論文：

Student Conversation or Student Communication:
Student Responses to Online Learning
During the COVID-19 Pandemic

REBSTOCK Jim

"It is not only the teacher/instructor who determines the quality of the learning experience. We shouldn't forget that learning is an interaction. Because learning is an interaction, students are also part of the equation."

Abstract:

This paper is a case study and literature review of pandemic pedagogies- efforts made by teachers and learning institutions all over the world to provide education to students in the middle of a dangerous pandemic and global emergency. Issues discussed are conversation versus communication, dialogue versus conversation, social isolation, learning communities, technological issues, and the differences between ERT and online learning. We hope to show that efforts made by teachers should be appreciated. We also want to call attention to the fallacy that treating education during a global crisis as "normal" is not normal, and the extra effort involved by everyone, students, families, educators, administrators and staff should be recognized as extraordinary.

Keywords

ERT; Online learning; learning communities; student-centered lessons; flipped classroom; asynchronous lessons; social isolation; dialogue; communication

Introduction

As the world enters 2021 still in the grips of a highly contagious, potentially lethal pandemic, students all over the world are forced into less-than-ideal learning situations. Affouneh et al estimate that the children and youth of 188 countries have been affected by school closures due to COVID-19 (2020). But so are teachers. In fact, no one was prepared for this pandemic, and virtually no one was trained for it, especially the students (Kirschner and Neelen, 2020; Zhang, 2020; Zhang et al, 2020; Nartingrum and Nugroho, 2020; Costa et al, 2020.) So how have students responded to education under pandemic conditions? This case study documents attempts to create inclusive, student-centered courses in a remote learning environment at a university in Japan, and how students have responded.

First, we should establish what educators have been doing. There was a rush in 2020 to label educational efforts in the time of the pandemic as "online learning." Administrators and politicians, and even some educators, have tried to cast this as education continuing as normally as possible. Which has led students to complain that they are not getting their "normal" educational experience. Some educators have pushed back against this idea, pointing out that what is being done in response to a global catastrophe is not "normal" and should not be considered "normal," but rather is an emergency response (Schlesselman, 2020; Mohmmed et al, 2020; Hodges et al, 2020). The difference between Emergency Remote Teaching and online teaching has been the subject of many papers. A search of Google Scholar for papers since 2020 on "difference between ERT and online teaching" returns "About 1410 results." [Full disclosure: I did not read all 1410 articles.]

ERT vs. Online Learning

Hodges et al (2020) define online education as courses that are planned well in advance of implementation, usually six to nine months, quite often by committees, with careful attention to content, modality, pedagogy, feedback, communication, and students' and educators' roles; in other words, typically a course considered from a great many angles, if not all, with input from faculty and administration, planned almost a year before being offered publicly. Wright states that "well-rounded lessons with suitable activities and proof of participation should be devised" for online courses (2017). Gurung and Stone state, "Synchronous lectures designed to keep to the same days and times as face-to-face instruction were a major factor distinguishing ERT from traditional online education, which tends to use asynchronous lecturing, (if any) for the purpose of allowing learners to get content on their own schedules" (2020).

Emergency Remote Teaching, (ERT) on the other hand, is "a temporary shift of instructional delivery to an alternate delivery mode due to crisis circumstances" (Hodges, et al, 2020). Article after article makes the same statement that the switch to emergency distance or remote teaching was stressful and difficult for everyone because of its suddenness (Roy and Covelli, 2020; Ranellucci and Bergey, 2020; Swartwood, 2020; Nartiningrum and Nugroho, 2020; Zhang, et al, 2020; Gurung and Stone, 2020; Costa et al, 2020, Kirschner and Neelen, 2020; Fryling, 2020). Aguilera-Hermida (2020) makes the point that students should not confuse online learning and emergency online learning. "Face-to-face education has an overall ecosystem designed to support learners," (Aguilera-Hermida, 2020). Roy and Covelli (2020) report how faculty at their university had to adapt quickly "to replicate the in-class experience … to the online format." According to them, the emergency transition to remote learning did not give faculty enough time to focus on community building with the students. Bai et al (2020) states, "Remote instruction has a long way to go in terms of incorporating principles of instructional design to improve student outcomes." Zhang (2020) complains that "there is no way to evaluate the effectiveness of emergency remote teaching." But as Fryling (2020) points out, online education is different from in-person education. In fact, this issue is not new. Wright pointed out in a 2017 article that "Instructors and students must take responsibility to engage fully in online teaching and learning opportunities." This was echoed

again in 2020 by Kirschner and Neelen when they said that both teachers and students "share responsibility for the level/quality of teaching and learning."

