LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING IN EMERGENCY REMOTE TEACHING: ARE LEARNERS REALLY ENGAGED?

Le Thanh Ha*, Vu Phuong Hong Ngoc, Truong Thi Thanh Canh

Foreign Trade University campus in Ho Chi Minh city
15 D5 street, ward 25, Binh Thanh district, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam

Abstract: This study analyzed the students' engagement in emergency remote teaching (ERT) environment as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. The subjects were 49 business-majored students at a university in Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam. The research was drawn upon Moore's interaction framework with the adoption of a 5-Likert scale questionnaire to examine learner-content, learner-learner and learner-instructor engagement. Open-ended questions at the end of the survey and videos synchronous classroom observations from four lessons provided insights into students' perceptions and behaviors. The quantitative result reveals learner-instructor engagement to be the strongest among the three categories, and the lack of interaction with their peers was the most frequently observed and reported. The fundamental cause lies in the loss and lack of human interactions. The engagement of both learner-learner and learner-instructor were dwarfed by superficial interaction in synchronous learning platforms. The paper ends with some recommendations to increase students' learning engagement in the uncertain times of ERT.

Keywords: emergency remote teaching, engagement, synchronous teaching

1. Introduction

The spread of Covid -19 has caused a global hazard to all facets of society, including the education system. This threat has resulted in the lockdown or social distancing crisis in many nations. Therefore, educators and parents are forced to devise new teaching methods to keep their students engaged. Sharing the similar belief, Hodges et al. (2020) claim that Covid-19 has forced colleges and universities to decide how to continue with their programmes while keeping their staff, faculty and students safe from the pandemic. As a result, these institutions have opted to cancel their face-to-face classes and move to online platforms. This sudden change is known as Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT). ERT is an alternative, temporary method of teaching that is evolved in response to a specific crisis situation and thus strictly differs from typical distance education (Wang et al., 2020).

In Vietnam, even though it is considered a notable case study of instantaneous and conspicuous collaboration between the government and society to minimize the cases of Covid-19 (La et al., 2020), the shift in the educational system was unforeseen and caused significant side effects (MOET, 2020). During the

---

* Corresponding author.
  Email address: lethanhha.cs2@ftu.edu.vn

pandemic, Vietnam enforced a national lockdown, and educational institutions were the firsts to face closure at a short notice from the government. Schools closed from January to May in the first lock down in 2020, then at the beginning of a new academic year, institutions were forced to close for the second half of August, 2020. The situation continued to the year 2021. Administrators, faculty, and students have been adapting themselves to the novel online learning and stumbling upon unpredictable obstacles, varying from digital literacy and digital divide to digital readiness (Shim & Lee, 2020).

In online learning, engagement is crucial as it is the indicator of student motivation, satisfaction and performance. Student engagement plays a crucial role in students' learning and satisfaction in distance education (Martin & Bolliger, 2018). It is even more important during the time of lockdown and social distancing when social isolation and the lack of interactivity is inevitable. In an online learning environment, interactions that students have with materials, peers and teachers ensure positive learner experience and thus engagement becomes the indicator of successful online teaching.

During ERT, several factors played their roles in the level of student engagement. In the context of Saudi Arabia, interaction with teachers and peers were evident with a high level of satisfaction and engagement in a research by Oraif and Elyas (2021). In other contexts, the results were rather mixed. Deka (2021) conducted a quantitative analysis with Indian tertiary students and concluded that the strongest influence on online engagement was related to instructor characteristics. In addition, Ali, Narayan, and Sharma (2020) revealed through New Zealand teachers' reflective statements that the use of synchronous and asynchronous channels proactively supported learning, yet frustrations with

online technology and insufficient inter-personal connection hindered students' engagement level.

To follow the guidance from the Ministry of Education and Training, which can be translated as "Suspending Classes without Suspending Learning" (MOET, 2020), all language classes have been moved online. In Vietnam, the situation was rather less satisfying. Language students showed dissatisfaction towards ERT in terms of teaching methodology (Thach et al., 2021), and limited interaction (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2021). This study aims at providing further details towards student engagement in synchronous learning in one class during ERT by analyzing a wide range of instruments including a questionnaire, online classroom observation notes and in-depth interviews. The research question that guided this study is:

How engaged were students in learning English as a second language in emergency remote teaching?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Online Learning vs ERT

During national lockdown, many Vietnamese educational institutions have opted to implement the quick transformation of face-to-face classes to an online learning platform which is known as emergency remote learning. However, online learning and ERT are different in terms of instructional design and course design. Online learning is characterized by careful instructional design and planning and systematic models for design and development (Branch & Dousay, 2015). Hodges et al. (2020) emphasized the design process and careful consideration of different design decisions which have an impact on the quality of the instruction; therefore, types of interactions – namely student-content, student-student, student – instructor are the more robust bodies of

research in online learning.

