

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

**EXPLORING TURKISH EFL TEACHERS' ONLINE TEACHING
SELF-EFFICACY DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIA**

**THESIS BY
Çiğdem ŞEKER**

**Supervisor: Dr. Gürcan DEMİROGLARI
Jury: Dr. Aysun YURDAIŞIK DAĞTAŞ
Jury: Dr. Deniz ELÇİN (Siirt University)**

MASTER OF ARTS

MERSİN / JULY 2023

APPROVAL**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY****ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY****DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

We **certify** that thesis under the title of “**EXPLORING TURKISH EFL TEACHERS’ ONLINE TEACHING SELF-EFFICACY DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIA**” which was prepared by our student **Çiğdem ŞEKER** with number 20198031 is satisfactory consensus for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the **Department of English Language Education**.

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)

Univ. Inside -Supervisor-Head of Examining Committee: **Dr. Gürcan DEMİROGLARI**

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)

Univ. inside - permanent member: **Dr. Aysun YURDAIŞIK DAĞTAŞ**

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)

Univ. Outside- permanent member: **Dr. Deniz ELÇİN**

(Siirt University)

I confirm that the signatures above belong to the academics mentioned.

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)

06/07/2023

Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ

Director of Institute of Social Sciences

Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for mother sources is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought. No: 5846.

ETHICS DECLARATION

Student's

Name & Surname: Çiğdem ŞEKER
Number: 20198031
Department: English Language Education
Program: Master Thesis (X)
Thesis Title: Exploring Turkish EFL Teachers' Online Teaching
Self-efficacy During Covid-19 Pandemia

I hereby declare that;

I prepared this master thesis in accordance with Çağ University Institute of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,

I prepared this thesis within the framework of academic and ethics rules,

I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with scientific ethical and moral principles,

I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis,

The work of art in this thesis is original,

I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance. (in case of any circumstance contradicting with my declaration)

06/07/2023

Çiğdem ŞEKER

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Undoubtedly, I've had a lot of company on this challenging road. This study has been made possible by the contributions and support of these people.

Firstly, I would like to express my gratitude to my wonderful supervisor, Dr. Gürcan DEMİROGLARI for his assistance, direction, criticism and support throughout this challenging thesis process. I'd like to thank, Dr. Deniz ELÇİN and Dr. Aysun DAĞTAŞ, who served on the examining committee along with my thesis advisor, for their insightful criticism and feedback on this work. They unquestionably contributed significantly to the improvement of my thesis.

I want to thank my precious friends Rahime and Beyza, who always offered me moral support during my thesis writing process.

I am grateful to my family for their support and motivation in my thesis writing process. They gave me encouragement, inspiration and ability to restore my faith in myself. Without them, completing this process would undoubtedly have been considerably more challenging.

Endless thanks to my elder sister, Bedisim, who contributed so much in every period of my life including this thesis writing process.

I am proud of my own patience and effort I put in this thesis despite all the difficulties.

Finally, I would like to dedicate my thesis to my beloved parents Nurettin Seker and Sehliye Seker, to whom I am grateful for bringing me up to these days. They are sources of love in my life.

P.S.: To Hazal, my beloved 6-year-old niece: I love you to the moon and back...

ABSTRACT**EXPLORING TURKISH EFL TEACHERS' ONLINE TEACHING SELF-EFFICACY DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIA****Çiğdem ŞEKER****Master Thesis, Department of English Language Education****Supervisor: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gürcan DEMİROGLARI****July 2023, 120 Pages**

The purpose of this research study is to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' self-efficacy levels for online teaching which was implemented during Covid-19 pandemic, in relation with some of their demographic characteristics (i.e. age, gender, years of teaching experience, online teaching experience, pre-service and in-service training on use of educational technologies). The study also examines EFL teachers' views on their online teaching self-efficacy in addition to their reflections on the pandemic online education. A mixed-method research design was implemented through two sequential data collection phases. The sample size was 160 EFL teachers working at state schools in Siirt province. The Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (MNESEOTS), which was renamed as "EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (ETSEOTS)" in this study's context, was applied for quantitative data collection, and a semi-structured interview was administered to gather qualitative data. Quantitative findings showed that participant EFL teachers' average online teaching self-efficacy was at medium levels, not at desired levels. Moreover, qualitative findings revealed that the online education process was challenging for EFL teachers, because they had many problems and limitations, which, in turn, limited their language teaching activities and caused them to feel inefficient, exhausted, lonely and so on during online courses. On the other hand, their awareness and willingness for professional development, and interest in applied trainings about online teaching were raised. Consequently, it was implied that EFL teachers need to be supported through professional development opportunities that enable applied in-service trainings about online teaching and that the online teaching methodology needs to be incorporated into the pre-service training provided within teacher education programmes.

Keywords: self-efficacy, teacher self-efficacy, online teaching, online teaching self-efficacy, distance education, Covid-19 pandemic, Turkish EFL teachers

ÖZ

COVID-19 PANDEMİSİ SIRASINDA TÜRK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN ÇEVİRİMİÇİ ÖĞRETİM ÖZYETERLİKLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

Çiğdem ŞEKER

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gürcan DEMİROGLARI

Temmuz 2023, 120 Sayfa

Bu araştırma çalışmasının amacı, Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Covid-19 pandemisi sırasında uygulanan çevrimiçi öğretime ilişkin öz-yeterlik düzeylerini, bunun onların bazı demografik özellikleri ile (yaş, cinsiyet, öğretmenlik deneyimi yılı, çevrimiçi öğretim deneyimi, eğitim teknolojilerinin kullanımına ilişkin hizmet öncesi ve hizmet içi eğitim) olan bağlantısını, ve İngilizce öğretmenlerinin çevrimiçi öğretim özyeterlikleri hakkındaki görüşleri ile onların pandemik çevrimiçi eğitime dair düşüncelerini incelemektir. Çalışmada birbirini takip eden iki veri toplama aşamasından oluşan karma yöntemli bir araştırma modeli uygulanmıştır. Örneklem boyutu, Siirt ilinde devlet okullarında görev yapan 160 İngilizce öğretmeni olarak belirlendi. Bu çalışmanın kapsamına uyacak şekilde “İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Çevrimiçi Öğretim için Yeterlik Algısı Ölçeği (ETSEOTS)” olarak yeniden adlandırılan Michigan Hemşire Eğitimcilerinin Çevrimiçi Öğretim için Yeterlik Algısı Ölçeği (MNESEOTS) nicel veri toplamak için uygulandı ve nitel verileri toplamak için yarı yapılandırılmış röportaj aracılığı ile görüşmeler yapıldı. Nicel bulgular, katılımcı İngilizce öğretmenlerinin ortalama çevrimiçi öğretim özyeterliklerinin orta düzeyde olduğunu, yani istenen düzeyde olmadığını gösterdi. Ayrıca, nitel bulgular, online eğitim sürecinin pek çok sorun ve sınırlama barındırdığından İngilizce öğretmenleri için zorlayıcı olduğunu gösterdi. Bu da onların dil öğretim aktivitelerini sınırlandırmış ve çevrimiçi dersler sırasında kendilerini yetersiz, tükenmiş, yalnız vb. hissetmelerine neden olmuştur. Öte yandan, çevrimiçi öğretim ile ilgili mesleki gelişime yönelik farkındalıkları ve isteklerinin yanı sıra uygulamalı eğitimlere olan ilgilerinin arttığı görülmüştür. Sonuç olarak, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin çevrimiçi öğretime yönelik uygulamalı hizmet içi eğitimler sağlayan mesleki gelişim fırsatları yoluyla desteklenmesi ve online öğretim metodolojisinin öğretmen eğitimi programları dahilinde verilen hizmet öncesi eğitime dahil edilmesi gerektiği kanısına varılmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: öz yeterlik, öğretmen öz yeterliği, çevrimiçi öğretim, online eğitim, online öğretim öz yeterliği, uzaktan eğitim, Covid-19 pandemisi, Türk İngilizce öğretmenleri

DEDICATION

*To my beloved parents
Sehliye and Nurettin ŞEKER*

CONTENTS

COVER	i
APPROVAL	ii
ETHICS DECLARATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	vii
CONTENTS	viii
ABBREVIATIONS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF APPENDICES	xii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Purpose Statement	2
1.3. Significance of the Study	3
1.4. Review of the Literature	3
2. METHODOLOGY	25
2.1. Research Design of the Study	25
2.2. Research Setting and Participants	26
2.2.1. Characteristics of Participants	26
2.3. Data Collection Procedure of the Study	28
2.4. Data Collection Tools	29
2.4.1. The Michigan Nurse Educators’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale	29
2.4.1.1. Reliability Analysis of Scales	30
2.4.2. The Semi-structured Interview	31
2.5. Data Analysis	31
3. FINDINGS	33
3.1. Findings of Quantitative Data	33
3.1.1. Findings on Scale Items	33
3.1.2. EFL Teachers’ Self-efficacy Levels for Online Teaching	36

3.1.3. Analysis of EFL Teachers' Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Demographic Variables	37
3.2. Findings of Qualitative Data.....	45
3.2.1. Findings on Reasons for EFL Teachers' Online Teaching Self- efficacy Levels during the Covid-19 Pandemic Distance Education.....	45
3.2.2. Findings on EFL Teachers' Reflections on the Pandemic Online Education.....	60
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	68
4.1. Overview of the Study	68
4.2. Implications	79
4.3. Suggestions for Further Research	80
4.4. Limitations of the Study	81
REFERENCES	83
APPENDICES	93

ABBREVIATIONS

DE	: Distance Education
EBA	: Educational Information Network
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ELT	: English Language Teaching
ETSEOTS	: EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale
HEC / YÖK	: Council of Higher Education
LOC	: Locus of Control
M	: Mean
MA	: Master of Art
MNESEOTS	: Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale
MNE	: Ministry of National Education
N / n	: Sample Size
OEF	: Open Education Faculty
OHS	: Open High School
p	:: Significance Value
Std	: Standart Deviation
Sign.	: Significance Level
SLA	: Second Language Acquisition
SPSS	: Statistical Package for Social Sciences
TRT	: Turkish Radio and Television Corporation
WHO	: World Health Organization

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Descriptive Statistics for Characteristics of Participant EFL Teachers	27
Table 2.	Cronbach’s Alpha for the MNESEOTS	30
Table 3.	Shapiro Wilk Normality Test Results	32
Table 4.	Descriptive Statistics on Scale Items.....	33
Table 5.	EFL Teachers’ Self-efficacy Levels for Online Teaching	36
Table 6.	Analysis of EFL Teachers’ Online Teaching Self-efficacy According to School Type.....	37
Table 7.	Analysis of EFL Teachers’ Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Education Level.....	38
Table 8.	Analysis of EFL Teachers’ Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Age	39
Table 9.	Analysis of EFL Teachers’ Sense of Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Gender	40
Table 10.	Analysis of EFL Teachers’ Online Teaching Self-efficacy According to Years of Teaching Experience	41
Table 11.	Analysis of EFL Teachers’ Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Online Teaching Experience Before the Covid-19 Pandemia	42
Table 12.	Analysis of EFL Teachers’ Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to In-service Training on Educational Technologies.....	43
Table 13.	Analysis of EFL Teachers’ Online Teaching Self-efficacy According to Pre-service Education on Educational Technologies	44
Table 14.	EFL Teachers’ Views on Their Online Teaching Self-efficacy Levels	46
Table 15.	EFL Teachers’ Reflections on the Pandemic Online Education.....	61

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A. Ethical Permission Letter	93
Appendix B. Bilgilendirilmiş Onam Formu	95
Appendix C. Consent Form	96
Appendix D. Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale.....	97
Appendix E. Interview Questions	103
Appendix F. Approval from Çağ University	106
Appendix G. Approval from Siirt Provincial Directorate of National Education.....	107

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Teachers possess significant roles in the educational systems because teaching is a profession endowed with responsibilities which make teachers irreplaceable. In the teaching process, teachers need to decide for the required learning contents in parallel with their students' needs, and they have to deliver the content in appropriate learning environments through appropriate teaching materials and methods. As stated by Herman (2019) what "a quality or good teacher" does is not "just planning, making lesson plans or teaching" (p. 1). In fact, teachers are not only sources of knowledge who deliver course content for students but they also "counsel" and "inspire" them in order to "help them utilize the knowledge they receive into their lives so that they can become valuable members of society" (Herman, 2019, p.1). In this sense, teachers not only help in conducting the core function of teaching but they also moderate students' academical and personal growth. In other words, teachers are "the manager or controller," "the tutor", "the prompter", "the organiser" "the assessor" and "the role model" for their students (Herman, 2019, p. 1). Therefore, teachers' effectiveness in fulfilling such roles and responsibilities is important and it is influenced significantly by their self-efficacy beliefs about their teaching capabilities. In other words, the more teachers believe in themselves and their teaching skills the more successful they are expected to be in their teaching environments. Nowadays, it is observed that teaching environments for teachers and learners might vary as a result of developments in educational technologies, new teaching trends and unexpected extraordinary conditions such as natural disasters, wars, pandemics, etc. Although a teaching environment is generally a classroom at schools, sometimes it might be an online platform, where teachers and students are physically separated. In fact, regardless of where and how the teaching environment is, the moderating role of teachers and the influence of their self-efficacy on their teaching efficiency always maintain.

Research Problem and Justification

Today's teaching and learning facilities are gaining new dimensions, requiring new teaching environments and carrying educational practices beyond the walls of classrooms due to the developing technologies in the 21. century world, and some unexpected mandatory situations like natural disasters, pandemics and so on. In 2020, a

pandemia called “Covid-19” influenced the whole world drastically in many fields, including education. The pandemic caused closure of schools all around the world, which resulted in new situations and sanctions for teachers and learners as for continuing their educational facilities. Online education suddenly became the new compulsory way of conducting the interrupted educational process. Therefore, a need for research about the distance online education that was implemented during the Covid-19 pandemic emerged. Regarding the novelty of online education for the majority of Turkish EFL teachers in their professional lives and their lack of familiarity with online teaching environments, it is crucial to consider and search about whether they were ready for such a process and how efficacious they regarded themselves for conducting the online language teaching practices.

1.2. Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to investigate Turkish EFL teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy levels during the Covid-19 pandemic distance education, to find out whether there is a relationship between the functioning of their online teaching self-efficacy and some of their demographic variables such as age, gender, years of teaching experience, online teaching experience before pandemic, and participation in an in-service or pre-service education on how to use educational technologies, and to examine EFL teachers’ reflections on the pandemic online education process.

The study tries to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the online teaching self-efficacy levels of Turkish EFL teachers during the Covid-19 pandemic?
2. Does the online teaching self-efficacy of participants differ according to their personal aspects such as;
 - a) Age?
 - b) Gender?
 - c) Years of teaching experience?
 - d) Having online teaching experience before the pandemic?
 - e) Having participated in an in-service or pre-service training on use of educational technologies?
3. What are Turkish EFL teachers’ reflections on the pandemic online education?

1.3. Significance of the Study

This research study might be considered significant as it handles the online teaching that was put into action with the Covid-19 pandemic outbreak in recent years. The study enables to have deep insights into Turkish EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy and searches about whether and how their personal aspects influence their online teaching self-efficacy levels. Moreover, the study reveals EFL teachers' reflections on the pandemic online education regarding both positive and negative aspects of it. As a whole, the study is expected to contribute to the related literature about teacher self-efficacy, online teaching self-efficacy and pandemic distance online education. In addition, it provides implications for enhancement of EFL teachers' future online working conditions and professional development opportunities to help them attain more sustainable online language teaching achievements and better online teaching self-efficacy levels. Suggestions for further research on the topic are given as well.

1.4. Review of the Literature

This review of literature brings together relevant and comprehensive information from background theories and conducted studies about *the human self*, *self-efficacy*, *teacher self-efficacy*, *online teaching* and *online teaching self-efficacy* in relation with one another within the framework of distance online education that was implemented amid the Covid-19 pandemic.

Social Cognitive Theory

Put forward by Albert Bandura (1986), the Social Cognitive Theory basically focuses on the construction and various dimensions of the human self. In this theory, Bandura described humans as “proactive, self-reflective, and self-regulating beings” (as cited in Mercer and Williams, 2014, p. 7). Maddux and Gosselin (2012) underlined the four main principles of Social Cognitive Theory regarding the human self in their study. First, as they assert, human brain provides individuals with strong reflective cognitive abilities on their experiences. Thus, individuals are able to observe and evaluate their actions, thoughts and feelings; make future plans and predict the outcomes; evaluate their predictions; and share their opinions and experiences with others. Secondly, three main factors, which are personal, environmental and behavioral, are reciprocally influential on humans' ways of thinking and behaving. The personal factors, which are constituted of individuals' cognitive, emotional and biological aspects, are affected by the

environmental and behavioral factors around them (Maddux & Gosselin, 2012). In other words, as Bandura (1986) emphasized, an individual's environment, behavior and personal aspects are in mutual interactions with their cognitive, psychological and emotional dimensions (as cited in Raoofi et al., 2012). Thirdly, the human self and identity are not only constructed but also shaped by social interactions (Maddux & Gosselin, 2012). This, within the educational context, emphasizes the significance of focusing on individuals' social relationships in order to have an insight into their inner self and the reasons behind their behaviours. The fourth and final principle explained by Maddux and Gosselin (2012) is that humans both possess agency and reflect their self in their actions, in that, they give reactions to surrounding factors, set targets and regulate their actions in accordance with the outcomes of their past experiences. As a whole, the way Social Cognitive Theory handles and explains the reciprocal relationship of the human self with individuals' psychological, behavioral and environmental determinants makes Bandura's theory an important element of educational psychology (Schunk & Pajares, 2009).

The Human Self. Humans are not only biological beings but they also have emotional and cognitive characteristics. The emotional and psychological existence of individuals is mainly based on their perceptions about themselves as human beings. These perceptions constitute the basis of the human self, over which individuals first create self-concepts and then build their identities (Mercer, 2011). Therefore, the human self is a "complex dynamic" structure made of an individual's "multiple interrelated components" and varying attributes (Mercer and Williams, 2014, p. 162). Accordingly, individuals' sense of self is shaped by how they are conceptualising themselves; and in parallel, their self-concepts influence the formation of their self-beliefs and the way they behave in social contexts. The dynamic system of the self produces self-belief constructs like self-concepts, self-esteem, self-efficacy and self-confidence, which, as Valentine and DuBois (2005) stated, are shaped around people's perceptions about their qualifications and capabilities as individuals (as cited in Mercer, 2011). In this sense, as Baumeister (1989) suggested, the self of humans cooperate with their biological being to make sense in the surrounding cultural system (as cited in Schroeder, 2013). As a whole, the human self is one and only for "its ability to turn inward and engage in self-reflection"; for "its identity as an interpersonal being, partner, and group member"; and "by its executive function as an agent that makes choices, exerts control, and engages in self-regulation" for human beings (Baumeister, 1989, as cited in Schroeder, 2013, p. 1).

