Online Teaching Attitudes: COVID-19 Impact

Authored by

mohammed looti

November 22, 2025

The Context of the Rapid Shift to Remote Instruction

The COVID-19 pandemic necessitated an unprecedented, rapid global transition from traditional, face-to-face instruction to emergency remote teaching (ERT). This sudden migration represented one of the most significant disruptions in the history of higher education, profoundly impacting the attitudes of faculty, students, and administrators toward technology-mediated learning environments. Unlike planned online education, which is designed meticulously over time, **emergency remote teaching** was characterized by immediacy, lack of preparation, and high levels of psychological stress imposed upon all stakeholders. The initial attitudes were often dominated by feelings of uncertainty, anxiety regarding technical competence, and skepticism about the ability of digital platforms to replicate the richness of the physical classroom experience, particularly in disciplines reliant on practical work or deep interpersonal interaction. This immediate, forced adoption of technology served as a critical, large-scale experiment, revealing both the potential and the inherent limitations of distance learning when implemented under crisis conditions.

The psychological landscape of educators was complex. Many faculty members, especially those nearing retirement or those specializing in fields historically resistant to digital tools, harbored deep-seated negative attitudes rooted in perceived lack of control over the learning environment and fear of technological failure. Conversely, younger faculty or those already utilizing blended learning approaches demonstrated greater flexibility and sometimes positive anticipation regarding the opportunity to innovate. This dichotomy in initial attitudes was crucial, as it dictated the speed and effectiveness of pedagogical adaptation across various institutions. The global nature of the crisis meant that these shifts occurred simultaneously across diverse technological infrastructures and cultural contexts, making the study of attitudes toward online teaching a truly universal phenomenon, yet one requiring nuanced interpretation based on regional resources and prior experience with educational technology.

Furthermore, the distinction between ERT and established **online learning pedagogy** became a central point of contention in assessing attitudes. ERT, by definition, prioritized continuity over quality or design excellence. This reality meant that negative attitudes often stemmed not from the intrinsic failure of online learning as a model, but rather from the haphazard execution forced by the pandemic timeline. Consequently, researchers needed to carefully isolate attitudes toward the necessity of the remote environment (the crisis factor) versus attitudes toward the efficacy of digital tools themselves (the pedagogical factor). Understanding this separation is paramount when analyzing the long-term legacy of the pandemic on educational policy and the enduring perceptions held by the academic community regarding distance instruction.

Initial Reactions and Psychological Stressors

The initial phase of the transition was dominated by significant psychological stressors that heavily shaped early attitudes toward online teaching. Faculty reported a dramatic increase in workload, often feeling compelled to restructure entire courses in a matter of days while simultaneously managing personal and family crises related to the pandemic. This environment led to widespread reports of **burnout and emotional exhaustion**, which directly translated into negative attitudes regarding the sustainability and desirability of remote instruction. The loss of clear spatial and temporal boundaries between work and home life exacerbated this stress, contributing to the phenomenon colloquially termed "Zoom fatigue"--a cognitive overload resulting from continuous video conferencing, requiring intense focus on non-verbal cues and self-presentation.

For many educators, the primary source of anxiety was the perceived loss of control over the classroom dynamic. Traditional teaching relies heavily on immediate feedback, subtle non-verbal communication, and the spontaneous flow of discussion, elements that faculty felt were severely compromised or lost entirely in the asynchronous or synchronous digital environment. This perceived diminution of instructional quality fueled reluctance and resistance among many academics who prioritized the relational aspects of teaching. Furthermore, the necessity of monitoring student attendance and engagement in novel ways--often involving invasive technological proctoring or constant digital communication--created ethical dilemmas and added layers of administrative burden, further eroding positive attitudes toward the remote modality.

The rapid shift also exposed pre-existing vulnerabilities in faculty training and institutional preparedness. Many professors had minimal prior experience using Learning Management Systems (LMS) beyond basic grade posting, and the sudden demand to master complex tools for interactive activities, virtual labs, or secure assessment generated intense performance anxiety. This lack of technological readiness meant that attitudes were often tethered directly to feelings of **self-efficacy**; those who felt capable of mastering the new tools developed more positive or pragmatic attitudes, while those who struggled experienced heightened frustration and negative sentiment toward the technology itself, viewing it as an obstacle rather than an aid to instruction.

