Modern English Education

https://doi.org/10.18095/meeso.2021.22.2.1

Student Performance and Satisfaction in Online vs. Offline English Course: Do Delivery and Exam Format Matter?

Sang-Gu Kang
Cheongju University

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 21 March 2021
Revised: 14 April 2021
Accepted: 10 May 2021

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels:
Secondary/ Tertiary

KEYWORDS

online class/
university English course/
open-book exam/
student performance/
student satisfaction/
온라인 수업/ 대학교 영어 강좌/
오픈북 시험/ 학생 수행/
학생 수업 만족도

ABSTRACT

Kang, Sang-Gu. (2021). Student performance and satisfaction in online vs. offline English course: Do delivery and exam format matter? *Modern English Education, 22*(2), 1-9.

The COVID-19 pandemic forced educational institutions around the world to suddenly shift most of their traditional offline classes to the online in 2020. Korean universities were no exception to the trend, and it provided an opportunity to investigate student performance and satisfaction in an online versus offline university English course. In this study, an introductory English linguistics course conducted online in 2020 was compared to the same course conducted offline in 2019. The exams of the online English class probed in this study were the same versions used for the offline class consisting of multiple choice and short answer questions, but were administered in an open-book online format without a proctor. Then, students' course evaluation results were analyzed to compare their satisfaction in different class delivery formats. Results of online and offline classes revealed that students' exam results and course evaluation were almost identical, which suggest that the online format of university courses can be as effective as the traditional offline courses for the recent younger generation of online-friendly university students.

I. INTRODUCTION

Online learning in higher education has been a popular topic of research for more than a couple of decades, especially focusing on the efficiency of it compared to the traditional face-to-face learning in the classroom (e.g., Bernard et al., 2004; Means et al., 2010; Russell, 1999; Tallent-Runnels et al., 2006). Thanks to recent ongoing technological advances that allowed courses to be offered online, online courses in Korean universities are increasing and it seems clear that they have certain strengths over in-class courses. Online courses reduce or eliminate travel time to and from the classroom for many students who are in a situation where it is difficult for them to take face-to-face offline classes due to jobs and/or family obligations (Summers et al., 2005; Wilkins & Barret, 2000). In addition, from an administrative perspective, online courses can be a cost-effective alternative to in-class courses (Driscoll et al., 2012). A single online class can permit more student enrollment leading to budget reduction, which is probably one of the main reasons most Korean universities offer at least a few number of online courses. Such courses tend to be built around general content and multiple choice exams, attracting students who view these courses as easy and convenient (Ritzer, 2004).

Ideally, educational issues regarding online courses

Sang-Gu Kang (Professor)
Department of English Language & Literature, Cheongju University, 298, Daeseong-ro, Cheongwon-gu, Cheongju-si, Chungcheongbuk-do, 28503, Korea
Tel: (043) 229-8357 / Email: kangsg39@hanmail.net

should be identified and examined based on previous findings from relevant literature (e.g., Hodges et al., 2020; Stansfield et al., 2004) before online courses are offered to students. However, the COVID-19 pandemic that started seriously damaging the global community in 2020 forced Korean educational institutions to quickly change their medium of instructional delivery from traditional face-to-face classes to online classes and participate in the "Great Online-Learning Experiment" (Zimmerman, 2020). The unexpected and abrupt transition to online course[1], with futile expectations about resuming face-to-face classes, left many instructors without much choice but to simply translate their preexisting in-class curriculum into an online format without considering how to effectively utilize the technology. For example, for the university online classes in the current study, course contents including the textbook were simply presented electronically without much consideration about new and innovative ways to facilitate students' learning experience using the electronic medium. All the blame for this cannot be directed solely towards the instructors since they were also the victims of uncertainties that the pandemic caused not knowing when or even whether their classes would return to the classroom. As a result, it seems that most instructors, who were not preparing for online courses before the pandemic, were busy just learning and getting used to the online format rather than devoting their time and energy to developing online courses that can provide ideal learning environment and experience (Hodges et al., 2020).