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is one of the prominent self-constructs that Bandura explained in the Social Cognitive Theory. Research on individuals' self-efficacy has gained significance in the educational area within the last two decades. According to Bandura (1982), self-efficacy refers to the amount of confidence humans possess about their capabilities to perform specific actions. Bandura adds that individuals' previous successful accomplishments are the greatest basis for the creation and development of self-efficacy in them (as cited in Lane et al, 2004). In this sense, Bandura (1997) associated higher self-efficacy levels with effective organization and fulfillment of a particular task (as cited in Ucar, 2016). Bandura further explained that efficacy beliefs influence individuals' faith in their personal attributes and abilities considerably (as cited in Mercer, 2011). Accordingly, self-efficacy belief is influential on most of human behaviour and actions because they are directed by how much capable and efficacious the individuals perceive themselves as social beings. Similarly, as Pajares (1996) stated, one's self-efficacy can affect the interest, persistence, and endeavor they invest in the action they are performing. As a result, individuals who have greater self-efficacy levels are expected to invest more effort in their actions to achieve their goals when compared to less self-efficacious people (Pajares, 2002). In this sense, as Bandura suggested, one's amount of self-efficacy can be regarded as an indicator for the success level they can attain in a task or activity (as cited in Pajares, 1996). In addition, the self-efficacy of individuals holds a critical impact on their self-motivation, goal setting and self-evaluation abilities. In this regards, as Şenel (2013) indicated, in case of encountering challenges, people with high self-efficacy has stronger resistance than those with lower self-efficacy levels. In other saying, self-efficacy is determinant on individuals' endurance level against impediments in life. In brief, self-efficacy might be regarded as an indicator of the functioning of human agency in relation with the way individuals think, feel and behave as social beings (Çağlar, 2019), because it makes direct and indirect influences on humans' behavior, willpower, aims and expectations (Bandura, 2000). As a whole, self-efficacy is an essential element of the human self and agency due to its executive role on individuals' behaviour (Bandura, 1991, 1997, 1999; Wood & Bandura, 1989).

In the Social Cognitive Theory, Bandura (1997) based the construction of self-efficacy on four main resources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and psychological and emotional states. These four resources are all

influential on the stimulation and improvement of self-efficacy in humans (Raoofti et al., 2012). The first resource, mastery experience, which is also called *enactive self mastery*, is built upon the previous accomplishments of an individual in a particular context. According to Bandura (1997) mastery experience is the most influential source for the improvement of self-efficacy, because if the individuals achieve successful results after a long struggle with challenging situations, they attain a notable efficacy level as for controlling the events taking place around them. The second source of self-efficacy, vicarious experience is obtained through an observation on the results of other people's actions. In other words, individuals evaluate their own abilities required for performing a specific action according to the outcomes achieved by other people after performing the same action (Bandura, 1997). As the third source of self-efficacy, social or verbal persuasion signifies the influence of successful persuaders on fostering people's belief in themselves for managing particular tasks. Accordingly, if an individual receives positive persuasion in appraisal language for their abilities, this contributes to their self-efficacy to start an action, try new strategies and put the required effort to become successful (Bandura, 1997). Conversely, negative persuasion is found to diminish people's self-efficacy levels considerably (Pajares, 2002). The fourth source of self-efficacy, people's psychological and affective factors like stress, anxiety, and excitement influence their self-efficacy significantly. Therefore, helping to lower people's stress and anxiety factors to transform their undesired feelings to positive ones holds an improving effect on their self-efficacy levels (Bandura, 1997).

Teacher Self-efficacy

In literature, teachers' judgements and opinions about their teaching abilities are called *teacher self-efficacy*. In the educational area, teacher self-efficacy is among the main determinants that highly influence teachers, their teaching activities and learners' success outcomes (Ucar, 2016), because teachers possess an active role in the overall teaching and learning process. In the Social Cognitive Theory, Bandura (1997) described teacher self-efficacy as one type of self-efficacy, which he believed needs to be taken seriously in the framework of educational psychology (as cited in Ucar & Bozkaya, 2016). He emphasized on a requirement for more research about teacher self-efficacy, because according to him, "teachers' efficacy beliefs are generally open to change... and hence, this construct should be examined deeply" and continually (as cited in Ucar, 2016, p.16).

Teacher self-efficacy has been studied increasingly in the context of educational psychology to have insights into teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for their competence in effective teaching and producing successful student achievements (Ucar & Bozkaya, 2016). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) defined teacher self-efficacy as teachers' own beliefs about their skills and abilities to obtain positive student outcomes by enhancing their motivation and engagement in learning. Teachers being the eminent factor that has influences on students' apprehension and goal setting at school (Afsaneh & Safoura, 2015), teachers' self-efficacy level is observed to be highly influential on their students' success outcomes in those aspects (Chacon, 2005). Besides, teachers' self-efficacy determines how diligent they are about their classroom goals, instructional preparations and delivery (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Moreover, teacher self efficacy is regarded to be enhancing teachers' resistance against possible challenges, readiness for implementing new approaches in their teaching environments to foster students' learnings, and so on. Gibson and Dembo (1984) claimed that the teachers with strong self-efficacy beliefs are more likely to try innovative strategies and methods in their teaching, particularly when they get unsuccessful student outcomes. Similarly, Ghaith and Yaghi (1997) reported that instructors who have higher self-efficacy beliefs regard themselves as more effective teachers. Furthermore, such teachers believe that use of innovation is inevitable and indispensable in their teaching, and they find it easier to implement innovative teaching strategies in their instruction. In other words, as studies have supported, highly efficacious teachers always hold a pathbreaking perspective and feel more ready to try new methods and approaches in order to cope with problems they come across (Berman et al., 1977; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988), because high self-efficacy empowers teachers' endurance in times of impediments in their job (Smylie & Denny, 1989). According to Trentham et al. (1985), individuals who have powerful self-efficacy are more contented with and committed to their jobs. Similarly, studies have shown that teachers who have powerful sense of self-efficacy are inclined to be more dedicated to teaching and more cooperative with school management (Berman et al., 1977; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). Consequently, as clarified by Henson (2001), there is a meaningful relationship between greater teacher self-efficacy and desirable teaching activities, which, in turn, produce positive student outputs. All in all, teacher self-efficacy might be regarded as a backbone in the teaching and learning process due to its decisive influence on teachers' instructional activity, prolificacy (Ashton & Webb, 1986) and

learner acquisitions. In this study's ELT / SLA context, EFL teachers' self-efficacy is expected to be determinant and influential on their conceptualizations of effective language teaching (Alemi & Pashmforoosh 2013).

As a multidimensional construct, teacher self-efficacy depends on accomplishments in varying tasks and situations and it is powered by four resources of self-efficacy that are postulated by Bandura in the Social Cognitive Theory. According to Dellinger et al. (2008), the multidimensional nature of teacher self-efficacy adds to its further expansion in terms of its strength, level and generality. As a result, several measures for assessing teacher self-efficacy have been developed on the basis of Bandura's depiction of self-efficacy in Social Cognitive Theory, Gibson and Dembo's (1984) Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) and Ashton & Webb's (1986) measurement of teacher self-efficacy are among the frequently utilized measures. The Teacher Efficacy Beliefs System-Self (TEBS-Self) by Dellinger et al. (2008) is another measurement that is frequently used to evaluate self-efficacy beliefs of teachers as well as their group-work collective efficacy. Dellinger et al.'s (2008) instrument is constituted of six subscales, which are "clarification, management, accommodation, motivation, regulation of interdisciplinary routines, and higher-order thinking skills" (as cited in Alemi & Pashmforoosh, 2013, p. 27). Recent studies have further examined and assessed teacher self-efficacy regarding the ability to implement inclusive strategies in teaching activities (Romi & Leyser, 2006; Sharma et al., 2012). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy's (2001) Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSE) was developed with this purpose in order to go "a step forward in capturing an elusive construct of teacher efficacy" (as cited in Alemi & Pashmforoosh, 2013, p.27). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy's (2001) instrument is widely utilized and accepted as a more comprehensive and superior measure compared with prior teacher self-efficacy assessment tools, because it enables to assess an extensive range of factors which affect teachers' perceptions on their teaching capabilities (Alemi & Pashmforoosh, 2013).

Locus of Control. Locus of control (LOC) is a famous personal attribute described by Rotter (1966) in the Social Learning Theory regarding individuals' way of thinking, behaving and feeling in relation with their perception of the world and the level of control they have on their life experiences. In this sense, locus of control is among the basic elements of human psychology that have direct influences on individuals' behaviour and way of thinking. According to Rotter (1966), individuals either have internal locus of control or external locus of control as source of impulse in them. These

two locuses of control operate in opposite directions in individuals. People with internal locus of control possess a self-initiated change orientation, whereas for those who have external locus of control the change orientation is attributed to a power or source outside the individual. Hence, individuals with internal LOC believe that they have the ability to control and influence the outcomes of their actions, because they know that their own effort and personal efficacy bring about those outcomes for them. Accordingly, studies have indicated that individuals' productive aspects and desirable accomplishments stem from internal locus of control (Toussi, 2012). Moreover, people who are driven by internal locus of control prefer making choices for their lives by themselves. Thus, they are inclined to "feel happier, free, and less stressed" (Cascio et al., 2014, p. 150), because no matter what the result of their choice is, they accept and appreciate it. Accordingly, individuals whose source of motivation is internal locus of control are expected to be more successful and pleased with their lives.

On the other hand, an impulse driven by external locus of control diminishes individuals' creativity and freedom in their choices, and such people are inclined to link the outcomes of their actions with factors beyond their control, such as fate, chance or any person except themselves (Rotter, 1966). For this reason, "they perceive themselves to have little or no control over their lives" (Cascio et al., 2014, p. 150) and they are inclined to hold another person or situation accountable for undesired consequences in their lives (Joe, 1971). Consequently, they are inclined to feel stressful and depressed in their lives (Cascio et al., 2014).

Regarding the relationship between human psychology and locus of control, the construct of LOC can be associated with Bandura's concept of self-efficacy. Even further links can be observed between locus of control and teacher self-efficacy in the framework of educational psychology. In his Social Learning Theory, Rotter (1966) described the impact of teachers' locus of control on their behavior and self-efficacy beliefs in the educational context. Accordingly, teacher self-efficacy is dependent on the extent of control that teachers believe they have over the factors that influence the teaching and learning practices in and around their teaching environments (Ucar & Bozkaya, 2016). In other words, teachers are driven by either internal locus of control or external locus of control in their teaching practices. As for language teaching and learning, EFL teachers with internal locus of control are expected to base their students' success or failure results on the language teaching methods and materials they choose and utilize. On the other hand, EFL teachers with external locus of control are inclined

to associate the undesired outcomes in their classes with external sources other than themselves, such as insufficient efforts by students, technical problems, lack of teaching materials and so on. In this sense, language teachers with inner locus of control might take more responsibility in their teaching, do their best and try new approaches for desirable student outcomes, whereas the language teaching facilities of EFL teachers with external locus of control might be limited. Unfortunately, such EFL teachers may not be able to come up with innovative solutions in case of impediment in their teaching environments. Consequently, EFL teachers with external LOC are expected to have lower self-efficacy than EFL teachers with internal locus of control, because those with internal locus of control believe more in their teaching abilities to create successful language learning environments full of opportunities for their students.

The Impact of Covid-19 Pandemia on Education around the World and in Turkey

In December 2019, a novel type of coronavirus which is named as “Covid-19” appeared in Wuhan, China (Ministry of Health, 2020). Unfortunately, it crossed the Chinese borders and rapidly spread the world, which led to a worldwide declaration of pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) (WHO, 2020). In order to slow down the spread of the coronavirus, governmental decisions were made by all countries for masses of people to stay in quarantine at homes (Zhong, 2020). Negative effects of the Covid-19 pandemic were observed in many areas that directly affect human life. According to Telli et al. (2020), following the health sector, education was among of the most drastically influenced fields by the pandemic due to the pandemic lockdown and the accompanying closure of schools around the world. According to reports in Miks and McIlwaine’s (2020) study, “approximately 1.6 billion children and young people were affected by the pandemic,” which equals to “more than 91 percent of students worldwide” (as cited in Bakioğlu & Çevik, 2020, p.110). Lockdowns meant a deprivation of teaching and learning activities for teachers and learners because of the suspension of face-to-face education at schools, which resulted in an urgent switch to distance education by educational policies in order to help the continuation of teaching and learning process (Zhong, 2020). Consequently, distance online education started to get implemented all around the world at all levels and branches of education, including English language teaching. In this sense, Covid-19 brought on the agenda of educational studies a new framework that can be referred to as *distance education in pandemic periods* (Hebebcı et al., 2020).

As in the whole world, distance education became essential for all levels of education in Turkey during the Covid-19 pandemic. For this purpose, various technological medias both on two-way interactive and on one-way non interactive teaching platforms started to be utilized within distance education programs so that lessons could be delivered without time limitations and physical boundaries between teachers and students (Bates, 1999). For example, the Council of Higher Education (YOK) transferred authority to universities for conducting the theoretical courses of formal associate, undergraduate and graduate programs through distance education. Consequently, lessons started to be taught within distance education channels. Online live courses began to be conducted at all levels of education on digital applications such as ZOOM, Skype, etc. Therefore, YOK took decisions on many issues, including a free 6 GB distance education support quota for university students (Karadağ & Yucel, 2020). Similarly, the Ministry of National Education (MNE) sustained distance education programs at primary and secondary school levels through digital technologies such as television broadcasts and Internet-based platforms. The Educational Information Network (EBA) and the EBA-TV channel, which is sustained by Turkish Radio and Television Corporation (TRT), provided courses and supplementary materials in accordance with the specified curriculum programs of primary, secondary and high school levels. Actually, the EBA digital education portal was established by MNE in 2011 (Özer, 2020) and so far it has been in service to provide curriculum-based learning materials such as videos, tests, e-books and documents for students ranging from pre-school to high school level. On the EBA portal, more than 5.000 books, hundred thousands of documentaries and cartoons are available for students, teachers, and even parents. Additionally, it enables teachers to schedule and give online live courses, upload assignments, assessment tasks and video-records of their lessons students. The EBA portal also involves an analysis tool that identifies the academic needs of students by means of the data gathered from students' responses to tasks. This enables students to have access to appropriate learning materials for their individual academic needs (Özer, 2020). During the Covid-19 pandemic, the MNE reinforced the EBA portal's infrastructure aspects to sustain online live courses (Özer, 2020). Moreover, agreements were made with GSM operators to provide up to 8 GB of internet use free of charge (MEB, 2020) for students in order to ensure continuity in the distance online education. All in all, YOK and the EBA portal undertook serious roles in the conduction of distance online education during the Covid-19 pandemic in Turkey.

Although distance education practices in Turkey during the Covid-19 pandemic contributed to the continuation of education, there were still deficiencies and problems resulting from limitations related to scheduling, time and implementation of appropriate and effective online teaching methods (Hebebcı et al., 2020). Accordingly, some challenging “factors such as lack of infrastructure (software, hardware etc.), economic reasons, technical staff problem, lack of awareness of the society,” specifically of students and parents, and “regional differences in the level of utilization of information technologies” were categorized as obstacles that teachers encountered in application of distant online education (Gökdaş & Kayrı, 2005, as cited in Hebebcı et al., 2020, p. 268). Unfortunately, all those factors had negative impacts on teachers’ effectiveness in online teaching incorporated during the pandemic crisis in Turkey.

Distance Education

Alternative channels and platforms for teaching and learning have been produced and utilized frequently in the history of education in addition to the traditional classrooms of face-to-face education through the increase in the usage of internet and instructional technologies (Aydın & Tirkeş, 2010). As one of the alternatives, distance education (DE) has been popularly applied across the world by many universities and other formal and non-formal educational institutions. In literature, distance education has been referred to with various terms such as “distant education, distance learning, distance teaching, open learning, online learning, asynchronous learning, e-learning, etc.” (Caner, 2016, p.215). Accordingly, different conceptualizations of distant education have been produced by scholars in regards with differing technologies (Caner, 2016). Holmberg (1989) conceptualized distance education as a framework that covers teaching and learning activities in relation with learner’s cognitive and psychological aspects and the organization that provides the infrastructure facilities and regulates the distance education process. Moreover, Bates (2005) defined distant education as individual learners’ study at their own choice of time and place with no vis-a-vis communication with the instructor. According to Edvardsson and Oskarsson (2008), distance education basically provides a different kind of class that is adapted to unconventional learners who do not join regular classes. Similarly, McIsaac and Gunawardena (1996) defined it as a delivery of instruction to people through print or electronic communications media.

As a whole, distance education is a planned way of teaching and learning that takes place at different locations for teachers and learners. Moreover, it requires “special techniques of course design, instructional techniques, and methods of communication by electronic and other technology along with organizational and administrative arrangement” (Moore & Kearsley, 1996, as cited in Caner, 2016, p. 216). Keegan (1980) proposed that distant education is dependent on six principles, that are, “separation of teacher and learner; influence of an educational organization...; the use of technical media to link teacher and learner; the provision of two-way exchange of communication; learners as individuals rather than groups; and education as an industrialized form” (as cited in Caner, 2016, p. 215). Similarly, Garrison and Shale (1987) explained distant education as being dependent on three main points: “noncontiguous communication, two-way interactive communication, and the use of technology to mediate the necessary two-way communication” (as cited in Caner, 2016, p. 215). In this regards, in today’s educational world, distance education requires incorporating “web-based course content delivery tools, synchronous and asynchronous communication systems, multimedia and simulations, assessment tools, virtual spaces for sharing resources, discussion boards, grading systems, chat rooms, assignment submission components, etc... within a systematic framework of instructional and design strategies” (Caner, 2016, p. 216). All in all, what makes distance education attractive is that it brings together the instructors and learners who are at different locations and time (Ozkul, 2003). Thus, in distance education the teaching and learning facilities are more flexible in regards with time and place limitations, which enables learners to have access to information at any time and place (Aydın and Tirkeş, 2010).

Background of Distance Education Around the World. The historical background of distance education, which was formerly defined as *correspondance education*, goes back to late 1800s, when correspondence posts were used for the provision of education to people who could not travel and attend face-to-face classes. Since the early times of distance education, it has been practiced in many countries in the globe through variable tools and technologies ranging from the primitive to advanced forms. The very first example of distance education was an advertisement published in a newspaper in 1833, which aimed at catching readers’ attention for study purposes. In time, the evolution of technology enabled usage of radios, televisions and finally the Internet to provide educational activities for teachers and learners who are at different time and places (Caner, 2016).

In literature, Caleb Philips is regarded as the pioneer of distance education in the world. He gave weekly lessons with the support of the United States postal service. The earliest example of distance education school was established in 1873 in Boston, Massachusetts, USA with the name of “the Society to Encourage Studies at Home”. It was especially for women coming from different “socio-economical” backgrounds and it provided correspondence instructions for 24 years (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 3). In fact, research in literature shows that in early times of distant courses, the majority of attendants were women (Pregowska et al., 2021).

