EFL Students' Views on MOOCs' Usability in the North of Vietnam: A Qualitative Study

Nguyen Huu Hoang

huuhoang309@gmail.com
Academy of Journalism and Communication
(Vietnam)

ABSTRACT: *The primary aim of this study was to explore the usability of Language Massive Open Online Courses (LMOOCs) from the perspective of Vietnamese learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). To achieve this, the research utilized a qualitative questionnaire to gather data from a purposively selected group of 12 EFL learners. These participants were drawn from five different universities in the north of Vietnam. The outcomes of the study encompass a wide array of positive and negative facets pertaining to LMOOCs. Based on the findings of content analysis, it can be observed that learners exhibit consensus regarding the favorable attributes of LMOOCs. These attributes encompass the learning environment, the applicability of LMOOCs in language acquisition, the inclusive nature of educational technology employed, and the existence of parental involvement. However, the attitudes of the learners exhibited inconsistency when it came to affective variables and feedback in the context of LMOOCs. Ultimately, it was posited that contextual considerations serve as impediments to the adoption of LMOOCs. The study posits that it would be beneficial for EFL authorities in Vietnam and similar contexts to increase the provision of teacher education and professional development courses. This would help EFL instructors to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to effectively implement teaching methodologies utilizing LMOOCs.*

1. Introduction

The landscape of digital education has undergone a significant transformation with the advent of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), a paradigm shift that has substantially broadened the horizons of online learning. MOOCs have democratized access to education, allowing unrestricted access to course materials, enrollment, and curriculum for learners worldwide (Waks, 2016). These online courses are distinguished by their open and free nature, facilitating learning without the constraints of time or location (Geng et al., 2020). The popularity of MOOCs has surged, as evidenced by an increase in participant engagement (de Freitas et al., 2015). However, despite their widespread acceptance and the expansion of educational opportunities they offer, MOOCs are confronted with challenges, notably lower completion rates when compared to traditional educational methods (Alraimi et al., 2015).

This discrepancy in completion rates has sparked a growing interest among scholars, leading to numerous studies aimed at understanding the underlying factors that influence course completion. Recent investigations have shed light on the psychological dimensions influencing learner engagement and persistence in MOOCs. Specifically, research has focused on the roles of motivation, self-regulation, and attitudes towards learning, and their impact on the successful completion of MOOCs (Reparaz et al., 2020; Kumar & Kumar, 2020; Romero-Frias et al., 2020). These studies underscore the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, the development of clear learning goals, task motivation, and the relevance of academic subjects as pivotal elements in fostering learner persistence and achieving higher completion rates.

In the expanding corpus of research on MOOCs, Language Massive Open Online Courses (LMOOCs) have emerged as a

specialized focus, designed to enhance language learning and proficiency. LMOOCs present a compelling opportunity for language acquisition in the increasingly globalized world, aiming not just to teach languages, but to make them accessible, interactive, and applicable to real-life contexts (Teixeira & Mota, 2014). Practicality in this context refers to the ease with which learners can access and navigate LMOOC platforms, integrating language learning seamlessly into their daily lives without the need for extensive technical knowledge or resources (Uchidiuno et al., 2017). Usability, on the other hand, encompasses the effectiveness and efficiency with which users can achieve their language learning goals through LMOOCs, ensuring that the courses are learner-friendly, engaging, and supportive of their educational needs (Walji et al., 2016). Despite these advantages, challenges persist, including limited interaction with native speakers and insufficient opportunities for learners to practice language skills in authentic social contexts. These barriers could potentially undermine the practicality and usability of LMOOCs, making it harder for learners to fully benefit from the opportunities these platforms offer (Deng et al., 2020; Gupta & Maurya, 2020).

Given the critical role of learner attitudes in the adoption and success of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) tools, including LMOOCs, this study seeks to address a notable gap in the research. It aims to explore the perceptions of Vietnamese English language learners regarding the practicality of LMOOCs, contributing to a deeper understanding of the factors that influence the efficacy of LMOOCs in language education. This inquiry is motivated by the limited research on the applicability of LMOOCs in the Vietnamese context and the need for a comprehensive understanding of this emerging tool in CALL. Therefore, the guiding research question for this study is: What are the views of Vietnamese English language learners regarding the practicality of LMOOCs?

2. Literature review

The emergence of MOOCs heralds a pivotal transformation in the landscape of digital education, challenging traditional educational paradigms through the democratization of learning opportunities. Rooted in the principles of open education, MOOCs aim to transcend geographical, financial, and social barriers, offering an egalitarian approach to education. According to Waks (2016), MOOCs embody a significant leap towards educational inclusivity, providing learners worldwide with unfettered access to high-quality educational resources. However, the MOOC model, despite its revolutionary potential, is not without its criticisms and challenges, particularly regarding learner engagement and course completion rates.

While MOOCs offer unparalleled access to education, their effectiveness is marred by persistently low completion rates, a phenomenon that has become a focal point of scholarly inquiry. Research indicates that completion rates for MOOCs often fall below ten percent, highlighting a disconcerting gap between initial enrollment and successful course completion (Alraimi et al., 2015; Alario-Hoyos et al., 2017). This discrepancy raises critical questions about the alignment between MOOC design and learner needs, suggesting a potential misfit between the aspirations of MOOC providers and the realities of learner engagement (de Freitas et al., 2015; Littlejohn et al., 2016). The literature points to the necessity of a more nuanced understanding of learner behavior within MOOC environments, urging educators and course designers to rethink strategies to enhance engagement and retention.