Moreover, the psychological toll extended beyond the technical difficulties to encompass the emotional burden of teaching through a global trauma. Educators were not merely delivering content; they were simultaneously serving as front-line support for students experiencing profound mental health crises, economic instability, and illness. This dual role of instructor and emotional caretaker significantly amplified the strain, leading many faculty to conclude that the remote environment, while necessary, was inherently unsustainable for maintaining both high academic standards and personal well-being.

Technological Self-Efficacy and Infrastructure Challenges

A core determinant of attitudes toward online teaching was the perceived competence of faculty regarding the required technological infrastructure, known as **technological self-efficacy**. Educators who felt confident in navigating complex digital platforms, troubleshooting technical issues, and creatively utilizing interactive software generally expressed more favorable views of the remote environment's potential. Conversely, low self-efficacy was a major predictor of negative attitudes, often leading to instructional paralysis or the reliance on simplistic, passive methods of content delivery, such as merely uploading lecture slides or lengthy readings without interactive elements. This technological divide within the faculty cohort created significant disparities in the quality of remote education offered across departments and institutions.

The infrastructural limitations faced by both institutions and individuals also profoundly shaped attitudes. The digital divide--the gap between those with reliable access to high-speed internet, necessary hardware, and private workspaces, and those without--became acutely visible. Faculty and students in rural areas or those with limited economic resources often struggled with bandwidth issues, leading to dropped calls, inability to stream video, and delays in accessing course materials. These systemic failures were often interpreted by users as failures of the online teaching model itself, fostering frustration and negative attitudes toward the equity and accessibility of remote instruction. Institutions struggled to scale up server capacity, provide necessary software licenses, and offer 24/7 technical support, leading to widespread system crashes and technical bottlenecks that further exacerbated negative sentiment.

Furthermore, the choice and implementation of specific educational technologies influenced user acceptance. Platforms that were intuitive, stable, and integrated well with existing LMS systems were generally met with less resistance. However, the sheer proliferation of new tools--from specialized virtual whiteboards to complex proctoring software--required continuous learning and adaptation, which contributed to cognitive fatigue. Faculty expressed dissatisfaction when mandated to use technologies that were poorly supported or that lacked clear pedagogical alignment with their teaching goals. The administrative pressure to quickly adopt and implement these tools often overshadowed the crucial need for adequate training and philosophical buy-in, resulting in superficial integration rather than transformative pedagogical practice.

The issue of data privacy and security also played a role in shaping attitudes. The necessity of using video conferencing tools and assessment software raised concerns among faculty about surveillance, intellectual property, and student privacy. These ethical considerations added another layer of complexity, making some educators hesitant to fully embrace technologies that felt intrusive or required extensive data collection, thereby fostering cautious or negative attitudes regarding the long-term ethical implications of fully digitized learning environments.

Pedagogical Adaptations and Instructional Design

The transition demanded radical pedagogical adaptations, which significantly influenced attitudes toward online teaching efficacy. The fundamental challenge was translating established, successful face-to-face instructional strategies--such as spontaneous small group work, hands-on laboratory exercises, or complex clinical simulations--into effective digital formats. Faculty often expressed frustration that the remote environment necessitated simplifying complex content or abandoning interactive elements entirely, leading to a perception that the quality and rigor of the education had been fundamentally compromised. This compromise was a major source of negative attitudes, particularly among faculty dedicated to highly experiential learning models.

Effective instructional design principles, which emphasize asynchronous flexibility, clear structure, and focused digital activities, were often overlooked during the initial emergency shift. Instead, many faculty simply replicated their lecture format online, resulting in what is often termed "shovelware"--the passive transfer of traditional content without meaningful redesign for the digital medium. Students and faculty quickly grew dissatisfied with this approach, recognizing that long, uninterrupted synchronous lectures were poorly suited for remote attention spans and digital fatigue. The realization that **effective online teaching requires fundamentally different design skills**, including chunking content, utilizing multimedia, and fostering structured interaction, became a key factor in improving attitudes, but only for those institutions that quickly invested in pedagogical training.