Distance education in Canada started in 1889 for the purpose of providing equal degree of opportunities for rural teachers to get degrees (Pregowska et al., 2021). Similarly, in Australia, distance education was a big necessity due to “huge distances” between people settling on “large areas” (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 4). For this purpose, Australian people benefited from the International Correspondence Schools (ICS) in Pennsylvania, USA since 1890. Later, in 1920 “the Australian branch was officially registered”, however, the practice of distance education within Australian borders started in 1910, with the establishment of a Department of Correspondence Studies by the University of Queensland, which enabled many Australian people with substantial education within a correspondence-based program (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 4). In fact, in Australia initially there were “travelling teachers” who visited rural and less populated districts to give elementary level education until the startle of World War I. Afterwards, this practice ended and the Correspondence School in Bridge Street was established. Furthermore, Australia’s postal service was actively utilized as a tool to communicate correspondence teaching, and there were also “mail-based” distance education systems practised till 1967 (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 5).

Practices of distance education were observed in European countries, as well. Distance education was given great importance in Poland. In 1776, at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland, a distance education course was started for artisans, and physics lessons started to be given in 1779 via correspondence lessons in the University of Warsaw. One of the world’s most famous scientists, Maria Skłodowska-Curie was among the participants of the so-called “Flying University” which was founded secretly in 1886 “under Russian annexation” and contributed to the education of many people in Poland via correspondence teaching (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 4). In 1990, the European School of Correspondence Education was founded in Poland and distance English courses were given within its framework in seven countries in central and

eastern Europe. Likewise, in 1858 in England, the External Programme at the University of London was founded as the first regular distance education course. In 1894, the first college dedicated to correspondence education was established in the United Kingdom, i.e., Wolsey Hall, Oxford. Moreover, the first distance education degree program was founded in 1858 at the University of London. British author Charles Dickens named it as “People’s University”, which was “affordable and suited to students from less affluent backgrounds” (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 4). In Berlin, Germany, the earliest example of “correspondence language school” was established in 1856. According to researches, “the largest distance learning universities in Europe were established in the United Kingdom (Open University, 1969) and Germany (FernUniversität in Hagen or Distance University of Hagen, 1974)” (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 4). In Sweden, correspondence teaching and learning began in 1898 with the foundation of Liber Hermonds institution by Hans Svensson Hermod. In France, distance teaching for the public started in 1939 via correspondence courses. In 1944, the National Centre for Distance Education (Le Centre national d’enseignement à distance) was established, and later in 1986 it was transformed into a high school that served for the education of “sick children, ex-prisoners and deportees” (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 4).

In the continent of Africa, distance education had great significance for the education of students from rural areas. Many universities around the world conducted distance teaching facilities for African people until the University of South Africa was founded in 1946 and took over the distance education activities in the continent. Nowadays, it is still the largest public institution providing distance teaching facilities in Africa (Pregowska et al., 2021).

In China, the first examples of distance education were provided via the postal service beginning from 1979. Later, in the late 19th century, Waseda University implemented a different system for distance teaching “in the form of reprints of lecturers’ notes, as there were no native language textbooks”. In fact, in China the Ministry of Education did not recognize correspondence schools to be allowed with “award degrees” until 1950, thus, distance education studies in China have been “covered by a different accreditation system than full-time studies” till present (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 5).

In India, distance education began to be applied in 1967 in the framework of five-year plan after the country’s independence. Later in 1962, distance education through

post office was initiated at the undergraduate level at the University of Delhi in the field of the arts via a delegation to the Soviet Union.” In time, distance teaching system in India expanded to be applied in “directorates or departments of correspondence education” at top universities (Pregowska et al., 2021, p. 5).

All in all, distance education has been implemented in various forms and degrees in most countries and continents since its beginning for the provision of education to people who have no face-to-face training opportunities.

Background of Distance Education in Turkey. In Turkey, the roots of distance education (DE) can be traced back to ninety years ago (Alkan, 1987). As Alkan (1987) explained in his study, distance education first came into question during a meeting in 1927 with the purpose of fostering the literacy of the public. However, as Demiray et al. (2008) reported, DE was not implemented in Turkey at those times due to the preconception that a teacher and real classroom atmosphere are required for substantial education. Later on, distance education was put into practice particularly in undergraduate programs at universities, thus, the actual application of DE in Turkey started in 1982 (Ruzgar, 2004). When reviewing the literature, the implementations of distance education in Turkey had been observed more frequently in faculty education and high school levels than in primary and secondary school levels till a recent time. In 1982, the Council of Higher Education (HEC), which is referred to as *YOK* in Turkish, was founded for the purpose of planning, organization, administration, supervising and regulation of the higher educational institutions in Turkey (Demiray et al., 2008). In the same year, the Open Education Faculty (OEF) was established within Anadolu University with the help of its extensive infrastructure facilities. Nowadays, the OEF provides undergraduate programs to thousands of university students across Turkey, Cyprus and Europe (Demiray et al., 2008). In 1992, Open High School (OHS) application was constructed by Ministry of National Education (MNE) with a similar structure and operation model of OEF in order to provide distance education at secondary and high school levels. The OHS application utilized the mass communication means such as radio and television when required in addition to face-to-face education activities and supportive teaching materials like computer diskette, video cassette and printed documents (Ulug, 1994). In fact, the initial implementations of distance education in Turkey covered only supplementary or one-way non-interactive delivery methods and materials such as textbooks, CDROMs, television and radio broadcasts (Hismanoglu, 2012). However, in today’s advanced world of information

technologies and with the increasing use of Internet in education, the applications of distance education in Turkey have been reshaped (Caner, 2012). Specifically after the outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic and the accompanying two-way interactive online education process, distance education facilities in Turkey have now become even more innovative and flexible for its practitioners.

Online Teaching

Online teaching constituted the major part of distance education facilities conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic both in Turkey and around the world. Therefore, extensive research about the underlying tenets, advantages, disadvantages and impediments of online teaching is of great importance. Online teaching, which is also called virtual teaching, refers to “the method of content dissemination through the application of information technology and Internet technology” (Zhou et al., p. 502). It “includes real-time (synchronous) and anytime, anywhere (asynchronous) interactions” (Poe & Stassen, n.d., p. 5). In other words, instruction in online education is delivered not in traditional classrooms at schools but at any place by means of “a computer network, usually the Internet, without requiring face-to-face meetings of students and faculty” (Sales, 2009, p.1666). Actually, online teaching was already known and applied in Turkey even before the pandemic, but in a narrower and less known context. Previously, online education had been applied specifically by higher education institutions as a complementary and supportive teaching in addition to face-to-face education. However, after Covid-19 pandemic started and lockdowns were announced for all countries around the world, online education was became the only option for continuation of teaching and learning at all levels and branches of education, including English language teaching.

As Bigatel et al. (2012) dictated, “effective online teaching includes competencies such as active course facilitation, instructional design skills, comfort choosing and using technology, engagement with online students, and communicating expectations” (as cited in Culp-Roche et al., 2021, p. 2). Similarly, Song et al. (2004) indicated that “course design, learner motivation, time management, and comfortableness with online technologies” are the basic elements that affect the achievement of online education. On the other hand, online teaching environments possess possible challenges such as “technical problems, a perceived lack in sense of community, time constraints and difficulty in understanding the objectives of the online courses” (p.59). “The separation

between teachers and their students” (Moore, 2014), instructors’ “lack of online teaching experience” (Johnson et al, 2020) and their “difficulties in the application of information-communication Education and Information Technologies techniques, problems in sustaining interaction with students, organising online learning resources and lack of sufficient facilities for students” (Verma et al, 2020) are counted among other drawbacks of online teaching (as cited in Ma et al, 2021, p. 2). The abrupt shift from conventional face-to-face education to online teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic brought about similar challenges and drawbacks for most of the teachers who were not ready for the process. Therefore, some scholars called this transition as a “crisis online course transition” or emergency remote teaching due to some circumstances that ordinary “online course development does not have to face”:

Those circumstances were (1) a need to rapidly, with little to no preparation, transition instruction online; (2) execute the transition online and subsequent online instruction under traumatic conditions of a pandemic; and (3) pursue extended online teaching with little to no information regarding if this transition to online teaching will be temporary or more permanent (Cutri et al., 2020, p. 524).

Importance of Computer Self-efficacy in Online Teaching. The evolution and use of innovative technologies and Internet in distance online education have transformed it into a mostly computer-based teaching method (Hebebcı et al., 2020). Hence, online teaching requires its practitioners, both teachers and students, to attain computer self-efficacy so that they can incorporate distance teaching and learning facilities efficiently. Compeau & Higgins (1995) defined computer self-efficacy as an individual’s perceived ability to manage a task by using computers. According to Bandura’s perspective in Social Cognitive Theory, people with powerful computer self-efficacy beliefs feel more comfortable when using computers and regard themselves as successful computer technology users (Compeau & Higgins, 1995). Therefore, teachers’ computer self-efficacy levels are expected to be influential on their use of information and communication technologies (ICT) in the instructional delivery. In the EFL context, Chen (2012) explained that the evolvement and increasing utilization of computer and information technology has contributed to the overall success in teaching of English as a foreign language. However, she further explained that some EFL teachers do not incorporate ICT into their language teaching practices sufficiently even if they are at high-tech schools, and that “teachers prone to computer avoidance face negative consequences” in their instruction (Chen, 2012, p. 100). Such an avoidance from

computers might stem from EFL teachers' computer anxiety and technophobia. Computer anxiety, which is also called *computer phobia*, refers to people's negative feelings and assumptions about interactions with computers (Cantrell, 1982; Chua et al., 1999). Computer phobia is also correlated with technophobia, which means a refrainment from using technology (Brosnan, 1998). Studies have revealed that computer phobia is negatively associated with computer self-efficacy (Liu & Kleinsasser, 2015) and that individuals with computer phobia are generally against using computers and technology (Harrington et al., 1990; Heinssen et al., 1987; Rachman, 1998; Todman, 2000; Torkzadeh & Angula, 1992; Weil & Rosen, 1995) as they are not sure how to make use of them successfully. Fortunately, teachers' computer self-efficacy has been found to increase with substantial instruction about integration of technology, pedagogy and course content, which may contribute to further development of their particular competencies and self-efficacy beliefs about online education (Liu & Kleinsasser, 2015).

As for EFL teachers' computer self-efficacy, in literature, there has been a general focus on EFL teachers' computer self-efficacy in their classroom practices as well as in the process of online language teaching. In Chen's (2012) study about Taiwanese EFL teachers' computer self-efficacy and computer anxiety, the collected data revealed that EFL "teachers who frequently used computers showed lower computer phobia; male teachers perceived themselves as having higher computer self-efficacy, and younger teachers tended to have a lower level of computer phobia and higher computer self-efficacy" (p. 100). Similarly, this research study handles Turkish EFL teachers' computer self-efficacy as part of their overall online teaching self-efficacy to give implications on how to improve EFL teachers' computer-based efficiency in the framework of online language education.

Online Teaching Self-efficacy. Online teaching self-efficacy refers to the levels of self-confidence that teachers possess about "effectively managing the online classroom, providing effective teaching, selecting appropriate technology, and building a sense of community in the online course" (Ali et al., 2017, as cited in Culp-Roche et al., 2021, p. 2). As Hampton et al. (2020) stated, "greater levels of online teacher self-efficacy are correlated with greater teaching satisfaction" in virtual teaching environments ($r = 0.64$, $p < 0.001$; as cited in Culp-Roche et al., 2021, p. 2). In their empirical study, Zhang et al. (2014) stated that the effectiveness of online "distance education depends greatly on teachers' active participation" (p. 335). In other words, teachers' self-efficacy and

devotion in their online teaching abilities and roles are the main determinants on successful achievements in an online teaching process. As stated by Chiasson et al. (2015), “effective transitioning of face-to-face course work to a virtual format requires extensive planning, implementation, and reflection strategies” by teachers (as cited in Culp-Roche et al., 2021, p. 2). In this sense, as suggested by Krish (2008), in online courses “instructors need to maintain a conducive climate to weave ideas, draw attention to relevant parts at the appropriate time and provide expert advice when and where necessary” (p. 125). Therefore, apart from conventional responsibilities teachers possess, they had to take on new roles in the pandemic online education such as “expert learners, facilitators, course designers and organizers” (Xu, 2012, p. 3), which signify the characteristics that teachers should develop in order to have high self-efficacy levels for online teaching.

Unlike the basic concept of teacher self-efficacy in the context of face-to-face education, the assessment of teachers’ self-efficacy in online teaching is limited to less numbers of tools developed so far. The most well-known and frequently applied assessment tool for teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy is the Michigan Nurse Educators’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (MNESEOTS), which is utilized in this study as well in order to assess Turkish EFL teachers’ self-efficacy levels in online teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic. The MNESEOTS was adapted from Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy’s Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and further developed to be used by faculty members in the higher education contexts (Black, 2019). It was developed by Kristi Robinia (2008) from Northern Michigan University for the assessment of nurse educators’ online teaching self-efficacy. It is a valid and reliable scale which explores sub-dimensions of online teaching such as efficacy in student engagement (adding students to the lesson), efficacy in instructional strategies, efficacy in classroom management and efficacy in use of computers.

Related Studies

Many educational disciplines were influenced by lockdowns during the Covid-19 pandemic including English language teaching (Erarslan, 2021). In fact, As Erarslan (2021) stated, the online language teaching practices of English “is not a new phenomenon, yet the urgent transition to emergency online language teaching exhibited certain challenges for EFL teachers and students”, specifically those who did not have previous online teaching and learning experiences (p. 350). In the EFL context, considerable number of studies have been conducted on different dimensions of English language teaching applied during the pandemic online education. The studies mainly focused on English language teaching practices, online teaching channels, and the instruction of language skills in addition to the drawbacks and advantages of the pandemic online teaching period for EFL teachers and learners. Moreover, the studies give details about EFL teachers’ self-efficacy for online language teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic and give implications about how they handled the online language teaching process in many aspects. Bailey and Lee (2020) investigated how online teaching experience affected EFL teachers’ way of handling problems during the pandemic in distant online courses at a South Korean university. They reported that among the participant EFL university instructors those with online teaching experience had less problems and were able to utilise variant communicative tools and activities easily in their online courses (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Kitishat et al. (2020) searched about the impacts of pandemic outbreak and the sudden shift to online teaching on the English language teaching and learning. They found out that virtual classes enabled students to get engaged with learning activities in comfortable and systematic teaching environments if supported by effective language teaching activities (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Similarly, Fansury et al. (2020) found out that online classes equipped with dijital teaching content helped in motivating and raising interest in students for online language learning.

On the other hand, some studies have suggested that organising effective online language teaching activities and delivering them in online environments was not a comfortable process for EFL teachers and that online teaching during the pandemic had disadvantages for EFL teachers besides advantages (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Khatoony and Nezhadmehr (2020) examined a group of Iranian EFL teachers and the problems they encountered in online courses during the Covid-19 pandemic. Results showed that although Iranian EFL teachers were able to incorporate digital applications

successfully on virtual platforms for their online courses, they still encountered challenges resulting from some other factors such as limited materials appropriate for online teaching, students' low levels of attention and motivation during online courses, and insufficient funding for educational institutions. Despite such problems, the major part of the participants agreed that use of technology in online language teaching is necessary and has benefits both for teachers and learners in terms of minimizing time and place constraints (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Yi and Jang (2020) searched about the online teaching activities of EFL teachers in two schools in South Korea. Their study revealed that practitioners of the pandemic online teaching, the teachers, students, parents and administrators all had difficulties in dealing with the period. On the other hand, their findings showed that the unexpected crisis upon the online teaching urged EFL teachers to use innovative tools and get more cooperated in their online instructional activities (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Tamah et al. (2020) examined language teachers' online teaching activities during the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia. According to findings of their study, although at the beginning the participant EFL teachers were facing problems about incorporating effective teaching materials in their online courses due to lack of technological knowledge, within a short time they improved much about how to use educational technology in online courses (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Likewise, Lestyanawati (2020) focused on Indonesian EFL teachers' practices and problems in online teaching during the Covid-19 outbreak. Results of the study indicated that Indonesian EFL teachers encountered problems such as lack of information about how to access technologies and virtual educational activities, inability to use and define virtual teaching materials, and student problems resulting from their lack of access to Internet due to economical disadvantages. Despite all these problems, the participant EFL teachers agreed that after they got accustomed and learned enough about how to better conduct online courses, the online teaching and learning system made things easier for them during the pandemic distant education (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Sepulveda-Escobar and Morrison (2020) wanted to examine the advantages and disadvantages of online teaching during the pandemic and they conducted a case study in Chile with twenty-seven EFL teacher candidates. Based on their research results, they concluded that although in online teaching EFL teachers and their students experienced less interaction than in face-to-face education, still the online language teaching facilities would probably add to EFL teachers' teaching career a lot (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). In another study, Abduh (2021) searched about Saudi EFL

teachers' opinions about the pandemic online language teaching and the challenges they encountered about online student assessment. Results indicated that the participant Saudi EFL teachers mostly had positive perceptions about online teaching and they were mostly able to utilize technics and methods in virtual teaching environments, but on the other hand they showed a moderate attitude toward online assessment, which was challenging for most of them (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). In Pakistan, Mukhtar et al. (2020) included both EFL teachers and students in their study to explore pros and disadvantages of pandemic online language teaching. Results of their study indicated that online courses were advantageous both for teachers and students as they are comfortable and accessible, but still they were not efficient enough in terms of fulfilling all the educational goals of language teaching and learning (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021).

Putri et al. (2020) searched about the limitations of online teaching during the pandemic based on the perceptions of EFL teachers and parents in Indonesia. The participant EFL teachers reported they faced the limitations about insufficient virtual materials to be utilised in online courses and lack of experience about use of technology, which they believed diminished their efficiency in online teaching (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Likewise, Atmojo and Nugroho (2020) examined Indonesian EFL teachers' self-perceptions about their online teaching activities and the challenges they faced. Results of their study showed that the encountered limitations and problems originated not only from teachers but also from students, parents and some other factors. It was concluded that online teaching and learning is inefficient without necessary planning and preparation by all practitioners of it (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Al-Khresheh (2021) searched about the impacts of pandemic on Jordanian EFL teachers. The participant EFL teachers reported that in online teaching they had limited language teaching facilities due to limited e-content and that in order to organize and sustain a substantial online language class they had to be equipped with a specialized skill set categorized with "4 P's", that are "presuming, planning, preparing, and performing" (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021, p. 2026). Kundu and Bej (2020) made an exploratory study with 141 EFL teachers from different countries around the world to search about both the challenges and positive outcomes of online language teaching for EFL teachers during the Covid-19 pandemic. Findings in their study showed that most EFL teachers around the world had challenges with "lack of student and parents' engagement, need for training, difficulty in accessing digital equipment, unclear monitoring mechanisms,

and other systematic obstacles”. Moreover, it was concluded that “both teachers and the education systems were not fully ready for this shift” from face to face education to online teaching (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021, p. 2026). Astuti and Solikhah (2021) conducted a study to examine EFL teachers’ reflections about teaching English online during the Covid-19 pandemic. The researchers also focused on the responsibilities that EFL teachers had to take on as for “preparation to teach objectives, teaching materials, teaching methods and evaluation processes” (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021, p. 2026). Findings of their study revealed that participant EFL teachers found it challenging to teach English in virtual classrooms basically due to limited “support systems and quotas of the internet” (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021, p. 2026). On the other hand, in another study by Nambiar (2020) it was pointed out that “timely and quality interplay between students and teachers, availability of technology, structured modules for online class, and alterations to normalize the execution of practical classes” are some positive aspects of the pandemic online teaching both for EFL teachers and their students (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021, p. 2026). As a whole, the studies about EFL teachers’ online language teaching experiences during the Covid-19 pandemic reveal details about both the positive sides and drawbacks of the pandemic online language teaching for EFL teachers. In addition, the studies contribute to our understanding of the online teaching self-efficacy of EFL teachers around the world from different points of view.