Central to the discourse on MOOC completion rates is the exploration of psychological factors that influence learner engagement and persistence. Studies have consistently highlighted the role of motivation - both intrinsic and extrinsic - in sustaining learner interest and engagement in MOOCs (Romero-Frias et al., 2020). Self-regulation emerges as another crucial determinant of success, involving learners' ability to set clear learning goals, maintain motivation, and perceive the relevance of course content to their personal or professional development (Reparaz et al., 2020). This body of research underscores the complexity of learner engagement, calling for MOOC designs that accommodate diverse learner

profiles and create environments conducive to sustained engagement and learning (Deshpande & Chukhlomin, 2017; Kumar & Kumar, 2020).

LMOOCs represent a specialized segment of MOOCs, designed with the primary goal of facilitating language learning and acquisition. LMOOCs promise to address some of the limitations of traditional language learning methods by leveraging the flexibility and accessibility of online platforms. Nonetheless, LMOOCs confront specific challenges, particularly in simulating the immersive experiences and social interactions essential for effective language learning (Deng et al., 2020). The literature emphasizes the need for LMOOC designs that incorporate interactive elements and communicative tools to replicate the nuances of language use in real-world contexts (Gupta & Maurya, 2020; Rayyan et al., 2016).

The efficacy of LMOOCs in facilitating language learning is significantly influenced by learners' attitudes towards these platforms. Research in this area explores the complex interplay between learners' cognitive assessments, affective responses, and behavioral intentions, suggesting that positive attitudes towards LMOOCs correlate with higher levels of motivation, engagement, and, potentially, course completion (Sun et al., 2018). However, the literature reveals a gap in our understanding of the specific attitudes of Vietnamese English language learners towards LMOOCs, a demographic whose perspectives could offer valuable insights into the design and implementation of more effective LMOOCs (Gupta & Maurya, 2020; Romero-Frias et al., 2020).

The examination of existing literature on MOOCs and LMOOCs reveals a rich discourse on their potential impacts, challenges, and the psychological underpinnings of learner engagement. However, there is a notable absence of research focused on the views of Vietnamese learners towards LMOOCs. This oversight represents a significant gap in the literature, given the potential of LMOOCs to transform language education for Vietnamese learners. This study aims to address this gap by investigating the views of Vietnamese EFL learners regarding the usability of LMOOCs, contributing to a deeper understanding of how LMOOCs can be optimized to meet the needs of this learner demographic.

3. Methodology
3.1. Research design
The study adopted a phenomenological research design, as delineated by Creswell and Creswell (2018), to delve into the views of Vietnamese EFL learners on the usability of LMOOCs. This choice was motivated by the phenomenological method's emphasis on exploring how individuals make sense of their experiences and the essence of those experiences. A sample of 12 EFL learners, enrolled at five universities located in the northern region of Vietnam, was selected to participate. The researcher contends that the sentiments of students towards LMOOCs are inherently complex and nuanced, resisting straightforward quantification. Thus, a phenomenological approach was deemed most suitable for achieving a deep, nuanced understanding of the learners' views regarding LMOOC usability (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

3.2. Participants
The research was carried out during the academic year 2021-2022, focusing on Vietnamese EFL learners' experiences with LMOOCs. The selection of five universities in the northern region of Vietnam was deliberate, chosen for their diverse language programs and innovative use of technology in education, aiming to capture a wide range of user experiences with LMOOCs (Patton, 2002).

Initial outreach to colleagues and classmates at these institutions yielded expressions of interest from 31 language learners. To ensure the study's depth and manageability, deliberate sampling was employed, focusing on the representativeness and similarity of the cases (Marshall & Rossman, 2014; Alario-Hoyos et al., 2017; Palinkas et al., 2013). Participant selection hinged on three criteria: a high level of enthusiasm for online language learning, as determined by scores of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale in a preliminary survey; an intermediate proficiency in the English language, verified through self-assessments and

Table 1. Participants' Demographic Information

Participant	Gender	University	Age	Enthusiasm Score (1-5)	English Proficiency (CEFR)	Familiarity with Online Learning (1-5)
P1	Male	UniA	18-19	5	B2	5
P2	Female	UniA	20-21	4	B2	3
P3	Female	UniA	18-19	4	B1	4
P4	Male	UniA	22-23	4	B1	4
P5	Female	UniB	18-19	5	B1	4
P6	Female	UniB	18-19	5	B1	3
P7	Female	UniC	22-23	4	B1	2
P8	Female	UniC	20-21	5	B1	3
P9	Female	UniD	18-19	5	B2	4
P10	Male	UniE	20-21	4	B1	5
P11	Male	UniE	20-21	4	B2	4
P12	Female	UniE	18-19	4	B2	5

an online test aligning with B1 or B2 levels of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001); and familiarity with online learning platforms, gauged by self-reported experiences and a comfort level of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale. This process culminated in the selection of 12 participants, comprising eight females and four males, who were then divided into two groups for participation in different LMOOCs. The participants' ages ranged from 18 to 23, with six individuals aged 18-19, four aged 20-21, and two aged 22-23. Consent forms were obtained from all participants prior to their involvement in the study, ensuring ethical research practices and participant awareness.

