

## DISTANCE LANGUAGE-LEARNING EXPERIENCES DURING THE COVID LOCKDOWN

**Polona Vičič**

*polona.vicic@um.si*

*University of Maribor, Faculty of Logistics, Celje, Slovenia*

### **Abstract**

In recent years, online language learning has become increasingly used in language instruction, especially in combination with face-to-face (F2F) instructional methods. This blended approach is commonly labeled blended or hybrid learning (Whittaker, 2013). It combines different proportions of F2F and online instruction (ibid.), whereby seamless integration of the best elements of both delivery modes frequently leads to increased learning effectiveness and flexibility. Recognizing the value of this blended approach to the education process, many universities worldwide were developing and implementing blended courses well before the outbreak of the COVID pandemic at the beginning of 2020. With the introduction of COVID restrictions, however, this changed for many, with online learning becoming the only mode available during the ensuing crisis. For most educators, this shift occurred suddenly, thus presenting them with the challenge of adapting their teaching practices to fully online delivery to the best of their abilities. In the face of this sudden challenge, many teachers resorted to “emergency remote teaching” or ERT (Hodges et al., 2020). These emergency solutions allow continuity in the education process, but they rarely exploit the full potential of well-established online instruction, thus calling for evaluation and refinement for future use. Undoubtedly, the challenge was nearly—if not, equally—as demanding for students, many of whom had limited or no prior experience with fully online learning. In the midst of the continuing COVID pandemic, this article thus outlines the design and delivery of a fully online course and analyses students’ feedback on their experiences with remote language learning during the Coronavirus lockdown. Building on this, the article concludes with lessons learned from the process that could be applied in post-pandemic education to enrich and enhance blended or fully online language courses.

**Key words:** blended approach, continuity in the education process, fully online course, distance language learning, emergency solutions

## 1. Introduction

The tradition of distance or remote language instruction based on computer technology dates back to the 1960s, when early computer-related technologies were predominantly used in a “Skinnerian behaviorist framework” (Blake, 2008, p. 49). This behaviorist approach focuses on practicing grammar, vocabulary, and language functions through repetition of a specific stimulus or experience in response to which students learn to provide an automatic response and thus acquire a particular behavior (ibid.). Typically, this type of learning is based on trial and error, and it is thus inherently dependent on performance feedback (Conole et al., 2004). Although largely limited by the capabilities and functionalities of the computer technologies of the time, these early applications of computer-enhanced instruction, commonly referred to as computer-assisted language learning (CALL), paved the way to today’s technology-enhanced teaching and learning practices. During the years that followed, computer technology significantly evolved in terms of scope and sophistication. Accordingly, today terms such as *digital*, *mobile*, and *online technology*<sup>1</sup> are typically used alongside or instead of computer technology because they better suit the wider range of digital devices and online environments used today. These modern technologies can be used either for language practice of the behavioristic type or, increasingly more frequently, for activities promoting deeper learning, such as abstraction, generalization, decision-making, problem-solving, and creative thinking (Bates, 2019). This trend has also been reflected in the shift from the concept of CALL to the concepts of multimedia learning, technology-enhanced learning, or online learning,<sup>2</sup> which are predominantly grounded in more recent pedagogies; that is, cognitivism, socio-constructivism (Holmes & Gardner, 2006), and connectivism (Bates, 2019).

Over the years, another important shift has occurred in the realm of online learning; that is, the shift in the rationale for its implementation. In the early days, the reasons were of a more practical nature (i.e., providing greater flexibility in terms of when, how fast, and where to learn), whereas in the last two decades the focus has shifted to pedagogy and language-learning theories, the latter approach frequently being labeled as a “principled approach/way” (Whittaker, 2014, p. 9). This shift is evidenced in a number of studies recognizing the importance of pedagogically driven implementation of online learning, typically in combination with face-to-face (F2F) instruction (Holmes & Gardner, 2006; Whittaker, 2014). Before the outbreak of the COVID pandemic, this pedagogically informed blended language instruction was thus gaining ground in educational settings

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter, the term *online technology* is used to refer to any form of information and communication technology used for educational purposes.

