Language and Literacy
Langue et littératie

The Intersections of Student Engagement and Academic Integrity in the Emergency Remote 'English for Academic Purposes' Assemblage

Eugenia (Gene) Vasilopoulos and Francis Bangou

Volume 24, Number 1, 2022

Literacy Entanglements and Relationality, Time, Place, Space and Identity

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1090946ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.20360/langandlit29621

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Language and Literacy Researchers of Canada

ISSN

1496-0974 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Vasilopoulos, E. & Bangou, F. (2022). The Intersections of Student Engagement and Academic Integrity in the Emergency Remote 'English for Academic Purposes' Assemblage. *Language and Literacy / Langue et littératie*, *24*(1), 6–23. https://doi.org/10.20360/langandlit29621

Article abstract

This paper explores the disruption of space, place, and material conditions brought on by the migration of traditional on-site language teaching to emergency remote teaching (ERT) in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program designed to bridge international students into higher education. We focus on two aspects of language teaching considered essential to academic success: student engagement and academic integrity. Through the Deleuzian concept of assemblage and post-qualitative inquiry, data vignettes from interviews with 12 teacher participants are presented to examine the contingency and relationality between the affordances of technological tools and the absence of embodied connection brought on by the move to ERT. Data vignettes are linked to map how instructors' perceptions of student engagement mediated through space, place, and materials, inadvertently shape/are shaped by perceptions of academic dishonesty.

THE INTERSECTIONS OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN THE EMERGENCY REMOTE 'ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES' ASSEMBLAGE

EUGENIA (GENE) VASILOPOULOS
University of Ottawa

FRANCIS BANGOU
University of Ottawa

Abstract

This paper explores the disruption of space, place, and material conditions brought on by the migration of traditional on-site language teaching to emergency remote teaching (ERT) in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program designed to bridge international students into higher education. We focus on two aspects of language teaching considered essential to academic success: student engagement and academic integrity. Through the Deleuzian concept of assemblage and post-qualitative inquiry, data vignettes from interviews with 12 teacher participants are presented to examine the contingency and relationality between the affordances of technological tools and the absence of embodied connection brought on by the move to ERT. Data vignettes are linked to map how instructors' perceptions of student engagement mediated through space, place, and materials, inadvertently shape/are shaped by perceptions of academic dishonesty.

Introduction

In Spring 2020, universities and schools around the world experienced an unprecedented mass migration from traditional in-person face-to-face learning to online education because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Emergency remote teaching (ERT) (Hodges et al., 2020) was implemented as a sudden and temporary remedy to the closure of schools, radically disrupting the place, space, and material conditions of language teaching and learning. With little time or warning, in-person course offerings were reconfigured to ERT delivery through existing tools (i.e. video-conferencing, learning management systems, digital textbooks), online pedagogy, and resources developed for distance learning in general (Hodges et al., 2020).

Nowhere has the transition to ERT been more far-reaching than for international students who would typically relocate to host institutions to experience on-campus learning, but given pandemic restrictions, must now take courses from their home country, without the experience of international travel. In this paper, we focus on the disruption of space, place, and material conditions brought on by migrating traditional on-site language teaching to ERT in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program designed to bridge international students into higher education (herein referred to as ERT-EAP). We examine how the absence of coveted face-to-face interaction, shared space, and trust that comes from embodied experience transformed EAP teaching in relation to two aspects of language learning and higher education preparation: (1) perceptions of student

engagement; and (2) student academic integrity. Herein, the relationality EAP instructors' perceptions of student engagement and academic integrity are framed through the Deleuzian concept of assemblage, a concept that can account for the interconnectivity between space, place, and material conditions of EAP through ERT.

Contextualizing the Issue

Engagement in Online Language Learning

Language learning has a distinct connection to space and place, a connection evidenced in the presumption that a language is best learned in the target community through engagement with target community members. As with in-person learning, in distance learning, the principle of authentic and meaningful interaction underlies effective language acquisition. Educators, teaching online (or in-person), must foster communicative learner-centered classrooms that create opportunities for interaction (Hampel & Stickler, 2015). Meaningful and authentic classroom interaction helps students develop active participation skills, interpersonal connection, and a sense of community, again elements that are essential to successful online language learning (Heins et al., 2007). Effective interaction also fosters active learning and a student's sense of responsibility for their own learning, a mindset necessary for autonomous learning, and the development of learner accountability. Creating the conditions for meaningful engagement in online learning communities demands extra attention. Teachers must be aware of how technology and digital communications re-shapes the demands of learner autonomy and accountability, and to this effect, teachers also need to be aware of how to exploit technology to transform online spaces into spaces for online learning (Stickler et al., 2020).

Early research on online language teaching revealed technological challenges, including working across different time zones, dealing with insecure and unstable internet connections, and tolerating technical glitches such as frozen screens and distorted audio/video, all of which limits students' ability to communicate and interact in class (Le & Troung, 2021). Prolonged technical difficulties often lead to impacted students feeling excluded, and overall decreasing students' attentiveness (Sevencan, 2021). Technical problems also make it difficult for teachers and students to facilitate interaction (Sun, 2014), collaboration, and socialization (Kainat & Adnan, 2020). Additionally, while online language learning brings the convenience of space and place to a greater number of students, ERT research on language learner motivation, interaction, and engagement has been critical of the quality and quantity of interaction in ERT contexts, consequently, reaffirming the irreplaceability of face-to-face language teaching/learning through ERT delivery (Le & Truong, 2021).