While the observation that students have to take responsibility for their learning is admirable, we need to go back to what Emergency Remote Teaching is. Hodges et al (2020) define teaching as "the concerted sharing of knowledge and experience." But they also caution that ERT and online learning are different and should not be compared directly. ERT is defined by its suddenness and emergency, temporary status. ERT courses are designed to be temporary. It is true that "Teaching is more than just delivering content" (Gurung and Stone, 2020). In 2017, Wright made the point about online teaching that simply uploading links is not enough. Bai et al (2020) says "Coronavirus has resulted in countless changes to the teaching and learning process in such a short period of time." But in this global catastrophe where we are all just trying to stay alive, it is important to remember that the very fact that teachers and schools are trying to offer any educational content is remarkable. As Kirschner and Neelen state, teachers deserve gratitude and respect (2020). Each ERT course represents more hours of labor and preparation from teachers than in-class courses (Gurung and Stone, 2020; Kaiper-Marquez et al, 2020). Watermeyer et al (2020) report that in trying to stay connected to their students in this time of crisis, educators are sacrificing "their right to work-life balance." Many of these programs are experimental, such as China's "Suspending Classes Without Stopping Learning" (Hodges et al, 2020; Zhang et al, 2020). Administrators, faculty and students need to stop pretending that everything is normal and that a "normal" experience is possible in the middle of a global crisis caused by a highly contagious, extremely dangerous virus. Everyone is scrambling to do the best that they can under the circumstances, including students.

Literature review

Even though online learning and ERT are different, student responses are similar. A 2014 study of online lessons of Chinese as a foreign language found that students reported procrastination was a problem, as well as lack of focus (Zhang). In 2017, Wright found that students found it challenging to study independently. A 2015 study by Al Zumor reported lower motivation and increased drop out rates among students online due to feelings of social isolation. Yu and Du reported that in online EFL classes, once students fell behind,

they had problems catching up (2019). In a 2018 study, participants in an online teacher education course complained of lack of social interaction (Hambacher et al).

Study after study conducted throughout 2020 around the world and across subjects report similar student complaints about ERT. Bai et al in China report less student interaction, engagement and understanding of lectures and less time spent on homework assignments (2020). Zhang, also in China, reported that participants claim there is "no learning atmosphere in online teaching-learning mode" (2020). Roy and Covelli (2020) in the United States found "students were less comfortable about the switch in modality despite having more experience taking online classes." They also found that 89% of students had trouble concentrating because of distraction. Most students in their study felt online classes (ERT) did not improve their social skills. Levels of social isolation increased and students missed personal interaction. Aguilera-Hermida (2020), also in the U.S. reported student motivation, self-efficacy and cognitive engagement decreased. Another study conducted in the U.S. by Gurung and Stone also found students reported that they read less, studied less, procrastinated more and were more nervous on tests (2020). Nartiningrum and Nugroho (2020) in Indonesia also found students reported lack of communication, social interaction, and motivation as well as being easily distracted from their studies. Watermeyer et al (2020) in the United Kingdom reported student social disconnection and warned that student mental health may suffer. Students in their study reported suffering from becoming disconnected from their studies and learning communities. Also in the U.K., students in a different study said that the quality of their lectures went down after the switch online and the majority of students felt a lack of motivation (Swartwood, 2020). Flynn and Noonan (2020) reported Irish students felt disconnected. Costa et al in Brazil, asked "Given that social isolation is necessary, how do we train nurses" in response to their students feeling isolated and needing well-developed social skills for their future jobs (2020). Two major complaints across studies were lack of reliable internet access and a skeptical attitude towards the effectiveness of online/distance learning/ERT (Zhang, 2020; Fryling, 2020; Zhang et al, 2020; Reich et al, 2020; Swartwood, 2020; Nartiningrum and Nugroho, 2020; Hodges et al, 2020; Williamson et al, 2020; Schuck and Lambert, 2020).