Although the pandemic turbulence forced many instructors in Korea to literally translate their traditional classroom curriculum into the online, it also provided an opportunity to compare offline and online classes taught by the same instructor with identical contents. Thus the current case study aims to compare the same course delivered in two different formats under identical circumstances including the instructor, class material, and exam questions. This empirical research examines the effectiveness of an online course in the Korean context involving an introductory English language and linguistics course and student satisfaction compared to the same course offered offline.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Many previous studies have found that students in online courses perform no less or better than students in offline courses (e.g., Allen & Seaman, 2016; Grgurovic et al., 2013) or vice versa including factors that hinder online learning (e.g., Karkar-Esperat, 2018; Liu et al., 2010), while other studies have shown that there is no significant difference in student performance or satisfaction depending on the two instructional mediums (e.g., Allen et al., 2002; Summers et al., 2005). Plethora of such studies demonstrating various results depending on the participants, subjects, or specific format of online and offline courses among others almost seems to make the debate about the effectiveness of online versus offline learning confusing and even useless. Thus, rather than focusing on introducing studies with diverse results concerning course format efficiency, this section will focus on presenting some literature that used methodology comparable to the current research and probe a gap in the literature that could be partially filled with the findings of this study.

A number of studies within this body of literature rely on small number of samples. Although they do present some methodological weaknesses, conducting research based on small sample size is to some degree inevitable in order to control for factors such as instructor, course materials, and methods of evaluation between the two types of instructional mediums. For example, Summers et al. (2005) examined one online versus one offline undergraduate statistics class involving a total of 38 students from the two classes taught by the same instructor with the same course materials. The same exams were administered to the offline and online students under supervision of a proctor. There was no significant difference in performance between students in the two classes, but online students were less satisfied with the course. The biggest contributors of their dissatisfaction seemed to be related to students' perception about the instructor, including the instructor's explanations, enthusiasm, openness to students, and interest in student learning (even though the same instructor taught both classes).

The design of the current study closely resembles Summers et al. (2005) in that performance and satisfaction of a small number of students from very few online and offline of classes taught by the same instructor using the same course materials are investigated. Of course, there are more research probing online and offline students' performance and satisfaction under similar conditions (i.e., sharing the same instructor and course materials) such as Driscoll et al. (2012) on an introductory sociology course, Singh et al. (2012) on a consumer behavior course, and Dell et al. (2010) on an educational psychology course and a graduate human development and learning course. However, Summers et al. differ from these studies in that students from the online and offline classes took the exactly same exams consisting of multiple-choice or short answer questions testing their statistical knowledge; although Summers et al. do not provide any examples of the test items, it can be speculated that the test items might consist of multiple-choice or short answer questions, which are the types of questions in the English linguistics course exams probed for this study. On the other hand, other studies include essay type test items that were not used for the current English linguistics course.

As in the current study, the online students in Summers et al. (2005) were tested using the same exams with their offline counterparts, but still there is one slight difference in the way the tests were administered. While online stu-

[1] D. J. Lee and M. Kim (2020) report that only 1% of university classes in Korea were conducted online in 2019.

dents in the former took closed-book tests with a proctor present, the online students in the latter took open-book tests online at their convenient places without a proctor. Although there are very few studies comparing student performance on closed-book and open-book exams (e.g., Vazquez et al., 2021), they usually involve essay type questions. Thus, one of the gaps in the literature seems to be a report on the effectiveness (demonstrated by student performance) of a multiple choice and short answer type open-book test compared to the same type of closed-book test. Therefore, providing a piece of evidence for this issue is one of the main purposes of the current study.

Some of the earlier researches mentioned above probe university courses in various fields of study including statistics, sociology, and psychology. In order to review literature dealing with English courses, studies conducted in the Korean online and offline context should be discussed. Especially, recent studies in the Korean context after the COVID-19 outbreak will be the focus of review as they specifically explore online courses offering *emergency remote teaching* (Hodges et al., 2020) in the pandemic era.