Academic Integrity in Higher Education and L2 Writing Assessment

Upholding academic integrity is not a new concern for institutions of higher education. Academic integrity is particularly relevant in EAP bridging programs where teachers are expected to prepare students for academic readiness, the norms of the academic community, and the conventions of academic writing. In EAP writing assessment, academic integrity relates to the tradition of "language competence" in language teaching. In L2 (second language) assessment, students' written or oral work is expected to be reflective of their own linguistic ability as natural and spontaneous authentic

production. Language assessment must therefore occur in controlled conditions, free of external sources of input, to determine the test taker's proficiency (Shin et al., 2021).

This principle of L2 language assessment can be seen in commercial language testing services, such as the International English Language Testing Systems (IELTS) and the Test of English as a Foreign language (TOEFL), operated by agencies such as Educational Testing Services (ETS), which serve as gatekeepers for university admission. Language testing, through these providers, occurs in heavily controlled contexts where test-takers have little to no access to external tools or linguistic input (Huang, 2018). Expectations of test validity transfer over to ERT-EAP teaching where the assessment of L2 writing proficiency must be students' individual performance produced without the immediate influence of external input (Al-bargi, 2022). Indeed, completion of university-affiliated EAP courses as part of conditional admission to degree-granting programs often acts in lieu of a standardized test score as fulfilling university admission requirements.

In EAP instruction, the concern with authentic and ethical writing is compounded by uninhibited access to digital tools and resources to support students' learning and written production (Oh, 2020; Shin et al., 2021). Associated with this range of assistive tools and resources are academic transgressions such as textual plagiarism, the use of translation tools, and the hiring of ghost-writers or contract-cheating, transgressions which can largely go undetected (Eaton, 2021). Concerns of academic integrity are not unique to language learners, but incidents of academic dishonesty are disproportionately attributed to international students (Pecorari & Petric, 2014).

To counteract growing academic dishonesty in online delivery, universities have invested in controversial (and imperfect) technologies such as Respondus Lockdown Browser, an application that locks the test-takers browser, records the screen and student's face, and flags suspicious activities such as head and eye movement. Another popular and equally controversial device in academic integrity protection is Turnitin, an originality detection software used to detect plagiarism, and deter and detect transgressions. Despite the growing application of technologies to prevent academic dishonesty, there still are many challenges to preventing all forms of academic transgression in online assessment (Perkins et al., 2020). Research in the context of ERT points to growing concern regarding academic dishonesty in L2 writing assignments and the validity and authenticity of students' written production in ERT contexts. This concern has led some to question the accuracy of online writing assessments (Al-Bargi, 2022, Guo & Xu, 2021; Zou et al., 2021).

Considering the shift to ERT for international students in EAP bridging programs, this study explores the interconnection between the competing tensions of meaningful student engagement and academic integrity in L2 writing, and how these components of EAP instruction have been transformed by changes in place, space, time, and material conditions in the move from in-person to ERT-EAP.

Conceptual Framework

Theoretically, this study draws on the Deleuzian concept of assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) to examine the relationality elements that impact the delivery of remote EAP. Assemblages focus on the interconnection of elements. In this study, we focus on

what can be conceived of as the instructor ERT-EAP assemblage comprised of (but are not limited to):

- human actors (teachers, students, administrators, peers, etc.)
- tangible material objects (computers, tablets, tables, desks, walls, doors, etc.)
- intangible material objects (digital software, including learning management platforms, Zoom video conferencing, webcams, digital texts, breakout groups, online language learning applications, etc.)
- material objects as content (such as writing on a discussion board, student assignments submitted through uploaded documents, and students' recorded work as evidence of learning, etc.)
- structures (program curriculum, assessment tools, rubrics, learning objectives, institutional norms, instructor expectations, university admission requirements, etc.)
- expressions (teachers' instructions, students' linguistic proficiency, students' attentiveness, interaction, participation, etc.)
- intensities mediated by space, place, time, and connections between elements.

In the assemblage, actors, expressions, signs, and materials come together and operate in unpredictable (non)habitual ways around actions and events to produce further actions and events (Potts, 2004). Unpredictability extends from the non-pre-determined status of each element; elements are defined by their capacity and how they function in relation to each other (Fox & Alldred, 2015). For example, if you are not connected to the internet, a Zoom video conference icon on your computer is only a symbol indicating the program is installed on your computer. When connected to the internet, that exact same symbol serves as the gateway to accessing an online meeting. On the surface, the icon is identical but holds a fundamentally different function when the computer is invisibly connected to an operational modem.

The potential for each element to function in non-pre-determined ways allows for the exploration of relationality between human actors and the material world. For instance, the web camera function on the Zoom video conferencing platform allows video representation, a dimension of multimodality that is believed to enhance communication between participants; however, the same camera function can also serve as a tool for surveillance that undermines communication. The impact of web camera use across conditions of space, place, and time can transform the assemblage and how human actors (e.g. students or instructors) respond, or how other tools are operationalized. For example, web cameras are required to operate the eye-tracking function on Respondus software, which is quite different than using web cameras in open classroom discussions. Without pre-established status, traditionally passive elements such as material objects that form the background for human actors to manipulate, can be agentic and shape other elements. Exploration into this dimension of relationality between the material and human actors can shed light on how transformations in space and place, brought on by ERT, have impacted student engagement and academic integrity in EAP. To guide this exploration, the following research questions are posed:

1) How do student engagement and academic integrity operate in the ERT-EAP assemblage?

2) How are these elements mediated by space, place, time, and material conditions?