3.3. Research instrument

The research instrument was developed employing the Delphi methodology, a recognized and pragmatic approach particularly suited for the construction of research tools within the field of educational technology (Sekayi & Kennedy, 2017; Nworie, 2011). This iterative method is designed to harness expert feedback to refine research instruments, facilitating informed decision-making among educators, researchers, and administrators. An initial qualitative questionnaire was crafted and subjected to the Delphi process, which involved soliciting input from a panel of twenty experts across various fields: educational technology, educational psychology, computer science, computer-assisted language learning (CALL), and English language teaching. The Delphi technique unfolded over three stages, as delineated by Keeney et al. (2001), encompassing the collection of expert opinions, identification of pertinent themes, and synthesis of these insights. Following three rounds of feedback, adjustments were made to the questionnaire items based on expert consensus, culminating in a refined and camera-ready version of the instrument. The final questionnaire included three demographic questions and ten open-ended questions, tailored to probe the perspectives of Vietnamese EFL learners on the usability of LMOOCs.

3.4 Data collection

Data collection from participants was conducted with an emphasis on ethical considerations, particularly concerning anonymity and confidentiality. Each student was assigned a pseudonym to protect their identity throughout the research process.

Twelve participants were then divided into two groups to engage in different LMOOCs. This division was guided by the study's intent to compare learning outcomes across different instructional designs and content areas within the domain of English language learning. Each group was assigned to a course under the instruction of

Amelia Ng, an experienced educator specializing in online language instruction and curriculum development. Amelia Ng's involvement was crucial for ensuring consistency in instructional quality across the two courses.

The courses differed in thematic focus - one concentrated on general English language skills, while the other targeted specific language skills for academic purposes. Despite these thematic differences, both courses were equal in terms of content richness, duration (each spanning a period of 8 weeks), and language difficulty level, aligning with the intermediate proficiency target (B1-B2 CEFR). Such parity was essential for a fair comparison of user experiences and learning outcomes.

Prior to disseminating the qualitative questionnaire, participants were required to complete an Informed Consent form, ensuring they were fully informed of the study's nature and their rights as participants. Only those who submitted the duly completed consent forms were administered the questionnaire via email. This meticulous approach to data collection not only adhered to ethical research practices but also ensured the reliability and validity of the gathered data by securing informed and voluntary participation from all respondents.

3.5. Data analysis

To conduct the data analysis, the researcher employed a content analysis approach, renowned for its systematic and objective examination of human behavior through indirect means (Neuendorf, 2017; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). This method ensures the analysis remains uninfluenced by participants' behavior and experiences, thereby enriching the understanding of their experiences and attitudes (Babbie, 2004; Alario-Hoyos et al., 2017). Bengtsson (2016) outlined a structured qualitative data analysis process involving four critical stages: decontextualization, recontextualization, categorization, and compilation.

In the decontextualization stage, the researcher meticulously reviewed participants' responses to develop an in-depth understanding and capture the overall meaning conveyed. A deductive

coding approach, guided by the recommendations of Richards and Morse (2012), was adopted to ensure methodological rigor and minimize cognitive biases. The coding scheme was based on the rule model proposed by Tafazoli et al. (2020), with further refinement by the procedures suggested by Thamrin and Pamungkas (2017), facilitating the systematic organization of data into categories reflecting both the internal and external dimensions of the LMOOC experience.

For consistency in terminology, all external negative influences were classified as "threats," while internal challenges were coded as "vulnerabilities." Positive aspects were designated as "strengths," and external beneficial factors as "opportunities." A color-coding system - red for vulnerabilities, yellow for threats, green for strengths, and blue for opportunities - was used for the initial segregation of data.

Figure 1. The Rule Model

| | | Score | |
		Positive	Negative
Factor	Internal	Strength	Weakness
	External	Opportunity	Threat

The recontextualization phase involved a thorough verification of these codes (Burnard, 1991) to confirm the reliability and validity of the inter-coder agreement (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This included a detailed examination of both highlighted and unmarked texts to ensure no significant data units were inadvertently overlooked.

The differentiation between main themes and sub-themes was carefully executed. Main themes, such as "positive learning environment," were derived from aggregated data on strengths and opportunities. Sub-themes, like "flexibility," emerged from detailed analyses of specific strengths related to the adaptability and accessibility of LMOOCs, allowing for the identification of patterns and relationships within the data.

Following the categorization process, the researcher conducted a comparative analysis of the coding methodology to identify commonalities

and discrepancies (Creswell & Creswell, 2018), achieving a thematic consensus. This process led to the condensation of meaning units to succinctly capture essential information while preserving the integrity of the data (Graneheim and Lundman, 2004). The analysis culminated in a refined organization of the data into four principal categories: strengths, vulnerabilities, opportunities, and threats, elucidating the complex interplay between internal efficiencies and external factors.

4. Findings

In this section, the researcher provides an examination of the perspectives held by Vietnamese EFL learners regarding the practicality of MOOCs in language learning. The results indicate that the existence of a favorable learning environment and the integration of inclusive educational technology are significant characteristics of LMOOCs. In addition, LMOOCs offer improved usability for language skill learning, however there is a generally observed penalty in terms of speaking proficiency. Another constraint associated with LMOOCs relates to the delivery of feedback. Conversely, the involvement of parents is perceived as a favorable opportunity for individuals engaged in the process of acquiring a new language. One of the intriguing characteristics of LMOOCs concerns the impact of emotive factors, which are viewed as a possible benefit for specific learners while presenting a difficulty for others. In the perspective of learners, contextual conditions present substantial risks.