This review of literature has revealed detailed information about the underlying tenets for the concepts of *human self*, *self-efficacy*, *teacher self-efficacy*, *distance education*, *online teaching* and *online teaching self-efficacy* in addition to related studies about EFL teachers’ online language teaching practices during the challenging times pandemic online education. Accordingly, the terms *self-efficacy* and *teacher self-efficacy* are explained embedded in two underlying theories: Bandura’s social cognitive theory and Rotter’s social learning theory. In addition, historical background of distance education (DE) both around the world and in Turkey is covered in detail with references to its applications before and during the Covid-19 pandemic. Moreover, the concepts of online teaching and online teaching self-efficacy are explained in relation with EFL teaching. Finally, studies about EFL teachers’ online language teaching practices around the world and their reflections on the process are examined so as to reveal the pros and cons of online education for delivery of English language during the Covid-19 pandemic.

2. METHODOLOGY

This chapter covers detailed information about the methodological process followed in this study, including its research design, setting, participants, data collection instruments, and data collection and analysis procedures. All steps in the methodological process were conducted in accordance with the focus of the study in order to obtain relevant data that can help answer research questions objectively.

2.1. Research Design of the Study

This study followed a mixed-method research design incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools and analysis methods as for gathering rich data and attaining comprehensive results for a better understanding about the functioning of Turkish EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy during the Covid-19 pandemic. In order to attain findings that can address research purpose of the study, data collection procedure was conducted in two sequential phases with two data collection tools. First, the Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (MNESEOTS) was implemented for quantitative data collection with the name of "EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching" (ETSEOTS). Secondly a semi-structured interview with open-ended questions was conducted for qualitative data collection. According to Creswell (2014), quantitative data collection method helps to obtain a sustainable statistical information about the relationship between the variables that are linked to the research problem of the study. Additionally, qualitative data collection helps to interpret the quantitative data, find the reasons behind and draw conclusions on the overall findings. Therefore, the implementation of mixed-method research design has been emphasized by many scholars. Dörnyei (2007) states that results drawn only from qualitative data can be "overly simplistic, decontextualized and reductionist", however, the quantitative data supported by qualitative one might contribute to the research by adding "depth to the quantitative results and thereby putting flesh on the bones" (p. 45). Similarly, Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) supported the use of mixed-method research design, in that, it makes the relationships between dependent and independent variables clear by means of a comparison between the quantitative and qualitative results. For this purpose, the two data collection phases in this study were done sequentially, qualitative data being gathered following and

according to the results of quantitative data collection in order to help explain the possible reasons behind them and reach comprehensive findings.

2.2. Research Setting and Participants

The target population of this study are Turkish EFL teachers who actively took part in the Covid-19 pandemic online education at public primary, secondary and high schools. Participants of the study were selected regarding convenience and eligibility issues. In line with purposive sampling, 160 EFL teachers working in Siirt province took part in the study. The reason for why the participants were selected only from Siirt province is that the researcher lived in Siirt and could not have access to EFL teachers from other provinces of Turkey due to the ongoing Covid-19 restrictions and additional formal permissions required at that time. In other words, easy accessibility to participants, their availability and willingness to participate were criteria for choice. The sample size was 160 for quantitative data collection, and 15 for qualitative data collection. The participating EFL teachers possessed a range of varying demographic characteristics related to their age, gender, school type, education level, years of teaching experience, online teaching experience before the pandemic, and having received in-service or pre-service education on use of educational technologies. Regardingly, in this research study these characteristics of participants constituted the independent variables whereas EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy was the dependent variable.

2.2.1. Characteristics of Participants

Within this study's research scope, 160 EFL teachers filled out the "EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale" (ETSEOTS). Table 1 shows demographic information about the participants.

Table 1*Descriptive Statistics for Characteristics of Participant EFL Teachers*

Descriptors	Sub-descriptors	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
School Type	Primary School	31	19,4	19,4
	Secondary School	70	43,8	63,1
	High School	59	36,9	100,0
Gender	Male	52	32,5	32,5
	Female	108	67,5	100,0
Age	21-25 Years	27	16,9	16,9
	26-30 Years	62	38,8	55,6
	31-35 Years	53	33,1	88,8
	36-40 Years	11	6,9	95,6
	41-45 Years	7	4,4	100,0
Education Level	Bachelor's	145	90,6	90,6
	Master's	15	9,4	100,0
Teaching Experience Period	1-5 Years	84	52,5	52,5
	6-10 Years	59	36,9	89,4
	11-15 Years	13	8,1	97,5
Online English Teaching Experience	16-20 Years	4	2,5	100,0
	Yes	33	20,6	20,6
	No	127	79,4	100,0
In-service Training On Educational Technologies	Yes	66	41,3	41,3
	No	94	58,8	100,0
Pre-Service Course On Educational Technologies	Yes	75	46,9	46,9
	No	85	53,1	100,0

Demographic information on table 1 shows that the majority of the participant EFL teachers (67.5%) are female (N=108) and the rest (32.5%) are male (N=52).

As for their school type, 19.4% of the participant EFL teachers teach in primary school, 43.8% teach in secondary school and 36.9% teach in high school.

In terms of their ages, 16.9% of the EFL teachers are in the 21-25 age range, 38.8% in the 26-30 age range, 33.1% in the 31-35 age range, 6.9% in the 36-40 age range and

4.4% are between the ages of 41-45. That is, in this study the most frequent age-ranges among the participants are respectively 26-30 and 31-35, while the least frequent ones are respectively 21-25, 36-40 and 41-45. In other words, the older participants constitute the lowest size whereas younger and middle-aged ones are in the majority.

The majority of participating EFL teachers (90.6%) have a bachelor's degree and only 9.4% have a master's degree. No participant with a doctoral education level was found.

The majority (52.5%) of participating EFL teachers have 1-5 years of English teaching experience whereas 36.9% of them have 6-10 years, 8.1% have 11-15 years and 2.5% have 16-20 years of experience in teaching. No participant with more than 20 years of teaching experience was found.

Only 20.6% of the participants gave online English lessons before the pandemic situation while the resting 79.4% did not.

41.3% of the participants received in-service training on use of educational technologies but the majority (58.82%) did not.

Similarly, while 46.9% of the EFL teachers in the study have taken pre-service courses on use of educational technologies in university education, the major part (53.1%) did not.

2.3. Data Collection Procedure of the Study

In order to begin data collection, the researcher first applied for the ethics committee permission from Çağ University. Data collection process began officially after receiving the committee approval. The process of data gathering was completed in two sequential phases. Firstly, the researcher implemented the EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (ETSEOTS) with 160 EFL teachers for the collection of quantitative data. The scale was conducted on Google Forms, which is an online survey preparation and data collection platform. Although the pandemic limitations on personal contact restricted the collection of quantitative data to be completed only via online platforms, in fact, the online data collection enabled better organisation, transformation and analysis of the data on the SPSS program. Later, in the second data collection phase, the researcher prepared and applied a semi-structured interview, which covered 12 open-ended questions for qualitative data about EFL teachers' views on their online teaching self-efficacy as well as their reflections on the pandemic online education process. The interview was administered to 15 volunteer EFL teachers among the 160

participants of the study. Interviews were conducted both via online meetings on the Zoom application and through face-to-face meetings in line with participants' preferences within the Covid-19 measurements. A consent form was attached to both the quantitative and qualitative data collection tools so as to ensure that participants are involved in the study voluntarily. The participants were informed by the researcher that they can withdraw from the study at any stage they wish. Moreover, EFL teachers were given participant numbers on the ETSEOTS, and pseudonyms were used on interviews in order to sustain participants' anonymity as for the confidentiality of the study. The gathered quantitative and qualitative data were preserved for the next stage of data analysis.

2.4. Data Collection Tools

As this study utilized a mixed-method research design, multiple tools for data collection process were applied. A scale on EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy was administered to gather quantitative data and a semi-structured interview with open-ended questions was implemented for qualitative data collection.

2.4.1. The Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale

The Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (MNESEOTS), renamed as "EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (ETSEOTS)" to address this study's context, was applied to 160 EFL teachers working at state schools in Siirt province with the purpose of collecting quantitative data about EFL teachers' self-efficacy levels in online teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic. Permission to utilize and rename the scale was given by the author Kristi Robinia. The MNESEOTS was adapted from Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and it was further developed to be implemented by faculty members in the higher education contexts (Black, 2019). It was developed by Kristi Robinia (2008) from Northern Michigan University for examination of the nurse educators' online teaching self-efficacy. The scale consisted one demographic information section and four subscales with a total number of 32 items. See Appendix D for the instrument. The demographic information section included questions about participants' age, gender, school type, education level, years of teaching experience, online teaching experience and pre-service and in-service training on use of educational technologies. The four subscales, which are entitled as *Efficacy in*

Online Student Engagement, Efficacy in Online Instructional Strategies, Efficacy in Online Classroom Management, and Efficacy in Use of Computers, each contained 8 items that aimed at getting a reflection of participant EFL teachers' judgements about their online teaching self-efficacy. Participants were expected to choose the appropriate rating for their self-efficacy level for each item in the subscales. The levels of items on the MNESEOTS are arranged in line with 9-point Likert scale design, which ranges from *Nothing* to *A Great Deal* (Nothing = 1, Very Little = 3, Some Influence = 5, Quite A Bit = 7, and A Great Deal =9). The participants were given participant numbers on the raw data gathered from the ETSEOTS to sustain anonymity.

2.4.1.1. Reliability Analysis of Scales

The reliability of a research study highly relies on the validity of data collection instruments implemented. In this sense, the Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale, which was used in this study with the name "EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale", is a valid and reliable instrument that has been applied in many studies so far to explore various dimensions of teachers' and university instructors' online teaching self-efficacy. Reliability of the MNESEOTS was tested by Kristi Robinia (2008) through Cronbach's alpha statistics. According to the statistical results obtained, the overall alpha was .97, the Student Engagement alpha was .93, the Instructional Strategies alpha was .94, and the Classroom Management alpha was .93 (Black, 2019). Table 2 shows the Cronbach alpha values of the MNESEOTS calculated by Robinia.

Table 2

Cronbach's Alpha for the MNESEOTS (Robinia, 2008)

Subscale	Cronbach's Alpha
Student Engagement	0.93
Instructional Strategies	0.94
Classroom Management	0.93
Total Reliability	0.97

Furthermore, the internal consistency coefficients of the “EFL Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (ETSEOTS)” were calculated in this study. Accordingly, the internal consistency coefficient of the ETSEOTS is $C\alpha = 0.963$, the internal consistency coefficient of the sub-dimension “Efficacy in Student Engagement” is $C\alpha = 0.885$, the internal consistency coefficient of the sub-dimension “Efficacy in Instructional Strategies” is $C\alpha = 0.879$, the internal consistency coefficient of the sub-dimension “Efficacy in Classroom Engagement” is $C\alpha = 0.903$, and the internal consistency coefficient of the sub-dimension “Efficacy in Computer Use” is $C\alpha = 0.864$. According to Özdamar (2002: 673) if the reliability coefficient is $0.60\alpha \leq 0.80$, the scale is reliable, and if it is $0.80\alpha \leq 1.00$, the scale is highly reliable. Therefore, the $C\alpha$ coefficients obtained for this scale show that it is a highly reliable scale.

2.4.2. The Semi-structured Interview

Apart from the ETSEOTS used for quantitative data collection, the researcher prepared and conducted a semi-structured interview to gather qualitative data in this study. The interview included 12 open-ended questions that aimed at learning EFL teachers’ views on the reasons behind their online teaching self-efficacy scores as well as their reflections on the pandemic online education process. The interview was administered to 15 volunteer EFL teachers among the participant group and they were given pseudonyms in order to anonymize them and sustain confidentiality in the study. The interviews were conducted both on Zoom application and through face-to-face meetings regarding the participant’s choice and consent.

In order to sustain reliability of qualitative data, the semi-structured interview was examined and piloted by three non-participant EFL teachers as well as the researcher’s advisor from Çığ University before it was administered to participants. Required modifications on the interview questions were done in accordance with the received feedback. Only after ensuring the appropriateness and clarity of interview questions did the qualitative data collection procedure get started.

2.5. Data Analysis

The analysis of collected data was done in two separate sections. The quantitative data gathered by means of the ETSEOTS was analyzed through descriptive statistics and inferential statistics on Statistical Packages of Social Sciences (SPSS 22.0). Descriptive statistics were utilized to describe demographic characteristics of participant

EFL teachers and their online teaching self-efficacy scores whereas inferential statistics were used to compare their self-efficacy levels according to their aforementioned demographic characteristics. Significance level taken as 0.05, Shapiro Wilk test was applied to check normality distribution of variables on the scale. Table 3 reveals results of the Shapiro Wilk normality test.

Table 3

Shapiro Wilk Normality Test Results

	Sign.
Efficacy in Student Engagement	,008
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	,036
Efficacy in Classroom Management	,017
Efficacy in Use of Computers	,002
EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (ETSEOTS)	,008

Since the p values obtained from the Shapiro Wilk normality test were lower than 0.05 significance level, the assumption of normality could not be sustained. Therefore, nonparametric tests were used in the analyzes. For this purpose, Mann Whitney U test was applied for analysis of the differences between two groups, and Kruskal Wallis H test was used for analysis of the differences between 3 or more groups. The obtained results depicted participant EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy levels in terms of student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management and use of computers by making comparisons between groups according to participants' age, gender, school type, education level, teaching experience, online teaching experience, and pre-service and in-service education on use of educational technologies. On the other hand, the qualitative data was analyzed by means of content analysis through emergent coding and interpretation of the themes gathered from participants' responses on interviews. The analysis of qualitative data helped in better understanding the reasons behind EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy scores on the ETSEOTS. It also helped to draw conclusions about EFL teachers' reflections on the pandemic online teaching process. After an in-depth analysis and control of both quantitative and qualitative results, the attained findings were revealed objectively.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Findings of Quantitative Data

This section covers detailed information related to quantitative findings about EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy levels achieved on "the EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale" (ETSEOTS).

3.1.1. Findings on Scale Items

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics on scale items depicting the highest and lowest frequencies in average and for each subscale on the EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (ETSEOTS).

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics on Scale Items

		1 Nothing	2	3 Very Little	4	5 Some	6	7 Quite A Bit	8	9 A Great Deal	M	Sd
Efficacy in Student Engagement												
1. How much can you do to help your students think critically in an online class?	N	2	6	13	9	24	30	48	16	12		
	%	1,3	3,8	8,1	5,6	15,0	18,8	30,0	10,0	7,5	6,01	1,85
2. How much can you do to get through to disengaged students in an online class? (e.g. passive learners who might lurk online, but fail to actively contribute to their own learning.)	N	2	8	25	18	31	23	29	15	9		
	%	1,3	5,0	15,6	11,3	19,4	14,4	18,1	9,4	5,6	5,38	1,96
4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in online work?	N	1	2	9	17	21	33	37	21	19		
	%	,6	1,3	5,6	10,6	13,1	20,6	23,1	13,1	11,9	6,25	1,78
6. How much can you do to get students to believe that they can do well in an online class?	N	2	1	6	12	19	33	34	31	22		
	%	1,3	,6	3,8	7,5	11,9	20,6	21,3	19,4	13,8	6,54	1,76
9. How much can you do to help online students' value learning?	N	1	1	7	12	23	30	46	24	16		
	%	,6	,6	4,4	7,5	14,4	18,8	28,8	15,0	10,0	6,4	1,65
12. How much can you do to foster individual student creativity in an online course?	N	2	5	11	15	33	44	28	16	6		
	%	1,3	3,1	6,9	9,4	20,6	27,5	17,5	10,0	3,8	5,7	1,68
14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing in an online class?	N	1	5	7	23	29	26	34	25	10		
	%	,6	3,1	4,4	14,4	18,1	16,3	21,3	15,6	6,3	5,95	1,79
22. How well can you structure an online course that facilitates collaborative learning?	N	7	3	18	17	21	37	29	19	9		
	%	4,4	1,9	11,3	10,6	13,1	23,1	18,1	11,9	5,6	5,61	1,99

Efficacy in Instructional Strategies												
7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from <u>online</u> students?	N	0	2	2	9	10	22	24	44	47		
	%	0	,13	,13	,56	,63	,138	,150	,275	,294	7,31	1,66
10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught in an <u>online</u> course?	N	1	1	17	17	14	34	41	22	13		
	%	,6	,6	,106	,106	,88	,213	,256	,138	,81	6,10	1,8
11. How well can you craft questions or assignments that require students to think by relating ideas to previous knowledge and experience?	N	1	2	4	15	25	36	46	20	11		
	%	,6	,3	,25	,94	,156	,225	,288	,125	,69	6,24	1,57
17. How much can you do to adjust your <u>online</u> lessons for different learning styles?	N	2	4	12	18	20	30	39	25	10		
	%	1,3	,5	,75	,113	,125	,188	,244	,156	,63	6,01	1,84
18. How much can you do to use a variety of assessment strategies for an <u>online</u> course?	N	3	3	13	15	25	35	43	17	6		
	%	1,9	,9	,81	,94	,156	,219	,269	,106	,38	5,83	1,74
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students in an <u>online</u> class seem to be confused?	N	2	1	3	5	16	26	50	29	28		
	%	1,3	,6	,19	,31	,100	,163	,313	,181	,175	6,89	1,62
23. How well can you structure an <u>online</u> course that provides good learning experiences for students?	N	3	1	6	12	24	31	45	33	5		
	%	1,9	,6	,38	,75	,150	,194	,281	,206	,31	6,25	1,64
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students in an <u>online</u> environment?	N	2	0	4	9	21	42	50	25	7		
	%	1,3	0	,25	,56	,131	,263	,313	,156	,44	6,37	1,44
Efficacy in Classroom Management												
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior (e.g. disrespectful posting or failure to adhere to outline policies for posting) in an <u>online</u> environment?	N	3	2	9	15	15	25	36	28	27		
	%	1,9	,3	,56	,94	,94	,156	,225	,175	,169	6,48	1,96
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior in an <u>online</u> class?	N	2	2	10	7	24	29	43	19	24		
	%	1,3	,3	,63	,44	,150	,181	,269	,119	,150	6,41	1,82
8. How well can you establish routines (e.g. facilitate or moderate student participation) in coursework to keep <u>online</u> activities running smoothly?	N	1	3	4	7	23	30	38	35	19		
	%	,6	,9	,25	,44	,144	,188	,238	,219	,119	6,61	1,67
13. How much can you do to get students to follow the established rules for assignments and deadlines during an <u>online</u> class?	N	2	4	11	20	19	25	36	28	15		
	%	1,3	,5	,69	,125	,119	,156	,225	,175	,94	6,11	1,93
15. How much can you do to control students dominating <u>online</u> discussions?	N	1	0	7	10	26	33	42	29	12		
	%	,6	0	,44	,63	,163	,206	,263	,181	,75	6,40	1,57
16. How well can you establish an <u>online</u> course (e.g. convey expectations; standards; course rules) with each group of students?	N	1	2	2	11	18	42	43	29	12		
	%	,6	,3	,13	,69	,113	,263	,269	,181	,75	6,48	1,51
19. How well can you develop an <u>online</u> course that facilitates student responsibility for <u>online</u> learning?	N	2	1	4	14	24	41	36	22	16		
	%	1,3	,6	,25	,88	,150	,256	,225	,138	,100	6,31	1,65
21. How well can you respond to defiant students in an <u>online</u> setting?	N	2	2	8	12	22	35	40	24	15		
	%	1,3	,3	,50	,75	,138	,219	,250	,150	,94	6,28	1,74