But there have been positives reported as well. Going back to the 1980's, Wedemayer, as reported in

Simonson et al stated, "some students felt that remote learning actually help them with their academic achievement... they could repeatedly review recorded class videos as well as focus better studying alone (1999). In that same article, Simonson et al described online learning as providing "independent, convenient environments that fit the learner and provide a sense of individuality and responsibility as major important characteristics of online learning" (1999). Moving forward in time, Meyer found that online classes have the advantages of allowing students to take their time to think and reflect to find and analyze more in-depth information and being better suited to more introverted students (2007). In 2017, Wright found a smaller number of students preferred online lessons because of speed and ease of completing online work, flexibility of time and place, self-pacing, motivational content of lessons, the novelty of studying online, and the fun of using the internet. A 2020 study of Korean college students found "that the online learning environment is comfortable and convenient to most students which can be an important element that positively affects academic achievement" (Shim and Lee). Students also reported that they could experience free communication in ERT because of chat rooms. The researchers reported, "students were also satisfied with the fact that remote learning (ERT) allowed them to reduce their commuting time to school." Swartwood, in the U.K., found that despite negatives such as lack of motivation and not wanting to study online because the students had to do everything else online, such as shopping and talking to family and friends, students felt the flexibility of time was positive. Students also enjoyed not having to travel to class (2020). An Indonesian study of EFL students found that while some students preferred in-class instruction, they also considered "online activities as effective and efficient ways in learning course content" (Nartiningrum and Nugroho, 2020). This study also found that female students preferred using computers to study more than male students. Their study showed that digital technology benefits vocabulary outcomes. Bawa, conducting a study in the U.S. says, "There was no evidence to suggest ERT environments led to lower performance grades" (2020). "The statistical results indicate that students performed equally or significantly higher when situated in the ERT environment." Correia and Silva in Portugal report that the majority of their students are satisfied with their online (ERT) experience. A large majority of students have a positive self-assessment and feel that they have improved their own study and work skills (2020).

One issue that educators face, from K-12 to higher education, even special education teachers of disabled students, is whether to introduce new material and skills, and hope the students can master the new material in less-than-ideal learning environments, or, to review and strengthen students' mastery of already learned skills and content. Reich et al compare the different approaches to this question taken by the individual states' education agencies in U.S. public schools (2020). The rationale behind trying to meet pre-pandemic academic goals and making "forward progress" is that by pushing as many students as possible forward, then there will be fewer students needing to make up lost ground after the crisis ends. On the other hand, states that choose an "enrichment and review" policy, hope that students emerge from the epidemic with new life skills or useful knowledge. It seems that the forward progress approach rests on acting as if everything is normal, whereas the enrichment approach seems to be more concerned with students' emotional and mental well-being. It should be pointed out that no state education agency advocates for a full six-to-eight-hour school day under ERT. As Bozkurt and Sharma point out, "We have to keep in mind that students will remember not the educational content delivered but how they felt during these hard times" (2020).

Then, what works with ERT? What is realistic for the faculty and beneficial to the students? When the majority of studies conducted in 2020 seem to indicate that students of all ages, around the world, and across subjects, prefer in-class, or face-to-face, lessons, what can be done in a crisis situation for which no one was prepared? We can acknowledge that students and teachers at all levels prefer being in the classroom under optimal, safe conditions (Bai et al, 2020; Roy and Covelli, 2020; Ranellucci and Bergey, 2020; Shim and Lee, 2020; Zhang, 2020; Fryling, 2020; Kirschner and Neelen, 2020; Zhang et al, 2020; Swartwood, 2020; Gurung and Stone, 2020; Williamson et al, 2020; Bawa, 2020; Costa et all, 2020; Watermeyer et all, 2020; and many others). But then, we have to acknowledge that at present, being in the classroom is dangerous and potentially deadly. Numerous studies listed social isolation, lack of connection to teachers and other students, and not understanding lesson material as student complaints. So, we can begin by addressing isolation and lack of connection. "Social interaction is a core component of learning," (Hambacher et al, 2020). "In the virtual environment, asynchronous online discussions are commonly used in hybrid and fully online courses as a way to facilitate student interaction