<sup>2</sup> Hereafter, the term *online learning* is used to refer to any form of learning mediated through information and communication technologies.

at all levels, especially higher and further education settings, which best accommodate student-centered instructional approaches typically relying on markedly autonomous and self-regulated learning. With the sudden introduction of lockdown measures, however, this changed abruptly, with fully remote instruction becoming the only option available during the ensuing crisis. Given their previous experiences, many educators were thus ill-prepared for this sudden transition to fully online instruction because it requires additional technological and teaching knowledge and skills for designing and delivering live (i.e., synchronous) online sessions. Accordingly, in the early days of this transition, many educators had to improvise when adapting to a fully online setting, especially when this involved live online instruction. Consequently, the early solutions often did not meet the quality of well-established educational practices and can accordingly be labeled “emergency remote teaching” or ERT (Hodges et al., 2020). Over the last year and a half, ERT has been informed by the experiences and insights gained in the pre-COVID and present pandemic times. Accordingly, this article takes stock of lessons learned in the process that could be used to enhance the future delivery of blended or fully online courses.

In pursuing this goal, this introduction is followed by an outline of two ESP (English for specific purposes) courses tailored to the needs of second-year undergraduate students at the University of Maribor and delivered fully online. Next, the empirical part of the article analyses and discusses students’ feedback on their experiences with fully online delivery of the two language courses. The analysis aims to answer two research questions: 1) What are students’ experiences with fully online delivery? 2) How do students’ experiences with live online lectures compare to their experiences with F2F lectures? The article concludes with lessons learned from the shift to fully online delivery and how they could be applied in post-pandemic education.

## **2. Transitioning to fully online delivery**

In the last two decades, blended language learning has become mainstream in tertiary education worldwide. With the outbreak of the COVID pandemic, however, this changed almost overnight, with the online format becoming the only option for maintaining instruction at most universities and faculties. One such institution is the Faculty of Logistics, where the blended approach was used for more than ten years before the outbreak. This previous experience, especially with asynchronous online instruction set in the virtual learning environment (VLE) Moodle, proved invaluable but not fully sufficient during the pivot to fully online delivery. This is largely due to the fact that the fully online blend combines live online instruction delivered via the synchronous collaboration tool Microsoft Teams (hereafter Teams), asynchronous self-paced instruction provided via VLE Moodle, and self-study of materials developed in-

house and commercial materials, whereby live online instruction has been introduced as a substitute for F2F instruction.<sup>3</sup> Although fully online, this type of delivery still comprises three components and remains blended in the sense introduced by Procter (2003), who defines blended learning as “the effective combination of different modes of delivery, models of teaching and styles of learning” (p. 3). Furthermore, the author suggests that different delivery modes accommodate distinctive teaching and learning methods (*ibid.*), this further implying the need for “the reskilling and upskilling” of educators and students that do not have relevant prior experience for fully online delivery (Naidu, 2021, p. 1).

Given the fact that at the outbreak of the pandemic most educators had limited or no skills and knowledge for online synchronous instruction, many of them were overwhelmed by the additional workload and the steep learning curve they had to tackle, especially during the first lockdown. For most, the greatest challenge was how to adapt to a new medium and use new tools in a technologically and pedagogically sound manner. In the face of this challenge, many educators resorted to remote instruction that replicates F2F instruction and typically lacks a proper redesign for the new media (Naidu, 2020). To mark the difference between the regular (*i.e.*, well-planned and well-established) online instruction and the fully online instruction developed during the COVID crisis, authors such as Hodges et al. (2020) and Naidu (2020) have proposed the term *emergency remote teaching* (ERT). These authors also argue that—given the pronounced differences between the two approaches (*e.g.*, research-based, well-planned and long-term solutions vs. hasty, short-term solutions; a distance education-based approach vs. a hasty adaptation of F2F education to new media)—ERT should not be compared or by any means equated with traditional online instruction. Following this view, this article focuses on a fully online blend introduced at the outbreak of the pandemic and lessons learned in the process. In the empirical part, however, a comparison is made between the regular and fully online blend, where the students were asked to compare their experiences with live online lectures and their experiences with F2F lectures. This approach is taken because the students’ previous experiences with regular blended learning serve as a viable point of reference for eliciting their experience with the fully online blend and gaining insight into the extent to which their learning experience changed with the transition.

