was repeated with a further peer-review and final copy edit. (The English version of the survey statements appear in the appendix).

The survey consisted of thirty statements divided into five categories. These are:

- English study
- Online learning
- Learning environment
- Lesson activities
- Teacher engagement

Students had to rank each statement on a six-point Likert scale from 1 = strongly disagree, to 6 = strongly agree. A six-point scale was chosen in order to avoid neutral responses.

The survey was administered to second-year students in their final English Communication class (week 15). A paper copy of the questionnaire was administered and students had to circle/write their responses by hand. A total of three hundred and twenty-seven (n = 327) valid responses were obtained.

4.2 Analysis

Data from the survey was first inputted into an Excel file and formatted for statistical analysis. Jeffrey’s Amazing Statistics Program (JASP) was used for statistical analysis. As the Likert Scales only provide ordinal data, only non-parametric analysis could be conducted. For descriptive data, the median, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation were calculated (Norman, 2010).

5. Results and discussion

In the interest of brevity, the discussion will principally focus on those results most relevant to the three research questions. A full breakdown of the data is available from the author upon request.

5.1 Research Question 1

Do students perceive face-to-face classes or online classes as more effective for communicative language learning?

Table 1: English study						
	S1	S4	S10	S20	S26	S27
Median	4.500	5.000	4.000	4.000	5.000	3.000
Std. Deviation	1.312	1.150	1.085	1.164	0.991	0.881
Coefficient of variation	0.301	0.233	0.286	0.303	0.204	0.314

Table 1 shows the data derived from the statements associated with studying English in both classroom and online situations. The median scores for the five statements all indicate a strong preference for studying English communication in the classroom. In particular, the scores for S4 (*I use more English in face-to-face classes than online classes.*) and S26 (*I think the quality of English education is higher in face-to-face classes.*) had a median of 5 indicating a high level of agreement. Communicative language teaching is very much dependent on language use; the reduced opportunities online learning provided for such use seems to have been duly noted by the students. Although the notion of ‘quality’ was deliberately left undefined, S26 would seem to indicate that

students believe 'better' teaching and learning occurs in the classroom as compared to online. Note too the contrast with S27 (*I learned English better in online classes than in face-to-face classes.*) where the median score was 3.

	S2	S6	S11	S28	S29	S30
Median	5.000	3.000	3.000	2.000	5.000	4.000
Std. Deviation	1.317	1.400	1.403	1.773	1.086	1.406
Coefficient of variation	0.291	0.464	0.419	0.640	0.217	0.346

Table 2 shows the data for statements concerned with specific aspects of students' online learning experience. There was a marked preference for face-to-face learning (S2) and a corresponding ambiguity about interaction in online classes (S11). Interestingly, the majority of students did not encounter technical issues with their online classes (S28). This suggests that dissatisfaction for online classes was intrinsic to the manner of the learning process rather than caused by specific technical issues. The data for the statements about online assessment (S29 and S30) was mixed. Although students perceived online exams as being 'fair', the majority of their responses also indicated that they believed it was easier to cheat online. However, it should be noted that all students in the survey took their final exam in English Communication in person. The replies to S29 and S30 could potentially relate to students' attitudes to online assessment in general rather than specifically to English Communication.

5.2 Research Question 2

Does classroom or online education better facilitate language learning?

This question was primarily concerned with the learning environment in which students were learning English. The serendipitous split between online (weeks 1-7) and classroom (weeks 8-15) environments for the spring term covered by this survey enabled respondents to make a direct comparison between the two. Table 3 shows that students predominantly preferred being in the classroom rather than learning online.

Table 3: Learning environment						
	S3	S12	S13	S15	S16	S17
Median	5.000	3.000	5.000	4.000	5.000	5.000
Std. Deviation	1.064	1.004	1.024	1.341	1.024	1.144
Coefficient of variation	0.218	0.363	0.207	0.316	0.209	0.245

The lowest median score was obtained for S12 (*Online classes are a better way to learn a language*) with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.004, the lowest for the six statements in this category. Given the interactive nature of the English communication class and the difficulty of successfully incorporating such interaction into the online class, this is to be expected. The split in class formats midway through the term meant students could make a direct comparison between online and classroom language learning. Whereas students were equivocal about online learning in their responses to S12, they showed a clear recognition for the suggested advantages of a classroom environment as seen from the strongly agree responses (median score of five) for S3 (*Face-to-face classes are easier to understand than online classes*) and S13 (*I feel that face-to-face classes are a more natural way to learn a language*). Similarly, the pair of statements that examined students' ability to concentrate in the different learning environments (S15 and S16) also showed a marked preference for face-to-face learning. As a bounded learning environment, the classroom imposes both strictures on the students (stay physically present in the room; attend to the teacher; carry out the lesson activities, etc.) and also invokes certain expectations from them (the classroom is a place of learning; certain behaviours are acceptable/unacceptable in the classroom, etc.).