Assessment posed another major challenge that colored faculty attitudes. Concerns about academic integrity skyrocketed in the unmonitored home environment, forcing faculty to either adopt intrusive proctoring software (which raised ethical hackles) or to completely redesign assessment strategies toward authentic, project-based work (which increased grading workload). The difficulty in ensuring fair and accurate evaluation led many educators to view online assessment as inherently problematic, contributing to the belief that remote instruction could not maintain the same academic standards as traditional models. This tension between flexibility and accountability remains a persistent source of debate and differing attitudes.

However, the crisis also spurred innovation, shifting some attitudes toward cautious optimism. Necessity forced faculty to experiment with tools they might never have considered, such as interactive simulations, specialized discussion forums, and collaborative document editing. For those who successfully navigated this experimentation, the experience revealed new possibilities for reaching diverse learners and providing flexible access to materials. The ability to record lectures and provide transcripts, for instance, proved highly beneficial for students needing accommodations or review, leading some faculty to appreciate the unexpected benefits of digital persistence and accessibility inherent in the online format.

Faculty Attitudes: Challenges vs. Opportunities

Faculty attitudes during the pandemic were characterized by a dynamic tension between significant challenges and emerging opportunities. On the challenge side, the most persistent negative attitudes revolved around the **increased workload** associated with content conversion, managing two modes of student communication (email and LMS messages), and the emotional labor of supporting distressed students. Furthermore, many faculty felt the remote environment diminished the relational aspects of teaching, making it harder to establish rapport and mentor students effectively, which is a core professional satisfaction driver for many academics. The perception that online teaching required more time for less satisfactory results fueled widespread resistance to making the remote model permanent.

Conversely, the crisis revealed unexpected opportunities that fostered more positive attitudes among a segment of the faculty. The shift forced institutions to provide extensive professional development, resulting in a sudden, necessary increase in digital literacy across the academic workforce. Faculty gained proficiency in tools that could be seamlessly integrated into future hybrid or face-to-face courses, enhancing pedagogical options permanently. Moreover, the flexibility inherent in asynchronous learning appealed to many, allowing for better management of research commitments and personal schedules. Some educators discovered that online discussion forums could facilitate deeper, more reflective student engagement than traditional classroom discussions, particularly for shy or non-native English speaking students.

The experience also prompted many academics to reassess the fundamental goals of their teaching, moving away from simple content delivery toward facilitating active learning and critical thinking using digital resources. This forced reflection, combined with evidence that some students thrived in the flexible environment, led to a softening of initial negative attitudes among those who found success in adapting their instructional methods. Ultimately, faculty attitudes became stratified: those who received strong institutional support and successfully mastered the technology tended toward pragmatic acceptance or even advocacy for hybrid models, while those who felt unsupported or overwhelmed retained strong negative views of mandatory remote instruction.

Student Perceptions and Engagement Issues

Student perceptions of online teaching during the pandemic were highly varied, heavily influenced by their academic discipline, access to resources, and individual learning preferences. Initial attitudes were often characterized by disappointment and frustration, primarily stemming from the perceived decline in the quality of instruction and the transactional nature of the emergency remote environment. Many students felt that they were paying full tuition for a diminished experience, particularly regarding access to campus facilities, labs, and face-to-face interaction with peers and faculty, which are vital components of the university experience.

A critical issue affecting student attitudes was **engagement and motivation decline**. The isolation imposed by remote learning led to feelings of disconnection from the academic community, exacerbating mental health challenges. Students reported difficulty maintaining focus in the home environment, struggling with time management, and lacking the external structure provided by physical attendance. While asynchronous flexibility was appreciated by some, others found it led to procrastination and a lack of accountability. This widespread reduction in motivation fueled negative perceptions about the effectiveness of online learning, especially when courses failed to incorporate robust interactive elements.

However, certain demographics expressed more positive views. Students with existing commitments, such as part-time jobs, family responsibilities, or chronic health issues, often appreciated the geographic flexibility and the ability to access recorded lectures on demand. For these learners, the remote modality reduced barriers to access, leading to more favorable attitudes toward future distance learning options. Furthermore, students enrolled in programs that were already digitally oriented, such as computer science or certain business fields, generally adapted more quickly and expressed less dissatisfaction compared to students in fields requiring extensive physical practice, like nursing, arts, or engineering.