---

<sup>3</sup> Although the main body of literature defines blended or hybrid learning as a blend of F2F and an online component, recognizing the importance of the third (*i.e.*, self-study) component, Whittaker (2014) proposes a trimodal approach comprising F2F, online, and self-study components. Because the self-study component is an important part of blended learning at the Faculty of Logistics, this trimodal approach has been adopted for all its courses, and accordingly also for the two courses discussed in this article.

As introduced above, the fully online format of the two courses in English for logistics introduced at the outbreak of the pandemic and explored in this article builds on the format of a regular blended course. Accordingly, it comprises live online, asynchronous online, and self-study components, which play an equally important role in the teaching and learning process and build on each other. In light of the focus of this study, further attention is given to a live online component, and its design and delivery. Introduced to maintain education and reach out to students online, technically this component relies on various networking tools, including the synchronous collaboration tool Teams, the interactive presentation tool Mentimeter, and the virtual learning environment Moodle. These tools allow different forms of interaction (via video, audio, and text), collaboration (whole and small group), and feedback (immediate and delayed) in a fully online setting. Given their inbuilt features and affordances, these tools serve different functions in online lessons: a) Teams presents a framework tool for live online lectures and collaboration, b) Mentimeter is typically used for brainstorming and live polling, and c) Moodle is commonly used for sharing further content information and formative assessment via online quizzes. Although years of experience with traditional online instruction have already provided evidence for its effectiveness, a growing body of research on emergency remote instruction calls attention to the need for its refinement and redesign to fully exploit the technical and pedagogical possibilities of the online setting.

To contribute to this goal, the empirical part of this article analyses students' feedback on their experiences with fully online instruction. Parallels are drawn with the findings of other studies on language instruction during the pandemic, which provides a broader context and sheds light on how they compare.

### **3. Materials and methods**

The empirical part of the article builds on students' feedback on their experiences with fully online instruction, which was elicited via an anonymous online questionnaire (Vičič & Mlaker Kač). The questionnaire was administered to second-year undergraduate students enrolled in courses in English for logistics at the end of the course in the 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 academic years. A total of 68 students (34 in each academic year) responded to an invitation to fill out the questionnaire and submitted their feedback via their digital devices.

The student questionnaire consisted of 26 items divided into the following four parts:

- a) 3 demographic questions (i.e., sex, mode of attendance: full-time or part-time, and age).

- b) 3 five-point Likert scale statements measuring the students' perceived satisfaction with the course as a whole and its two online components (ranging from 1 = poorly satisfied to 5 = very satisfied), and 6 open-ended questions eliciting the students' reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of the course as a whole and its two online components.
- c) To explore how the students' experiences with live online lectures compare to their experiences with F2F lectures, the students were next asked to rate 13 aspects of lectures delivered via Teams on a scale of 1 (much less) to 5 (much more).
- d) The final questionnaire item was an open-ended question inviting the students to give further comments and suggestions for fully online delivery of the course. These data do not relate directly to this study and are therefore excluded from the ensuing analysis and discussion.

The analysis of the students' feedback starts with an examination of the demographic data. Next, the mean and median values are determined for the five-point Likert scale statements. The quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS version 27. The students' open-ended responses on the strengths and weaknesses of the course and its two online components were thematically coded and categorized.

## 4. Results

This section of the article discusses the questionnaire results and findings. It starts with an analysis of the students' demographic data, which shows that, out of the 68 students that responded to the invitation to complete the online questionnaire, 39 (57.4%) were females and 29 (42.6%) males. The sample included 64 full-time students (mean<sub>age</sub> = 21.6 years, range: 19–35) and 4 part-time students (mean<sub>age</sub> = 31 years, range: 25–35). Some of the students did not answer all the questionnaire items<sup>4</sup>. Despite the missing answers, these students' submissions provide useful insights into the students' overall feedback and were therefore included in the analysis with the missing values replaced by zero.