Efficacy in Use of Computers												
25. To what extent can you use knowledge of copyright law to provide resources for online students?	N	4	8	11	15	20	27	41	22	12		
	%	2,5	5,0	6,9	9,4	12,5	16,9	25,6	13,8	7,5	5,91	2,01
26. How well can you navigate the technical infrastructure at your institution to successfully create an online course?	N	6	1	5	11	29	33	39	18	18		
	%	3,8	0,6	3,1	6,9	18,1	20,6	24,4	11,3	11,3	6,18	1,86
27. How well can you navigate the technical infrastructure at your institution to successfully teach an established online course?	N	5	2	9	6	31	30	47	16	14		
	%	3,1	1,3	5,6	3,8	19,4	18,8	29,4	10,0	8,8	6,11	1,82
28. To what extent can you use asynchronous discussions to maximize interactions between students in an online course? (Asynchronous means not online at the same time)	N	12	8	9	19	29	28	31	17	7		
	%	7,5	5,0	5,6	11,9	18,1	17,5	19,4	10,6	4,4	5,37	2,11
29. To what extent can you use synchronous discussions (e.g. same time chat rooms) to maximize interaction between students in an online course?	N	10	6	15	14	19	41	34	16	5		
	%	6,3	3,8	9,4	8,8	11,9	25,6	21,3	10,0	3,1	5,46	2,02
30. How well can you use computers for word processing, internet searching and e-mail communication?	N	2	1	4	6	15	19	30	38	45		
	%	1,3	0,6	2,5	3,8	9,4	11,9	18,8	23,8	28,1	7,17	1,78
31. To what extent does your comfort level with computers facilitate participation in online teaching?	N	1	2	7	9	16	22	43	31	29		
	%	0,6	1,3	4,4	5,6	10,0	13,8	26,9	19,4	18,1	6,77	1,78
32. How well can you navigate the internet to provide links and resources to students in an online course?	N	2	1	6	2	19	18	43	35	33		
	%	1,3	0,6	3,8	1,3	11,9	11,3	26,9	21,9	20,6	6,95	1,76

As seen on table 4, averages of items in the dimension of “Efficacy in Student Engagement” show that the highest average is 6,54, item “6. How much can you do to get students to believe that they can do well in an online class?” has the highest average of 6,54, and item “2. How much can you do to get through to disengaged students in an online class?” has the lowest average of 5,38.

The averages of items in the “Efficacy in Instructional Strategies” dimension reveal that item “7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from online students?” has the highest average of 7,31; whereas item “18. How much can you do to use a variety of assessment strategies for an online course?” has the lowest average of 5,83.

The average values of items in the “Efficacy in Classroom Management” reflect that item “8. How well can you establish routines?” has the highest average of 6,61 while item “13. How much can you do to get students to follow the established rules for assignments and deadlines during an online class?” has the lowest average of 6,11.

The averages of items in the “Efficacy in Computer Use” dimension show that item “30. How well can you use computers for word processing, internet searching and

e-mail communication?” has the highest average of 7,17; whereas item “28. To what extent can you use asynchronous discussions to maximize interactions between students in an online course?” has the lowest average of 5,37.

An examination of the scale as a whole shows that item “7. How well can you answer difficult questions from online students?” has the highest average of 7,31 while item “28. To what extent can you use asynchronous discussions to maximize interactions among students in an online course?” has the lowest average of 5,37.

3.1.2. EFL Teachers’ Self-efficacy Levels for Online Teaching

Table 5 reveals EFL teachers’ self-efficacy levels for online teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Table 5

EFL Teachers’ Self-efficacy Levels for Online Teaching

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Max
Efficacy in Student Engagement	160	5,98	1,35	1,5	9
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	160	6,37	1,23	2	9
Efficacy in Classroom Management	160	6,39	1,34	2	9
Efficacy in Use of Computers	160	6,24	1,35	1	9
Total Efficacy	160	6,24	1,22	1,63	9

In nine-point likert scales, the average can be examined in three sections; as 1.00-3.66 (low), 3.67-6.33 (medium) and above 6.34 (high). Accordingly, the mean scores achieved on the “EFL Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale” reveal that the average of participant EFL teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy in totality is at a medium level of 6.24. Similarly, their efficacy level in taking the students to the lesson (5.98) and their efficacy level in computer use (6.24) are at medium levels. Although their level of efficacy in teaching strategies (6.37) and their level of proficiency in classroom management (6.39) are a bit higher than medium level, these results do not influence EFL teachers’ average online teaching self-efficacy in totality.

3.1.3. Analysis of EFL Teachers' Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Demographic Variables

EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy was analyzed according to different demographic variables of them both in totality and in the four subscales. The following tables respectively show their online teaching self-efficacy levels according to the aforementioned variables.

Table 6

Analysis of EFL Teachers' Online Teaching Self-efficacy According to School Type

	School Type	N	Median	Min	Max	P
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Primary School	31	6,25	3,5	8,88	0,176
	Secondary School	70	6,06	1,5	9	
	High School	59	5,62	3,25	8,13	
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Primary School	31	6,87	3,38	9	0,608
	Secondary School	70	6,5	2	9	
	High School	59	6,5	3,5	8,75	
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Primary School	31	7,12	3,25	9	0,308
	Secondary School	70	6,62	2	9	
	High School	59	6,25	2,38	8,63	
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Primary School	31	6,5	2,13	8,75	0,689
	Secondary School	70	6,37	1	9	
	High School	59	6,25	3,13	8,75	
Total Efficacy	Primary School	31	6,78	3,44	8,75	0,385
	Secondary School	70	6,35	1,63	9	
	High School	59	6,03	3,16	8,25	

$p < 0,05$, Kruskal-Wallis H Test

Table 6 indicates that regardless of the school type EFL teachers work at, their self-efficacy levels in all the four sub-dimensions are at close values and there is no significant difference ($p=0,176$; $0,608$; $0,308$; $0,689$; $>0,05$). EFL teachers' self-efficacy for online teaching in totality does not differ according to the type of school they work at, either ($p=0,385 >0,05$). In other words, EFL teachers' school type is not an influential variable on their online teaching self-efficacy.

Table 7*Analysis of EFL Teachers' Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Education Level*

	Education Level	n	Median	Min	Max	P
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Bachelor's	145	6	1,5	8,88	0,652
	Master's	15	6	3,75	9	
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Bachelor's	145	6,5	2	9	0,629
	Master's	15	6,37	4	9	
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Bachelor's	145	6,62	2	9	0,815
	Master's	15	6,5	4,63	9	
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Bachelor's	145	6,37	1	8,75	0,623
	Master's	15	6,87	2,13	9	
Total Efficacy	Bachelor's	145	6,31	1,63	8,75	0,967
	Master's	15	6,43	3,75	9	

p < 0,05, Mann Whitney U Test

Table 7 indicates that both the participant EFL teachers with Bachelor's degree and those with Master's degree have scores at close values as for self-efficacy for online teaching and its all four sub-dimensions. In other words, the participant EFL teachers' self-efficacy for online teaching does not differ according to their education level because it is not an influential variable ($p=0,967 > 0,05$).

Table 8*Analysis of EFL Teachers' Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Age*

	Age	n	Median	Min	Max	p	Pair Comparisons
Efficacy in Student Engagement	21-25 Years	27	6,25	3,88	7,88	0,003	4,5>2
	26-30 Years	62	5,5	1,5	8,13		
	31-35 Years	53	6	3,25	9		
	36-40 Years	11	6,75	3,25	8,88		
	41-45 Years	7	7	6,88	7,38		
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	21-25 Years	27	6,62	4,63	7,75	0,51	
	26-30 Years	62	6,25	2	8,75		
	31-35 Years	53	6,5	3,88	9		
	36-40 Years	11	7	5,63	9		
	41-45 Years	7	7,25	6,88	8,25		
Efficacy in Classroom Management	21-25 Years	27	7	4,13	8,63	0,051	
	26-30 Years	62	5,93	2	8,5		
	31-35 Years	53	6,5	2,38	9		
	36-40 Years	11	7	6	9		
	41-45 Years	7	6,87	6,88	7,38		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	21-25 Years	27	6,25	3,38	8,75	0,392	
	26-30 Years	62	6,25	1	8,75		
	31-35 Years	53	6,12	3,13	9		
	36-40 Years	11	7	5,38	8,13		
	41-45 Years	7	6,87	6,5	6,88		
Total Efficacy	21-25 Years	27	6,34	4,41	8	0,051	
	26-30 Years	62	6,03	1,63	8,25		
	31-35 Years	53	6,37	3,16	9		
	36-40 Years	11	7,12	5,44	8,75		
	41-45 Years	7	6,96	6,94	7,47		

p<0,05, Kruskal-Wallis H Test

The scale scores on table 8 show that participant EFL teachers who are between the ages 21 and 25 have a self-efficacy level of 6,25 in student engagement; those at the 26-30 age range have a level of 5,5; and the ones between the ages 31 and 35 have a self-efficacy level of 6; whereas the level of self-efficacy in student engagement for EFL teachers at the 36-40 age range is 6,75; and this level is 7 for those at the 41-45 age range. Accordingly, EFL teachers who are between the ages of 36-40 and 41-45 have a higher level of self-efficacy in terms of adding students to online lessons compared to younger participants, especially those at the 26-30 age range. This result indicates that the self-efficacy of participant EFL teachers for adding students to online lessons vary according to their ages ($p=0,003<0,05$). On the other hand, other scale scores related to their average online teaching self-efficacy and the sub-dimensions of instructional strategies, classroom management and use of computers do not differ according to participants' ages ($p=0,51$; $0,51$; $0,392$; $0,51>0,05$). In other words, older EFL teachers had higher levels of self-efficacy for student engagement in online courses compared with younger EFL teachers.

Table 9

Analysis of EFL Teachers' Sense of Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Gender

	Gender	n	Median	Min	Max	p
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Male	52	6,25	3,25	9	0,299
	Female	108	5,87	1,5	8,5	
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Male	52	6,87	3,38	9	0,058
	Female	108	6,37	2	8,38	
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Male	52	6,68	2,38	9	0,431
	Female	108	6,5	2	8,63	
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Male	52	6,75	3,13	9	0,042
	Female	108	6,18	1	8,38	
Total Efficacy	Male	52	6,65	3,16	9	0,122
	Female	108	6,09	1,63	8,41	

$p<0,05$, Mann Whitney U Test

Table 9 reveals that male participant EFL teachers' self-efficacy level for using computers (6,75) in online lessons is higher than that of female teachers (6,18). Accordingly, the participant EFL teachers' self-efficacy levels in the use of computers vary according to their gender ($p=0,042<0,05$). However, other scale scores related to EFL teachers' self-efficacy in online teaching and its sub-dimensions do not differ according to the variable of gender ($p=0,299$; $0,058$; $0,431$; $0,122>0,05$). Gender is seen to be influential only on EFL teachers' ability for computer use in online courses.

Table 10

Analysis of EFL Teachers' Online Teaching Self-efficacy According to Years of Teaching Experience

	Teaching Experience Period	n	Median	Min	Max	P
Efficacy in Student Engagement	1-5 Years	84	5,62	1,5	8,13	0,081
	6-10 Years	59	6,25	3,63	9	
	11-15 Years	13	6	3,25	8,5	
	16-20 Years	4	6,68	6,5	8	
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	1-5 Years	84	6,43	2	8,5	0,256
	6-10 Years	59	6,5	3,5	9	
	11-15 Years	13	6,37	4,5	8,25	
	16-20 Years	4	7,12	6,63	7,75	
Efficacy in Classroom Management	1-5 Years	84	6,5	2	8,63	0,306
	6-10 Years	59	7	3	9	
	11-15 Years	13	6,5	4,5	8,5	
	16-20 Years	4	6,93	6,38	7,13	
Efficacy in Use of Computers	1-5 Years	84	6,25	1	8,75	0,367
	6-10 Years	59	6,62	2,13	9	
	11-15 Years	13	6,37	4,38	8,13	
	16-20 Years	4	6,87	6,25	7,5	
Total Efficacy	1-5 Years	84	6,03	1,63	8	0,252
	6-10 Years	59	6,59	3,75	9	
	11-15 Years	13	6,25	4,34	8,28	
	16-20 Years	4	7	6,44	7,41	

$p<0,05$, Kruskal-Wallis H Test

On table 10, the median scores of EFL teachers with 1-5, 6-10, 11-15 and 16-20 years of teaching experience in the sub-dimensions of the scale are at close values between 5,62 and 7, and there is no significant difference ($p=0,081$; $0,256$; $0,306$; $0,367$

> 0,05). As a whole, the participant EFL teachers' self-efficacy levels in online teaching do not differ according to their teaching experience period ($p=0,252 > 0,05$). In other words, years of teaching experience is not an influential variable on EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy.

Table 11

Analysis of EFL Teachers' Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to Online Teaching Experience Before the Covid-19 Pandemia

	Online Teaching Experience	n	Median	Min	Max	P
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Yes	33	6,12	3,25	9	0,667
	No	127	5,87	1,5	9	
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Yes	33	6,87	3,88	9	0,889
	No	127	6,5	2	9	
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Yes	33	6,62	2,38	9	0,670
	No	127	6,5	2	9	
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Yes	33	6,25	3,13	9	0,172
	No	127	6,5	1	9	
Total Efficacy	Yes	33	6,5	3,16	9	0,516
	No	127	6,25	1,63	9	

$p < 0,05$, Mann Whitney U Test

According to table 11, 33 participant EFL teachers gave online courses before the pandemic distance education process, whereas other 127 participants did not have online teaching experience at all before the pandemia. However, the median scores for online teaching self-efficacy of both groups are at a close range of 5,87 - 6,87; and the significance levels in the sub-dimensions show that there is no significant difference ($p = > 0,05$), which means EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy levels do not differ according to whether or not they had online teaching experience before the Covid-19

pandemia ($p=0,516 > 0,05$). In other words, their previous online teaching experience did not have an impact on their self-efficacy for the pandemic online education.

Table 12

Analysis of EFL Teachers' Self-efficacy for Online Teaching According to In-service Training on Educational Technologies

	In-Service Training on Educational Technologies	N	Median	Min	Max	P
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Yes	66	6,12	1,5	9	0,299
	No	94	5,68	3,13	8,5	
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Yes	66	6,62	2	9	0,349
	No	94	6,37	3,13	8,75	
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Yes	66	6,62	2	9	0,684
	No	94	6,5	3,13	8,63	
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Yes	66	6,37	1	9	0,776
	No	94	6,5	3	8,75	
Total Efficacy	Yes	66	6,42	1,63	9	0,620
	No	94	6,09	3,09	8,41	

$p < 0,05$, Mann Whitney U Test

According to the data on table 12, 66 participant EFL teachers took in-service training on use of educational technologies while 94 did not. However, the median scores for both groups do not change significantly ($p=0,299; 0,349; 0,684; 0,776 > 0,05$) and are at a range with close values of 6,12 and 6,62. In this sense, participant EFL teachers' self-efficacy in online teaching does not differ according to having taken in-service training on educational technologies or not ($p=0,620 > 0,05$). The in-service trainings on use of educational technologies taken by EFL teachers did not influence their self-efficacy for online teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Table 13

Analysis of EFL Teachers' Online Teaching Self-efficacy According to Pre-service Education on Educational Technologies

	Pre-Service Course on Educational Technologies	n	Median	Min	Max	P
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Yes	75	6	1,5	9	0,346
	No	85	6,12	3,25	9	
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Yes	75	6,5	2	9	0,427
	No	85	6,5	3,38	9	
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Yes	75	6,87	2	9	0,803
	No	85	6,5	3,25	9	
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Yes	75	6,5	1	9	0,663
	No	85	6,37	3,25	9	
Total Efficacy	Yes	75	6,4	1,63	9	0,466
	No	85	6,25	3,44	9	

p<0,05, Mann Whitney U Test

As indicated on table 13, 75 participant EFL teachers took pre-service courses on use of educational technologies during their university education whereas 85 participants did not. Nevertheless, the median values in the sub-dimensions for those who took courses and who did not are between close values of 6 and 6,87, and do not show a significant difference ($p=0,346; 0,427; 0,803; 0,663 > 0,05$). Accordingly, participant EFL teachers' self-efficacy level in online teaching does not differ according to having taken pre-service education on use of educational technologies ($p=0,466 > 0,05$). EFL teachers' pre-service training taken at university on use of educational technologies does not have an influence on their online teaching self-efficacy during the Covid-19 pandemic.

3.2. Findings of Qualitative Data

This section covers the qualitative findings achieved through content analysis of the semi-structured interviews that were administered with 15 participant EFL teachers who work at state schools in Siirt province. The interviewees were selected among the participants of the ETSEOTS from the quantitative data collection phase. There were 12 open-ended questions on interviews that questioned EFL teachers' views on the possible reasons for the scale scores of their online teaching self-efficacy levels achieved on results of the ETSEOTS as well as their reflections on the pandemic online education process. Related themes, sub-themes and concepts were obtained through content analysis and coding on the participants' interview responses, which helped in answering research questions of the study more comprehensively.

3.2.1. Findings on Reasons for EFL Teachers' Online Teaching Self-efficacy Levels during the Covid-19 Pandemic Distance Education

Table 14 reveals the sub-themes and concepts that emerged from the coding process on EFL teachers' views about the possible reasons for their undesired online teaching self-efficacy levels observed on scale scores as well as the reasons for similarity and differences in their online teaching self-efficacy according to some of their demographic characteristics.