to supply students with social components." It has been noted that one of the problems of the transition from in-class lessons to ERT was the lack of time to build learning communities. Shim and Lee recommend using chat room communication (2020). Wright suggested in 2017 "incorporating, for instance, an online wall posting activity, viewable to all students," to promote "a sense of belonging". Hsieh et al use a flipped classroom model in their remote EFL course (2016) F-L-I-P refers to Flexible environment, Learning culture, Intentional content, and Professional educator (Hsieh et al, 2016). Students study learning material at their own pace, and the instructors encourage the use of subtitles in videos, for example, which the students can view repeatedly. This instructor also recommends students use subtitles on online videos, which they are able to watch as many times as they want. (Fryling relates how asynchronous material helped the transition to ERT, and how designing a flipped classroom-style course maintained 90% attendance (2020). A flipped classroom is simply assigning material for the students to study on their own, and then working through activities based on that material in the classroom, often in groups. It is the opposite of students listening to a lecture in class and then reinforcing what was learned in class with homework activities. Swartwood suggests offering asynchronous classes with flexible deadlines and even a choice between synchronous and asynchronous classes and activities (2020). Many students in that study reported that they liked that they could re-watch videos on their own time, at their own pace. In Nartiningrum and Nugroho's Indonesian study, students asked for asynchronous assignments, mainly due to technical/access issues. Some students wanted synchronous video conferencing so that they could get faster responses from their teachers. But, they did note, "Although some teachers have tried to add the experience of direct interaction by utilizing video conferences in their online classes (ERT), it still cannot substitute for the real-life communication" (2020). In fact, there are a number of studies already out studying technology exhaustion, what is being called "Zoom fatigue" (Wang and East, 2020). And while students complain of a lack of interaction and contact, it is the students who refuse or are reluctant to turn on their cameras during video conferencing (Kirschner and Neelen, 2020; Shim and Lee, 2020). This educator has had the same experience multiple times working with university students remotely. An added complication is that students who do not know each other, refuse to speak to each other or work together on group assignments or discussion topics in break out rooms

during synchronous video conference lessons. Howley recommends using activities that are collaborative, and are minimally digitally reliant (2020). The instructor should act as facilitator and not lecturer. Bawa (2020) advises keeping class learning materials and assignments as close to the original as possible. Major and Calandrino use micro-learning, or more simply, keep their lessons and class videos short (2020).

But this brings us back to the issue of trying to teach new material and keep forward progress, or enrich and review. With a flipped classroom design, and a combination of synchronous and asynchronous lessons and activities, forward progress seems theoretically possible. However, many educators seem to be trying to replicate their face-to-face classes exactly using synchronous video conferencing. But studies have reported how the video conferencing does not allow the same emotional connection or interaction that face-to-face exchanges allow (Schuck and Lambert, 2020; Bozkurt and Sharma, 2020). Al Zumor recommends "frequent, regular, and meaningful contact" between students and instructors to humanize the remote learning environment (2020). Zhang (2014) states that using critical reflection builds personal empowerment. Kaiper-Marquez et al recommend using mini lessons. Keep lessons short, around two minutes, especially if they are videos (2020). They used National Geographic content to interest students. This educator also uses National Geographic content to try to connect students to the "outside world". Brooke (2020) uses questions as feedback, which students do not find as harsh as comments correcting their work. It also serves to encourage communication between instructor and student.

One of the advantages of remote online teaching is the flexibility of offering synchronous lessons in real time, and asynchronous activities and assignments that students can access at their convenience. Ray and Covelli report faculty at their school used "Both synchronous and asynchronous modalities were used for content delivery" (2020). They continue, "Use of asynchronous sessions, on the other hand, was primarily driven by an intent to provide flexibility to students". Yu and Du report that blended learning, a combination of synchronous lessons & asynchronous online listening practice promotes positive results in a content-based EFL course (2020). Baran and Alzoubi implemented a more student-centered, flexible course with regular, personalized emails to students. "To establish the social presence, we incorporated several asynchronous activities, including

online discussions and peer feedback" (2020). Hodges et al, Swartwood, Bawa, and Al Zumor recommend relaxing grading standards (all 2020). Oxford University has cancelled most exams of first-year students and passed these students due to the global pandemic. Some schools have implemented No Detriment policies. These are temporary grading policies that allow students to freeze their grades, so their GPA is not harmed if they should have problems during the pandemic. Students receive a simple pass or fail for the course credit (Gamage et al, 2020). Hodges et al suggest giving pass/fail options instead of letter grades during the pandemic (2020).