ERT, to some extent, differs from online learning. ERT is a temporary shift of instructional delivery to an alternate delivery mode due to crisis circumstances, which is in contrast with experiences that are well planned from the beginning and designed to be online (Hodges et al., 2020). These authors assess ERT with the terms of delivery modes, methods, and media.

In May, 2020, Shisley published his research paper influenced by Hodges et al. (2020), Craig (2020) and Manfuso (2020) on major differences between online learning and ERT. Technology integrated in ERT might be limited. This can include both the lack of access to computers or a stable internet connection and/ or educational software or learning management system. The users – teachers and students alike – possess minimum technical skills and run short of digital literacy training prior to online learning. Learning activities are often the imitations of what happens in a face-to-face learning environment and teachers have no training in online teaching methodology as well as have little time for preparations. All aforementioned issues may result in less-than-optimal engagement and interaction circumstances.

In short, although emergency remote learning may take place online and share similar components as online learning, it differs from its counterpart regarding purposes, design, teaching modes, technological competence and level of interactions.

2.2. Learners' Engagement and Online Learning

Engagement is an emerging variable of interest that captures the attention of researchers in both learning psychology and language education. As motivation, engagement and achievement are closely linked together, improving learner engagement becomes a fundamental process of teaching and learning. Engagement is defined as "the extent to which students are interested in, committed and curious about what they are learning" (Finn & Zimmer, 2012, p. 18). Engagement is outward manifestation of motivation (Skinner et al., 2009), which is linked to generally improved attention, participation and involvement in language learning (Liu, 2021) and mediated positive correlation between classroom emotional climate and grades (Rivers et al., 2013).

Engagement and online learning is particularly important as it is harder for the teachers to control or observe students' behaviors. Successful student engagement is presented via their personal involvement with their peers, their teachers and the materials. With the use of synchronous online environments, students now can learn from anywhere, however, at the cost of losing contact with their classmates and teachers. Technological advancement has allowed several functions to ensure more meaningful interaction such as archiving the session, viewing the webcam, text chat, then a voice component during synchronous meetings compensate for delayed student–student and student– instructor interaction of asynchronous discussion. Synchronous classrooms, together with text chat are believed to increase opportunity to interact and support learning (McBrien et al., 2009; Nguyen & Pham, 2021).

During emergency remote teaching period, student engagement in the form of collaboration and community becomes pivotal in the teaching process. Yet, it becomes exceptionally challenging for educators to track and control student's engagement in online teaching and learning. Both teachers and students were struggling in maintaining the level of engagement during the COVID-19 crisis due to several challenges and obstacles in the process of switching from face-to-face delivery to

online synchronous platform in a relatively short time (Lie et al., 2020).

2.3. Engagement Framework

One of the major models that defines interactions in distance education is Moore's interaction model which proposes three interaction categories: learner–content, learner–instructor, and learner – learner (Moore, 1989). Using Moore's model as a guide, the authors investigated students' perspectives on their engagement in ERT. Moore's model can be adapted to a crisis scenario and provides the bare minimum of interactions required for successful learning while recognizing learning as a social and cognitive process.

Learner - Content interaction

This type of interaction refers to the process of engaging with material intellectually to produce improvements in the learner's comprehension, perspective, or cognitive structures. Moore (1993) emphasizes that learner-content engagement should focus on the process of interacting with the content to better change a learner's understanding and improve critical thinking. Individualized learning is the subject of this relationship. Student-content interaction can also occur through watching videos, interacting with multimedia, using search engines, such as Google Scholar or online libraries and dictionaries (Banna et al., 2015).

Learner - Instructor interaction

Moore (1989) claims that this type of interaction is highly desirable by many learners. Instructors strive to pique or sustain a student's interest in what is being learned, to encourage the student to learn, and to improve and maintain the learner's interest, including self-direction and self-motivation. The instructors then make or cause presentations to be made. This may be in the form of informational presentations, skill demos, or role modeling of such attitudes

and values. Following that, teachers attempt to coordinate students' implementation of what they've learned, whether it's practicing skills that have been taught or manipulating knowledge and ideas that have been introduced. Instructors perform tests to see whether students are progressing and to determine whether or not they can change their strategies. Regarding the same topic, Sher (2009) stated that learner-instructor interaction can be accomplished by the instructor delivering information, encouraging the learner, or providing feedback. In addition, learners may interact with the instructor by asking questions or communicating with the instructor about course activities. Dixson (2010) and King (2014) both believe that in order to promote online student engagement, students and instructors in online courses must cooperate and collaborate.