The second questionnaire section focused on the fully online delivery of the two courses in English for logistics. This section elicited respondents' feedback on their experiences with the course as a whole and its live and asynchronous online components via five-point Likert scale statements (hereafter, the terms *Teams lectures* and *Moodle lectures* are used to distinguish between the two online components). As shown in Table 1, the analysis of the students' responses yielded almost no differences in mean values, with median (average) values being 4.00 for all three items. Given the fact that all median

---

<sup>4</sup> Specifically, five students did not give their ages, one student did not answer item 4, one did not answer item 10, one did not answer item 15, and one did not answer items 16, 18, and 22.

and mean values are actually 4, and most answers clustered around values 4 and 5<sup>5</sup>, it would be fair to assume that students had a positive experience with the two fully online courses as a whole as well as their live and asynchronous components. Interestingly, the results also show no preference for either the live or asynchronous component. These quantitative data thus provide a quantitative answer to the first research question: What were students' experiences with fully online delivery?

**Table 1.** Students' satisfaction with the fully online course and its two online components

Aspect	1	2	3	4	5	Mean, median
Course as a whole	0	2	10	35	20	4.03, 4.00
Teams lectures	0	4	13	30	21	4.00, 4.00
Moodle lectures	0	4	11	34	18	3.93, 4.00

Levels of satisfaction: 1 = poorly satisfied, 2 = slightly satisfied, 3 = moderately satisfied, 4 = well satisfied, 5 = very satisfied

To gain more detailed quantitative insight into the students' experiences with the fully online delivery of the two courses in English for logistics, the students were further asked to give their reactions to open-ended questions on its strengths and weaknesses. All comments were carefully examined and compared to each other to identify emerging patterns, based on which related comments were grouped into thematic categories (Vičič, 2020). When the students gave comments including more than one theme, such comments were broken down into thematic units, which were subsequently included in respective thematic categories (*ibid.*). Table 2 includes only the most frequent (*i.e.*, identified by three or more students) thematic categories.

<sup>5</sup> 55 out of 67 answers for the course as a whole, 51 out of 68 answers for Teams lectures, and 52 out of 67 answers for Moodle lectures.

**Table 2.** Strengths and weaknesses of fully online delivery

Aspect	Strengths and weaknesses
Course as a whole	<p>Strengths (43 comments in total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Working from home (8)</li> <li>- Saves commuting time (8)</li> <li>- E-quizzes are an advantage (6)</li> <li>- Better time management (3)</li> <li>- Easier learning (3)</li> <li>- Good combination and organization of Teams and a lectures (3)</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses (38 comments in total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less personal contact, lack of F2F communication (8)</li> <li>- Less interaction (5)</li> <li>- Less concentration (5)</li> <li>- More difficult to follow than F2F lectures (4)</li> </ul>
Teams lectures	<p>Strengths (37 comments in total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Working from home (10)</li> <li>- Saves commuting time (3)</li> <li>- Easier to follow lectures (3)</li> <li>- Liked the quizzes in Moodle (3)</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses (28 comments in total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less personal contact, lack of F2F communication (6)</li> <li>- Occasional technical problems (6)</li> <li>- Lack of IT equipment (3)</li> <li>- Less cooperation (3)</li> <li>- Not able to focus (3)</li> </ul>
Moodle lectures	<p>Strengths (26 comments in total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further information and exercises for consolidating knowledge (7)</li> <li>- E-quizzes are an advantage (7)</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses (17 comments in total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too many and/or overly long quizzes (3)</li> <li>- Do not provide the right answers (3)</li> </ul>