4.1. Positive learning environment

The findings reveal that LMOOCs exhibit significant usability, particularly in terms of their learning environment. Participants highlighted various facets of the LMOOCs learning environment, such as its flexibility, user-friendliness, and authenticity. The study found that LMOOCs offer considerable flexibility, making them apt for both synchronous and asynchronous communication modes. One student highlighted the appeal of online language learning as a viable option due to the constraints of time that prevent participation in private sessions or attending classes with fixed schedules (P1). Additionally, P4 mentioned their ability to interact with educators, address language-related challenges, and enhance their English language skills outside traditional classroom settings. P10 noted that time and space are of minimal concern in online learning, asserting that physical co-location of students is not necessary for receiving uniform training.

The usability of LMOOCs is further evidenced by their provision of a pleasurable, user-friendly, accessible, and educationally entertaining environment for language proficiency acquisition. P8 praised the platform's remarkable user-friendliness and its abundance of activities and resources. Similarly, P12 showed a preference for online courses, likening them to popular social networking platforms like Instagram, especially the courses' emphasis on game-based activities.

Another highlighted benefit of the LMOOCs' learning environment is its openness. Eight participants expressed interest in features that allow them to join additional classes and interact with a diverse community of educators and students. P11, for example, appreciated the opportunity to share difficulties with peers and instructors, a process that facilitates language acquisition and contributes to successful course completion.

4.2. Usability in language learning

The results of the study indicate that MOOCs have the potential to augment students' acquisition of language skills. In relation to this particular strength, P2 claimed that "the platform exhibited exceptional qualities and facilitated the concurrent enhancement of my language proficiency." Furthermore, P10 emphasized the need to engage in conversations and informal discussions as a means to enhance their English competence. P12 articulated that the utilization of movies including interpersonal communication significantly contributed to the enhancement of their speech proficiency to the greatest extent attainable. On the contrary, a student expressed dissatisfaction with the efficacy of MOOCs in enhancing their oral proficiency. P6 emphasized

that individuals who enroll in language courses anticipate enhancing their oral communication skills. However, in the context of MOOCs, the researcher's involvement is limited to written communication or online chatting.

4.3. Multifaceted educational technology

MOOCs offer learners the opportunity to acquire knowledge through several channels, aligning with blended and flipped learning approaches and remaining consistent with the conventional classroom setting. Participant 5 expressed that the inclusion of podcasts, videos, various learning activities, and assignments in the course was very commendable due to the alignment of the course content with our institute's fellow students. However, it was noted that learning and interaction occurred inside a distinct setting. Furthermore, MOOCs offer learners the opportunity to view and download the educational materials provided by their instructors. P12 mentioned that users have the ability to download course materials, including PDF books, videos, and audios. This allows them to review the subject repeatedly in case they encounter difficulties comprehending the topic after their initial exposure.

4.4. Parental presence

One notable advantage of MOOCs is the inclusion of students' parents in the context of their children's online language learning. In essence, MOOCs provide students the ability to engage in learning activities while being accompanied by their parents. As exemplified by P2, it was noted that the individual's parents fostered an environment that promoted engagement with both their teacher and peers. Furthermore, P4 made the observation that it is intriguing that our parents also possess their own profiles. P3 observed that the presence of their family members was highly intriguing as they were able to engage with their teacher and assist in resolving any issues that arose.

4.5. Feedback

Moreover, it has been noted by students that the feedback provided by instructors in MOOCs

is deemed less valuable when compared to the feedback received in regular classroom settings. As stated by P11, a notable drawback of the online course is to the provision of feedback. Specifically, the instructor's inability to address errors, particularly in relation to oral proficiency, inside the online learning environment was identified. Additionally, P4 highlighted the uncertainty about the correctness of one's pronunciation.

4.6. Affective filters

The results indicate a discrepancy in the perceptions of students regarding the learning environment inside MOOCs. From an optimistic standpoint, MOOCs offer numerous psychological advantages. In this context, P1 discussed the suitability of the approach for pupils who are shy and reluctant. Additionally, P2 stated that they refrain from participating verbally in traditional classroom settings, but they experience a higher level of engagement with their peers in the context of MOOCs. This discovery demonstrates the potential for learners to engage in more confident dialogue and self-expression, with the absence of face-to-face communication being regarded as a favorable aspect. Conversely, five students emphasized that the absence of in-person engagement is a notable limitation of MOOCs, since it precludes genuine interpersonal connections and a competitive environment. As per the observations made by students, it was noted that the competitive nature of the face-to-face class is more pronounced when compared to the online class (P8). Furthermore, P4 contended, "Within the confines of a conventional educational setting, there exists a dynamic exchange of knowledge among peers, fostering an environment that serves as a catalyst for diligent academic pursuit." Moreover, P3 expressed the belief that "Traditional classrooms offer a more enjoyable experience as a result of the direct interpersonal interaction." Furthermore, it should be noted that a student expressed dissatisfaction regarding the absence of nonverbal communication cues in MOOCs.