Methodology

Research Context

This post-qualitative study was conducted at a large urban Canadian university and focuses on an EAP program designed to prepare incoming English language learners, mainly international students, for the linguistic and academic requirements for university admission. The EAP program at the center of this study consists of 4 levels, each 14 weeks long, with the last level being the bridging level. Prior to the pandemic, students received 15 contact hours per week split between two instructors (8:30-11:30 a.m. five days per week), with each instructor responsible for teaching academic and linguistic skills. In the afternoon, students spent 6 hours (approximately 2 hours 3 times per week) with a teaching assistant (T.A.) to review and practice the content presented by the instructors. With the move to ERT, the schedule was reduced to 10 instructor contact hours and 5 T.A. contact hours. To account for the time difference between Canada and students' home nations, courses ran between 7:00-9:00 a.m. with the two instructors alternating days, and with the T.A. from 9:00- 10:00 a.m daily. In Fall 2020, 12 sections were offered with approximately 20-25 students in each class. All courses were delivered through Zoom and supported by the Brightspace learning management system.

Data Collection

At the end of the Fall 2020 semester, a participant recruitment letter was sent to 36 instructors (including T.A.'s) in the EAP program. Twelve participants responded: seven instructors and five T.A.'s[1]. All respondents participated in a one-hour semi-structured online Zoom interview with the first author to discuss their experience teaching EAP online. The first author and primary investigator was also an instructor in the program. Having taught in the EAP program for over 5 years including the Fall 2020 semester, the first author was familiar with all participants as a long-time colleague and with the EAP program policies and shift to ERT. Participants also knew Eugenia Vasilopoulos from the Ph.D. program and were aware of her research interests in EAP academic writing, technology, and academic integrity. Given the shared experience and role as EAP faculty, interviews were semi-structured and designed to be reflexive and dyadic (Ellis & Berger, 2002), as "a conversation between two equals and should not be seen as a hierarchical question and answer exchange" (Kruger, 2015, p. 81). Interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed, and uploaded into Transana 3.0 for rhizoanalysis.

[1] Instructor and teaching assistant backgrounds: Instructors: Ph.D. holders and candidates, all with extensive teaching experience; TA's: MA or Ph.D. students with varying degrees of extensive teaching experience. Instructors and TA's were employed on a part-time basis through sessional contracts.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed through rhizoanalysis (Masny, 2013), an approach to post-qualitative research designed to explore linkages and interconnection between elements (Alvermann, 2000). To conduct rhizoanalysis, the interview data was first read as a whole, a collective unit of the ERT-EAP assemblage, with the first author using the Transana memo function to make notes of key impressions and affect. Affect refers to reactions "generally *other than* conscious knowing, vital forces insisting beyond emotion" that create impressions and provoke thought (Gregg & Seigworth, 2010, p.1, emphasis in original). Affect, in the research assemblage, is the interconnection between the researcher(s) and the data and refers to the "forces understood as feelings, senses, and the subconscious…." (Collier et al., 2015, pp. 396-397) that contributes to the researchers' interpretations and understandings of the reality expressed in the data. Therefore, the memo notes made, the themes explored, and the mapping of relationality are no more than the affects between the data and the researchers[2].

The second reading of the data involved identifying key elements related to the three components of this study: student engagement, academic integrity, space, place, and material, in the ERT assemblage. Re-reading the data and labeling elements provided a more concrete understanding of the dynamics in each instructor's assemblage. Coding also allowed for the aggregation of common elements across participants, which were used in the third reading of the data to re-define the tentative themes noted during the first reading (Fox & Alldred, 2015).

Thematic analysis in the third reading traced relationships between elements, combining and/or dividing categories based on the frequency and intensity of their links to each other (Fox & Alldred, 2015). Throughout the third reading, new affects were noted with the memo function. Newly identified elements were added to the existing list and incorporated into relational mapping. Through this stage, categories were refined, and most importantly, possible connections between elements, signified through converging and diverging elements, and their effects were linked to outline a possible sequence of connectivity between space, place, material, student engagement, and academic integrity in ERT-EAP.

Findings and Discussion

Key Elements in the ERT-EAP Assemblage

Space, place, and material in the EAP instructors' assemblage defined their ERT experience. Key elements include the location (the convenience of working from home), time (having already experienced ERT teaching in previous semesters and the reduced teaching hours), technology (the array of tools and resources required for ERT), training (seminars provided by the university and the EAP to prepare instructors for ERT), support (varying levels of support from EAP administrators throughout the semester regarding ERT and program policies), and previous online experience (outside of the EAP program). Instructors were also impacted by the need to follow the EAP program curriculum, cover specific content and skills, use specified textbooks and materials, prepare students for

[2] At the time of the study, the first author was a Ph.D. candidate, and the second author was her academic supervisor. The second author is included as co-author given his position as the supervisor on the research training award which sponsored this study.

standardized assessment, and comply with EAP program policies, structures that further shaped their ERT experience. Instructors' experience in the ERT assemblage also depended (in part) on their own teaching philosophy, their adaptability to the ERT conditions, their students, and the classroom dynamics; however, these interactions cannot be viewed separately from elements of space, place, and material.

Below, interview data are presented as vignettes that act as an entry point into the ERT-EAP assemblage to begin the discussion of relationality between elements. Through the vignettes, discrete data pieces are linked to explore the themes of student engagement and academic integrity, and to lead the reader through a series of possible connections between the themes. The sequencing and linkages between data excerpts reflect researcher affect and perceived operations of ERT assemblage as reported in the participants' interview data. Of course, others may read the data differently and form connections of their own.