First, the results show that the numbers of comments on strengths (range: 26–43) outnumber the comments on weaknesses (range: 17–38) in each category, which resonates with the assumption that the students had positive experiences with the two fully online courses as a whole, as well as their two online components. Further analysis of the students' comments shows that the most frequently mentioned benefits of the course as a whole (16 comments) as well as for Teams lectures (13 comments) relate to the comfort of working from home, whereas the most frequently observed benefits of Moodle lectures relate to more educational aspects of their experiences; that is, opportunities for further knowledge consolidation (7 comments) and the respective role of e-quizzes (7 comments). It could be assumed that this bias is at least partially due to the relatively long tradition of Moodle lectures and the students' prior experience with this mode of learning. Furthermore, the students' prior experience and the role of

online quizzes in ongoing learning formative assessment (Cohen & Sasson, 2016) could also be the reason why the students recognize them as an important element of the course as a whole (6 comments) as well as its live online lectures (3 comments). As for the most frequently observed weaknesses, a parallel can again be drawn between the course as whole and the Teams lectures because for both of these a lack of personal contact and communication was the most frequently observed drawback (8 comments for the course as a whole and 6 comments for the Teams lectures). Conversely, the most frequently observed weaknesses of Moodle lectures focus on technical aspects; for example, the quantity and length of online quizzes and the fact that they do not offer the right answers (both comments were given three times). These and other comments by the students shed important light on their experiences with a fully online blend and will be used to inform future regular blended or fully online delivery of the two language courses studied in this article.

In line with the second research question, questionnaire items 13 to 26 invited the students to compare their experiences with various aspects of Teams lectures and their experiences with F2F lectures by rating these on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (much less) to 5 (much more). Table 3 summarizes the results.

**Table 3.** Students' experiences with Teams lectures compared to F2F

How Teams lectures compare to F2F lectures	1	2	3	4	5	Mean, median
Time investment	9	12	26	11	10	3.02, 3.00
Comprehensibility	7	20	32	5	4	2.69, 3.00
Effectiveness	11	22	27	4	3	2.45, 2.50
Opportunities for discussion	5	21	31	7	3	2.69, 3.00
Opportunities for taking notes	7	22	26	6	7	2.77, 3.00
Effectiveness of teacher feedback	5	12	38	7	5	2.88, 3.00
Opportunities for learning and understanding content	5	22	33	6	2	2.68, 3.00
Opportunities for consolidating content	7	13	38	7	3	2.79, 3.00
Opportunities to ask questions	3	9	47	6	3	2.95, 3.00
Opportunities for T-S interaction	4	22	36	3	2	2.61, 3.00
Opportunities for S-S interaction	11	19	32	4	2	2.51, 3.00
Level of self-discipline needed for participation	4	6	26	18	14	3.47, 3.00
Level of self-discipline needed for learning and understanding the lecture content	3	3	31	19	12	3.50, 3.00

Levels of comparison: 1 = much less, 2 = less, 3 = as much as, 4 = more, 5 = much more

A brief overview of comparisons shows that the mean values for 10 out of 13 aspects are below 3 (ranging from 2.45 to 2.95). This indicates that the students found live online lectures slightly lacking compared to F2F lectures. One aspect for which the students reported a slightly greater lack is effectiveness (mean = 2.45; median = 2.50). Of the three items showing a mean value higher than the midpoint of the scale (3 = “as much as”), time investment scored lowest (mean<sub>time investment</sub> = 3.02), indicating that the time students invested in Teams lectures nearly equals the time invested in F2F lectures. The students’ reflections on the level of self-discipline needed for participation (mean = 3.47) and for learning and understanding the lecture content (mean = 3.50) in Teams lectures show highest values, this implying that compared to F2F instruction, live online instruction requires a higher level of student self-discipline and autonomy.