Table 14*EFL Teachers' Views on Their Online Teaching Self-efficacy Levels*

Theme	Sub-themes	Concepts
EFL Teachers' Views on Their Online Teaching Self-efficacy Levels	Reasons for EFL Teachers' Undesired Online Teaching Self-efficacy Levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - System-related factors - Teacher-related factors - Student-related factors
	Reasons for Similar Self-efficacy Levels Regardless of Online Teaching Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new and extraordinary situation - Differences in planning, organization, scope, purpose, etc. - Lack of devotion
	Reasons for Similar Self-efficacy Levels Regardless of In-service and Pre-service Trainings on Educational Technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Theoric education rather than applied training - Passive participation by EFL teachers - Not feeling relaxed in online courses - Low student participation - Changing conditions in time - Easy adaptation and familiarity with technology through daily use
	Reasons for Older EFL Teachers' Higher Self-efficacy in Student Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teaching experience - Ability in teaching styles and materials - Better classroom management - Familiarity with educational technologies - More cooperation and communication - More self-confidence and authority
	Reasons for Male EFL Teachers' Higher Self-efficacy in Use of Computers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Males being more interested in technology - Social gender roles diminishing females' technology usage - More opportunities of technology usage for males

Findings on Reasons for EFL Teachers' Undesired Online Teaching Self-efficacy Levels

The Covid-19 pandemic was a challenging time for Turkish EFL teachers in terms of continuing the language teaching and learning process, because it was conducted online, which differs from face-to-face education in many aspects. The quantitative results of this study showed that online teaching self-efficacy levels of participant EFL teachers during the pandemic distance education were at medium degrees, that is, not desirably high. Therefore, the possible reasons of such a result were among the most curious points during the qualitative data collection and analysis phase. According to qualitative findings achieved through participant EFL teachers' responses on interviews, there are three main factors that might have influenced their online teaching self-efficacy negatively during the pandemic online education process. These are system-related factors, teacher-related factors and student-related factors.

The EFL teachers' responses on interviews revealed that most of them experienced "system-related problems", "could not find efficient solutions" and thus could not represent high self-efficacy levels in the pandemic online teaching. As reported on interviews, the system-related factors that affected participant EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy during the pandemic are "poor internet connection" and "insufficient technological infrastructure and devices" for the users of online teaching, as declared in the following excerpts:

P5: *"Basically the problem is about poor internet connection and we feel bad and it makes us exhausted... This affects our teaching self-efficacy."*

P9: *"The internet in this city, in Siirt is not as efficient as it should be, so it does not provide the necessary infrastructure for all the users... I can only use the kitchen in my house for live courses because of the poor connection in other rooms of the house."*

P8: *"There are deficiencies arising from technological reasons, the problems caused by the technological infrastructure and technological devices such as tablets and computers."*

P13: *"In some houses, there are 3 or 4 students, but there is only one smart device, so the students had problems... Not all of them had access to the internet, some of them had devices, some did not. I think, not every teacher had a computer at home, either. Teachers may have encountered these problems, as well. That is why their self-efficacy levels are low."*

The analysis of EFL teachers' opinions on interviews revealed some "teacher-related factors" as well, which they believed were influential on their unsatisfactory online teaching self-efficacy levels during the pandemic online education. Some participants pointed out "the sudden start with online teaching" and their "lack of prior practical experience in online teaching" as important teacher-related factors, as stated in the following excerpts:

P2: *"They didn't have such an experience in their profession before, and because of the pandemic they suddenly passed to it. At such a duration, I think they did not know how to do, what to do... practically... I think it is related with lack of experience of the teachers."*

P11: *"The fact that they did not have any background related to online education before, that they were not included in such an education... That is why these things happened."*

EFL teachers' "lack of adaptation to technological tools, innovations and applications" for ELT in online lessons arose as another teacher-related factor that they regarded to have a lowering impact on their online teaching self-efficacy levels, as stated in the following excerpts:

P10: *"Many students and teachers are newly getting acquainted with online education. Computer use is insufficient. Yes, we always had computers in our lives, especially in recent years computers and our phones are in our lives, but it was difficult to adapt them to education."*

P13: *"The technological materials that were used during online courses... Some of teachers were familiar with these materials, but some of them were not... So, they first tried to learn how to use this technology. This, of course, costed loss of a certain amount of time and efficiency."*

P14: *"Being efficient in on-line teaching requires the knowledge and experience of using the technological devices appropriately, of how to manage and organize online teaching. In this sense, teachers may not have such qualifications and the abrupt change of education from face-to-face teaching to online teaching due to Covid-19 pandemic caused the teachers to dive into a world of struggles in which they have to survive by trial and error to find the correct way."*

According to participant EFL teachers, their "lackings about in-service/pre-service training and personal development about online teaching" were another teacher-related

factor that affected their self-efficacy in online teaching in a negative way, which is depicted in the following excerpts:

P7: *“The main reason for this is the insufficient in-service training. There is not enough in-service training both in the branch of English language education and in other branches, and teachers are not informed about this. A second reason is that teachers do not pay attention to their personal development and do not participate in any training that enhances their personal development.”*

P10: *“Not having been trained about online education may be one of the reasons... If we had received this training from the schools we graduated or from our in-service training, maybe we could have reached a better level... In other words, we learned online education by ourselves. So we were only able to get to the medium levels until we learned it on our own.”*

“Lacks of teacher-education programmes” at universities arose as another teacher-related factor that diminished EFL teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy levels during the Covid-19 pandemic. As stated by participants, so far the ongoing teacher education programmes have focused only on how to implement face-to-face teaching methods and prospective teachers have not been provided with required education about online teaching methodology, how to implement it in practice, and computer use. Therefore, such a crucial deficit in the teacher education system at universities might have resulted in negative impacts on EFL teachers’ efficiency, motivation and self-efficacy during the conduction of the pandemic online education, as stated in the following excerpts:

P8: *“We did not take any lessons for online education, and there was no practical application of it in anyway.”*

P11: *“Frankly, I do not think that any process related to online education is included in education faculties, neither in theory nor in practice. If it were included, we would have at least been prepared for such an extraordinary situation as was observed during the pandemic.”*

P6: *“While we were training as teachers at the university, I think we needed to be given better education on computer use. I mean, we were taught like a high school student whose top computer ability is to prepare a powerpoint presentation... We did not experience an educational environment where we could get practical training on more programs, applications, etc.”*

Consequently, some EFL teachers touched on the importance of integrating a substantial and applied training for online teaching into the teacher education programmes, as stated in following excerpts:

P7: *“In my opinion, online education curriculum should be integrated in teacher education programmes in the same percentage with face-to-face education. Practical training should be given for this... Technologically supported education should be given for a few terms or years.”*

P12: *“Definitely online education needs to be included in curriculums at universities now, as soon as possible... A course, a training must be given and it must be applied, not in theory, not on paper, but strictly in practice.”*

P10: *“If, from now on, applied training on online education is included in the university programmes of teacher education, I think such problems will not be experienced, at least it will have an effect on reducing them.”*

P5: *“They need to change some processes. Their focus should not just be improvement of teachers to be in face to face education. They should also prepare them for online teaching platforms.”*

P9: *“In the educational system in universities beforehand there was not such a situation, so they should adapt the system to the new situations or pandemia.”*

P3: *“We just learned how to teach face to face... This education system should go to renovations.”*

P8: *“ELT programs need to be revised, because the current circumstances demand it.”*

During the interviews, in addition to system-related and teacher-related factors, EFL teachers complained about some “student-related factors”, too, that they believed to have a negative influence on their online teaching self-efficacy levels. These factors were “lack of student participation and interaction”, “unwillingness of students”, “lack of eye contact with students”, and “lack of feedback from students” during the pandemic online lessons, as stated in the following excerpts:

P12: *“It was good at first. When it first started, 30 students for example, let say 25 or 20 students were coming, but it started to decrease day by day. Because not all of them had internet... or his/her siblings had online classes, too... Gradually the participation started to decrease... I am sorry about it.”*

P1: *“Student interaction is less in online education. I think that is the reason... Even if they do not have technical problems, they do not want to engage in the lesson much.”*

P9: *“Nevertheless, even if they have technological tools, some of them do not prefer it. I have asked the reason and their answer was like that: ‘Teacher, I know I have all the devices at home and I can participate, but I do not, because I do not like it.’”*

P3: *“No matter how much prepared you are for the lesson, if there are no students in your lesson, what can you do?”*

P8: *“As a teacher, you are looking for an interaction during the lesson in order to see yourself more competent. Since we cannot see this at a desired level on the online platform, it inevitably affects the self-efficacy levels negatively.”*

P9: *“Some people like me, they prefer face to face education... Because I am a teacher and I want to feel it. I want to look at my students’ eyes and understand whether the learner acquire it or not. I want to feel it... but there is no interaction as much as you want between you and your students in online teaching.”*

P4: *“In my opinion, EFL teachers need to make an eye contact with students... So, EFL teachers feel less efficient when teaching online, because there is no eye contact.”*

P3: *“I think the most important thing in the classroom when we teach face to face is that, we can understand whether the students learn the subjects or not. When we look at their eyes, we can understand that, but in online lessons, there is not an opportunity like that... so we don’t feel as comfortable as in face to face education. This affects us.”*

P5: *“You need to see the results but in online teaching we cannot get the feedbacks.”*

P15: *“Because they do not have a real classroom environment in online courses, teachers may have experienced a lack of motivation because they could not get the feedback they expected from their students.”*

Findings on Reasons for Similar Self-efficacy Levels Regardless of Online Teaching Experience

The quantitative results on the EFL Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (ETSEOTS) showed that while some demographic variables of participant EFL teachers were influential on some of the subdimensions in their online teaching self-efficacy during the pandemic, some variables did not affect their online teaching self-efficacy levels at all. For example, it was observed that among the participant EFL teachers those who had online teaching experience before the pandemic did not show higher self-efficacy levels during the pandemic online teaching process compared with the ones who did not have online teaching experience before. Therefore, EFL teachers were asked on interviews to figure out possible reasons for this result. Some of them stated

that the pandemic online education process was so “sudden and extraordinary” that it differed from the pre-pandemia online teaching practices in many ways, which produced unsatisfactory self-efficacy outcomes for most of them on similar degrees even if they had online teaching experience before the pandemic, as stated in the following excerpts:

P2: *“It is a new situation. Teachers’ being unprepared for online working and this transition from conventional system to online system occurred suddenly. And even if you have the previous fulfillments in online teaching... I mean the procedure of the new online teaching was a bit different.”*

P3: *“This is a very new thing for all of us. The situation is very different from all kinds of online education... so having experience before does not affect the self efficacy of teachers so much.”*

P13: *“This was a very new situation, because I do not think that the online education method used before this pandemic is compatible with the online education method used with the pandemic. Since this is a brand new thing, I think everyone is on an equal level in this process.”*

P1: *“The things we know sometimes do not mean anything in extraordinary situations.”*

The qualitative data on interviews revealed more, in that, some EFL teachers declared the reason why EFL teachers’ pre-pandemic online teaching experience did not work during the pandemic online education process was that the pre-pandemic online teaching process was probably much “different from the pandemic one in terms of many aspects such as planning, organization, scope, purpose, infrastructure, technological opportunities and student participation”, as stated in the following excerpts:

P5: *“Because it was a sudden situation, there’s not enough plan and organization as much as before the pandemic. That is why their efficacy did not show difference now.”*

P6: *“It may not be such a wide-ranging, serious platform for them to provide training before the pandemic. Maybe students had all the opportunities, maybe they didn’t have any problems about infrastructure, equipment... and such a comprehensive (wide-scale) online education has never been given before.”*

P12: *“Previously given online trainings were more planned and the number of target student group was lower.”*

P7: *“The number of lessons was probably lower... Maybe it was given as a supportive education together with face-to-face training, unlike the pandemic online education process that all of the country have entered due to this corona.”*

P8: *“The number of students they addressed, the profile was more limited... but... this online pandemic process was all over the country. The plan, the programs were also different, that is, teachers had to explain the whole curriculum in this process. But the teachers who taught online before, they taught a more limited curriculum... And willing students and unwilling students are now together. This creates difficulties in effectively engaging the student in the course.”*

P11: *“We cannot equate pre-pandemic and post-pandemic online education because the pre-pandemic education was well-organized. The student was willing, there was enough student participation, the teacher was consciously trained for this, but since this pandemic one was an unusual situation, the negative conditions affected everyone in the same way.”*

P7: *“The programme or conditions at that time were more planned than today. And the current applications are different.”*

P10: *“The critical element is student and no matter how hard the teacher works the students’ low participation and unwillingness unfortunately limits him and keeps his efficacy level at minimum.”*

P14: *“Teachers may have enough qualifications, however they do the teaching with their students, most of whom are inexperienced and deprived of necessary technological devices and internet. Also, those students are deprived of the necessary skills to manage to join the on-line learning at home environment. Those factors affect the teachers’ self-efficacy... That is, even if they have knowledge and prior practice in online education, it has no effect now.”*

Some participants criticized EFL teachers who had online teaching experience for their “lack of devotion” and “disregarding the pandemic online education”, which they believed was another reason for their unsatisfactory self-efficacy levels, as stated in the following excerpt:

P7: *“Instructors who have taught online before may have felt more comfortable during the pandemic, based on the opinion that ‘I can handle it in any way, I do not have to show the necessary devotion’. Therefore, I find it perfectly normal for the two groups to tend to the same levels of self-efficacy.”*

Findings on Reasons for Similar Self-efficacy Levels Regardless of In-service and Pre-service Trainings on Educational Technologies

One significant aim of the interviews conducted in this study was to learn about EFL teachers' views on the scale results about their online teaching self-efficacy levels according to some of their demographic characteristics, which contradicted both with some generalizations in self-efficacy theories and with the participant EFL teachers' opinions about some of the variables that they thought might be influential on their online teaching self-efficacy levels. As stated before, most participants stated that EFL teachers' lacks of in-service training could be possible reasons for their undesired online teaching self-efficacy levels during the pandemic distance education. However, the quantitative scale scores on the ETSEOTS showed that there was not a meaningful difference between the online teaching self-efficacy levels of participant EFL teachers who received pre-service and in-service training on use of educational technology and those who did not. Therefore, on the interviews EFL teachers were asked to figure out why EFL teachers with different backgrounds about in-service and pre-service education showed similarly undesired online-teaching self-efficacy levels during the pandemic. Their responses revealed specific facts that could have been influential. In this sense, some participants supported the idea that because the pre-service and in-service educations taken by EFL teachers were probably on "theoretical level", "insufficient", "superficial" and "sloppy" and "lacked practical education." Thus, the learning outcomes of those educations could not be transferred to practice in the pandemic online education, which is stated in the following excerpts:

P11: *"I think it remained theoretical. I think that everything that is not put into practice remains in theory."*

P2: *"Learning something in theory and doing something or practicing something in real life are very different."*

P15: *"I attribute it to the fact that the theoretical knowledge is not tied to a compelling system when it turns into practice."*

P8: *"First of all, how effective was this pre-service or in-service training, was it given online, and how long did it take?... Or were these trainings in theory or in practice? These need to be examined."*

P6: *"Generally, you know, seminars can be a bit sloppy... There is not a very practical work going on... This may have had an effect on results."*

Accordingly, the importance of “an applied education rather than a theoretic and superficial one” for teachers was emphasized, as stated in the following excerpt:

P12: *“If we are going to get an education on technology, it should be applied. We observe that an education that remains in theory has no effect in practice.”*

On the interviews, it was also reported that EFL teachers’ “passive participation in in-service trainings” might be another reason for their relatively undesired self-efficacy levels in online teaching, as stated in the following excerpt:

P7: *“In-service trainings may not have exactly the same effect as more teachers participate as listeners only, as passive participants.”*

EFL teachers’ “not feeling relaxed in online courses” because of “the uncertainty of the online education process” was regarded as another reason behind their unsatisfactory scale scores even if they got prior education about use of educational technology, as stated in the following excerpts:

P9: *“You are not yourself in online courses because something distresses you, your students and you are in front of camera... So, nobody is themselves, and they do not feel relaxed, comfortable, and that is one of the reasons.”*

P14: *“They encountered with a world of uncertainty with their students who didn’t have the same opportunities to reach internet connection, technological devices, which were the heart of on-line teaching. As a result, teachers with the pre-service or in-service courses had the same problems with the ones who did not have such training, which meant that such qualifications didn’t work during the online teaching.”*

Accordingly, “low degrees of student participation” in online courses was considered to be another reason by participant EFL teachers for their undesired self-efficacy scores despite their pre-service or in-service trainings on use of educational technologies, because they could not perform the outcomes of the educations they received when there were small numbers of students in online lessons, and thus any education received by teachers would go in vain if there is no engagement with students, which is depicted in the following excerpts:

P10: *“If the student does not participate, let the teacher receive as much education as he wants.”*

P2: *“Maybe some students are unwilling to attend the courses and if you don’t know how to make them more eager, you can be unsuccessful.”*

P4: *“Maybe the reason is... in online courses teachers cannot talk face to face with students as the students are not very willing and they don’t like to participate lessons.”*

Some participants revealed that the “changing conditions” from the times when the pre-service or in-service education was taken by EFL teachers may have resulted in inefficiency for most of EFL teachers during the pandemic online education regardless of whether or not they had any training, as stated in the following excerpts:

P13: *“I received in-service training about 13 years ago. The technology used back then and the technology today are very different. The method used at that time or the technological application used did not coincide at all with now. Therefore, it is normal for the results not to show any difference.”*

P7: *“It may be that the in-service training they receive and the current practices do not overlap with each other.”*

P6: *“Maybe... the in-service training they received did not match with the emerging products offered in the pandemic. ... may be... the content of the in-service training they receive and the content of the programs used in distance education during the pandemic do not match.”*

The fact that almost “everybody is now familiar with technology in daily life” and that “technology is easily learned through daily use” was accepted by EFL teachers as another possible reason for why EFL teachers educated about use of educational technology could not feel more successful in online teaching than the ones who were not educated, as stated in the following excerpt:

P5: *“Basically, we use technology in our daily life as well, not just on our courses. So we are familiar with the topic. We use technology, we use laptop, we use mobile phones, etc. We are all familiar with it. That is why it cannot change that much... You can learn it easily like in one or two days... and then apply it to the courses.”*

Findings on Reasons for Older EFL Teachers’ Higher Self-efficacy in Student Engagement