Learner - Learner interaction

Sher (2009) defines learner-learner interaction as the exchange of information and ideas that occurs among students about the course, whether the instructor is present or not. This type of interaction can take the form of group projects, group discussions, or other activities. Through student collaboration and knowledge sharing, learner-learner interaction can promote learning. Moore (1989) also regards it as an interaction between individual students or among students working in groups. Interaction is beneficial for cognitive and motivational reasons, but it is especially threatened in online education because students might not be aware of the identities of their classmates. Student-student interaction can be done in various ways through videoconferencing, instant chat and discussion boards (Banna et al., 2015; Martin & Bolliger, 2018).

Overall, Moore's classification of three types of interaction establishes a framework for assessing the relative

importance of various forms of contact in an emergency remote teaching scenario.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Context

The course was designed initially to be delivered face-to-face; however, because of the Covid-19 pandemic, it was forced to be switched into online mode. One week before the beginning of the course, students were informed via email the time, date and mode of delivery, including a code for Zoom ID and a code for Google Classroom. Each student was asked to prepare in advance a working laptop with Internet connection, a working micro and a webcam. During two weeks of social distancing, four lessons in total were delivered online via a synchronous tele-conference application named Zoom.

3.2. Sampling and Participants

Voluntary response sample was a class of 49 students at pre-intermediate level at a university in Hochiminh City, Vietnam. They were international business majors, and the English course had a specific focus on Listening and Speaking skill. The first national lockdown and school closure was in February, 2020 and since then, the country's education system has faced several more closures at irregular intervals. Since 2020, participants in this study have had experience of ERT lessons. This research was conducted through two-week closure at the beginning of 2021.

3.3. Instrument Development

In distance education, interaction is characterized as a perplexing component of distance education, and Moore (1989) has conceptualized and classified the term into three types of interaction: learner-to-learner, learner-to-instructor, and learner-to-content. This research deployed the work of Moore to draw a clear distinction among three types of interactions in real-time interaction class and analyzed upon that. 23 Likert-type items in the survey together with open-ended questions at the end were obtained to collect the data. The survey was piloted with two students, then added Vietnamese translation with the original English version for full comprehension. Modifications regarding the use of words, deletion of unnecessary questions and re-categorization of questions were made.

Classroom observation was adopted via synchronous classrooms' recordings. The researchers developed an observation protocol for online lessons to explore how students engaged in online activities and discussions. The development of the online classroom observation was based on different previous studies including Wheeler et al. (2019) and Topçu et al. (2018) studies. Four online lessons (40 minutes each) were observed. Observation field notes were taken including the types of activities in the online class, how teachers delivered instruction, encouraged students to participate in class activities and how students participated and interacted with their peers and their teacher. Technical or instructional issues were also recorded for analysis.

Finally, an in-depth interview was used as triangulation. Two students agreed to participate in a 15-minute interview for insights into the lessons.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

Noticing the emergence of ERT, the researchers contacted the teacher and students of the class for the granted permission to record and deliver a survey at the end of the ERT period. As students returned to schools, the researchers came to deliver the survey and collect the data in person. All four lessons were recorded by the instructing teacher and later watched and analyzed by the researchers.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

Descriptive analysis of survey data was provided and thematic analysis is used for qualitative data. Field notes data were analysed following the guidelines of thematic analysis Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 6) that suggest "thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data". The field notes were collected systematically in the form of participant observation memos. In the process of data analysis, the common themes emerging from the observation field notes and interviews were triangulated to make sense of student engagement in online teaching and learning.

The interview was conducted via Zoom Meeting room.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Learner-Content Interaction

Regarding learner-content factor, the result from the survey (Table 1) reveal the relatively high mean score for the issues surveyed, among which, the item confirms that students will earn a good grade in the course, gets the lowest mean score (Item 15, M=3.16, SD=1.06), while the highest mean goes for the item saying that the instructor provides a well-organized course (Item 14, M=3.59, SD=1.24).

Table 1

Learner-Content Engagement in Emergency Remote Teaching

Items	Mean	SD
LC6: I complete all the assigned class work	3.27	1.16
LC7: I visit the course website/ google classroom regularly	3.55	1.23
LC11: I truly desire to learn the course material	3.39	1.10
LC12: I give a great deal of effort to the class	3.37	1.02
LC13: I am well organized in my learning	3.37	1.10
LC14: My instructor provides a well-organized course	3.59	1.24
LC15: I will earn a good grade in the course	3.16	1.06
LC16: I stay caught up on learning after class.	3.16	1.06

The lowest mean score belonged to the grade (Item 15, Mean=3.16, SD=1.06). Because of the unexpected swiftness to online learning, students are not certain about the learning outcome of the course, which also leads to a controversial discussion among researchers of whether learner – content interaction affects their learning outcome. While the recent studies by Wei et al. (2015) and Zacharis (2015) claim the impact of the student-content interaction is low in comparison with other types of interaction, Kayode and Teng (2014) assert that this factor has the greatest impact on learning outcomes.