Student Responses

Two classes of English conversation students in Japan were asked to self-report in a university discussion forum how long they studied English every week since going remote. The students were also asked whether they preferred face-to-face English conversation classes or remote classes during the pandemic. Each class had 18 first year respondents, which admittedly is not enough for a real sample, nor was it randomly selected. One class had an average study time of four hours per week, the other class reported an average of 3-4 hours per week study time. Each first-year student is enrolled in two English classes per week. The second question, whether the students preferred face-to-face classes or remote classes during the pandemic got interesting results. The two classes had exactly opposite responses. In one class of 18 students, 12 students reported they preferred remote classes, and six students preferred face-to-face classes. The other class, 12 students preferred face-to-face classes, and six students preferred remote. They gave pretty standard reasons for their preferences. One example said, "I prefer to take classes face-to-face because I can concentrate on class more." Understanding the class better, asking questions, and making friends were also given as reasons. "I prefer to take classes online because my house is far from [the university]," was given as a reason for preferring remote instruction. Most of the respondents who chose remote listed the danger from COVID-19 as the reason.

Two different classes of students in two different English conversation classes were asked How they are using technology during the pandemic, and do they like distraction and checking social media and being online. One is a class of 13 first-year students, the other is a class of five upper-year students. The first-year students answered that nine of them are using video conferencing

(Zoom) for classes, and 13 are using the university platform (Moodle) for studying and classes. Students reported being new to video conferencing and not having heard of the particular service before. Five students report submitting homework electronically, which is new for them, and one student submits homework to the school office. The upper-year students reported only the types of devices they were using, four using computers, two using smart phones, with one of the students using both, which is what was reported in Shim and Lee's study conducted in Korea (2020). Eleven of the first-year students responded to the social media/distraction question. Ten students do not check social media when they are busy. Six students like distraction, so they make a point of not being distracted, for example signing onto social media, when they are busy. One student checks social media all the time. "I'm checking social media every day. I want to know my favorite youtuber information. I will start something I have to do, when I finished checking social media." Of the upper-year students, three responded, none of them like distraction, but one admitted to surfing online.

Three Academic English classes, two with first-year students, and a third class with upper-year students were asked, "How much time do you spend every day reading articles (such as from your textbook) on your phone or other device?" One class of freshmen with 32 respondents answered:

- 0-5 minutes- 9 students
- 10 minutes- 8 students
- 20 minutes- 6 students
- 30 minutes- 9 students

The second class of freshmen had 23 respondents:
- 0-5 minutes- 9 students
- 10 minutes- 4 students
- 20 minutes- 2 students
- 30 minutes- 6 students
- 1 hour- 2 students

The third class made up of upper-year students had 21 respondents:
- 0-5 minutes- 11 students
- 10 minutes- 2 students
- 20 minutes- 0 students
- 30 minutes- 7 students
- 1 hour- 0 students
- 2 hours- 1 student

*By contrast, without belaboring the point, self-reported times spent watching videos, playing video games, and texting friends were measured in hours per individual respondent.

In English conversation classes, the attempt to create a wall posting-type discussion group was made. Discussion groups were divided up in each class and limited to 3-4 students. Students were allowed to choose their own groups. The instructor posted discussion questions from the course textbook and established rules for interacting. One of the rules was not to make fun of each other. Another rule was that students had to read the other group members' answers and ask a question to each member. If the student was asked a question, the student had to reply. All exchanges had to be in English. One first-year English conversation class had a group that followed the rules and had a recognizable dialogue. None of the rest of the groups was able to manage sustaining a dialogue between students. Students were very good about answering instructor's questions, but not so good at communicating with each other. A sample exchange:

Instructor: Have you ever done an extreme sport? If so, which one?

Student#1: No, I haven't.

Student#2: Do you want to do that? [responding to student #1]

Student#1: No, I don't.

Student#2: No, I haven't. [responding to instructor]

Student#3: Yes, I have. I played winter sports such as skiing and snowboarding. [responding to instructor]

Student#1: Were you exciting when you played it?

Instructor: Were you excited when you played it? [correcting student#1]

(you are excited when you do something)

(the sport is exciting)

Student#1 corrects post: Were you excited when you played it?

Student#1: Thank you for pointing out an error.

Student #3 did not respond to student#1's question.

A more representative sample might be:

Instructor: How do you communicate with friends and family? [the question is referring to devices and apps]

Student #1: I use the line to tell by message or phone.

Student #2: A family and the classmate meet directly and talk.

I may use a line at the time of urgent tasks.

Quite often when I ask the students to ask each other questions in the discussion forum, I get a response

like this:

Instructor: Explain to us how to use something on your phone- your favorite function or app.

Student : How to use something on your phone is tapping or slide the screen on the phone.

Q. Do you think the phone is very useful?

[No student responded.]