Within the online learning environment these strictures and expectations were weakened if not outright dissolved. Often students 'attended' from their apartments/bedrooms, private spaces given over to more than just learning. Students were more easily distracted, be it by accessing non-lesson related internet sites, watching television, conversing with their friends/family, or, in one notable incidence, playing with their cat. Focus was hard to maintain with a consequential effect on the depth and breadth of students' language learning. In short, the online learning environment 'permitted' too many concentration disrupting distractions that tend not to occur in the physical classroom.

In terms of the learning activities students were required to engage in, the survey data clearly shows that the classroom was the preferred environment in which to engage in such activities.

	S5	S9	S21	S22	S24	S25
Median	2.000	3.000	5.000	4.000	4.000	3.000
Std. Deviation	1.397	1.505	1.074	1.210	1.247	1.416
Coefficient of variation	0.537	0.470	0.224	0.318	0.356	0.430

From Table 4 we can see that students strongly agreed with the statement that pairwork activities were most effective when conducted in the classroom (S21). Similarly, students also agreed (though not to the same extent as S21) that it was difficult to do pairwork activities in online classes (S24). Pairwork is central to the pedagogical approach used in my English Communication course. As a teacher, I know it is much easier, efficient, and more effective to do pairwork activities in the classroom. The technical issues in trying to replicate such activities online (camera/microphone not working; partner not appearing in breakout room; patchy internet connections; inability to provide instant assistance/feedback to students struggling with the activity; etc.) were a repeated source of frustration and annoyance. Clearly the students felt the same way as the responses in Table 4 show.

One of the supposed benefits of online learning is student autonomy; with prerecorded audio/visual material, students are able to access the material at their own convenience and thus learn at their 'own pace'. While there is some evidence for this in foreign language learning (Reinders, 2012; Nilson & Goodson, 2018), the students in this survey clearly did not think so. All of the seven online classes were recorded on Zoom and then the recording was made available to students via a link posted on the Moodle course page. Yet, students clearly did not avail of this resource. The median response for S5 (*For studying English, I rewatched recordings of online classes*) was two, 'strongly disagree'. Again, this is probably a reflection of the interactive nature of the English Communication class and the emphasis on pairwork. The pedagogical approach is essentially 'live'; it cannot be replicated in a recording. Hence, it is not surprising that students did not rewatch the online classes as there would be little pedagogical benefit in doing so.

5.3 Research Question 3

Are feedback and teacher support more accessible in the classroom or online?

The physical proximity of the teacher and the students in the same classroom should mean that students can question, talk with, or comment to the teacher easily and instantaneously. However, as Maher and King (2022) have highlighted, students may suffer from speaker anxiety brought on by the unfamiliarity of communicating in English in front of their peers. Hence, for some students the

relative anonymity afforded by online classes and the ability to communicate with the teacher on a one-to-one basis may prove more appealing.

Table 5: interactions with the teacher						
	S7	S8	S14	S18	S19	S23
Median	3.000	3.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
Std. Deviation	1.321	1.106	1.335	1.005	1.348	1.113
Coefficient of variation	0.425	0.404	0.359	0.231	0.356	0.247

The results from the survey tend to support this point of view. Unlike the more clearcut nature of the results in the other tables, in Table 5 these are a bit more nuanced. S7 (*I found it easier to use email, SMS or Moodle to consult with the teacher*) show that students were fairly neutral on this opinion, with a sizeable standard deviation of 1.321. Statements 19 (*It is easier to ask the teacher a question via email than to ask a question in public during class*), and 23 (*It is easier for the teacher to provide support to the students in face-to-face classes*) parse these differences a bit more closely, distinguishing between questioning the teacher and accessing his support. Students thought it was easier to ask questions online than in the public space of the classroom, though again there was a large standard deviation (1.348). Conversely, the students did consider the classroom as the more supportive environment as they perceived it as more conducive to the teacher facilitating students' learning. This may also reflect the immediacy of in-classroom feedback in that students can be assisted immediately should they have any issues with their language learning.