Student Engagement: What a Web Camera Can't Do

Many of the instructors and TA's commented on the challenges that ERT placed on student interaction and student engagement. One prominent concern was the impact of digital mediation – namely, web cameras, chat functions, and breakout rooms – on classroom communication and dynamics. Here, a common sentiment was that online interaction could not replace the quality of face-to-face in-person interaction, an element considered fundamental to language learning and built into the program curriculum through a firm attendance policy; students need to be present for 80% of the class to write the final exam. To monitor attendance, students were required to keep their web cameras on throughout the lesson. The use of cameras proved contentious between instructors and students, as each teaching team determined their own policies, and even within teaching teams, some instructors and TA's were more successful than others in convincing their students to turn on and keep on their web cameras.

TA "F"[3] describes the difficulty he had in maintaining the teams' web camera policy:

> *Yeah, first of all, the control over students was a big issue. It took like, several sessions to, like, force people to have their webcams on. So in my classes, I didn't make it a rule to have their webcams on this unless they were speaking or if they are doing an assessment. I often had some black windows on my Zoom window, but for example, the nine-hour teacher who I was working with, she was very serious about having the cameras on. Whenever she joined my class to remind students of something or add something that she missed in her class. I could see the students turn on their cameras immediately to show they were following the rules. But even when they have their webcams on in my class, it is just their foreheads against the wall, I couldn't see the whole face, though. One big feature that was missing in my class was this interaction with students. Knowing that they are following what you're teaching. You know if your students are paying attention, and if they are*

[3] At the beginning of the interview, all participants were asked to select a pseudonym. To indicate the participants' role as either an instructor or TA, their position plus the first initial of their pseudonym will be used for brevity.

engaged in the classroom and that was one big difference between this semester and teaching in the classroom.

Web cameras served as a window into the students' space, a window that ideally would provide a clearer understanding of the students at that particular point in time. The strategic use/non-use of the camera function to share certain images (a wall or a forehead) and conceal other images (a face), denied viewers what was expected: the students' faces, with facial expressions that could be read, facial expressions that conveyed the students' comprehension and engagement.

Even with web cameras on and students' faces visible, Instructor "T" explained how web cameras were inadequate in knowing how the students felt, a sense lost in online space:

Most of our students…. tend to be quite shy, and there are some exceptions, but most of the time, right. But once you're in class, in person, when you move towards someone, when you make eye contact with somebody, actually, it's much easier psychological to elicit the answers without calling on a specific student. However online, I have to call the students sometimes and of course, they might feel uncomfortable…You can see that in faces, in their body language in the classroom you know who is ready and who is not.

Calling on students and student discomfort are factors that inhibit engagement. In that sense, "proper" camera use might not be exclusively serving its intended function of promoting engagement. Even with cameras on and students' faces visible, Instructor "L" explained a similar situation:

In my classes we were on campus, it was much more interactive. There was a lot of communication, a lot of interaction, a lot of group tasks and activities. Whereas now, I can't do that. It's mainly like traditional lecture-based classrooms. I asked my students questions, I encourage them, I call their names, I ask them to talk. They're not willing to be in breakout rooms at all. And so all the time only one or two people, one person, is talking at a time with a group of 22 students ….

Instructor L's experience with breakout rooms stems from multiple occasions early in the semester where students turned their cameras off during breakout group activities, worked individually, used a shared first language thereby excluding group members from other language backgrounds, or were completely absent from the activity. Consequently, Instructor L discontinued the use of breakout rooms, relying exclusively on teacher-led whole-class discussion, which inadvertently eliminated opportunities for spontaneous and meaningful student-student interaction.

Student Engagement: Not Just a Face

As with Instructor L's perception, many of the participants also assumed their students would have more distractions when learning online, and that at a distance, it is physically impossible for instructors to control students' learning environment. In the physical classroom, instructors would be able to clearly see students' comportment, see the items in front of them, and know whether they were reading the assigned texts or sending

a message on their phone tucked under their desk. The absence of a corporeal view of the students created uncertainty. Instructor "G" explains below:

> *In spite of perfect attendance and everyone showing up on time, there were students that were not motivated because there are quite a lot of distractions for them. You don't know what they are doing. They get lost, even during class…We don't know what exactly they are doing when they are sitting in front of the computer looking at the screen….*

To ensure students were following as expected, Instructor G took prepared materials and delivered content in a way that could be easily monitored, that is, by worksheets that could be shared on Google Docs or through the screen share function that showed student progress during the lesson. Although this approach was intended to help students stay on task, Instructor G surmised that it created a more teacher-led classroom and was less engaging and communicative than her approach to teaching in-person.