4.7. Prohibitive contextual factors

There are some contextual challenges that

students and their parents encounter when utilizing MOOCs. For instance, certain platforms may lack accessibility in the northern region of Vietnam. P11 indicated that there were difficulties encountered by both themselves and their parents in locating the Edmodo platform. Furthermore, it should be noted that one of the learners employed a Virtual Private Network (VPN) in order to access and utilize the Edmodo platform. Language learners in the northern region of Vietnam encounter difficulties due to issues pertaining to internet connectivity and bandwidth. P12 expressed that the limited speed of the internet hindered their ability to effectively utilize online learning platforms, specifically referring to MOOCs. Furthermore, P10 expressed their ongoing difficulty with the internet's speed when it comes to downloading submitted stuff.

5. Discussion

The results of the investigation affirm the effectiveness of Language Massive Open Online Courses (LMOOCs) in facilitating language acquisition within the Vietnamese EFL context, corroborating existing literature that emphasizes the adaptive, inclusive, and engaging attributes of these educational platforms. The identified characteristics of LMOOCs, such as adaptability, inclusiveness, and user-friendliness, resonate with the observations made by Li (2017), Littlejohn et al. (2016), and Kumar & Kumar (2020). These scholars posit that learners can customize their educational experiences to align with their schedules, interests, and learning speeds, a flexibility that is pivotal for the effective acquisition of new languages, offering a personalized approach that caters to individual learner needs.

In alignment with conclusions drawn by de Freitas et al. (2015), Littlejohn et al. (2016), and Alario-Hoyos et al. (2017), the study underscores that the temporal and spatial flexibility of LMOOCs significantly enhances their utility in language education. This flexibility, coupled with the user-friendly interfaces noted by Kovanović et al. (2015) and the enjoyable learning experiences highlighted by Walji et al. (2016), mirrors the participant-reported satisfaction and perceived

advancements in language proficiency within the study.

Moreover, the positive impacts of LMOOCs on learners' academic performance and emotional well-being, as discussed by Pasawano (2015), find echoes in the study's findings, where the edutainment aspects of LMOOCs were notably appreciated. These aspects not only facilitate learning but also bolster motivation and engagement, highlighting the criticality of crafting enjoyable and meaningful educational experiences.

The investigation further illuminates the importance of realistic settings and authentic resources in LMOOCs, as advocated by Alioon & Delialioglu (2017), which are instrumental in simulating real-world communication and enhancing practical language skills. Such emphasis on real-life applicability is identified as a crucial factor in engaging learners and fostering deeper language comprehension and proficiency, aligning with Hew's (2014) recognition of these components as essential for learner engagement in MOOCs. Through the integration of these elements, LMOOCs present a conducive environment for practical language acquisition, effectively bridging the theoretical knowledge with real-world application.

One area of uncertainty among learners pertains to the efficacy of LMOOCs in facilitating the acquisition of spoken English proficiency. In line with previous research, MOOCs have demonstrated efficacy in enhancing learners' linguistic abilities (Walji et al., 2016; Safdar et al., 2020). This is particularly evident in the development of receptive language skills, such as reading and listening (Zhou, 2016; Sun et al., 2018). Nevertheless, there exists a divergence of viewpoints among EFL learners regarding the efficacy of LMOOCs in enhancing speaking skills. This stands in contrast to the research conducted by Hashemifardnia et al. (2021), which revealed the favorable attitudes of Vietnamese EFL learners towards utilizing MOOCs for the development of speaking abilities.

The principal objective of educational technologists and designers entails the creation and advancement of educational tools that exhibit

a heightened level of inclusivity, accommodating the diverse needs of students encompassing disabilities, learning styles, and preferences. Therefore, the ability to present information in several formats and modes is advantageous for an educational resource (Correa, 2015). The outcomes of the study revealed that LMOOCs address the various learning styles and individual variations of learners, a phenomenon that has also been highlighted by Mellati and Khademi (2018).

The involvement of parents is an additional feature that plays a crucial part in facilitating successful online learning in LMOOCs. This finding is consistent with the speculation made by Zhou (2016) that parents have a favorable impact on the language abilities and motivation of pupils. In a study conducted by Thomas et al. (2019), it was observed that parental involvement and expectations play a crucial role in facilitating learners' academic progress and accomplishments. Furthermore, the study conducted by Rahimi (2022) revealed that the instrumentality-prevention of Vietnamese EFL learners in MOOCs can be influenced by social obligation and parental expectations.

The existing body of literature suggests that feedback has been recognized as a constraint in the context of LMOOCs. The discovery is consistent with the claim put forth by Veletsianos et al. (2015) that a significant barrier in MOOCs is the lack of timely corrective feedback. The significance and impact of feedback in the language learning and teaching process have been extensively recognized by scholars (Clifford et al., 2019). Previous studies (Philip, 2016; Waks, 2016; Lee & Chung, 2019) have indicated that students attach significant value to the receipt of corrective feedback as a means of promoting language development. This problem has also been investigated by other scholars who focus on the lack of peer-corrective feedback (Hmedna et al., 2019) as well as the feedback delivered by educators (Fuchs, 2017; Tseng et al., 2016; Teixeira & Mota, 2014). Tseng et al. (2016) argue that the feasibility of providing personalized feedback by lecturers in large-scale courses may be limited. As a result, the

authors suggest that prioritizing the cultivation of collaboration and the facilitation of peer input should be considered as an alternate strategy. The dearth of adequate feedback in LMOOCs may be attributed to the deficiency of essential literacy and pedagogical skills among teachers about the provision of feedback. Additionally, the researcher suggests that educators employ a form of blended learning, whereby providing feedback might extend beyond the confines of the LMOOCs and involve direct interactions with the language learners. Furthermore, in accordance with the recommendations put forward by Teixeira and Mota (2014), alternative approaches such as active student engagement, peer feedback, increased collaboration, and dialogues can serve as viable substitutes in situations where direct teacher feedback may not be feasible.