The highest mean score for the well-organized course, can be affirmed by the notes from class video observations. In each

class, the teacher uniformly classified learning activities into three stages. In Pre-listening, the instructor introduced the topic of a video or recording. While-listening stage included students' individual work of listening to assigned video and group work of some reflective or discussive questions. For individual listening practice, the instructor adopted Edpuzzle twice as an interactive platform for students to listen and answer comprehensive questions at the same time. In the final stage of post-listening, the instructor invited students to share the answers and group discussion and provided further explanation. It is also clear that they can interact with the material better in online learning. As students answered in the open-ended questions:

" I can hear better and repeat the part as I want"

" I can access the full collections of learning materials"

The interviewee expressed her preference of Edpuzzle over in-class listening activity, in which the teacher played and stopped the recording herself. She stated:

"I can play, stop or play back at my own time. It's like personalized learning and I find it more effective."

4.2. Learner-Instructor Interaction

With reference to the respondents' perceptions of learner-instructor engagement (Table 2), the item of the instructor handling inappropriate in-class interactions had the lowest mean score of the cluster (Item 10, Mean=3.39, SD=1.26). This can be explained by the lack of interaction and interference of the instructor during group discussion. Giving insights to the open-ended questions, a respondent said that she could approach the technology but she wanted to interact with her teacher and friends. Other students commented that although learning online was something new, interesting, the contact between teacher and students was less. Another participant answered that he could not interact and communicate much with the teacher.

Table 2

Learner-Instructor Engagement in Emergency Remote Teaching

Items	Mean	SD
LI2: The course rules are clear	3.53	1.20
LI3: My instructor is present and active in class discussions	3.80	1.05
LI5: My instructor is responsive to me when I have questions	3.65	1.30
LI8: My instructor is consistent about enforcing course rules	3.57	1.03
LI9: I know that I can contact my instructor when I need to	3.61	1.27
LI10: I trust my instructor to handle inappropriateness in class interactions	3.39	1.26
LL23: I feel isolated in the class	2.92	1.16

Observation reveals that students were not willing to respond to teacher's structuring questions *("Are we ready to continue?"* or *"Are you following me?"),* and the teacher ended up asking many times before someone answered. It was not until the third lesson, students started to respond when they did not understand. This lack of engagement can be explained by the answer from the interviewee:

"I was just lazy to turn on the microphone just to answer "yes". We often wait for the class monitor to answer that for the whole class."

This finding is in line with Ryan and Deci (2000) in which researchers found that in reality, many language-learning contexts are inhabited by learners who are both disengaged and passive. They display little autonomy and, at best, show only fairly low levels of extrinsic motivation. Ideally, they must contribute to the learning process, participate, give prompt feedback and assume responsibility for the accompanying circumstances rather than waiting to be asked by the instructor. This passive tendency in ERT can be explained by the teacher's mode of delivery. Learning activities were designed to aid learners in achieving course objectives in a face-to-face learning environment, they might not effectively promote active learning online, and students suffered a lack of connection with their peers and teacher (Shisley, 2020). This resulted in students' unwillingness to speak up. This finding is also consistent with the remarks by (Nguyen, 2011). In his research paper on computer-mediated communication language classrooms, Vietnamese students usually remain silent in

class and wait until called upon by the teacher, instead of volunteering to answer questions. The root of this trait may have originated in the Confucian heritage culture of Asian culture where students are supposed to be "passive, reproductive and surface" (Jones, 1999). Similar observation can be made in the context of Japan, King (2013) inferred silence in the classroom to the causes of disengagement or apathy, which often emerge with compulsory teacher-centered English classrooms for non-language majors.

Some students reported Internet disruption and technical issues, namely "background noise from teacher's microphone". As a result, they could not hear the instructor clearly. This expected problem is also addressed in Shisley's study (2020) indicating that limited technology may result in less-than-ideal engagement and interaction circumstances. Some students used a smartphone during the lessons with non-optimized digital content due to a shortage of proper digital devices. While mobile learning offers the possibility of prevalent computing, there are a number of technical drawbacks related to the inferior functionality involved compared to desktop computers (Alessia & Fernando, 2009).

On the other hand, some students also reported positive opinions towards the presence of the teacher during the online class. Statistically, the highest mean score (Item 3, Mean=3.80, SD=1.05) indicated that students appreciated the instructor's active presence and support in-class discussion. As students answered in the open-ended questions:

"I feel good and the teacher takes care of us much."

"I think learning with the instructor provides me so much power."