According to the quantitative results on the ETSEOTS, although the average online teaching self-efficacy of all participant EFL teachers was similarly at a medium level, some groups of participants with specific variables showed higher levels in some sub-dimensions of online teaching self-efficacy. For instance, the older EFL teachers at the 41-45 age range showed higher degrees of online teaching self-efficacy in terms of student engagement compared with the younger participant EFL teachers who are at the 26-30 age range. For this reason, EFL teachers were asked on interviews to figure out the possible reasons for such a difference between the older and younger EFL teachers’

student engagement self-efficacy levels in pandemic online courses. Interestingly, all the respondents agreed on the same consensus that the reason is older EFL teachers' being "more experienced" about "teaching styles and materials", "classroom management", "use of educational technology", "having more cooperation and communication" with their students and parents, thus having "more self-confidence and authority", which they believe helped older EFL teachers in better engaging and including students in online classes during the Covid-19 pandemic, as stated in the following excerpts:

P6: *"Their years of experience may have provided a positive aspect for those teachers."*

P5: *"We can have a simple answer for that. Basically it is the experience in teaching. For example, I have experience like for two years and the other one has 10 years of experience. Of course they will have better position in instruction."*

P2: *"For me, it is related with experience. The more years you have in your profession the better you are I think."*

P4: *"The only reason is experience... because the older teachers in English language teaching are capable of teaching styles. And they know how to affect students and they know how to deal with and react the problems... I am young and I have been teaching for one and a half years... I don't know how to react the problems and students' questions. But the older teachers, I mean the ones at the 40-45 age range, are more capable of teaching styles and teaching methods, they know the teaching skills."*

P14: *"I think, that is the result of experience. Older teachers are more experienced than younger teachers, and they may have used technological devices more during their profession, which contributed to their efficacy during the on-line teaching."*

P7: *"Normally our young teachers are proficient in using technological tools, it really surprised me that such a result came out. This may be due to the fact that older teachers are more experienced in classroom management... At the same time, I think they use teaching methods and techniques more actively and effectively than young teachers."*

P13: *"I think it's just about experience and classroom management. They have motivated the student better in this regard."*

P11: *"I think experience is speaking here... We see the role of older teachers in bringing their own classroom management roles to online education."*

P9: *“It may be because they have that experience or maybe they have the classroom management. They know what to do and how to do.”*

P1: *“I think the reason maybe the experience of teaching because they saw a lot of students, maybe thousands of students, and they know how to react to each student, how to engage them.”*

P10: *“They can do more interesting work to attract students into the lesson.”*

P3: *“Maybe because of their experiences... they know better how a teacher should approach students... They set well the balance of respect with students. And also I think the students take them more seriously than younger teachers.”*

P12: *“The only logical answer to this is probably experience... that is, they use that dominance more effectively because of experience... A teacher at that age is known and recognized by parents more in Siirt... Parents take him into consideration better. They have more self-confidence and authority.”*

P15: *“I think it is experience. And I think it is the self-confidence they have because of this experience.”*

P8: *“During their teaching time, they encountered more and more different types of students. So, they probably solved the crisis management more effectively and efficiently during pandemic online education... I think they look at potential problems on a broader scale.”*

Findings on Reasons for Male EFL Teachers’ Higher Self-efficacy in Use of Computers

On the quantitative results of the ETSEOTS, it was observed that among the participants, male EFL teachers showed higher self-efficacy levels for computer use in online courses compared to female EFL teachers. Accordingly, participants were asked on interviews to find reasons for such a result. EFL teachers’ responses revealed that male EFL teachers’ being “more interested in technology”, and the different “social gender roles” on males and females determining “different amounts of opportunities” for them to use technology in daily life might have been influential on such a difference between male and female EFL teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy levels for use of computers, as stated in the following excerpts:

P15: *“I think the reason for this is purely interest.”*

P6: *“Male teachers like computers a little more than female teachers.”*

P14: *“I think, that is because the male EFL teachers are more interested in technological devices and internet applications.”*

P9: *“As a female teacher, I’m not so good at technological devices and technology and I believe that male users are more interested in that area. That can be a reason... Men are more assertive in technological matters.”*

P8: *“I think it’s probably because of their interests. Of course male participants were likely to be more productive and more successful, as they spent more time with technology.”*

P4: *“I think that men have been inclined to computers since childhood and they have been playing computer games for many years. Women are not interested in computers because of some reasons. I mean these reasons can be related to family relations, environment, bond of friendship, etc. Therefore, men are better than women about computers.”*

P13: *“Boys play more games, spend more time on the phone, have always spent more time in front of the computer since their youth, maybe that’s why.”*

P12: *“In Siirt, we men usually went to internet cafes a lot. And especially in the family, boys were the first to be given a cellphone. Because we’re more engaged with the phone, with technology... That’s why.”*

P2: *“Generally the males are more interested in the technology or technological devices, so they are better than women in all kinds of technological devices. And also... Because at home they don’t have responsibilities like females... they can spend time to do whatever they want on computer, telephones, etc.”*

P1: *“That’s maybe a cultural reason because in Turkish culture you know females are more engaged with houseworks... Gender roles, that makes the difference... Women have more responsibilities about the kitchens, about the houses, about the children. ... The females are of course using computer but only when necessary. But males are more engaged and more competent in using the computers.”*

P5: *“To me, the basic reason is women have more responsibilities than men in our society... Mostly they need to do stuff on house, kids, etc., and they don’t have time even for themselves. That’s a big problem. But for men, it’s not like this... Patriarchial society, social gender roles are influential.”*

P11: *“We should not ignore that a female EFL teacher is a housewife at home... While men generally do not deal with household chores at home, women have*

responsibilities such as taking care of children, doing housework and cooking. This inevitably distracts them from certain things.”

P7: “Our female teachers who are married and have children, they spend more time on housework, but our male teachers spend more time with technological devices. We live in a patriarchal society, equality of opportunity is not provided much between men and women.”

P9: “Responsibilities at home are burdened on females and females cannot spare time for technology usage, but males are free, they can do whatever they want at home or outside. They have mobile phones, they play games on mobile phones, they watch TV, they play computer games in their free times... We females also need spare time for more use of technology to become more efficient in it. But, unfortunately, there are some limitations on it.”

P10: “In this pandemic period, a female English teacher takes care of the house, takes care of her child, takes care of her lessons... The male, on the other hand, was able to adapt himself to online education in this process...The fact that a female English teacher is a mother, a teacher, and a woman has caused her to lag behind men in terms of technology use.”

3.2.2. Findings on EFL Teachers’ Reflections on the Pandemic Online Education

Table 15 shows the sub-themes and concepts that emerged from the coding process on EFL teachers’ reflections on the pandemic online education, covering the challenging aspects and positive outcomes of the process for EFL teachers.

Table 15*EFL Teachers' Reflections on the Pandemic Online Education*

Theme	Sub-themes	Concepts
EFL Teachers' Reflections on the Pandemic Online Education	Challenging Aspects of the Pandemic Online Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problems and limited solutions - Limited teaching of language skills and activities - Negative feelings in <u>online</u> courses
	Positive Outcomes of the Pandemic Online Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness about professional development needs - Willingness for professional development about <u>online</u> teaching - Interest in applied trainings

Further analysis on qualitative data revealed that EFL teachers mostly had negative reflections about the challenging aspects of the online teaching process regarding what problems EFL teachers encountered, whether and how they overcame the challenges, to what extent they managed to teach English online, and what feelings they had in online courses. On the other hand, they had some positive reflections regarding how this process raised their awareness and willingness for professional development about online teaching while increasing their interest in applied trainings.

Findings on Challenging Aspects of the Pandemic Online Education

EFL teachers' responses on interviews revealed that all of them had challenges due to problems about "poor internet connection", "technical and technological limitations", "student participation and engagement", "classroom management", and "adapting educational technologies, materials and applications to online courses", for which they could find "solutions to a limited extent", as stated in the following excerpts:

P13: *“We had especially connection problems... The application we used sometimes caused us problems. Until the application started, 6-7 minutes passed. In other words, the duration of 30 minutes was reduced to 23 minutes, sometimes 20 minutes. We were waiting for the students, if there were two students, we were waiting a few minutes for other students to come. In other words, I think that we teach between 15 and 20 minutes efficiently.”*

P10: *“The problematic situations were related to internet, computer and internet use... Students did not have internet access. The absence of a computer, the fact that families have many students but only one computer, one tablet or one smart phone at home... Actually, we couldn't find anything as solution.”*

P2: *“I think my problems are generally related with lack of technological devices and technological information... The other problem is participation of students. It is very low... And it is a big problem. I don't know what I should do.”*

P7: *“Especially the shortage of technological tools, the weak infrastructure of students and teachers were problems. Then, the participation of the students in the lesson, whether they come prepared or unprepared were big problems.”*

P1: *“I cannot engage all the students. Sometimes, the student does not have internet connection. And also sometimes I myself have internet problems... And all the students cannot open microphone. That's very important for me but I cannot hear the students... To increase student participation I pre-announce the lesson and I send the lesson link on Whatsapp, so this increases their participation a bit.”*

P5: *“Student engagement is the main problem... Some students want to attend, but they have problems with internet connection... We can't find a solution for it. So, the only solution can be opening schools again.”*

P12: *“There is a problem of adding the student to the lesson. We have whatsapp groups, there are some students who do not come even though we inform the lesson time there. It was personally demoralizing... I contact their parents but students are not willing. For students who do not have internet access, there are EBA access points in the city, I direct them there, but it is a problem for them to get there, too.”*

P8: *“I had a lot of problems in getting the student involved in the lesson. And, of course, there were problems related to technology and internet. The students cannot use this application (Zoom) in some cases. I had problems because of the bad infrastructure and not being able to use it. In general, I couldn't provide much of a solution. There*

were times when I could not intervene because the reasons such as technology, that is, the student did not have technological tools, were beyond me.”

P11: *“We have difficulties in involving the student in the lesson. They are getting bored. And the sudden disconnection of the internet. We had communicative problems due to this. When the internet connection was cut, I tried to re-enter the class many times. I couldn’t cope. This is against our will.”*

P6: *“We have great difficulty in getting the students involved in the lesson... We have a lot of problems with the internet because of geography. We have infrastructure problems in this region... Sometimes we were having trouble with classroom management because students were speaking all at once. This was solved after we made our warning.”*

P15: *“I experienced technical failures in online classes. Students could not connect to the lesson. This was also a kind of waste of time. Besides, a remote classroom management was more difficult than managing a real classroom. As for solutions, I made parent meetings when necessary and I shared the systemic problems with the school principal.”*

Some of the participants stated that apart from technical, student participation and classroom management problems, they experienced challenges about “applying materials, educational technologies and applications in online courses”, which they learned to deal with to a limited extent, as stated in the following excerpts:

P3: *“I didn’t know how I can use the material. It was a problem for me to apply the educational technologies in my online lessons. It took time. I am now using the educational technologies in my lessons... I learned by using day by day... by getting experienced.”*

P4: *“I had problems about using Zoom application and I learned the general use of Zoom by watching videos and taking notes for myself... I had problems in using educational technologies.”*

P14: *“At first times, I encountered many problems because... although I knew how to use computer I didn’t have any experience in online teaching... I overcame those problems by trial and error and by asking my colleagues.”*

P9: *“Internet background and educational technologies, we do not have them enough... I hope that would not be long lasting... I want to have an end to online education because I miss my classrooms. And actually I don’t want to have any solution to the problems.”*

EFL teachers added on negative reflections about the pandemic online education, in that, all such challenges of the process “limited their efficiency in teaching of English language online”. Their responses revealed that they could not manage to give all language skills and aspects thoroughly in online classes due to time limitations and technical problems, as stated in the following excerpts:

P13: *“English course is completely audio-visual, that is, the student will see, the student will hear, the student will speak, the student will read and write. Unfortunately, we could not include all this into a lesson of half an hour.”*

P6: *“Lessons at school are 40 minutes, but in distance education it is 30 minutes... It negatively impacted our curriculum... in explaining grammar issues... We couldn't do the activities we did in face-to-face training, some games for example, group work, pair works require being together, coming together. In this distance education, we couldn't do much of this. There was no interaction, speaking.”*

P15: *“When we teach English, the number of lessons is very important because we have to give four skills. We have to make students write, read, talk and listen. But unfortunately, English lessons decreased from 4 hours a week to 2 hours during the pandemic process... And the lesson time decreased from 40 minutes to 30 minutes. Unfortunately, we did not have time to do all skills.”*

P12: *“I believe that I can transfer language education very effectively in face-to-face education, but I have difficulties in online education.”*

P3: *“I couldn't use English very well because there are some online problems with students. They couldn't hear me. Sometimes they couldn't understand... They couldn't get my voice so well because of disconnection. I couldn't use English so good for all the skills... Speaking was the worst I think. In English language teaching, using the target language is very important. But we could not do it enough... My students couldn't get the sentence patterns so well. I think, they learned the vocabulary better.”*

P2: *“Ok, I can give grammar, I can give the vocabulary, but some skills, unfortunately I have to pass.”*

P1: *“I think speaking is at the background. Because when the students don't see one another they do not want to have interaction. Anyone doesn't want to speak to computer... Students don't want to write, they take screenshots, new way of writing. In reading there is no problem, they read. I can apply listening activities. Sometimes they don't understand, I help them.”*

P8: *“Speaking and listening activities were not at the desired level due to sound problems, some students not having microphones... In the same way, we had problem in group work activities.”*

P4: *“Since the sound is not transmitted well to the other party in online training, we did not listen too much. I tried to do it myself. This bored the students more, I don’t think it was too productive.”*

P9: *“I don’t know whether there are some teachers who can apply all the skills via online education, but I can not do it. The only thing I did was grammar mostly, solving the problems, tests and reading. I tried to do the other skills but I have to admit that it was failure.”*

P11: *“I could not do all the activities that I did in face-to-face teaching in online training. I had to reduce activities to minimum.”*

According to reflections of EFL teachers on the interviews, all the challenges they experienced and the limitations on teaching of English online caused them to have “negative feelings” such as “inadequacy”, “loneliness”, “helplessness”, “anxiety”, “exhaustion”, “boredom”, “frustration” and “disappointment” during online courses, as stated in the following excerpts:

P15: *“I felt inadequate to reach my students.”*

P2: *“The problems affect me badly... because I feel inefficient.”*

P10: *“I feel restricted, inadequate... I am waiting for the days when we will get rid of online education.”*

P1: *“I do not feel sufficient, I do not feel relaxed... Well, sometimes I feel that there is no one... I am alone... Talking to myself.”*

P6: *“It is so bad that you feel helpless as you can’t do anything.”*

P7: *“At first, like all our fellow teachers, we had concerns... We were anxious... because we did not have a good control on online platform.”*

P4: *“Absolutely, being in front of the screen is exhausting.”*

P8: *“This online education process was a completely exhausting process.”*

P9: *“All the time I am the speaker and doer and this is extra tiring... I feel miserable because the bound between me and my students has been cut by the pandemia... I do not feel enough for them.”*

P11: *“When the internet connection went out, I tried to re-enter the lesson many times. This became a serious source of impatience, boredom and weariness for me.”*

P13: *“I feel very nervous because the time is very short and the break is only 10 minutes. Sometimes we attend classes for 7 hours a day...There is no lunch hour, there is no break.”* P14: *“During the first times of pandemic, due to connection problems, and inexperience of me and my students in online teaching, I felt frustrated during the lessons.”*

P5: *“When I attend the course I feel like ‘Okay, this time it will be different’, but it does not change. That is why I feel disappointed. I feel moody, I feel bad.”*

P3: *“I don’t feel like I’m a teacher because I’m not in the classroom. A teacher should be in the classroom and with his or her students... I didn’t get accustomed to this system.”*

Findings on Positive Outcomes of the Pandemic Online Education for EFL Teachers

Although on one hand online teaching was mostly a tough process and had a diminishing effect on EFL teachers’ overall teacher self-efficacy, EFL teachers had some positive reflections on the process, in that, according to them the negative outcomes of online teaching raised their “awareness” and “willingness” for “professional development about online education”, and their “interest in applied trainings” for better implementation of online teaching was increased. It was understood from their responses that most of them were willing for self-development and interested in getting professional development support through an applied in-service training about the methodology of online teaching, as stated in the following excerpts:

P13: *“I think that learning never ends in any period of life. Especially for humans... We saw that the teachers were unprepared and I definitely think we need training in this regard.”*

P3: *“We should prepare ourselves for everything as teachers.”*

P4: *“I would definitely like to learn and address the learning system of the students in online education, about how the student can be sufficient in online education, what he can get, how we can give this, etc.”*

P2: *“If this situation will continue so, I can be willing for an in-service training to overcome problems I face in online education.”*

P8: *“If there is a training that will be productive, practical, efficient, not theoretical, I would like to participate voluntarily.”*

P10: *“We definitely need it. There are tutorials of this that I have participated online recently... But I don’t think it’s very useful... I think that this should be given on applied face-to-face education.”*

P9: *“If I know that there would be online education all the time, I would appreciate and attend that because whatever I learn will benefit me.”*

P7: *“I will gladly attend... and I want to make the most of such an in-service training.”*

P5: *“I can attend any courses about online teaching, but I don’t want to attend such courses online, it should include practical training.”*

P6: *“Of course, if a high-quality in-service education is given in my city, an education that does not remain only on paper or theory... If there is an education that includes us in the practice and positions us directly at the center about solving the problem, I would gladly attend it... Because just like this pandemic, there may be other unexpected situations. So we need to prepare ourselves for the possibilities.”*

P12: *“I would participate it lovingly. In fact, it can be given to parents or even students... Education is not one-sided... Collaboration between students, teachers and parents is required.”*

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

4.1. Overview of the Study

This research study aimed at examining Turkish EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy during the Covid-19 pandemic, understanding whether or not there is a relationship between their online teaching self-efficacy levels and some of their demographic characteristics (i.e. age, gender, teaching experience, online teaching experience, pre-service and in-service education on use of educational technologies), and understanding their reflections on the pandemic online education process. Accordingly, this section covers a discussion of the quantitative and qualitative findings achieved at the end of data collection and analysis phases in line with the research questions of the study in order to draw conclusions and make suggestions for further research based on the implications and limitations of the study.

Research Question 1: “What are the online teaching self-efficacy levels of Turkish EFL teachers during the Covid-19 pandemic?”