Other instructors responded to the absence of in-person presence by emphasizing a learner-centered approach and increased student autonomy:

> *Instructor "M": I know we are moving towards being more learner-centered, and with an online platform, it really becomes more and more learner-centered. That's what I liked about it. In-person, I didn't like seeing students check their phone in class. I couldn't stand it when students had all those gadgets in front of them. Now, I don't know if the students are checking their WeChat (Chinese social messaging platform). Online, I know some of them have two screens, and I didn't know what was happening on the second screen. I would just say to them, if you want to succeed, you have to be 100% here, and there's no way that I can see what you're doing. If you want to pass, okay, you have to pay attention.*

Instructor M's comments demonstrate the diverging effect of web cameras and perceptions of students' attentiveness on the participants' approach to teaching. Cameras offered a limited view. Students turning on their cameras was only the first step in demonstrating presence and engagement. Cameras did not replace the unrestricted view afforded in a shared space. Instead, the cropped image of the student, face only, meant that instructors did not have to concern themselves with anything more than what was directly visible: the students' faces. Instructor "A" articulates the tension that this restricted view and lack of physical proximity produced:

> *Some teachers try to control everything because they care. It's out of feeling responsible for students learning. It's not the only way to show you care for your students. You know, I care for the students too, but the reality is that you're not in their rooms.*

The absence of physical interaction and shared space limits the influence that instructors can have on their students. Learning in less supervised conditions and in spaces, such as their bedrooms, that were not specifically designed or designated as spaces for learning, effects instructor-student and student-student relations:

> *Instructor "D": I think there's a greater possibility that students are distracted during class, it doesn't feel like they're in class, because they're just sitting at home like everyone else. The connection made between students, I really can't imagine a*

friendship forming with an online classmate. I imagine it would be pretty rare. And then the connection that I have with the students who are not the ones, you know, raising their hands, volunteering answers, and so on, and so on. The quiet kid who doesn't turn on her, her camera, you know, what kind of connection can I make with that person? And with no connection, there is no accountability.

Turning on the cameras, from the perspective of the participants, both represents and facilitates sharing and building connections with others. Even with facial representation, participants perceived that the quality of interactions and relationships forged online were inferior to that of in-person communication. According to Instructor D, without facial representation via web camera, students were further isolated from the instructor and from each other.

In this context, Instructor D's comment leads to an important question: What creates the feeling of being in a class? Perhaps it is the shared goal of learning, and/or perhaps it is the relationships between students and instructors, an element that is compromised when students do not really know each other. Unfamiliarity impedes the development of a sense of community and erodes the obligations that members of a shared community might have to each other. As described above, many of the participants' interactions with and perceptions of students were defined through the unfamiliar.

Instructor D's final comment about the lack of connection leading to the lack of accountability introduces the second series of vignettes where the relationality between students' engagement, space, place, and material merges with the notion of academic integrity. According to Instructor D, not knowing each other lends to decreased accountability to each other as students, and instructors.

Academic Integrity Online: Policing the Conventional

Both instructors and TA's perceived students had more opportunities for academic dishonesty in the online environment due to the many digital affordances available online and the limitations in supervising students' conduct. Maintaining academic integrity is vital to the legitimacy of the EAP program, an alternative for TOEFL and IELTS test scores used for university admission. As such, the EAP program replicates the procedures of IELTS and TOEFL testing services with external assessors who are presumably more objective and specialized in their assessment of L2 academic writing, responsible for evaluating students' final writing exam. This final writing exam was designed for in-person test-taking where students are prohibited from using any tools or resources aside from the assigned text, a pen, and paper. Online, instructors were vigilant in ensuring that students' written work reflected students' own internalized knowledge, a measure taken in order to maintain academic integrity. Among the participants, however, were different understandings of what constitutes academic dishonesty, different experiences with incidents of academic dishonesty, and different understandings of why dishonesty might occur.

Diverging conceptualizations of what constitutes an academic infraction arose early in the semester when instructors became aware of assistive tool use, such as translation tools and automated grammar and spelling checking applications, in students' writing. For example, in the first week, Instructor L asked her students to write and post a short self-

introduction on the class discussion board which was visible to all class members. Instructor L describes the event as follows:

> *She (a student) posted a paragraph in Chinese, so she had made a mistake. She used a translation tool, and instead of copying and pasting the English version, she pasted the Chinese version… when I told the student, as it is something quite visible, obviously, she said, I'm sorry, I was using a translation tool. I made a mistake. I will never do that again. But with those students who posted something English, not Chinese, I knew that some of them were also using translation tools. I had a conversation with them, and I told them that I know that this is not your own writing. If you want to improve your English you got to rely on your own, you know, you need to try to step by step gradually improve your writing skills, blah, blah, blah. So I talked to them, and some of them admitted that they had used translation tools, and they told me that they didn't know that they cannot use a translation tool. Personally, I don't believe that. I think they know that this is cheating, but that was what they told me. And yeah, they said that they wouldn't use it, and some of them throughout the course they didn't. They didn't continue that kind of thing, and they really tried to improve their writing skills, but a small minority, they still continued to do the same thing and use translation tools…*

Instructor L's experience illustrates a shared concern among her colleagues regarding the use of assistive tools, tools that would normally be controlled for during in-class paper and pen writing tasks typical of in-person instruction, and tools that normally would not constitute academic transgression. Instructor L brought the issue to the attention of the EAP program administrators, leading to the implementation of an academic integrity provision (in addition to the official university academic integrity policy) that stipulates that instructors clarify which tools and aids are permitted for each assignment. Students were expected to comply with these restrictions. An attestation was also included on the mid-term and final exam for students to acknowledge awareness of program regulations for exams and compliance with these regulations. Instructors were to explain these conditions to students and post them on their Brightspace course page, yet many participants were skeptical about compliance.

Instructors and TA's also formed their own interpretations of the "assistive tools" covered in the provision with some prohibiting commonly used software such as Microsoft Word for its built-in spell check and grammar check features. Instructor G explains the approach taken in her class, and within her teaching team, to prohibit the use of embedded assistive tools for formative and summative in-class writing tasks:

> *I think any kind of tool that assists them with their writing is not allowed. So we expected how they would write it with pen and paper with nothing to help them… students were not allowed to use dictionaries, no writing tools, no word document, no spell checkers. At least, that is what I think their (EAP program administrators) instruction says. There is that passage: "So by taking this exam, I confirm that I haven't used any of the grammar tools, including Grammarly" … This was definitely difficult to enforce because even though I kept telling them not to, they did. But then I think it goes deeper than just telling them not to use it. They need to know when to use it and how to use all these tools, so they really didn't know what*

to use and when. Students still used Microsoft Word to write and then posted their answers on Brightspace instead of just writing it directly in the Brightspace textbox.