First, H. S. Kim & U. Y. Choi (2020)[2] reports the effectiveness of online exams administered without supervision of a proctor from an obligatory English course in a Korean university. This is one of the rare studies analyzing such online exams administered without a proctor. For the course, instead of students taking the same online exam, different versions of the exam were created. Online students were presented with total 100 test items divided into 10 sub-exams given in random order during the 50-minute exam period, which was twice the total number items offline students were given: test-takers were asked to respond to as many questions as possible without feeling pressured to respond to all of them, which was a means to prevent students from sharing information about the test items. Overall, although all online students took the same test, test items and multiple choice options were shuffled in different random orders to prevent students collaborating to cheat. They conclude this helped discourage academic honesty. Although students were not familiar with the exam format, students' perception demonstrated that they were generally open to this mode of test despite some negative comments.

Then, D. J. Lee & M. Kim (2020) conducted a survey on more than 100 Korean undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in various English education courses to find out their perception on online courses offered after the outburst of the pandemic. Students who expressed their dissatisfaction about their online courses pointed out that instructor's unpreparedness and lack of tech-savviness among other factors are the two main reasons for their dissatisfaction. Another interesting finding of the study related to the current research was regarding students' negative perception about take-home exams; they were worried about other students' cheating on the test and wondered about ambiguous evaluation criteria, which could be cleared by instructors' better class management. Overall, the results of D. J. Lee and M. Kim seem to indicate that factors that have the most room for improvement are mostly related to the instructors.

W. Choi (2020) also used a survey to explore factors affecting graduate students' satisfaction in an English course. Interview with students were also conducted and the results demonstrated that quality of course contents and clear evaluation criteria were most important to their satisfaction. Factors related to the instructor such as interaction with students were also found to be influential.

Finally, G. Kim (2021) reports results of a large scale study involving more than 2,400 students who took general English courses at a Korean university. Pretest and posttest scores were compared between 2019 (pre-pandemic) offline and 2020 (post-pandemic) online courses to measure the effectiveness of the courses. Results demonstrate more improvement in the posttest scores in offline courses. In addition, through interviews with some students, advantages (e.g., learner autonomy) and disadvantages (e.g., lack of interaction with instructor) of online courses are presented as notable factors to be considered for future online curriculum design.

One of the common findings from these researches conducted in the Korean context involves student perception on online courses. In general, students seemed to be open to online courses and factors related to their dissatisfaction mostly involve those that can be fixed by the instructors such as instructor's preparedness or course planning. Thus, another purpose of the current study is to probe whether student satisfaction in this study would reflect previous findings. Overall, the followings are the two research questions for the current research.

1) How will the online open-book exam format affect student performance in a university English course measured in the form of final grade?
2) How will the online format of a university English course influence student satisfaction determined by students' course evaluation?

III. METHOD

This study analyzed the performance of Korean university students who completed the same first year English linguists course titled 'Understanding of English' in two different academic years: one class in fall 2019 and two class sections of the same course in fall 2020[3]. Since this was an introductory level course, there was no prerequisites. The 2019 course was a face-to-face in-class course while the 2020 course was forced to be conducted online due to the pandemic.

[2] Unlike the studies introduced in this section, this study did not aim to compare online results with results from previous offline classes.

[3] Multiple (approximately three) sections for the course are offered annually. In 2019, the author was assigned one section and two sections in 2020.

1. Participants

Fifteen students received course credit for the 2019 course while 28 and 25 students did for the two class sections of the 2020 course, with fairly balanced proportion of male and female students in each section (Table 1). As the course was designed as a first year introductory English linguistics class, most of the students (approximately 70% overall) were freshmen. Most freshmen students who took the course did so to explore the field of English linguistics as they had to decide their major by the end of their freshman year. Upperclassmen were English majors or students minoring in English.