These are sample student responses. The aim of this paper is to give an overview of student responses to ERT. As the instructor I have to admit that as research was done for this article and I saw more possibilities of online engagement with students, different activities were put into action. Had I started the semester dividing up students into smaller posting groups for the discussion questions, the results might have been more successful. As it is, timed quizzes and activities during synchronous lessons were utilized from the beginning of the semester to satisfy attendance requirements of the school. Hambacher et al make the point, "dialogue is distinct from the more balanced reciprocity of conversation." They continue, "asynchronous dialogue in text-based online learning environments is useful" (2018).

Discussion

There has been a rush to put classes online all over the world. One point that was made repeatedly about the panicked rush to use video conferencing in the remote classrooms is that not all students have access to reliable internet connection (Zhang, 2020; Fryling, 2020; Zhang et al, 2020; Reich et al, 2020; Swartwood, 2020; Nartiningrum and Nugroho, 2020; Hodges et al, 2020; Williamson et al, 2020; Schuck and Lambert, 2020). But more to the point, not all students are "well connected, digitally savvy 'digital natives'" (Williamson et al, 2020). In fact, one of the complaints made by Japanese university students has been that they do not know how to use the university learning platform, or even how to operate a well-designed, easy-to-use website that accompanies the course textbook. Yet every Japanese university student who I have taught for the last several years, is in possession of a smart phone. And it is a challenge noted by various authors, including this one, to get the students to turn off and put away their devices in face-to-face classrooms. One of the complaints made by students around the world is that they are distracted during remote lessons, in part by their devices and platforms such as social media, and their friends texting (Kirschner and Neelen, 2020; Flynn

and Noonan, 2020). "Williamson et al state, "technology cannot fix social inequality." They also point out that "technology is not a neutral entity that simply does good when people have access to it" (2020). Bozkurt and Sharma say in their introduction in the 15th volume of Asian Journal of Distance education, "another flaw in current practices is the huge investments and high trust placed in merely technology-enhanced learning process." They continue, "technology is a tool, not an end; and the right approach should not be learning from technology, but rather with technology" (2020). There is a concern that edtech companies are using the global crisis of the pandemic to strongarm learning institutions into buying expensive technology packages for online learning based on soon outdated technology that will cost even more money to update (Williamson et al, 2020). There is another concern, also raised by Williamson et al, that by "digitalizing, packaging and platformizing" educational content, entire populations of children and young people around the world are being permanently excluded from education.

Which brings us back to Japanese students. Kawamura, while recommending using media sources in the EFL classroom, points out, "The Japanese educational system is mostly teacher-centered and students are still considered to be passive in their learning." The researcher goes on to stress that Japanese students are passive in their learning and expect to be told what to do by teachers. They also expect to listen to lectures. "Students are not accustomed to expressing their opinions and openly discussing social issues" (2017). Which is why teachers and administrators in Japan in particular, who are not experienced with online or remote learning, feel so strongly about using video conferencing in their lessons. It allows instructors to recreate their in-class curriculum, including lectures, much as they were pre-pandemic. However, Green et al make the point that "A shift into breakout rooms has the potential to be a harrowing participant experience if not managed well" (2020). Not all students have equal access to the internet or devices, even here in Japan. It is challenging to have to teach students a new way to approach their learning, and to teach them to take responsibility for their own learning. Gurung and Stone say clearly, "Learning online can be challenging in general, especially if it is new to students who were expecting a face-to-face experience" (2020). However, it should be pointed out, that not all students take part in in-class lessons equally. Wright, (2017), states, "it is worth bearing in mind that similar concerns may exist in face-to-face lessons, and shy

students may not necessarily ask for elucidation when surrounded by peers." Hambacher et al makes a similar point. "Whereas in a face-to-face classroom discussion it is common for some students to remain on the periphery, the online setting provides an entry point for students who do not readily speak in class" (2018). This is an issue facing the Japanese education system now; how to reconcile the passivity of Japanese students and teacher-centered learning with the desire of administrators to appear to be future-facing technology-wise, especially in the face of future global crises. As Schuck and Lambert point out, expectations of teaching and learning are not always aligned (2020). "Education is not one thing and is not experienced in the same way" by everyone (Williamson et al, 2020).

References

Affouneh, S., Sahla, S. & Khlaif, Z.N. (2020). Designing quality e-learning environments for emergency remote teaching in coronavirus crisis. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Virtual Learning in Medical Sciences, 11(2)*, 135-137.