Furthermore, the results of the study indicated that learners exhibit varying views towards the affective elements associated with LMOOCs. The issue of misunderstanding is also present in studies on MOOCs as evidenced by the works of Mellati and Khademi (2018) and Soffer and Nachmias (2018). Several studies have emphasized the favorable effects of MOOCs on students. Mellatli and Khademi (2018) found that MOOCs can alleviate the anxiety associated with traditional face-to-face classrooms. Additionally, Cohen and Holstein (2018) observed that MOOCs provide a good and competitive learning environment. While certain individuals have raised concerns with the lack of direct visual contact (Soffer & Nachmias, 2018), others have emphasized the inadequacy of interactions (Tseng et al., 2016; Uchidiuno et al., 2017; Doo et al., 2020; Tafazoli et al., 2020). The incorporation of LMOOCs in language teaching may be hindered by contextual constraints. Previous studies have reported similar results in different educational contexts when difficulties were faced in effectively utilizing MOOCs (Romero-Frías et al., 2020). This discovery aligns with previous Vietnamese research that emphasizes the restricted availability of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) resources and methods in language education

(Alraimi et al., 2015; Mellati & Khademi, 2018; Tafazoli, 2020).

6. Conclusions

The results obtained from the qualitative content analysis indicate that Vietnamese EFL learners possess favorable opinions towards the practicality of LMOOCs. LMOOCs have the potential to offer an educational and entertaining experience inside a flexible, open, enjoyable, authentic, and user-friendly learning environment. This presents a favorable occasion for individuals who are acquiring a new language to enhance their linguistic skills, particularly due to the absence of limitations pertaining to time and location. Additionally, LMOOCs offer the potential for enhanced communication chances among language learners, as well as the ability to acquire language proficiency through a diverse range of channels and materials. Furthermore, it is worth noting that LMOOCs exhibit compatibility with mixed and flipped classrooms, two potential prevailing educational models in the era following the pandemic. Furthermore, parents have the ability to monitor the progress of their children's language acquisition and establish their expectations for the language learning process.

One of the primary drawbacks associated with LMOOCs is the absence of a competitive educational environment. Furthermore, online platforms may not adequately address the acquisition of productive skills, particularly in the area of speaking proficiency. Additionally, there are certain constraints that learners have when it comes to engaging in interactions within online platforms. The extent of their interactions is confined to the utilization of chat boxes and comment sections, hence necessitating a greater emphasis on oral exchanges. Teachers often encounter challenges while providing feedback to learners, particularly when it comes to developing productive abilities. Furthermore, individuals engaged in the process of learning often encounter challenges related to contextual circumstances, such as the speed and bandwidth of their Internet connection.

In light of the affirmative results that have validated the efficacy of LMOOCs in the Vietnamese EFL setting for language education, there exist several implications and recommendations that have to be taken into account by language education stakeholders. Educators have the opportunity to include LMOOCs in their instructional practices, particularly in the context of blended and flipped learning models, as a means of facilitating post-pandemic education. By leveraging these approaches, teachers can provide students with a diverse range of knowledge in several formats. Educators may also provide introverted and apprehensive students the opportunity to exercise agency in selecting their preferred mode of instruction, be it through LMOOCs or conventional classroom settings. Furthermore, educators have the opportunity to establish communication with their counterparts in foreign countries, facilitating a virtual exchange program that enables pupils to interact with peers from diverse linguistic backgrounds.

To optimize the pedagogical strategies employed by EFL instructors in Northern Vietnam and comparable contexts, it is advised that educational authorities assign higher importance to the execution of teacher education and professional development initiatives. These programs ought to prioritize the provision of instructors with the essential skills and knowledge required to proficiently employ LMOOCs as instructional tools within their educational settings. Through active participation in these courses, educators are allowed to augment their TPACK (Tafazoli, 2020) and learn the essential literacies required for proficiently employing LMOOCs in their practicum. Furthermore, in countries like Vietnam where internet connectivity is regulated and subject to specific limitations, such as content filtering, there exists a possibility that collaborations between governing authorities and responsible entities may unintentionally hinder the accessibility of valuable educational resources intended for instructional purposes. Through the implementation of this method, a larger population of learners and educators will be able to avail themselves of inclusive educational technology, especially in remote

areas that are marked by a scarcity of instructors and insufficient digital resources.

It is noteworthy to emphasize that the research does have several limitations. As indicated in the research results, the ability to consistently access the LMOOCs was hindered for certain students due to contextual variables, such as limitations in Internet speed and content filtering. The generalizability of this conclusion may be limited in other environments characterized by more advanced Internet accessibility. Furthermore, the digital literacy of language learners may be a barrier to their goal attainment. Furthermore, it is worth noting that while learners have indeed expressed their satisfaction with the effectiveness of LMOOCs in enhancing their language skills, the validity of these findings may be called into question due to the researcher's sole reliance on learners' subjective perspectives. Ultimately, the learners exhibited a good disposition towards the presence of their parents. Nevertheless, the researcher failed to take into account the perspectives of the parents in this particular instance.