However, when it came to feedback, students also appreciated receiving it online (S18). This may be because online feedback is perceived as being more personalized, being tailored (and received) by each student individually, whereas feedback in the classroom tends to be more general, directed as it is towards the class as whole. Although it would prove somewhat challenging for the teacher, some form of combined in-class and online feedback would seem to be the preferred by students.

6. Conclusion

The Covid 19 pandemic resulted in an unprecedented adoption of different forms of pedagogy delivered via the internet. Universities and teachers had to hastily restructure their courses to suit online teaching. Concurrently, students went from a traditional classroom-based, interactive, social environment to a solitary situation where both learning and contact all took place through the internet. In an attempt to understand what this change meant for EFL education in Japan, this paper presented the findings from a small-scale survey of non-English majors at a Japanese university. The study

focused specifically on English classes that used a communicative language teaching (CLT) approach. The aim of the survey was to explore students' attitudes to both online and in-classroom communicative English language learning, and subsequently consider what implications these would have for student learning and teacher pedagogy.

This study found that students have a clear preference for classroom-based education. They considered it the more effective venue for learning communicative English. In comparison to online courses, the classroom greatly facilitated pairwork, peer interaction, the use of both linguistic and paralinguistic cues, and greater use of English. In terms of broader language learning, students again had a clear preference for the classroom. The expectations governing learning and appropriate behaviour in the classroom were undermined by the 'unbounded' nature of online learning. Similarly, the ease with which students could undertake pairwork activities in class contrasted noticeably with the difficulties they encountered with online classes. Finally, students noted the immediacy with which feedback could be given in the classroom and the ability to call on the teacher for support. However, students also appreciated receiving feedback online, particularly as it could be tailored for each student individually.

For teachers and educators, the results of this survey would suggest that (a) the classroom is the optimal environment for learning communicative language that emphasizes oral and aural activities for English acquisition; and (b) online platforms are best used as an ancillary resource that students can call upon for autonomous learning as well as providing opportunities to teachers for giving individualized feedback to students.

As we move towards a future that will be shaped by the advances in information technology, particularly AI, we should not lose sight of the value and effectiveness of the classroom.

References

- Abduh, M. (2021). Full-time Online Assessment during COVID -19 Lockdown: EFL Teachers' Perceptions, *Asian EFL Journal Research Articles*. 28(1), 1-21.
- Alhumaid, K., Ali, S., Waheed, A., Zahid, E., & Habes, M. (2020). COVID-19 & E-learning : Perceptions & attitudes of teachers towards e-learning acceptance in the developing countries. *Multicultural Education*, 6(2), 100-115.
- Carson, L. (2017). Second Language Use as a Threshold Concept: Reconceptualising Language Learning Journeys. *International Journal of Education*, 9(2), 34-43.

Chakraborty, P., Mittal, P., Gupta, M. S., Yadav, S., & Arora, A. (2021). Opinion of students on online education during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 3(3), 357-365.

Clandfield, L. & Hadfield, J. (2017). *Interaction online*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Croxton, R. A. (2014). The role of interactivity in student satisfaction and persistence in online learning. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 10(2), 314.

Ezra, O., Cohen, A., Bronshtein, A., Gabbay, H., & Baruth, O. (2021). Equity factors during the COVID-19 pandemic: Difficulties in emergency remote teaching (ERT) through online learning. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(6), 7657-7681.

Gloriez, P. (2022). Communicative language teaching and its implementation in online learning: The teachers' voice. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 7(1), 157-170.

Harsch, C., Mueller-Karabil, A., & Buchminskaia, E. (2021). Addressing the challenges of interaction in online language courses. *System*, 103, 102673.

Hockly, N. (2015). Developments in online language learning. *ELT Journal*, 69(3), 308-313.

Kalanzadeh, G. A., Mahnegar, F., Hassannejad, E., & Bakhtiarvand, M. (2013). The influence of EFL students' self-esteem on their speaking skills. *The International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 2(2), 77-84.

Li, B. (2022). Ready for online? Exploring EFL teachers' ICT acceptance and ICT literacy during COVID-19 in mainland China. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 60(1), 196-219.