Aguilera-Hermida, A. P. (2020). College students' use and acceptance of emergency online learning due to COVID-19. *International Journal of Research Open.* 10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.10001

Al Zumor, A.W.Q. (2015). Quality matters rubric potential for enhancing online foreign language education. *International Education Studies, 8(4)*, 173-178.

Bai, X., Ola, A., Reese, S., Eyob, E., & Bazemore, S. (2020). A study of the effectiveness of remote instruction from students' perspectives. *Issues in Information Systems, 21(4)*, 143-155; 10.48009/4_iis_2020_143-155

Baran, E. & Alzoubi, D. (2020). Human-centered design as a frame for transition to remote teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education; 28(2)*, 365-372.

Bawa, P. (2020). Learning in the age of SARS-COV-2: a quantitative study of learners' performance in the age of emergency remote teaching. *Computers and Education Open, 1(2020)*; 10.1016/j.caeo.2020.100016

Bozkurt, A. & Sharma,R.C. (2020) Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to coronavirus pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*,

15(1), i-vi.

Brooke, M. (2020). Seeking to reduce physical distancing using socratic dialogue in teacher feedback. *International Journal of TESOL Studies, 2(3)*, 32-40; 10.46451/ijts.2020.09.16

Correia, M. & silva, P.S. (2020). Higher education polytechnic students' perdpectives on the transition to emergency remote teaching. http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2733/paper28.pdf

Costa, R., Lino, M. M., de Souza, A. I. J., Lorenzini, E., Fernandes, G. C. M., Brehmer, L. C. F., Vargas, M. A. O., Locks, M. E. H., & Goncalves, N. (2020) Nursing teaching in COVID-19 times: How to reinvent it in this context? *Texto Contexto Enferm (Internet) 2020.* Retrieved October 23, 2020.10.1590/1980-265X-TCE-2020-0002-0002

Flynn, S. & Noonan, G. (2020). Mind the gap: Academic staff experiences of remote teaching during the COVID-19 emergency. *AISHE-J, 12(3)*, 1-19.

Fryling, M. (2020). From flipped, to flipping out, to mostly sunny: how the flipped classroom model made the move to emergency remote learning less stormy. *Issues in Information Systems, 21(1)*, 281-289; 10.48009/1_iis_2020_281-289

Gamage, K.A.A., de Silva, E.K., & Gunawardhana, N. (2020). Online delivery and assessment during COVID-19: Safeguarding academic integrity. *Education Sciences, 10(301)*, 1-24;10.3390/edusci10110301

Gamage, K.A.A., Wijesuriya, D.I., Ekanayake, S.Y., Rennie, A.E.W., Lambert, C.G., & Gunawardhana, N. (2020). Online delivery of teaching and laboratory practices: continuity of university programmes during COVID-19 pandemic. *Education Sciences, 10(291)*, 1-9;10.3390/edusci10100291

Green, J.K., Burrow, M.S., & Carvalho, L. (2020). Designing for transition: supporting teachers and students cope with emergency remote education. *Postdigital Science and Education, (2020)*2, 906-922; 10.1007/s42438-020-00185-6

Gurung, R.A.R. & Stone, A.M. (2020). You can't always get what you want and it hurts: learning during the pandemic. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*; 10.1037/stl0000236

Hambacher, E., Ginn, K. & Slater, K. (2018). From serial monologue to deep dialogue: designing online discussions to facilitate student learning in teacher education courses. *Action in Teacher Education*, 1-14;

10.1080/01626620.2018.1486753

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. Educause Review, 27 March. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning.

Howley, I. (2020). Adapting guided inquiry learning worksheets for emergency remote learning. *Journal of Information and Learning Sciences, 121(7/8)*, 549-557; 10.1108/ILS-04-202-0086

Hsieh, J.S.C., Wu, W.C.V., & Marek, M.W. (2016). Using the flipped classroom to enhance EFL learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*; 10.1080/09588221.2015.1111910

Kaiper-Marquez, A., Wolfe, E., Clymer, C., Lee, J., McLean, E.G., Prins, E., & Stickel, T. (2020). On the fly: adapting quickly to emergency remote instruction in a family literacy programme. *International Review of Education*, 2020; 10.1007/s1159-020-09861-y

Kawamura, M. (2017). Authentic information as topics for social awareness and language learning: integrating online multimedia into college-level EFL courses in Japan. *CALL-EJ, 18(2)*, 54-65

Kirschner, P. A. & Neelen, M. (2020, November 5). *EMERGENCY ONLINE TEACHING ≠ ONLINE LEARNING*. 3-Star learning experiences. https://3starlearningexperiences.wordpress.com/2020/11/05/emergency-online-teaching-%E2%89%A0-online-learning/

Major, A. & Calandrino, T. (2018) Beyond chunking: micro-learning secrets for effective online design. *FDLA Journal, 3(1)*13, 1-4.