TABLE 1
Participants' Demographics

Class	No. of Students Enrolled (M / F)	No. of Freshmen (%)
2019 Class	15 (8/7)	10 (66.7%)
2020 Class A	28 (14/14)	18 (64.3%)
2020 Class B	25 (10/15)	20 (80%)
Total	68 (32/36)	48 (70.6%)

2. Instructional Methods

'A little book of language' (Crystal, 2011) was the main textbook used for the course. In the book, there are forty short chapters covering diverse aspects of human language, starting from early child language acquisition to how recent technological development influences language use. Class content and instructional methodology was largely consistent between the three class sections. Approximately half of the chapters in the textbook and contents pertaining to the English language were covered mainly due to limited class time for a one semester course. In class, the instructor focused on explaining the text and demonstrating the content's relevance to the field of English linguistics.

Every class in fall 2019 met face-to-face in the classroom including mid-term and final exams. However, for the 2020 online class, students mostly had to watch lecture videos recorded by the instructor (asynchronous online learning). The online students were expected to log on to one of the university portal systems that supports online courses. Students had access to various parts of the course including lecture videos organized on a weekly basis, and usually they had two weeks span to complete each week's lessons. The amount of time students were logged on in the system was recorded and displayed to the instructor, which was mainly used for checking attendance. Students could always post questions to the instructor on the bulletin board and receive the instructor's response. Among 45 class hours (3 credits course running for 15 weeks), 10 hours were conducting real time online via Zoom, which resembled to some degree an offline class (synchronous online learning). Even if students missed a real time online class, they could watch the video recording of it uploaded after the class and check attendance.

Most importantly, mid-term and final exams also had to be administered online without supervision of a proctor. Since there seemed to be no realistic and valid way to prevent online students from taking the exams with their textbook open when it was risky to gather students together for the exams, the instructor simply allowed students to look up the textbook or any other reference if they wanted to, which seems to be a viable option selected by instructors when they had to conduct online courses in the pandemic era (e.g., Baker et al., 2020)[4]. The exams were designed to test students' knowledge about various aspects of the English language and linguistics based on the contents of the textbook. Exam questions remained largely the same, with very little modification on the 2020 course exams compared to those on the 2019 course. There were approximately 35 questions involving multiple choice and short answer questions in each exam adding up to a highest possible score of 40 in each exam. In 2019, in-class students were given two hours for each exam but everyone finished their exams within an hour and left the classroom. So, in the 2020 online course, students were given exactly 60 minutes[5] to finish the exams online.

3. Analysis

The efficiency of the format of learning (online vs. offline) is measured on the basis of students' performance. Students' performance may be measured in several different ways, but each student's final score out of 100 that includes exam scores and attendance will be compared in this study. Mid-term and final exams were worth 40 points each, and attendance was worth 20 points, adding up to 100 points for the final score. Students with up to three absences received full 20 points for attendance and one point was deducted for every extra absence after the third one.

Course evaluation survey administered by the university through one of its portal systems was the source of measuring student satisfaction with the course. Students were asked to participate in the survey once after the mid-term exam and again at the end of the semester before checking their final grade. Since the surveys were administered at different times, the items in them also slightly differed. Also, some additional items about online class were added to the 2020 mid-term survey that were not present in the 2019 survey; the end of semester survey remained the same. Students were to respond to survey questions on a scale of 1 to 10, which asked for their opinion regarding the instructor and class management (refer to the Appendix for the survey items).

[4] Unlike the current study, Baker et al. (2020) gave test items requiring critical thinking and problem-solving skills when switching to open-book exam.

[5] Since the start and end times of the exams were set online, students who logged on late could have had less than 60 minutes to finish the exam.