Instructor G (and her teaching team) was the only participant who cautioned students not to use any tool or software that could serve assistive purposes in academic writing, including Microsoft Word. Other instructors, such as T and L, adopted a different approach by creating a series of closely timed online quizzes on the Brightspace learning management system that could assess students' linguistic knowledge of the written language. To note, the use of timed Brightspace quizzes does control the use of embedded tools such as Microsoft spell-check, but it does not control the use of downloadable software such as Grammarly, which operates across programs and platforms. This strategy of small continuous formative assessment was recommended by the EAP curriculum development team early in the semester to ensure assessment validity.

Skepticism surrounding the authenticity of students' written assignments persisted in view of the many online services geared towards assisting students with their academic work available online:

Instructor T: I know in English, you could just do a simple Google search, and then you would find all of these, what they call contract cheating services that could do your homework for you. They are published openly online. I don't know about any other types of services that are new that have popped up. And I don't know, these are the types of services that are easily accessible publicly available, right?... Yeah, in writing, for sure. We're never sure and sometimes actually, even with the quizzes, not this session, this session was quite successful. The biggest thing was the motivation of the students. But the summer session was full of cheating. Even the quizzes, sometimes some students performed really well in quizzes during the class time. And sometimes their performance was significantly worse. It was just so inconsistent. Of course, it could be just maybe they didn't get enough sleep, whatever, so it's hard to judge. That's why I'm never sure, but they can share the information with somebody else online simultaneously. And when we (the teaching team) saw them speaking, it was a completely different picture. And we'll always have this cognitive dissonance trying to figure out the real level of those students.

Multiple elements converge in Instructor T's account: academic dishonesty through online services, efforts to maintain academic integrity through online quizzes, pervasive doubt, further attempts to determine proficiency, followed by further confusion. Triangulating students' written production with oral production was a strategy recommended by program administrators to confirm the authenticity of students' work. Participants acknowledged that this approach is problematic given that writing and speaking are very different skill sets, and students had limited opportunities to develop their speaking in the ERT context. Nevertheless, a degree of congruency between oral and written production was expected. An inexplicable gap between a student's written work produced outside of supervised conditions and oral proficiency demonstrated through spontaneous speech verified the unauthentic nature of the student's written work. Instructor M describes her use of this procedure:

What I did actually to make sure that what they wrote were their own words is because we know our students, I shared their work on our screen, and then I asked, for example, Helen's assignment, Helen read it, and Helen couldn't even read it. And then after that, I emailed her that, how come you cannot read even your own work?

As Instructors M and T explain, when students produced written work of advanced quality but performed much weaker orally, it was difficult for instructors to determine the students' overall linguistic proficiency, a measure necessary to ensure that students fulfilled the EAP program requirements and were ready to enter their university program of study. Uncertainty regarding students' ability intersects with the uncertainty invoked by the limitations of the web camera and not knowing what students were thinking or doing. Both senses of uncertainty lead to further mistrust and alienation for those suspected of dishonesty.

Many of the writing instructors commented on students' demonstrations of academic honesty, enacted through submitting imperfect writing representative of their level as language learners. As Instructor M explains, it is impossible to determine if the students' written work is copied, so:

Those students who wrote faulty sentences, I really appreciate it. Because it was their own sentence. I mean, they tried, and I gave more feedback to those students but when I read assignments, okay, this is even better than me. I cannot write something like this… I tried to check online to find where that student was taking that stuff from, and I couldn't find anything. So that was okay. So whatever. What am I going to do? I mean, there's nothing I can do.

In terms of regulating academic dishonesty and gaining an "accurate" view of students' linguistic and academic competence, some writing instructors (not all participants) expressed a sense of resignation to the fact that participants could not account for how students' writing was produced. If instructors suspected a transgression but could not prove it, students could not be penalized academically. Instead, as in the case of Instructor M, students were penalized indirectly such as receiving less constructive feedback, a move that works against fostering student motivation, and subsequently, decreasing student engagement and commitment to improvement. Similarly, if academic dishonesty was suspected, as in the case of Instructors G, T, and L, the entire class was indirectly penalized with additional restrictions, supervision, controlled assessments, and reprimands, again impeding the development of a collaborative and interactive learning community.

In attempts to uphold academic integrity, fostering greater student interaction, engagement, and collaboration were not prioritized, yet, creating a stronger sense of community may have been exactly what students and instructors needed to foster greater investment and accountability in their learning. Instructor D raises this point below:

When I say not having a connection with the teacher or accountability, that's something I think would lend itself to cheating. A student would feel more likely to cheat without accountability, the accountability made by relationships, and even if you're not cheating, you might have the impression that others in the class are

cheating. So what does that do to you? It might encourage you to cheat. It might. I don't know. I don't know. These are questions I don't have answers to, but I think about them because a student doesn't turn on his camera. I have no idea what he's doing.