"My online teachers are very enthusiastic and supportive."

"I was more confident when answering any questions from teachers, and maybe I could ask some questions in the meeting chat about the matter I was confused."

Wang and Degol (2016) and Rubie-Davies et al. (2016) also conclude that when students experience positive, constructive and warm relationships with their teachers, they are more likely to follow the rules of their classroom; and become more motivated and engaged within a learning-oriented environment (Kaufmann et al., 2016). Additionally, instructor's confirmation behaviors, such as answering students' questions, can be linked to positive student emotion and learning outcomes (Goldman & Goodboy, 2014).

However, although some students admitted that the teacher's presence and support were appreciable, more assistance from the teacher in group discussion was still expected in a Speaking lesson. As Finn and Schrodt (2016) highlighted in their study, how instructors facilitate class discussions exert an impact on students' level of interest, engagement, and understanding of course content. From the observation, the teacher in this case did not join group discussions, instead she asked students to choose a suitable platform for group discussion. The teacher then waited for about 10 minutes and collected group answers on Padlet to elaborate, which partly explained the low level of student engagement.

Overall, although learners showed the lack of autonomy and some criticism towards teacher's facilitation as well as technical accessibility, they still acknowledged and appreciated the value of teacher's active presence in the virtual learning environment.

4.3. Learner-Learner Interaction

The questions (Item 4, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23) on whether the students would interact, communicate or assist their

classmates elicited a predominantly unfavorable attitude towards online learning with mean scores from 3.08 to 3.57 (Table 3). These questionnaire findings coincided closely with the interview data. As explained further in the open-ended questions, 13 out of 49 respondents reported *"poor interaction", "difficult to interact"* or *"not enough interaction"* with peers. With reference to the participants' perceptions of personal direct connection with peers, the

mean score of the cluster was 3.08, this score indicated the lowest mean overall in the survey. Giving insights to the survey, the interviewee reported:

"I chat with my friends during group discussion. Some of my classmates don't have a working microphone or at home, the surroundings can be noisy because of other family members. Chatting is the only option."

Table 3

Learner-Learner Engagement in Emergency Remote Teaching

Items	Mean	SD
LL1: I participate actively in online discussions	3.57	0.93
LL4: I ask questions in discussions when I don't understand	3.33	1.08
LL17: I interact with classmates on course material	3.20	1.11
LL18: I connect personally with classmates	3.08	1.07
LL19: I enjoy interacting in my class	3.33	1.00
LL20: I help my fellow classmates	3.14	1.01
LL21: I share personal concerns with others	3.22	1.00
LL22: I am committed to working with my classmates so that we can help each other learn	3.35	1.04

To facilitate and collect opinions in post-listening activity, the instructor adopted Padlet to collect answers from students after their group discussion. In the first class, 44 out of 49 students shared their viewpoint on the interactive discussion board. The next three collected 34, 47, 22 shares respectively. This data confirmed students' preference of online discussion, which can be found in other papers of Revere and Kovach (2011) and Banna et al. (2015). Conclusion can be drawn that discussion boards or chat sessions have served well in promoting student-to-student interaction in online courses.

Regarding quantitative data, the highest mean score in learner-to-learner engagement category showed that students participated in virtual discussion at a relatively active level with cluster mean scores of 3.57 (Item 1, Mean = 3.57, SD=0.93). Participants seemed to discuss openly online; however, they discussed

asynchronously through the discussion board, rather than communicated verbally to their peers. This tendency was supported by Nguyen and Pham (2021), in which participants stated that they would prefer online written chat to oral direct discussion. The reasons for preference of online group chat included sufficient time to process input, self-paced edited comments and anonymity. During the group chat, students were supported with digital artefacts, for instance, electronic dictionaries or search engines, which helped students build confidence as they had more ideas to contribute to the discussion without worrying about "losing face" because of stumbling words or mispronunciations as oral discussions.

While asynchronous discussions were supported by a number of scholars, one response from the open-ended questions yielded another issue related to L2 use. During ERT, the teacher divided students

into groups and used breakout rooms for group members to discuss on a pre-assigned topic. Though the detail of the discussion in each break-out room remained to be unknown, the nature of the discussion was revealed during the open-ended questions. A participant reported L1 use as "we divide the task of group work and complete it individually". This can be correlated with the research of Xiao (2007), in which the researcher attributed the causes for reduced student's L2 use to a high number of students in class (N=49) and students sharing the same L1, and thus, "feeling communication is not authentic." Vuopala et al. (2016, p. 34) also reported a "fairly superficial level" of student interaction in the online environment. In another research, group work during online teaching was rated as the least valuable strategy and that they did not enjoy collaboration (Martin & Bolliger, 2018). The above reasons may explain why some students rated Item 18: "I connect personally with classmates" at a relatively lower score (Mean=3.08, SD=1.07).