TABLE 2
Students' Average Performance

Class (No. of Students)	Mid-term (*SD*)	Final (*SD*)	Attendance (No. of Absence)	Total Score (*SD*)
2019 Offline Class (15)	29.47 (6.58)	30.87 (6.01)	19.80 (0.93)	80.13 (12.48)
2020 Online Class A (28)	31.79 (6.98)	30.61 (8.51)	19.39 (1.46)	81.79 (15.73)
2020 Online Class B (25)	29.12 (7.31)	29.20 (6.84)	19.72 (0.92)	78.04 (13.90)

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overall, students' performance from the three classes under investigation (one online and two offline) were quite identical (Table 2). There was no more than 2.32 points difference (2020 class A − 2019 class) between the online class and any of the offline class mid-term exam results and no more than 1.67 points difference (2019 class − 2020 class B) between the final exam results. The attendance scores were also very much alike, resulting in no more than 2.09 points difference (2019 class − 2020 class B) of total scores between the online class and any of the offline classes. As one would expect based on the figures, there was no statistically significant differences between the performances of the three classes as determined by one-way ANOVA for the mid-term ($F(2, 65) = 1.09$, $p = 0.34$) and the final ($F(2, 65) = 0.33$, $p = 0.72$) exams or the total score ($F(2, 65) = 0.45$, $p = 0.64$).

The main research question of this study involved whether the online class students' performance on the exams would be different compared to that of offline class students; students in the offline class took the exams in the classroom with a proctor while students taking the online classes took the exams at their convenient places even with access to the textbook and other materials if they wanted to refer to them. The results indicate that there is hardly any difference in students' performance between a typical in-class pen and paper exam and an open-book exam[6]. Lack of literature comparing virtually the same multiple choice and short answer exams conducted in-class and online[7] makes it impossible to strongly argue that the two test formats would usually yield similar results, but the current observation provides one small piece of evidence to support the effectiveness and validity of a multiple choice and short answer type open-book exam conducted online.

Of course, there are several factors that should be considered here about the online open-book exams administered for this course. First, the particular portal system of the university did not allow students to return to the previous test items once they moved on to the next item. Students would usually go back to the previous test items to review or revise their answers on a pen and paper exam, but the online students were deprived of that option. So even if they later realized that they had made a mistake on a previous question, they would have no way to correct it. Secondly, short interviews with two upperclassmen from the 2020 online course (who received final grade of A^+ and A, respectively) reveal that the open-book format might have not been as much of an advantage for test-takers as one might expect. They reported that the open-book format does not help unless the test-taker is prepared well enough to know where to look up in the textbook for a particular piece of information in a short amount of time. Especially, since the online system did not allow students to revisit previous test items, they seemed to be pressured to move on to the next question without spending too much time on a particular one because they were uncertain how much time they might need for the upcoming items. They also reported that they had no intention of communicating with fellow students to share information during the test because they doubted the effectiveness of such behavior in a competitive exam. Based on the features of the online exam system and students' reports, the open-book exam online had its pros (e.g., being able to refer to materials related to the test items) and cons (e.g., being unable to revise answers to previous test items) that seem to balance out each other.

Next, Table 3 and Table 4 present students' course evaluation results after the mid-term exam and at the end of semester. More students participated in the latter survey since they were required to complete it in order to check if there are any questions or problems regarding their grade before it is finalized, while the former survey was optional. As mentioned above in the methodology section, survey items slightly differed in the two versions even when they are dealing with similar topics (refer to Appendix). Still, all items involved students' evaluation on the course or the instructor rather than students themselves like motivation or their study time.

---

[6] Vazquez et al. (2021) report that test-takers without supervision scored better than those with a proctor; they suggest ease of collaboration and information sharing between test-takers as some of the possible reasons. However, the freshmen students in the 2020 online classes in this study who constitute the majority of the enrollees were unfortunate in a sense that they rarely had opportunities to visit the campus and acquaint themselves with fellow students. Thus, collaboration and information sharing during the tests seem unlikely to have had happened.

[7] There are a limited number of research comparing closed-book and open-book exams such as Williams & Wong (2009), but they mostly probe essay type exam questions.