Instructor D's speculation brings the discussion back to the concept of student engagement mediated through web cameras: engagement connotes the expected use of web camera, although the use of the web camera does not connote engagement; without the camera on, the unknown fosters distance; this leads to less engagement and connection; with less engagement and connection, students have less accountability, and thus may be more likely to cheat because students perhaps do not feel an obligation to each other or the instructor. Indeed, while instructors attempted to create a sense of responsibility to each other and to their work by reminding students which tools and processes are expected and are permitted, or by creating more assessments, or by openly addressing cases of suspected transgression in front of the class as an example, or by appreciating imperfect writing, these strategies are taken up and reacted upon by students in different ways, leading to different outcomes. Inadvertently, some of the approaches described above, particularly those resulting in student embarrassment, over-restrictive practices, and patronizing lectures, might serve to alienate students from their instructors rather than connect them.

Disruptions of Space, Place, and Material: Teaching in the ERT-EAP Assemblage

Not all participants suspected that their students were engaged in academic misconduct. A common sentiment was that motivated students will be motivated online or in-person. Some students are stronger than others, more motivated than others, and more engaged than others. Likewise, academically and linguistically strong students will perform well despite the medium of delivery. Conversely, students that were less invested in their learning would carry that attitude into the classroom, online or on-campus, but attitudes of individual students, in part, extended from classroom dynamics and interaction. Teachers could also motivate or demotivate their students.

Interestingly, and contrary to findings in other ERT-based research, technical difficulties such as unstable internet connections or tools and devices not working as expected, were not significantly reported among the participants. While the occurrence of technical difficulty might impede communication, the participants did not perceive these issues as central to the effectiveness of their teaching or to their students' learning. One reason might be that most instructors and students were accustomed to ERT from their experience over the past 8 months (March 2020 to Sept 2020).

The data constructed above as a temporal representation of the ERT-EAP assemblage suggest two dominant themes: first, student engagement in ERT conditions was inferior to that of in-person delivery, and technological tools could not substitute the psychological and physical connections afforded in person. Second, and particularly among the writing instructors, academic dishonesty was occurring because of affordances online, barriers to supervision, inconsistent policies, fixed curriculum, and principles and practices of L2 writing assessment in the program.

In the highly variable conditions of the ERT-EAP assemblage, academic dishonesty was impossible to control leading many to question their role as instructors and their L2

writing pedagogy and assessment practices. As Instructor D confesses, the reconfiguration of space, place, and material, led him to question his approach to writing instruction in the ERT classroom:

> *I think when we switched (to online), I tried to do a lot of the same stuff. And I quickly realized some things that didn't translate well. Yeah, so you know, even when I give time in class for writing, I'm still not sure about that. Like, is that a good use of time? I don't know, like, in a regular class, I would, I would say, okay, you have the rest of the class, here's your paper and pencil and give me something at the end of it. But I don't know if that's the best use of synchronous online learning. So I don't know, it's, it's a work in progress.*

Within the ERT-EAP assemblage, the intensity of the unknown was the one common force that connected participants' experience and perceptions of student engagement and academic integrity. As instructors and TA's, the participants had the authority to impose certain rules, such as having students turn on their camera, yet doing so provided an incomplete solution as cameras only offered a limited view and could not provide adequate insight into students' thoughts, understanding, attentiveness, or conduct. Echoing throughout the participant data was the unknown of what students might be thinking and doing in their private space, thousands of kilometers away from the university classroom where expectations of interaction, engagement, learning, and assessment are required.

In the ERT-EAP assemblage, the absence of shared space and place and digitally-mediated teaching, learning, and assessment produced a radical disruption. As such, new questions for effective ERT-EAP emerge: How can educators create conditions for student engagement in ERT-EAP contexts? How can student engagement be fostered in competitive programs that culminate in high-stake testing? How can the validity of L2 writing assessment be administered in ERT where testing conditions cannot be fully controlled? Lastly, how can a sense of community be formed amongst a group of students, geographically separated, but all connected virtually through ERT with the shared goal of completing an EAP course to start their university-level studies? Because learner engagement is essential to language learning, and academic integrity is essential to L2 writing pedagogy and assessment, the challenge for EAP programs operating in ERT is to leverage the disruption of place, space, and material conditions to align with program curriculum and objectives. Inevitably, this might require a re-envisioning of what it means to teach EAP in a time of crisis.

Conclusion

Providing EAP instructors guidance on how to teach and assess L2 writing in ERT environments is beyond the scope of this paper. However, what this small post-qualitative exploration on the impact of space, place, and material on student engagement and academic integrity in ERT-EAP shows is that the way forward will likely be complex, contingent, and highly variable. The data vignettes presented above outline the events unfolding in the ERT-EAP assemblage and how these events comprise an entanglement of human actors, materials, structures, signs, and intensities. In the assemblage, when multiple elements come into contact, how they respond to each other can be routine. Conversely, responses may be unexpected and unforeseeable. Likewise, actions intended to produce

expected outcomes that may seem rather intuitive, such as requiring students to turn on their web cameras to foster interaction and engagement, can produce adverse effects that contribute to undesirable outcomes, such as students feeling uncomfortable and less motivated to participate. These unanticipated outcomes emerge from interaction with other elements, for example, instructors either shifting to teacher-centered instruction to keep students on task while reducing opportunities to meaningful student-student interaction, or instructors moving towards student-centered approaches as an adaptive measure and not because it promotes student learning. In either case, how students respond to these pedagogical reorientations will also be contingent on their relationship with the teacher, their perceived effectiveness of the instruction, the dynamics in the class, and their own personal attributes, affordances, learning goals, and beliefs of what constitutes academic honesty.