5. Conclusion

Results from the surveys and online classroom observations in this study offers a detailed description of student engagement during the emerging situations of emergency remote teaching in the Covid-19 pandemic. Despite evident interaction between learner and instructor, the lack of interaction with both the teacher and their peers was the most frequently reported. On the one hand, students generally complimented on the convenience of technology advancement and method of delivery, appreciated the instructor's effort to be present and support students from a distance and managed to hold discussions with peers regardless of technological struggles. On the other hand, participants showed demotivation due to the lack of a sense of community, frustrations towards the digital divide and infrastructure

failure. The fundamental cause lies in the loss and lack of human interactions. Both learner-learner engagement and learner-instructor were dwarfed by superficial interaction in synchronous learning platforms. During the Covid-19 pandemic, the instructor with their limited knowledge about online education use direct transmission without significant changes in their classroom practices, hindering the creation of a learning environment where students' engagement levels are high.

Results from this paper could benefit both instructors and administrators who are looking for ways to improve the quality of teaching and learning during the pandemic and to build engagement in the online learning environment. Higher education institutions should develop an online teaching-learning strategy that governs the learning process. Universities, for example, could tighten their attendance policies and camera policies. Instructors and students may be able to communicate more effectively as a result of this. Body language and facial expressions are key in communication, and voice and speech rate modulation could help (Bao, 2020). This problem may be solved by enforcing the use of cameras. Instructors should also be provided with professional development opportunities for online teaching in the following areas: techniques for (synchronous and asynchronous) online classroom management; skills and tactics for interactive learning and online interactions with students; methods and tactics for engaging students in learning, approaches for providing relevant feedback; the use of instructional technology in teaching and learning, particularly software for mini-lecture creation (Zhang, 2020).

Creating and maintaining online professional networks may be a great source of motivation and support for instructors. Once instructors have increased the awareness of the importance of digital

literacy, students should develop learning strategies and plans that empower them to take charge of their education. Finally, students are encouraged to seek psychological and pedagogical help from their instructor and administration because though academic achievement is important, a sense of community, and most significantly, socio-emotional support is helpful more than ever during an uncertain time of the global pandemic.

There are some limitations to this research. Although classroom observation was adopted as one instrument, insights into group discussions in which students collaborated were missed. In addition, since the Emergency Remote Teaching continues to last, though intermittently, such a short period of class observation time might not fully reflect the whole picture of engagement. Therefore, it is recommended to conduct more in-depth interviews with both students and teachers to understand their behaviors and motivations during emergency remote class. Future research could also shift the focus towards instructors' perspectives of emergency-forced distant education, concentrating on the effects on their professional growth as a result of this abrupt transition.

References

Alessia, D. A., & Fernando, F. (2009). Mobile devices to support advanced forms of e-learning. In G. Patrizia (Ed.), *Multimodal human computer interaction and pervasive services* (pp. 389-407). IGI Global.

Ali, I., Narayan, A., & Sharma, U. (2020). Adapting to Covid-19 disruptions: Student engagement in online learning of accounting. *Accounting Research Journal, 34*(3), 261-269. https://doi.org/10.1108/ARJ-09-2020-0293

Banna, J., Grace Lin, M. F., Stewart, M., & Fialkowski, M. K. (2015). Interaction matters: Strategies to promote engaged learning in an online introductory nutrition course. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 11*(2), 249-261.

Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: A systematic evidence map. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *17*(1), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0176-8

Branch, R., & Dousay, T. A. (2015). *Survey of instructional design models* (5th ed.). Association for Educational Communications & Technology.

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

Deka, P. K. (2021). Factors influencing student engagement in online learning during the COVID–19 pandemic period in India. *Journal of Management in Practice, 6*(1), 1-16.

Dixson, M. D. (2012). Creating effective student engagement in online courses: What do students find engaging? *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*, 1-13.

Finn, A. N., & Schrodt, P. (2016). Teacher discussion facilitation: A new measure and its associations with students' perceived understanding, interest, and engagement. *Communication Education, 65*(4), 445-462. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1202997

Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. S. (2012). Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter? In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 97-131). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_5

Goldman, Z. W., & Goodboy, A. K. (2014). Making students feel better: Examining the relationships between teacher confirmation and college students' emotional outcomes. *Communication Education, 63*(3), 259-277. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.920091

Jones, A. (1999). *The Asian learner: An overview of approaches to learning*. The University of Melbourne.