Maher, K., & King, J. (2022). 'The Silence Kills Me.': 'Silence' as a Trigger of Speaking-Related Anxiety in the English-Medium Classroom. *English Teaching & Learning*, 46(3), 213-234.

Moorhouse, B. L., & Kohnke, L. (2021). Responses of the English-language-teaching community to the COVID-19 pandemic. *RELC Journal*, 52(3), 359-378.

Nilson, L. B., & Goodson, L. A. (2018). *Online Teaching at Its Best: Merging Instructional Design with Teaching and Learning Research*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA, USA, 228-229.

- Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement and the "laws" of statistics. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 15, 625-632.
- Nguyen, H. U. N., & Duong, L. N. T. (2021). The challenges of e-learning through Microsoft Teams for EFL students at Van Lang University in COVID-19. *AsiaCALL Online Journal*, 12(4), 18-29.
- Octaberlina, L. R., & Muslimin, A. I. (2020). EFL students' perspective towards online learning barriers and alternatives using Moodle/Google Classroom during COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(6), 1-9.
- Qi, Q., Liao, L., & Zhao, C. G. (2021). I Didn't Even Know if My Students Were in Class: Challenges of Teaching English Speaking Online. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 18(4), 1455.
- Rahmawati, R., Sihombing, C., Ginting, E. K. B., & Arimonnaria, E. (2021). The effect of e-learning on students speaking skill progress: A case of the seventh grade at SMP Pencawan Medan. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 7(1), 69-78.
- Reinders, H. (Ed.). (2012). *Digital games in language learning and teaching*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Seely Brown, J., & Adler, R. P. (2008). Open education, the long tail, and learning 2.0. *Educause review*, 43(1), 16-20.
- Shin, M., & Hickey, K. (2021). Needs a little TLC: Examining college students' emergency remote teaching and learning experiences during COVID-19. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(7), 973-986.
- Sun, S. Y. H. (2011). Online language teaching: The pedagogical challenges. *Knowledge management & E-Learning*, 3(3), 428.

Tadesse, S., & Muluye, W. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on education system in developing countries: a review. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(10), 159-170.

Walter, D., & Schenker, T. (2022). Surviving or Thriving? Experiences and job satisfaction of language instructors in the USA during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 2(11), 1-14.

Zhang, C., Yan, X., & Wang, J. (2021). EFL teachers' online assessment practices during the COVID-19 pandemic: Changes and mediating factors. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30, 499-507.

Appendix

English version of the survey statements.

2021 English Communication Survey Questions

Q	Category	Question
1	English Study	It is easier to learn English conversation in a face-to-face classroom than online.
2	Online	I prefer face-to-face classes.
3	Learning Env't	Face-to-face classes are easier to understand than online classes.
4	English Study	I use more English in face-to-face classes than online classes.
5	Activities	For studying English, I rewatched recordings of online classes.
6	Online	Time passes quicker in an online class than in a face-to-face class.
7	Teacher	I found it easier to use email, SMS or Moodle to consult with the teacher.
8	Teacher	It is easier to understand the teacher's explanations in an online class.
9	Activities	Wearing a mask makes it hard to practice speaking English.
10	English Study	Learning to communicate in English online is important.
11	Online	For me it is easier to interact with my classmates online.
12	Learning Env't	Online classes are a better way to learn a language.
13	Learning Env't	I feel that face-to-face classes are a more natural way to learn a language.
14	Teacher	Teachers spend more time talking online than in the classroom.
15	Learning Env't	Focusing on learning is more difficult during online classes.
16	Learning Env't	Face-to-face classes create an environment where it is easy to concentrate on learning.
17	Learning Env't	Face-to-face classes suit my learning style.
18	Teacher	Online feedback from the teacher was helpful.
19	Teacher	It is easier to ask the teacher a question via email than to ask a question in public during class.
20	English Study	I enjoyed learning English online.
21	Activities	For English communication, pairwork in face-to-face classes is best.
22	Activities	I was able to actively participate in online classes.
23	Teacher	It is easier for the teacher to provide support to the students in face-to-face classes.
24	Activities	It is difficult to do pairwork activities in online classes.
25	Activities	Typing English on a keyboard is easier than writing it by hand.
26	English Study	I think the quality of English education is higher in face-to-face classes.
27	English Study	I learned English better in online classes than in face-to-face classes.
28	Online	I had technical problems during the online class.
29	Online	Exams conducted online are fair.
30	Online	It is easier to cheat in online exams.