Similarly, how assemblage-inspired research is conducted and reported will also be a contingent endeavor produced through the relationality between the research objectives, concepts, researchers, participants, data, and research outputs. Affect as a means of working with data accounts for the researchers' positionality as fundamental to the interpretation and mapping of data. Here, both authors read the data through the lens of a Deleuzian-ontology where intrinsically complex and dynamic relations are the norm, not the exception. The focus is on possibilities and the operation of forces and elements, known and unknown, that contribute to the realities experienced in teaching and learning. As with all assemblages, how elements interact is highly individualized and context-interdependent, thereby not only shaped by the context, but also shaping the context. As researchers, we have been particularly alert to manifestations of tensions, contradictions, and disruptions that were reported by the participants, and the participants, in turn, may have been alert to the interests of the researchers. Interconnection, such as that between the researchers, participants, and data, is vital in post-qualitative approaches to educational research. If we accept that language and learning literacy today, in a post-COVID 19 world is an entanglement of space, place, and identity, then awareness and acceptance of teaching-learning-researching entanglements in scholarly inquiry are necessary not only to evaluate the research process and product but arguably, to move the field of language and literacy research forward.

References

Al-Bargi, A. (2022). Exploring online writing assessment amid Covid-19: Challenges and opportunities from teachers' perspectives, *Arab World English Journal*, *2*, 3-21. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid2.1

Alvermann, D. E. (2000). Researching libraries, literacies, and lives: A rhizoanalysis. In E. A. St. Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 114–129). Routledge.

Collier, D. R., Moffatt, L., & Perry, M. (2015). Talking, wrestling, and recycling: An investigation of three analytic approaches to qualitative data in education research. *Qualitative Research*, *15*(3), 389-404. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794114538896

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia. (*B. Massumi, Trans.) University of Minnesota Press.

Eaton, S. E. (2021). *Plagiarism in higher education: Tackling tough topics in academic integrity*. ABC-CLIO.

Ellis, C., & Berger, L. (2002). Their story/my story: Including the researcher's experience in interview research. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 849–876). Sage.

Fox, N. J., & Alldred, P. (2015). New materialist social inquiry: Designs, methods and the research assemblage. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 18*(4), 399-414. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2014.921458

Gregg, M., & Seigworth, G. J. (Eds.). (2010). *The affect theory reader*. Duke University Press

Guo, Q., & Xu, Y. (2021). Formative assessment use in university EFL writing instruction: a survey report from China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *41*(2), 221-237. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1798737

Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2015) (Eds.), *Developing online language teaching: Research-based pedagogies and reflective practices*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Heins, B., Duensing, A., Stickler, U., & Batstone, C. (2007). Spoken interaction in online and face-to face language tutorials. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *20*(3) 279–295. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220701489440

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

Huang, L. S. (2018). A call for critical dialogue: EAP assessment from the Practitioner's perspective in Canada. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *35*, 70-84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.07.005

Kainat, A., & Adnan, M. (2020). Online learning amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Students perspectives. *Journal of Pedagogical Research, 1*(2), 45-51. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ed606496

Kruger, F. J. (2015). *Mapping peace and violence in the TESOL classroom* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria]. UPSpace. https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/52936/Kruger_Mapping_2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Le, H. T., & Truong, C. T. T. (2021). Tertiary students' perspectives on online learning during emergency remote teaching in the context of Covid-19: A case study. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *533*, 203-210. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210226.025

Masny, D. (2013). Rhizoanalytic pathways in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 19*(5), 339–348. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413479559

Oh, S. (2020). Second language learners' use of writing resources in writing assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 17*(1), 60–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2019.1674854

Pecorari, D., & Petric, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching, 47*(3), 269–302. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000056.
Perkins, M., Gezgin, U.B. & Roe, J. (2020). Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education. *International Journal of Educational Integrity, 16*(3), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8
Potts, A. (2004). Deleuze on Viagra (or, what can a Viagra-body do?). *Body & Society, 10(1)*, 17–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1357034X04041759
Sevencan, S. (2021). Language teaching to shift to e-learning in post-virus era. https://www.aa.com.tr/en/education/language-teaching-to-shift-to-e-learning-in-post-virus-era/2114720
Shin, D., Kwon, S. K., & Lee, Y. (2021). The effect of using online language-support resources on L2 writing performance. *Language Testing in Asia*, *11*(4), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-021-00119-4
Stickler, U., Hampel, R., & Emke, M. (2020). A developmental framework for online language teaching skills. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 3*(1), 133–151. https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.271
Sun, S. Y. H. (2014). Learner perspectives on fully online language learning. *Distance Education, 35*(1)18-42. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2014.891428
Zou, M., Kong, D., & Lee, I. (2021). Teacher engagement with online formative assessment in EFL writing during COVID-19 pandemic: The case of China. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30, 487–498. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00593-7

Author's Biography

Eugenia (Gene) Vasilopoulos has a Ph.D. in the Second Language Education from the University of Ottawa, where she also teaches. Most recently, her work centers on the socio-materiality of English language teaching and learning, particularly among international students as newcomers to Western higher education. Her most recent publications appear in the Canadian Modern Language Review and the OLBI Journal.

Francis Bangou is a Professor at the Faculty of Education of the University of Ottawa, specializing in the field of second language education. Part of his research is grounded in Deleuzo-Guattarian and new materialist scholarship and focuses on the adaptation of language teachers and learners to unfamiliar teaching and learning contexts, the training of language teachers, and the integration of information and communication technologies in language teaching.