TABLE 3
Course Evaluation after Mid-Term Exam

Items	2019 Offline Class	2020 Online Class A	2020 Online Class B
1. Syllabus	9.63	9.56	9.62
2. Learning Goals	9.38	9.63	9.46
3. Evaluation and Grading	9.5	9.56	9.38
4. Course Materials	9.5	9.5	9.31
5. Teaching Effectiveness	9.5	9.56	9.31
6. Online Interaction*	-	9.56	9.54
7. Instructor's Enthusiasm*	-	9.69	9.54
Average	9.5	9.58	9.45
Participation Rate	53.33% (8/15)	57.14% (16/28)	52% (13/25)

* Items 6 and 7 pertain to online classes only, which is why they are not included in the 2019 offline course survey.

TABLE 4
Course Evaluation at the End of Semester

Items	2019 Offline Class	2020 Online Class A	2020 Online Class B
1. Syllabus	9.64	9.64	9.52
2. Learning Goals	9.57	9.64	9.32
3. Evaluation and Grading	9.57	9.64	9.44
4. Instructor's Preparation	9.64	9.76	9.52
5. Instructor's Explanation	9.57	9.76	9.4
6. Instructor's Enthusiasm	9.57	9.72	9.56
7. Use of Class Time	9.64	9.68	9.48
8. Overall Satisfaction	9.5	9.64	9.44
Average	9.59	9.69	9.46
Participation Rate	93.33% (14/15)	89.29% (25/28)	100% (25/25)

No noteworthy difference in any course evaluation item between the offline and online classes seem to appear as all scores for the items in Tables 3 and 4 range between 9.31 and 9.76 out of 10. Overall, online class A students tended to give a slightly higher score than online class B students but their combined score would result in a score very analogous to the offline students' evaluation. Even the items 6 and 7 in Table 3 specifically asking for online class evaluation received high scores ranging from 9.54 to 9.69. Thus, the delivery platform itself (offline vs. online) does not seem to have influenced student satisfaction. Also, student satisfaction regarding their grades in item 3 demonstrated consistent level of satisfaction between the two class formats suggesting that the online students did not consider the non-proctored multiple choice and short answer type online test problematic.

Student satisfaction in an online class may decrease in spite of class content and instructional methodology being maintained in online and offline classes (e.g., Summers et al., 2005), but results from the current research demonstrates that student satisfaction on an online course can remain at the same level. Such result can be attributed to the instructor's satisfactory online class management, but other factors (which are not within the scope of this research) can be considered as well. One potential factor that might have influenced higher online student satisfaction level compared to previous studies is recent Korean university students' familiarity with online classes. Freshman students who constituted most of the enrollees of the online classes in this study (approximately 71.7%, 38 of 53) are probably quite familiar with using online media or taking online courses even before they were admitted to university (Strome, 2020). Furthermore, recent university students in Korea were reported to have positive attitudes toward learning English using digital technology and expect the importance of offline face-to-face English classes to decrease in the future (Jones et al., 2019). Thus, if students in this study also perceived online classes as posi-

tive, their high satisfaction level is not surprising. Another possibility is that students may have had low expectation about online courses because they understood the special circumstances surrounding the sudden shift to online courses. Then, their satisfaction level could turn out to be quite high if the course exceeded their low expectation.

V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Considering the extensive online teaching and learning experience that followed the COVID-19 pandemic, it might be virtually impossible to return to the days of entirely offline courses even in the future post pandemic era (e.g., Hodges et al., 2020). There is probably no way to exactly predict how the future education will be shaped in the post pandemic era, but the current unique situation caused by the sudden shift to online classes in 2020 provided an opportunity to compare student performance and satisfaction in online versus offline classes with the same content and instructional methods. As for student performance, this research probed the effect of non-proctored online open-book exams that consisted of virtually the same multiple choice and short answer items as in the offline class exams administered in the previous year. Then for student satisfaction, their course evaluation results were investigated.