## 5. Discussion and conclusions

In the aftermath of the COVID pandemic, this study focused on lessons learned from designing and delivering a fully online language course and students’ reflections on their experiences with fully online learning. Given the most frequently reported shortcomings of the fully online delivery of the two English for logistics courses—the lack of personal contact and communication, fewer opportunities for interaction, and impaired concentration and effectiveness—it could be concluded that despite all the effort and time devoted to developing fully online language instruction introduced during the pandemic, it failed to meet the quality of the traditional blend. This could at least partially be due to a failure to utilize all the “affordances and possibilities of the online format” (Hodges et al., 2020, p. 2). Building on this, the goal for the future should be to build more efficient, sustainable (ibid.), and “pedagogically driven” (Conole et al., 2004, p. 18) live online instruction. An important prerequisite for meeting this goal is the readiness among faculty to teach in a fully online setting (Cutri & Mena, 2020). The ultimate goal of education being successful learning, this should be coupled with student readiness; for example, having sound IT, self-learning, and other relevant study skills, and preferably also willingness to learn online. The results of this small-scale study provide some important albeit limited insights into these issues. To generate a more complete picture of the implications of fully online education, future research could investigate additional aspects of online instruction using an extended questionnaire and/or student interviews.

## References

- Bates, T. (2019). *Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Tony Bates Associates Ltd.
- Blake, R. J. (2008). *Brave new digital classroom: Technology and foreign language learning*. Georgetown University Press.
- Cohen, D., & Sasson, I. (2016). Online quizzes in a virtual environment as a tool for formative assessment. *Journal of Technology and Science Education*, 6(3), 188-208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3926/jotse.217>
- Conole, G., Dyke, M., Oliver, M., & Seale, J. (2004). Mapping pedagogy and tools for effective design. *Computers & Education* 43(1-2), 17-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2003.12.018>
- Cutri, M. L., & Mena, J. (2020). A critical reconceptualization of faculty readiness for online teaching. *Distance Education*, 41(3), 361-380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1763167>
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *EDUCASE Review*.
- Holmes, B., & Gardner, J. (2006). *E-learning concepts and practice*. MPG Books Group.
- Naidu, S. (2020). It is the worst-and the best-of times! *Distance Education*, 41(4), 425-428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1825929>
- Naidu, S. (2021). Building resilience in education systems post-COVID-19. *Distance Education*, 42(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2021.1885092>
- Procter, C. (2003). Blended learning in practice. *Education in a Changing Environment, Conference Proceedings*. The University of Salford.
- Vičič, P. (2020). A fully integrated approach to blended language learning. *ELOPE* 17(2), 219-238. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.17.2.219-238>
- Whittaker, C. (2013). Introduction. In B. Tomlinson & C. Whittaker (Eds.), *Blended learning in English language teaching: course design and implementation* (pp. 9-23). British Council.
- Whittaker, C. (2014). Blended learning in EFL: adopting a principled approach to integrating technology. In R. Al-Mahrooqi & S. Troudi (Eds.), *Using technology in foreign language teaching* (pp. 8-29). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

## ERFAHRUNGEN MIT DEM SPRACHENLERNEN IM FERNUNTERRICHT WÄHREND DER ABRIEGELUNG DURCH DAS CORONAVIRUS

In den letzten Jahren wurde das Online-Sprachenlernen zunehmend im Sprachunterricht eingesetzt, insbesondere in Kombination mit Präsenzunterrichtsmethoden (F2F). Dieser gemischte Ansatz wird gemeinhin als gemischtes Lernen oder hybrides Lernen bezeichnet (Whittaker, 2013). Er kombiniert unterschiedliche Anteile von F2F- und Online-Unterricht (ebd.), wobei die nahtlose Integration der besten Elemente beider Lehrmethoden häufig zu einer erhöhten Lerneffektivität und Flexibilität führt. In Anerkennung des Wertes dieses gemischten Ansatzes für den Bildungsprozess haben viele Universitäten weltweit bereits lange vor dem Ausbruch der Coronavirus-Pandemie Anfang 2020 gemischte Kurse konzipiert und umgesetzt. Mit der Einführung der Coronavirus-Beschränkungen änderte sich die Situation jedoch für viele, und das Online-Lernen wurde während der darauffolgenden Krise zur einzigen verfügbaren Methode. Für die meisten Pädagogen kam diese Umstellung plötzlich und stellte sie vor die Herausforderung, ihre Unterrichtspraktiken so gut wie möglich an die vollständige Online-Bereitstellung anzupassen. Angesichts dieser plötzlichen Herausforderung griffen viele Lehrkräfte auf den „Notfall-Fernunterricht“ (ERT) zurück (Hodges et al., 2020). Diese Notlösungen ermöglichen die Kontinuität des Bildungsprozesses, schöpfen aber nur selten das volle Potenzial eines gut etablierten Online-Unterrichts aus, sodass eine Evaluierung und Verfeinerung für den künftigen Einsatz erforderlich ist. Zweifellos war die Herausforderung für die Studierenden, von denen viele nur begrenzte oder gar keine Erfahrung mit Online- und Fernunterricht hatten, fast genauso groß, wenn nicht sogar noch größer. Inmitten der anhaltenden Coronavirus-Pandemie bietet dieser Artikel daher Einblicke in die Überlegungen der Lehrkräfte zur Gestaltung und Durchführung eines vollständigen Online-Kurses und analysiert das Feedback der Studierenden zu ihren Erfahrungen mit dem Sprachenlernen per Fernzugriff während der Coronavirus-Sperre. Darauf aufbauend schließt der Artikel mit den Lehren, die aus dem Prozess gezogen wurden und die in der Post-Pandemie-Bildung zur Bereicherung und Verbesserung von Präsenz-, Misch- oder Online-Sprachkursen angewendet werden könnten.