Kaufmann, R., Sellnow, D. D., & Frisby, B. N. (2016). The development and validation of the online learning climate scale (OLCS). *Communication Education, 65*(3), 307-321. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2015.1101778

Kayode, E. O., & Teng, T.-L., (2014). The impact of transactional distance dialogic interactions on student learning outcomes in online and blended environments. *Computer Education*, *78*, 414–427. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.06.011

King, J. (2013). Silence in the second language classrooms of Japanese universities. *Applied Linguistics, 34*(3), 325-343.

King, S. (2014). Graduate student perceptions of the use of online course tools to support engagement. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 8*(1), 1-18.

La, V.-P., Pham, T.-H., Ho, M.-T., Nguyen, M.-H., Nguyen, P. K.-L., Vuong, T.-T., Nguyen, T. H.-K., Tran, T., Khuc., Q., Ho, M.-T., & Vuong, Q.-H. (2020). Policy response, social media and science journalism for the sustainability of the public health system amid the Covid-19 outbreak: The Vietnam lessons. *Sustainability, 12*(7), Article 2931. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072931

Lie, A., Tamah, S. M., Gozali, I., Triwidayati, K. R., Utami, T. S. D., & Jemadi, F. (2020). Secondary school language teachers' online learning engagement during the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research, 19*, 803-832.

Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. *Online Learning Journal, 22*, 205-222.

McBrien, J. L., Cheng, R., & Jones, P. (2009). Virtual spaces: Employing a synchronous online classroom to facilitate student engagement in online learning. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 10*(3), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v10i3.605

Liu, H. (2021). Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms. *ELT Journal, 75*(2), 232-234. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab004

Moore, M. G. (1989). Editorial: Three types of interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education, 3*(2), 1-7.

Moore, M. G. (1993). Theory of transactional distance. In K. Harry, M. John & D. Keegan (Eds.), *Theoretical principles of distance education* (pp. 19-24). Routledge.

Nguyen, N. T. U., & Nguyen, V. L. (2021). Resilience to withstand Covid-19 crisis: Lessons from a foreign language institution in Vietnam. *Computer Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, *22*(2), 40-55.

Nguyen, V. L. (2011). Learners' reflections on and perceptions of computer-mediated communication in a language classroom: A Vietnamese perspective. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 27*(8), 1413-1436.

Nguyen, V. L., & Pham, A. T. D. (2021). Using synchronous online discussion to develop EFL learners' productive skills: A case study. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL, 18*(1), 179-207.

Oraif, I., & Elyas, T. (2021). The impact of Covid-19 on learning: Investigating EFL learners' engagement in online courses in Saudi Arabia. *Education Sciences, 11*(3), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11030099

Revere, L., & Kovach, J. V. (2011). Online technologies for engaged learning: A meaningful synthesis for educators. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 12*(2), 113-124.

Rivers, S. E., Brackett, M. A., Reyes, M. R., Elbertson, N. A., & Salovey, P. (2013). Improving the social and emotional climate of classrooms: A clustered randomized controlled trial testing the RULER approach. *Prevention Science, 14*(1), 77-87.

Rubie-Davies, C., Asil, M., & Teo, T. (2016). Assessing measurement invariance of the student personal perception of classroom climate across different ethnic groups. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 34*(5), 442-460. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282915612689

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 54-67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Sher, A. (2009). Assessing the relationship of student-instructor and student-student interaction to student learning and satisfaction in web-based online learning environment. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 8,* 102-120.

Shisley, S. (2020, May 20). *Emergency remote learning compared to online learning*. Learning Solutions. https://learningsolutionsmag.com/articles/emergency-remote-learning-compared-to-online-learning

Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (2009). Engagement and

disaffection as organizational constructs in the dynamics of motivational development. In K. R. Wenzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 223-245). Routledge.

Thach, P., Lai, P., Nguyen, V., & Nguyen, H. (2021). Online learning amid Covid-19 pandemic: Students' experience and satisfaction. *Journal of E-Learning and Knowledge Society, 17*(1), 39-48.

Topçu, M. S., Foulk, J. A., Sadler, T. D., Pitiporntapin, S., & Atabey, N. (2018). The classroom observation protocol for socioscientific issue-based instruction: Development and implementation of a new research tool. *Research in Science & Technological Education, 36*(3), 302-323.

Van Lier, L. (2008). Agency in the classroom. In J. P. Lantolf & M. E. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 163-186). Equinox.

Vuopala, E., Hyvönen, P., & Järvelä, S. (2016). Interaction forms in successful collaborative learning in virtual learning environments. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 17*(1),

25-38. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787415616730

Wang, M.-T., & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*(2), 315-352. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9319-1

Wheeler, L. B., Navy, S. L., Maeng, J. L., & Whitworth, B. A. (2019). Development and validation of the classroom observation protocol for engineering design (COPED). *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 56*(9), 1285-1305.