However, there are some limitations that should be noted. The small number of participants in the offline and online classes that were assumed to be homogenous makes it difficult to claim that the findings carry universal implications. Also, other factors that can influence students' performance and satisfaction such as learner motivation and effort level were not considered. Despite limitations of this case study that investigated a small sample from a Korean university, the results of this study provides additional evidence to claim that the format of delivery (online vs. offline) is not nearly as important for student performance and satisfaction as some might think since student performance and satisfaction level appeared to be quite similar in the two delivery formats. Especially, the result demonstrating no difference between proctored offline closed-book exam and non-proctored online open-book exam can be quite revealing to those who believe students will no doubt perform significantly better on online open-book exams. Although the scope of this research did not include online course design, this result suggests that instructors who are worried about student evaluation and test format in online classes may consider implementing evaluation format similar or identical to the offline classes and expect it to yield comparable student evaluation.

The emergency caused by the pandemic presented a situation in which online student performance was evaluated based on the same offline version of the test in an online open-book format and this case study demonstrated the effectiveness of a university English online course in terms of student performance and satisfaction. This is not to suggest that simply translating the contents and pedagogy of previous offline courses to online is an ideal or acceptable way to design and manage an online course; much consideration about how the change in delivery format will influence students and how to make the best of the technological advances that online teaching can provide should be given in advance. However, if the online exam format does not negatively affect student evaluation and their course satisfaction which are probably two of the most important parts constituting any course, instructors can consider retaining student evaluation criteria and focus their attention and energy on maximizing the potential merits of online course format.

The sudden forced shift to online courses probably made most of the unprepared instructors like the author panic and push some of them to simply translate the offline contents and pedagogy to the online like the English class investigated here. This might have caused some instructors to feel anxious about their unpreparedness to teach online and uncertain about how their students will perceive their online classes. This particular case study obviously cannot represent all the online courses in the pandemic era, but the results might indicate that the current generation of online-friendly students seem to have been ready to embrace the shift to online courses. Further studies reporting online education experience in the pandemic era will hopefully provide additional tips for curriculum design in the post pandemic era.

REFERENCES

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2016). *Online report card: Tracking online education in the United States*. Babson Survey Research Group.

Allen, M., Bourhis, J., Burrell, N., & Mabry, E. (2002). Comparing student satisfaction with distance education to traditional classrooms in higher education: A meta-analysis. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, *16*(2), 83-97.

Baker, R. M., Leonard, M. E., & Milosavljevic, B. H. (2020). The sudden switch to online teaching of an upper-level experimental physical chemistry course: Challenges and solutions. *Journal of Chemical Education*, *97*(9), 3097-3101.

Bernard, R. M., Abrami, P. C., Lou, Y., Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Wozney, L., Wallet, P A., Fiest, M., & Huang, B. (2004). How does distance education compare with classroom instruction? A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(3), 379-439.

Choi, Wonkyung. (2020). Comparison between online and offline general English classes in a graduate school: A case study amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, *19*(4), 223-245.

Crystal, D. (2011). *A little book of language*. Yale University Press.

Dell, C. A., Low, C., & Wilker, J. F. (2010). Comparing student achievement in online and face-to-face class formats. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, *6*(1), 30-42.

Driscoll, A., Jicha, K., Hunt, A. N., Tichavsky, L., & Thompson, G. (2012). Can online courses deliver in-class results? A comparison of student performance and satisfaction in an online versus a face-to-face introductory sociology course. *Teaching Sociology*, *40*(4), 312-331.

Grgurovic, M., Chapelle, C. A., & Shelly, M. C. (2013). A meta-analysis of effectiveness studies on computer technology-supported language learning. *ReCALL*, *25*(2), 165-198.

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

Jones, S., Richards, A., Cho, Youngsang, & Lee, Yoo-Jean. (2019). Digital technology in the 4IR and the future of English learning from the perspective of Korean EFL university students. *Modern English Education*, *20*(1), 53-70.

Karkar-Esperat, T. M. (2018). International graduate students' challenges and learning experiences in online classes. *Journal of International Students*, *8*(4), 1722-1735.