Ultimately, student satisfaction was deeply correlated with the level of pedagogical quality achieved by the instructors. When faculty utilized effective instructional design--creating clear expectations, fostering meaningful virtual discussions, and providing timely feedback--student attitudes were significantly more positive. Conversely, experiences with poorly designed, passive online courses reinforced the negative perception that remote learning is an inferior substitute for the traditional classroom, leading to calls for a rapid return to in-person instruction once health conditions allowed.

The Role of Institutional Support

The quality and accessibility of institutional support were perhaps the single most important mitigating factor in shaping faculty and student attitudes toward online teaching during the crisis. Institutions that rapidly mobilized resources to provide robust training, technical assistance, and pedagogical guidance reported significantly less faculty resistance and higher rates of successful adaptation. This support often took several key forms, including dedicated instructional design teams, extensive training workshops focused on best practices for remote assessment and engagement, and accessible 24/7 technical help desks. Where this support was lacking, faculty attitudes quickly deteriorated, fueled by feelings of abandonment and professional isolation.

Beyond technical support, institutions played a crucial role in validating the experience of their staff and students through clear policy communication and mental health resources. Recognizing that the shift was an emotional, not just technical, challenge, universities that provided mental health

services, workload reduction policies, and flexibility regarding grading standards fostered more positive and resilient attitudes. The perception that the administration understood and acknowledged the inherent difficulties of the situation encouraged collaboration rather than resentment, transforming the attitude from one of forced compliance to shared problem-solving.

Financial investment also signaled institutional commitment and influenced attitudes. Providing faculty with stipends for technology upgrades, subsidizing high-speed internet access for students, and investing in high-quality software licenses demonstrated a commitment to making the remote environment functional and equitable. Institutions that treated online teaching as a temporary, secondary option often failed to invest adequately, resulting in widespread infrastructure failures and negative user experiences. Conversely, those that viewed the shift as a long-term investment in digital capacity fostered a more forward-looking and positive attitude among their community regarding the future integration of technology in education.

Long-Term Implications and Future Attitudes

The experience of teaching and learning during the COVID-19 pandemic permanently altered the landscape of educational attitudes. The forced immersion in digital pedagogy debunked the myth that online learning was only suitable for specific demographics or disciplines; it proved that, under duress, virtually all content could be delivered remotely. This realization shifted the debate from whether online teaching is possible to how it can be optimized, leading to a more nuanced and pragmatic set of long-term attitudes. The primary long-term implication is the normalization and widespread acceptance of **hybrid and blended learning models**, where the flexibility and accessibility of digital tools are intentionally integrated with the relational richness of face-to-face interaction.

Future attitudes are likely to favor flexibility, recognizing that learners benefit from choices in delivery modality. Faculty who successfully adapted are now more likely to integrate digital components, such as recorded lectures, virtual office hours, and asynchronous discussion forums, into their standard practice, even when teaching in person. This evolution suggests a permanent positive change in technological competence and a higher baseline expectation for digital resources within all university courses. Institutions are now better prepared to manage future disruptions, shifting the underlying attitude from fear of technology to recognition of its utility as a core component of pedagogical resilience.

However, negative attitudes persist regarding the necessity of maintaining the human element. The pandemic reinforced the value of in-person interaction for community building, spontaneous mentorship, and certain types of experiential learning. Moving forward, attitudes will likely remain resistant to fully remote models for undergraduate education, but highly favorable toward remote options for professional development, graduate studies, and continuing education. The challenge

lies in ensuring that the digital tools adopted during the crisis are used to enhance, rather than replace, high-quality, human-centered instruction.

Ultimately, the pandemic served as a catalyst, accelerating digital transformation by at least a decade. Attitudes toward online teaching have matured from initial skepticism and resistance to a cautious, evidence-based embrace of flexible delivery. The focus has shifted from mere continuity to the strategic integration of technology to maximize accessibility and pedagogical effectiveness, ensuring that future educational models are robust, equitable, and capable of meeting the complex needs of diverse 21st-century learners.