Xiao, M. (2007). *An empirical study of using Internet-based desktop video conferencing in an EFL setting* [Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University].

Zhang, T. (2020, July 10). Learning from the emergency remote teaching-learning in China when primary and secondary schools were disrupted by Covid-19 pandemic. *Research Square.* https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/education_publications/101

Appendix A

Survey on Student Engagement in Emergency Remote Teaching

Dear respondents,

Thank you for your participation in this research. Please complete this short 3-minute survey to let us know how engaged you are during the time of Emergency Remote Teaching due to Covid-19 outbreak. All responses are recorded anonymously so feel free to provide honest feedback. The information you share with the researchers would be kept confidential and be used only for the specific objectives of this work without any identification.

Your responses will facilitate the research and improve Emergency Remote Teaching and Learning of English.

Rate your level of agreement with each statement with
(1) = Strongly disagree
(2) = Disagree
(3) = Neutral
(4) = Agree
(5) = Strongly Agree

Items	1	2	3	4	5
LL1: I participate actively in online discussions.					
LI2: The course rules are clear.					
LI3: My instructor is present and active in class discussions.					
LL4: I ask questions in discussions when I don't understand.					
LI5: My instructor is responsive to me when I have questions.					
LC6: I complete all the assigned class work.					
LC7: I visit the course website/ google classroom regularly.					

LI8: My instructor is consistent about enforcing course rules.					
LI9: I know that I can contact my instructor when I need to.					
LI10: I trust my instructor to handle inappropriateness in class interactions.					
LC11: I truly desire to learn the course material.					
LC12: I give a great deal of effort to the class.					
LC13: I am well organized in my learning.					
LC14: My instructor provides a well-organized course.					
LC15: I will earn a good grade in the course.					
LC16: I stay caught up on learning after class.					
LL17: I interact with classmates on course material.					
LL18: I connect personally with classmates.					
LL19: I enjoy interacting in my class.					
LL20: I help my fellow classmates.					
LL21: I share personal concerns with others.					
LL22: I am committed to working with my classmates so that we can help each other learn.					
LL23: I feel isolated in the class.					

Generally, how do you feel about learning online? What do you like and dislike about it?

Appendix B

Field Notes Lesson Observation

___date___
Observation of __[teacher name]___
Observer: _[initials]_____
Class: _____
Lesson time (start and end): _____
Type of lesson: Listening and Speaking
Unit: _____
Platform: Zoom
Instruction mode: synchronous

Time	What happened	Observations	Comments

Suggested questions to consider
What activities happen in online class?
How teacher encourages students to participate in the activities in online class?
How teacher provides provide feedback to student's participation and interaction?
How students interact with peers and the teacher?
Report any technical issues in the online class!
Note: Remember to include approximate time stamps (by the clock), brief notes on what happened and any observations relevant to the project, teacher development, students responses, excerpts to choose for transcription.

ĐÁNH GIÁ SỰ TƯƠNG TÁC CỦA SINH VIÊN
TRONG GIỜ HỌC NGOẠI NGỮ
THỜI KÌ GIẢNG DẠY TỪ XA KHẨN CẤP

Lê Thanh Hà, Vũ Phương Hồng Ngọc, Trương Thị Thanh Cảnh

Trường Đại học Ngoại thương - Cơ sở II tại Tp. HCM,
15 D5, Phường 25, Quận Bình Thạnh, Tp. HCM

Tóm tắt: Nghiên cứu này phân tích sự tương tác của sinh viên trong thời gian giảng dạy từ xa khẩn cấp do đại dịch Covid-19. Đối tượng nghiên cứu là 49 sinh viên ngành kinh tế tại một trường đại học ở Tp. Hồ Chí Minh, Việt Nam. Bài viết dựa trên khung nghiên cứu của Moore về ba loại tương tác trong lớp học: người học với nội dung học liệu, người học với giáo viên và người học với người học. Thiết kế nghiên cứu bao gồm bảng hỏi, dự giờ lớp học và phỏng vấn sâu. Kết quả cho thấy tương tác giữa người học và giáo viên là mạnh mẽ nhất, cùng với đó là sự thiếu tương tác giữa các sinh viênvới nhau thường xuyên được quan sát trong kết quả nghiên cứu định lượng. Nguyên nhân chính là do sự thiếu tương tác trực tiếp, điều này khiến cho tương tác giữa người học và giáo viên cũng như người học và người học bị hạn chế do những tương tác "giả" khi dạy và học đồng bộ. Bài nghiên cứu cũng đề xuất một số nội dung để tăng tính tương tác trong lớp học trong thời gian giảng dạy từ xa khẩn cấp này.

Từ khoá: giảng dạy từ xa khẩn cấp, tương tác, dạy học đồng bộ