Kim, Gyoo-mi. (2021). The prospect of English education preparing for post-COVID: Comparison of the effects of online and offline classes. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, *20*(1), 39-59.

Kim, Hyung-Sun, & Choi, Ung-Yong. (2020). Learner perception of an online L2-course summative exam. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, *23*(3), 258-279.

Lee, Dong Ju, & Kim, Misook. (2020). University students' perceptions on the practices of online learning in the COVID-19 situation and future directions. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, *23*(3), 359-377.

Liu, X., Liu, S., Lee, S., & Magjuka, R. J. (2010). Cultural differences in online learning: International student perceptions. *Educational Technology & Society*, *13*(3), 177-188.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2010). *Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies*. Center for Technology in Learning, U.S. Department of Education.

Ritzer, G. (2004). *The McDonaldization of society*. Pine Forge Press.

Russell, T. (1999). *The no significant difference phenomenon*. Office of Instructional Telecommunications, University of North Carolina.

Singh, S., Rylander, D. H., & Mims, T. C. (2012). Efficiency of online vs. offline learning: A comparison of inputs and outcomes. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, *2*(1), 93-98.

Stansfield, M., McLellan, E., & Connolly, T. (2004). Enhancing student performance in online learning and traditional face-to-face class delivery. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, *3*, 173-187.

Strome, D. M. (2020). Student perceptions toward the use of media for extensive study purposes. *English Language Teaching*, *32*(3), 21-45.

Summers, J. J., Waigandt, A., & Whittaker, T. A. (2005). A comparison of student achievement and satisfaction in an online versus a traditional face-to-face statistics class. *Innovative Higher Education*, *29*(3), 233-250.

Tallent-Runnels, M. K., Lan, W., Cooper, S., Ahem, T. C., Shaw, S. M., & Liu, X. (2006). Teaching courses online: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, *76*(1). 93-135.

Vazquez, J. J., Chiang, E. P., & Sarmiento-Barbieri, I. (2021). Can we stay one step ahead of cheaters? A field experiment in proctoring online open book exams. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, *90*, Article 101653. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2020.101653

Wilikins, B., & Barrett, J. (2000). The virtual construction site: A web-based teaching/learning environment in construction technology. *Automation in Construction*, *10*, 169-179.

Williams, J. B., & Wong, A. (2009). The efficacy of final examinations: A comparative study of closed-book, invigilated exams and open-book, open-web exams. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *40*(2), 227-236.

Zimmerman, J. (2020). Coronavirus and the great online-learning experiment. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 10, 2020. https://www.chronicle.com/article/coronavirus-and-the-great-online-learning-experiment

APPENDIX I

Course Evaluation Survey Items after Mid-Term Exam (translated into English)

Items	
1. Syllabus	The course syllabus clearly stated about the course.
2. Learning Goals	The instructor specified the learning goals in class.
3. Evaluation and Grading	Evaluation and grading criteria were clearly explained.
4. Course Materials	The course materials helped to understand the class.
5. Teaching Effectiveness	The instructors teaching methodology was effective.
6. Online Interaction	Various types of interaction with the instructor is available for the online course.
7. Instructor's Enthusiasm	The instructor has enthusiasm for the online course.

* Items 6 and 7, which pertain to online courses, were included only in the 2020 course evaluation.

APPENDIIX II

Course Evaluation Survey Items at the End of Semester (translated into English)

Items	
1. Syllabus	The course followed the schedule in the syllabus.
2. Learning Goals	The class effectively accomplished the learning goals.
3. Evaluation and Grading	Evaluation and grading criteria were appropriate.
4. Instructor's Preparation	The instructor had wide knowledge in the field and was well-prepared for the class.
5. Instructor's Explanation	The instructor helped me understand the contents.
6. Instructor's Enthusiasm	The instructor actively interacted with students.
7. Use of Class Time	There was no loss of class time due to the instructor being late, shortening class, missing class, etc.
8. Overall Satisfaction	Overall, I am satisfied with this course.