**Schlüsselwörter:** gemischter Ansatz, Kontinuität im Bildungsprozess, vollständiger Online-Kurs, Fernunterricht, Notfalllösungen

## Appendix 1

### Student questionnaire

#### Q1 Sex

Female

Male

#### Q2 Mode of attendance

Full-time

Part-time

#### Q3 Your age (please give a number)

\_\_\_\_\_ years

#### Q4 How satisfied were you with the course as a whole?

<input type="checkbox"/>	1- poorly satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	2- slightly satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	3- moderately satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	4- well satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	5- very satisfied

#### Q5 Could you point out any **STRENGTHS** of the fully online blend: a blend of Teams lectures and Moodle lectures?

-----

#### Q6 Could you point out any **WEAKNESSES** of the fully online blend: a blend of Teams lectures and Moodle lectures?

-----

#### Q7 How satisfied were you with Teams lectures?

<input type="checkbox"/>	1- poorly satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	2- slightly satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	3- moderately satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	4- well satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	5- very satisfied

**Q8 Could you point out any STRENGTHS of Teams lectures?**

-----

**Q9 Could you point out any WEAKNESSES of Teams lectures?**

-----

**Q10 How satisfied were you with Moodle lectures?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	1- poorly satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	2- slightly satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	3- moderately satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	4- well satisfied
<input type="checkbox"/>	5- very satisfied

**Q11 Could you point out any STRENGTHS of Moodle lectures?**

-----

**Q12 Could you point out any WEAKNESSES of Moodle lectures?**

-----

**Q13 Your experience with the fully online delivery of the course.**

Please rate your experience on a scale of 1-5 (1 = much less; 2 = less; 3 = as much as; 4 = more; 5 = much more)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Live online lectures require the same time investment as F2F lectures.					
Live online lectures are as comprehensible as F2F lectures.					
Live online lectures are as effective as F2F lectures.					
Live online lectures offer the same opportunities for participation in discussion as F2F lectures.					
Live online lectures offer the same opportunities for summarizing the main points and taking notes as F2F lectures.					
Teacher feedback provided through live online lectures is as effective as in F2F lectures.					
Live online lectures offer the same opportunities for learning and understanding content as F2F lectures.					
Live online lectures offer the same opportunities for consolidating content as F2F lectures.					
Live online lectures offer students the same opportunities to ask questions as F2F lectures.					

Live online lectures offer the same opportunities for teacher–student interaction as F2F lectures.					
Live online lectures offer the same opportunities for student–student interaction as F2F lectures.					
Participation in live online lectures requires the same level of student self-discipline as participation in F2F lectures					
Live online lectures require the same level of student self-discipline for learning and understanding the content as F2F lectures.					

**Q14 Please add further comments and suggestions for the fully online delivery of the course.**

---