The researcher posits that further investigation is necessary to examine the efficacy and usability of LMOOCs, with a special focus on areas where a consensus has not yet been reached. To enhance clarity, future studies should focus on elucidating the potential interactions facilitated by LMOOCs, the significance of effective filters, and the importance of providing feedback. Furthermore, the present study primarily examined the EFL setting. Consequently, doing further research in alternative English contexts will likely yield significant insights. The study asserts that taking into account the perspectives of many stakeholders, such as parents, teachers, authorities, and teacher educators, could contribute to making informed decisions on the usability and effectiveness of LMOOCs.

References

Alario-Hoyos, C., Estévez-Ayres, I., Pérez-Sanagustín, M., Delgado Kloos, C., & Fernández-Panadero, C. (2017, May 12). Understanding Learners' Motivation and Learning Strategies in MOOCs. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *18*(3). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v18i3.2996

Alioon, Y., & Delialioğlu, M. (2017, April 12). The effect of authentic m□learning activities on student engagement and motivation. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(2), 655–668. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12559

Alraimi, K. M., Zo, H., & Ciganek, A. P. (2015, January). Understanding the MOOCs continuance: The role of openness and reputation. *Computers & Education*, *80*, 28–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.08.006

Babbie, E. R. (2004, January 1). *The Practice of Social Research*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, *2*, 8–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.npls.2016.01.001

Burnard, P. (1991, December). A method of analysing interview transcripts in qualitative research. *Nurse Education Today*, *11*(6), 461–466. https://doi.org/10.1016/0260-6917(91)90009-y

Clifford, E., Pleines, C., Thomas, H., & Winchester, S. (2019, December 9). Learners as teachers? An evaluation of peer interaction and correction in a German Language MOOC. *CALL and Complexity –*

Short Papers From EUROCALL 2019, 88–93. https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2019.38.991

Cohen, A., & Holstein, S. (2018, March 30). Analysing successful massive open online courses using the community of inquiry model as perceived by students. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *34*(5), 544–556. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12259

Correa, M. (2015, June 30). Flipping the Foreign Language Classroom and Critical Pedagogies. *Higher Education for the Future*, *2*(2), 114–125. https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631115584122

Council Of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018, January 6). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.

de Freitas, S. I., Morgan, J., & Gibson, D. (2015, April 8). Will MOOCs transform learning and teaching in higher education? Engagement and course retention in online learning provision. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *46*(3), 455–471. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12268

Deng, R., Benckendorff, P., & Gannaway, D. (2020, March 29). Linking learner factors, teaching context, and engagement patterns with MOOC learning outcomes. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *36*(5), 688–708. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12437

Deshpande, A., & Chukhlomin, V. (2017, November 27).

What Makes a Good MOOC: A Field Study of Factors Impacting Student Motivation to Learn. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 1–19. https://doi.org /10.1080/08923647.2017.1377513

Doo, M. Y., Tang, Y., Bonk, C. J., & Zhu, M. (2020, January 2). MOOC instructor motivation and career development. *Distance Education*, *41*(1), 26–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1724770

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006, January 1). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. McGraw-Hill Companies.

Geng, S., Niu, B., Feng, Y., & Huang, M. (2020, July 25). Understanding the focal points and sentiment of learners in MOOC reviews: A machine learning and SC☐LIWC☐based approach. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *51*(5), 1785–1803. https:// doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12999

Graneheim, U., & Lundman, B. (2004, February). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, *24*(2), 105–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001

Gupta, K. P., & Maurya, H. (2020, October 12). Adoption, completion and continuance of MOOCs: a longitudinal study of students' behavioural intentions. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, *41*(3), 611–628. https:// doi.org/10.1080/0144929x.2020.1829054

Hashemifardnia, A., Shafiee, S., Rahimi Esfahani, F., & Sepehri, M. (2021, January 1). Effects of flipped instruction on iranian intermediate EFL learners' speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency. *Cogent Education*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/233118 6x.2021.1987375

Hew, K. F. (2014, December 22). Promoting engagement in online courses: What strategies can we learn from three highly rated MOOCS. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *47*(2), 320–341. https://doi. org/10.1111/bjet.12235

Hmedna, B., Mezouary, A. E., & Baz, O. (2019). How Does Learners' Prefer to Process Information in MOOCs? A Data-driven Study. *Procedia Computer Science*, *148*, 371–379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.01.045

Keeney, S., Hasson, F., & McKenna, H. P. (2001, April). A critical review of the Delphi technique as a research methodology for nursing. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *38*(2), 195–200. https://doi. org/10.1016/s0020-7489(00)00044-4

Kovanović, V., Joksimović, S., Gašević, D., Siemens, G., & Hatala, M. (2015, April 6). What public media reveals about MOOCs: A systematic analysis of news reports. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *46*(3), 510–527. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12277

Kumar, P., & Kumar, N. (2020). A study of learner's satisfaction from MOOCs through a mediation model. *Procedia Computer Science*, *173*, 354–363. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.06.041

Lee, S., & Chung, J. Y. (2019, April 3). Lessons learned

from two years of K-MOOC experience. *Educational Media International*, *56*(2), 134–148. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/09523987.2019.1614245

Li, G. (2017). A Study on the Blended-Teaching Mode Combining MOOCs and Flipping Classroom in College English Teaching. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Education, Management, Information and Mechanical Engineering (EMIM 2017)*. https://doi.org/10.2991/emim-17.2017.256

Littlejohn, A., Hood, N., Milligan, C., & Mustain, P. (2016, April). Learning in MOOCs: Motivations and self-regulated learning in MOOCs. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *29*, 40–48. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.12.003

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2014, December 16). *Designing Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications.