Meyer, K.A. (2007). Student perceptions of face-to-face and online discussions: the advantage goes to… *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 11(4)*, 53-69.

Mohmmed, A.O., Khidhir, B.A., Nazeer, A., & Vijayan, V.J. (2020). Emergency remote teaching during coronavirus pandemic: the current trend and future directive at Middle East College Oman. *Innovative Infrastructure Solutions, 5(72)*, 1-11; 10.1007/s41062-020-00326-7

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.

Ranellucci, J. & Bergey, B.W. (2020). Using motivation design principles to teach screencasting in online teacher education courses. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 28(2)*,393-401.

Reich, J., Buttimer, C.J., Fang, A., Hillaire, G., Hirsch, K., Larke, L., Littenberg-Tobias, J., Moussapour, R., Napier, A., Thompson, M., Slama, R. (2020). Remote learning guidance from state education agencies during the COVID-19 pandemic: a first look. Retrieved from: osf.io/k6zky/

Roy, S. & Covelli, B. (2020). COVID-19 induced transition from classroom to online mid semester: case study on faculty and students' preferences and opinions. *Higher Learning Research Communications, 11(0)*, 10-32; 10.18870/hirc.v11i0.1197

Schlesselman, L.S. (2020). Perspective from a teaching and learning center during emergency remote teaching. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, May 2020*, ajpe8142; 10.5688/ajpe8142

Schuck, R.K. & Lambert, R. (2020). "Am I doing enough?" Special educators' experiences with emergency remote teaching in spring 2020. *Education Sciences,10(320)*, 1-15;10.3390/edusci10110320

Shim, T.E., & Lee, S.Y. (2020). College students' experience of emergency remote teaching due to COVID-19. *Children and Youth Services Review, 119(2020) 105578*; 10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105578

Simonson, M., Schlosser, C., & Hanson, D. (1999). Theory and distance education: a new discussion. *American Journal of Distance Education, 13(1)*, 60-75.

Swartwood, D. (2020). The struggles students experienced with remote learning. https://sites.psu.edu/das202c/files/2020/06/DanaFormalReport.pdf

Wang, D. & East, M. (2020). Constructing an emergency Chinese curriculum during the pandemic: a New Zealand experience. *International Journal of Chinese Language Teaching, 1(1)*, 1-19; 10.46451/ijclt.2020.06.01

Watermeyer, R., Crick, T., Knight, C., & Goodall, J. (2020). COVID-19 and digital disruption in UK universities: afflictions and affordances of emergency online migration. *Higher Education*; 10.1007/s10734-

020-00561-y

Williamson, B., Eynon, R., & Potter, J. (2020). Pandemic politics, pedagogies and practices: digital technologies and distance education during the coronavirus emergency. *Learning, Media and Technology, 45(2)*, 107-114; 10.1080/17439884.2020.1761641

Wright, B.M. (2017). Blended learning: student perceptions of face-to-face and online EFL lessons. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7(1)*, 64-71; 10.17509/ijal.v7i1.6859

Yu, W. & Du, X. (2019). Implementation of a blended learning model in content-based EFL curriculum. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies, 14(5)*, 188-199; 10.3991/ijet.v14i05.8546

Zhang, S. (2014). An evidence -based practical guide to designing and developing Chinese-as-a-foreign-language (CFL) courses online. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning, 10(1)*, 52-71.

Zhang, T. (2020). Learning from the emergency remote teaching-learning in China when primary and secondary schools were disrupted by COVID-19 pandemic. *Education Faculty Publications*. 101. https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/education_publications/101; 10.21203/rs.3.rs-40889/v1

Zhang, W., Wang, Y., Yang, L., & Wang, C. (2020). Suspending classes without stopping learning: China's education emergency management policy in the COVID-19 outbreak. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 13(55)*, 1-6; 10.3390/jrfm13030055