Mellati, M., & Khademi, M. (2018, December 11). MOOC-based educational program and interaction in distance education: long life mode of teaching. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *28*(8), 1022–1035. https:// doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2018.1553188

Neuendorf, K. A. (2017, January 1). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. SAGE.

Nworie, J. (2011, August 11). Using the Delphi Technique in Educational Technology Research. *TechTrends*, *55*(5), 24–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-011-0524-6

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2013, November 6). Purposeful Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *42*(5), 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Pasawano, T. (2015, February). Results of Enhanced Learning with the Edutainment Format. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *176*, 946–951. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.563

Patton, M. Q. (2002, January 1). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. SAGE. http://books.google.ie/ books?id=FjBw2oi8El4C&printsec=frontcover&dq= Qualitative+Research+%26+Evaluation+Methods+(3rd+ed.)&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api

Philip, J. (2016). New pathways in researching interaction. In *Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp. 377–395). John Benjamins.

Rabin, E., Henderikx, M., Kalman, Y. M., & Kalz, M. (2020, June 29). What are the barriers to learners' satisfaction in MOOCs and what predicts them? The role of age, intention, self-regulation, self-efficacy and motivation. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *36*(3), 119–131. https://doi.org/10.14742/ ajet.5919

Rayyan, S., Fredericks, C., Colvin, K., Liu, A., Teodorescu, R., Barrantes, A., Pawl, A., Seaton, D., & Pritchard, D. (2016, March 19). A MOOC based on blended

pedagogy. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *32*(3), 190–201. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12126

Reparaz, C., Aznárez-Sanado, M., & Mendoza, G. (2020, October). Self-regulation of learning and MOOC retention. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *111*, 106423. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106423

Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2012). *README FIRST for a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods*. SAGE Publications.

Rohs, M., & Ganz, M. (2015, December 3). MOOCs and the claim of education for all: A disillusion by empirical data. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *16*(6). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v16i6.2033

Romero-Frías, E., Arquero, J. L., & del Barrio-García, S. (2020, July 28). Exploring how student motivation relates to acceptance and participation in MOOCs. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *31*(1), 480–496. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1799020

Safdar, M., Yasmin, M., & Anwar, B. (2020, April 23). English for specific purpose through facilitated and nonfacilitated MOOCs: An analysis of the learners' perspectives. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, *29*(4), 786–794. https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22246

Sekayi, D., & Kennedy, A. (2017, October 20). Qualitative Delphi Method: A Four Round Process with a Worked Example. *The Qualitative Report*. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2017.2974

Soffer, T., & Nachmias, R. (2018, March 22). Effectiveness of learning in online academic courses compared with face-to-face courses in higher education. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *34*(5), 534–543. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12258

Sun, Y., Ni, L., Zhao, Y., Shen, X., & Wang, N. (2018, December 18). Understanding students' engagement in MOOCs: An integration of self-determination theory and theory of relationship quality. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(6), 3156–3174. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12724

Tafazoli, D., Gómez Parra, M. E., & Huertas-Abril, C. A. (2020, July 11). A Cross-Cultural Qualitative Study on Students' Attitudes towards Computer-Assisted Language Learning. *The Qualitative Report*. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.4033

Teixeira, A., & Mota, J. (2014). A proposal for the methodological design of collaborative language MOOCs. In *Language MOOCs: Providing learning, transcending boundaries* (pp. 33–47). De Gruyter Open.

Thamrin, H., & Pamungkas, E. W. (2017). A Rule Based SWOT Analysis Application: A Case Study for Indonesian Higher Education Institution. *Procedia Computer Science*, *116*, 144–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.10.056

Thomas, V., De Backer, F., Peeters, J., & Lombaerts, K. (2019, January 16). Parental involvement and adolescent school achievement: the mediational role of self-regulated learning. *Learning Environments Research*, *22*(3), 345–363. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-019-09278-x

Tseng, S. F., Tsao, Y. W., Yu, L. C., Chan, C. L., & Lai, K. R. (2016, April 8). Who will pass? Analyzing learner behaviors in MOOCs. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-016-0033-5

Uchidiuno, J. O., Ogan, A., Yarzebinski, E., & Hammer, J. (2017, November 14). Going Global: Understanding English Language Learners' Student Motivation in English-Language MOOCs. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *28*(4), 528–552. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-017-0159-7

Veletsianos, G., Collier, A., & Schneider, E. (2015, May). Digging deeper into learners' experiences in MOOCs: Participation in social networks outside of MOOCs, notetaking and contexts surrounding content consumption. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *46*(3), 570–587. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12297

Waks, L. J. (2016, January 1). *The Evolution and Evaluation of Massive Open Online Courses: MOOCs in Motion*.

Walji, S., Deacon, A., Small, J., & Czerniewicz, L. (2016, May 3). Learning through engagement: MOOCs as an emergent form of provision. *Distance Education*, *37*(2), 208–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2016.1184400

Zhou, M. (2016, January). Chinese university students' acceptance of MOOCs: A self-determination perspective. *Computers & Education*, *92–93*, 194–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.10.012