The study first examined what levels of online teaching self-efficacy Turkish EFL teachers had during the Covid-19 pandemic online education. Quantitative results revealed that the average online teaching self-efficacy of participant EFL teachers was at a medium level in totality. In other words, the online teaching self-efficacy of EFL teachers was not deep at the bottom but was not at desirably high levels, either. In fact, the qualitative findings on interviews showed that such a result originated not only from EFL teachers' self-perceptions about their teaching abilities in pandemic online lessons but it was also caused by the problems and limitations they faced during such a challenging time. Research on the pandemic online education has showed that the process was challenging for the majority of its practitioners because it had many drawbacks. According to some research, “the separation between teachers and their students” (Moore, 2014), instructors' “lack of online teaching experience” (Johnson et al, 2020) and their “difficulties in the application of information-communication, Education and Information Technologies techniques, problems in sustaining interaction with students, organising online learning resources and lack of sufficient facilities for students” (Verma et al, 2020) are among the drawbacks of the pandemic online teaching (as cited in Ma et al, 2021, p. 2). Some studies have suggested that organising effective online language teaching activities and delivering them in online environments was not

a comfortable process for EFL teachers and that online teaching during the pandemic had disadvantages for them besides advantages (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Khatoony and Nezhadmehr (2020) examined a group of Iranian EFL teachers and the problems they encountered in online courses during the Covid-19 pandemic. Results showed that they encountered challenges such as limited materials appropriate for online teaching, students' low levels of attention and motivation during online courses, and insufficient funding for educational institutions (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Most of the Turkish participants in this study revealed they experienced similar drawbacks and limitations on their online teaching practices during the Covid-19 pandemic. As Hampton et al. (2020) stated, "greater levels of online teacher self-efficacy are correlated with greater teaching satisfaction" in virtual teaching environments ($r = 0.64$, $p < 0.001$; as cited in Culp-Roche et al., 2021, p. 2). Unfortunately, this was observed *visa versa* in this study as Turkish EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy levels were not high due to the diminishing effect of challenges in the process, and thus they could not achieve as much job satisfaction and self-efficacy as it should be. In another study, Lestiyanawati (2020) focused on Indonesian EFL teachers' practices and problems in online teaching during the Covid-19 outbreak. Results indicated that Indonesian EFL teachers encountered problems such as lack of information about how to access technologies and virtual educational activities, inability to use and define virtual teaching materials, and student-related problems such as their lack of access to Internet due to economical disadvantages. Despite all these problems, the participant EFL teachers agreed that after they got accustomed and learned enough about how to better conduct online courses, the online teaching and learning system made things easier for them during the pandemic distant education (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). Unlike the Indonesian EFL teachers, Turkish EFL teachers in this study could not manage the process successfully enough as their undesired online teaching self-efficacy levels and the problems of the process lowered their effectiveness and success in the pandemic online education, their ability to overcome encountered problems was limited, their language teaching activities were hindered, they experienced negative feelings during online courses, and their motivation and willingness for continuing the process was diminished. Such results of the study might contribute to the literature about the negations and limitations on EFL teachers amid such a worldwide condition as Covid-19 pandemic, and they can assist in stressing the significance of refining EFL teachers' online working conditions and enhancing EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy beliefs. It also might help

raise awareness about EFL teachers' needs for activities, programmes and trainings that might reinforce them emotionally, psychologically and professionally. Any refinement on these aspects of EFL teachers might contribute to their teacher self-efficacy and online teaching self-efficacy levels, help them demonstrate more positive attitudes towards their teaching practices, achieve more job satisfaction, be more flexible and open to sudden changes in their profession and changing teaching environments, feel more efficient and develop more effective strategies to cope with adversities and challenges on their language teaching path.

Research Question 2: “Does the online teaching self-efficacy of participants differ according to their personal aspects such as age, gender, years of teaching experience, having online teaching experience before the pandemic, and having participated in an in-service or pre-service training on use of educational technologies?”

The study interrogated whether there is a relationship between participant EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy and their demographic characteristics such as age, gender, years of teaching experience, online teaching experience, and participation in in-service and pre-service trainings on use of educational technologies. Findings showed that Turkish EFL teachers' average online teaching self-efficacy in totality did not change according to any of these variables. However, the demographic variable of age was found to be influential on their online teaching self-efficacy for *Student Engagement* sub-dimension and the variable of gender had an impact on their online teaching self-efficacy for *Use of Computers* sub-dimension. Apart from the variables of age and gender, other variables were not influential on any sub-dimension of participants' online teaching self-efficacy.

The fact that older EFL teachers regarded themselves more successful and had higher self-efficacy levels than the younger EFL teachers in terms of adding their students to online lessons aroused curiosity in the qualitative phase of this study. When asked about the possible reasons behind such a result, most of the participants considered older EFL teachers' overall teaching experience to be influential on their abilities to sustain better student engagement in pandemic online courses. Accordingly, thanks to their teaching experience, older EFL teachers were regarded to be more competent about teaching styles and materials, classroom management, use of educational technology, cooperation and communication with their students and parents, and thus they had more self-confidence and authority, which assisted them in better engaging and including

students in their online classes during the Covid-19 pandemic. In a similar study by Shresth (2019), it was observed that “teachers of older age groups expressed greater satisfaction with their work than their younger colleagues” during the online education process (as cited in Bartosiewicz et al., 2022, p. 14), which is consistent with the results of this study in terms of older Turkish EFL teachers’ higher self-efficacy levels, because according to Bartosiewicz et al. (2022) “there is a close relationship between teachers’ level of self- efficacy and job satisfaction” (p. 2). Such results about the positive impact of older EFL teachers’ teaching experience on their self-efficacy and job satisfaction are significant, because originally on the scale scores of the ETSEOTS, participants’ years of teaching experience were not observed to be an influential on their average online teaching self-efficacy. Furthermore, it is interesting that in this study most of the participants interpreted older ages as being more experienced in teaching. Although this might be true to some extents, there might be exceptions like older EFL teachers who newly started teaching. Even so, their lifelong experiences, either professional or not, might bring in more flexible crisis management and problem solving abilities for them compared to younger EFL teachers. On the other hand, this was a surprising result because the younger EFL teachers are expected to show more successful fulfillment on a technological teaching platform in many aspects considering the assumption that young people have more familiarity and engagement with technological tools in their daily lives. In fact, this was observed in a study on EFL teachers’ self-efficacy, job satisfaction and professional burnout during the Covid-19 pandemic online education. According to the study’ findings, “younger teachers and teachers with work experience from 1 to 5 years showed a higher level of job satisfaction” and self-efficacy “compared to older people working from 6 to 20 years” (Lisowska, 2017, as cited in Bartosiewicz et al., 2022, p. 14). Lisowska’s research result is opposite to the findings of this study about older Turkish EFL teachers’ higher self-efficacy levels in student engagement. In this sense, the results of this study and Shresth’s (2019) findings about older EFL teachers’ higher levels of self-efficacy and job satisfaction in online education provide implications for younger EFL teachers about the importance of teaching experience. Thus, it can be suggested that they need to improve their online teaching abilities, develop better student engagement and communication skills in line with the requirements of virtual teaching platforms so that they can compensate for their lacks of teaching experience compared to their older colleagues.

The quantitative result that participant male EFL teachers had higher self-efficacy levels than female EFL teachers in terms of using computers in online lessons was another point of questioning on the interviews. In fact, the interview responses by Turkish EFL teachers in this study revealed that some factors are influential on such a difference on the results of male and female EFL teachers. First, male EFL teachers are assumed to be more interested in technology and technological tools, and thus are more capable for using computers, smart tools and internet. Besides, women's social gender roles are lowering their opportunities for technology usage in daily life. In the patriarchal Turkish society, women are burdened with responsibilities such as house keeping, child raising and cooking at home. Unfortunately, this does not change even if the woman is a teacher, doctor, etc. and they have to fulfill their responsibilities at home together with the workloads in their professional lives. Whereas, men are held exempt from such responsibilities and thus they are more free in many aspects. They have much more free time and opportunities both at home and outside for attending social life activities, following technological developments, playing computer games and so on. In line with this study's findings, another study by Ghanbari and Nowroozi (2021) revealed that "maintaining the work-life balance was a constant challenge especially for the female teachers" during the pandemic online education process, because "they had to manage their household chores which overlapped with their online classes" (p.10). In other words, females' social gender roles seem to have had diminishing impact on their online teaching self-efficacy levels not only in Turkey but also in any patriarchal society. Similarly, in Chen's (2012) study about Taiwanese EFL teachers' computer self-efficacy and computer anxiety, the collected data revealed that "male teachers perceived themselves as having higher computer self-efficacy" (p. 100). Compeau & Higgins (1995) defined computer self-efficacy as a person's perceived ability to manage a task by using computers. In this regards, ability in use of computers has been related with computer self-efficacy in literature. According to Bandura's perspective in Social Cognitive Theory, people with powerful computer self-efficacy beliefs feel more comfortable when using computers and regard themselves as successful computer technology users (Compeau & Higgins, 1995). Therefore, results of this study regarding male and female Turkish EFL teachers' different self-efficacy levels for computer use in online courses should not be attributed to gender only, because research has shown that teachers' abilities for computer use might increase with substantial instruction about integration of technology, pedagogy and course content, which may

contribute to further development of their particular competencies and self-efficacy beliefs about online education (Liu & Kleinsasser, 2015). Rather, results of this study can be interpreted as a natural outcome of different amounts of time, opportunities and interests put in technology usage by any person, either male or female. As a whole, it is an important result on behalf of female EFL teachers as it might raise awareness in the educational community about the negative impacts of the inequalities between men and women on female EFL teachers' competency and effectiveness in their teaching profession. Moreover, it may encourage the decision makers in educational system to apply positive discrimination for women by setting on activities and workshops that enable female EFL teachers to improve their technology usage abilities. In this way, negative impacts of women's social gender roles on their professional lives can be mitigated to some extent.

The self-efficacy theories generally point out the idea that if one person has successful previous fulfillments in an activity, they have a higher level of self-efficacy in doing that activity compared to those who do not have successful previous fulfillments in the same activity. However, results in this study showed that online teaching self-efficacy of the participant EFL teachers was not influenced positively by their pre-pandemic online teaching experience and that their online teaching self-efficacy levels did not show significant differences regardless of whether or not they had online teaching experience before the pandemic. It was suggested through participants' views that the pandemic online education process was a new and extraordinary situation for all EFL teachers and it probably had differences from the pre-pandemic online teaching activities in terms of planning, organization, scope, purpose, infrastructure, technological opportunities, and student participation. In fact, some scholars called the transition to online education during Covid-19 pandemic as a "crisis online course transition" or emergency remote teaching and suggested that it involved some circumstances that ordinary "online course development does not have to face":

Those circumstances were (1) a need to rapidly, with little to no preparation, transition instruction online; (2) execute the transition online and subsequent online instruction under traumatic conditions of a pandemic; and (3) pursue extended online teaching with little to no information regarding if this transition to online teaching will be temporary or more permanent (Cutri et al., 2020, p. 524).

It was also suggested that EFL teachers who had previous online teaching experience might have disregarded the pandemic online education process by not attaching enough importance and devotion to it, as they thought it would be similar with their previous online teaching experiences. As a result, their online teaching self-efficacy levels during the pandemic were not higher than that of other EFL teachers with no previous online teaching experiences. However, in an empirical study by Zhang et al. (2014) it was stated that the effectiveness of online “distance education depends greatly on teachers’ active participation” (p. 335). In other words, teachers’ self-efficacy and devotion in their online teaching abilities and roles are the main determinants on successful achievements in an online teaching platform. Bailey and Lee (2020) investigated how online teaching experience affected EFL teachers’ way of handling problems during the pandemic in distant online courses at a South Korean university. Unlike this study’s findings about Turkish EFL teachers, Bailey and Lee reported that among the participant EFL university instructors those with online teaching experience had less problems and were able to utilise variant communicative tools and activities easily in their online courses (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). This might be because the South Korean EFL teachers had more devotion to the pandemic online education process compared to Turkish EFL teachers in this study. All such research results are important in raising EFL teachers’ awareness about their lacks of devotion to the process as well as self-development and professional development needs for updated online teaching facilities so that they become more ready and equipped for new situations in their professional life.

On the interviews, possible reasons for why having received pre-service and in-service training on use of educational technologies did not influence Turkish EFL teachers’ pandemic online teaching self-efficacy significantly were also questioned. Participants reported that perhaps the pre-service and in-service educations taken by EFL teachers stayed on theoretical level, were superficial and inefficient, and that EFL teachers probably participated in such educations passively and unwillingly. Consequently, they could not transfer the learnings of those trainings into practice during the pandemic online education. Further reasons were revealed on interviews, in that, even if the received education was sufficient, low student participation in pandemic online courses might have negated the effective implementation of it in practice. Participants also suggested that the changing conditions from the times when pre-service and in-service training was taken by EFL teachers, and the fact that today

almost everybody is familiar with technology in daily life and that technology is easily learned by daily use might have resulted in their inefficiency in pandemic online lessons. It was also suggested by participants that due to the uncertain conditions of pandemic and online education process, even if they got efficient prior education about use of educational technology, they could not feel relaxed enough in online courses to transfer gainings of their pre-service and in-service trainings into practice. In a quantitative study, Graziano et al. (2023) examined 51 secondary school teachers' self-efficacy to teach online after they participated an online, six-week professional development training program on the implementation of distance online education. Findings of their study revealed that participation of teachers in the program impacted their self-efficacy domains for online teaching in a positive way. In other words, a quality and applied training on use of educational technologies might provide EFL teachers with higher self-efficacy levels in online teaching compared to inefficient, theoretical and superficial trainings. Besides, EFL teachers can benefit such applied trainings more willingly and put their learning outcomes into practice more easily. Such research results are significant to catch the decision makers' attention about transforming in-service and pre-service trainings that are filled with theoretic information into more beneficial applied educations for EFL teachers. For this purpose, online teaching methodology and its practical application needs to be included both in the pre-service education taken within teacher education programmes and in in-service trainings administered to EFL teachers for professional development. Especially the pre-service education provided to prospective teachers at educational faculties of universities needs to be revised to fulfill the requirements of developments in educational technology and the new trends of teaching environments in the 21st century.

Research Question 3: “What are Turkish EFL teachers’ reflections on the pandemic online education?”

Another important purpose of this research study was to understand Turkish EFL teachers' reflections on the pandemic online education process. For this purpose, the semi-structured interview that was administered to 15 participants interrogated EFL teachers' views on their problems, limitations, feelings, language teaching activities and willingness for development during the pandemic online education process. The responses on interviews revealed that almost all the participant EFL teachers experienced problems about poor internet connection, insufficient infrastructure and

lacks of technological tools both for themselves and their students, which all together caused EFL teachers to have difficulty in sustaining student participation, engagement and classroom management in their online courses. The interview results also suggested that due to lack of student participation and their unwillingness to join and speak in online classes there was considerably less interaction compared with face-to-face education, and EFL teachers had less opportunities to get eye contact with and attain feedbacks from their students about their language learning outcomes. This result of the study is significant as to better understand the superiority of face-to-face education over online education in terms of providing more substantial language teaching and learning opportunities for EFL teachers and learners. Moreover, as they asserted, some EFL teachers could not adapt and incorporate educational technologies, teaching materials and applications successfully in their online courses, because although they were accustomed to use them in the pre-pandemic face-to-face education, the online platform was a new, different and challenging teaching environment where it was hard for them to accomplish such technological fulfillments. Unfortunately, EFL teachers could find little or no solution for such problems, because the sources of most problems were technical and technological deficiencies that were beyond EFL teachers to achieve and find solutions. In fact, some researches have suggested that organising effective online language teaching activities and delivering them in online environments was not a comfortable process for EFL teachers and that online teaching during the pandemic had disadvantages for EFL teachers besides advantages. Khatoony and Nezhadmehr (2020) examined a group of Iranian EFL teachers and the problems they encountered in online courses during the Covid-19 pandemic. Results showed that although Iranian EFL teachers were able to incorporate digital applications successfully on virtual platforms for their online courses, they still encountered challenges resulting from some other factors like limited materials appropriate for online teaching, students' low levels of attention and motivation during online courses, and insufficient funding for educational institutions. Yi and Jang (2020) searched about the online teaching activities of EFL teachers in two schools in South Korea. Their study revealed that all practitioners of the pandemic online teaching; teachers, students, parents, and administrators; had difficulties in dealing with the period. On the other hand, unlike the findings of this study about Turkish EFL teachers, their findings showed that the unexpected crisis upon the online teaching urged South Korean EFL teachers to use innovative tools and get more cooperated in their online instructional activities (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021).

Similarly, Tamah et al. (2020) examined language teachers' online teaching activities during the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia. According to findings of their study, although at the beginning the participants were facing problems about incorporating effective teaching materials in their online courses due to lack of technological knowledge, within a short time the Indonesian EFL teachers, improved much about how to use educational technology in online courses (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). All such research results are significant as for raising decision makers' awareness about the importance and necessity of eliminating or minimizing possible problems and limitations in EFL teachers' future online teaching environments in order to improve their motivation, job satisfaction and self-efficacy beliefs.

Qualitative data revealed more information about how the aforementioned problems diminished their language teaching activities and restricted the teaching of English language skills and aspects for them. Just as any language, the teaching of English language requires interaction with and among students. Besides, audials and visuals need to be incorporated in language courses by means of listening and speaking activities. However, as EFL teachers stated on interviews, due to time limitations and connection problems in online courses they had to keep their language teaching activities short and eliminate some time-taking speaking and listening activities. Moreover, they could not teach some of the grammatical patterns as effectively as in face-to-face education. Findings of a similar study conducted with 70 Turkish EFL teachers showed that "EFL teachers do not feel capable of delivering online instruction effectively since they do not have adequate knowledge and necessary skills to do that" (Civelek et al., 2021, p. 87). In Pakistan, Mukhtar et al. (2020) included both EFL teachers and students in their study to explore pros and disadvantages of pandemic online language teaching. Unlike this study's findings about Turkish EFL teachers, Mukhtar et al.'s study indicated that online courses were advantageous for both teachers and students as they are comfortable and accessible but still they were not efficient enough as for fulfilling all the educational goals of language teaching and learning (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021). In another study by Al-Khresheh (2021) about the impacts of pandemic on Jordanian EFL teachers, participants reported that in online teaching they had limited language teaching facilities due to limited e-content, and that in order to organize and sustain a substantial online language class they had to be equipped with specialized skills as for its "presuming, planning, preparing, and performing" (as cited in Alolaywi, 2021, p. 2026). Such research results are in line with this study's findings

about the fact that Turkish EFL teachers could not give all the linguistic aspects and skills of English due to the limitations of the process and their lack of knowledge and skills about the conduction of online education. Moreover, these are all significant results in terms of raising awareness about a quick requirement for eliminating the limitations in EFL teachers' future online teaching experiences in addition to fostering their lacking knowledge and skills for better delivery of English language skills and activities in virtual teaching environments.

All in all, the pandemic online education was a challenging process full of problems and limitations for EFL teachers which they could not interfere and find sufficient solutions. Even worse, they could not teach all the aspects and skills about English language as successfully as in face-to-face education. All these caused them to have negative feelings during online lessons and diminished their online teaching self-efficacy. Participant EFL teachers reported on interviews that they felt inadequate and inefficient, lonely, helpless, anxious, exhausted, bored, disappointed and frustrated during online courses because of the aforementioned problems and limitations. In line with this study's findings, in another study about EFL teachers' affective barriers and teaching stress during the assessment of pandemic online courses, participants revealed that they felt exhausted because "preparing online tests while considering the content, time, and situation of the students along with maintaining the work-life balance" were challenging, and that they felt "self-isolated" due to the negative impacts of "national quarantine order" on their "mental health" (Ghanbari and Nowroozi, 2021, p.9). Such findings together with this study's results about Turkish EFL teachers are significant in terms for providing better understanding and arising attention about EFL teachers' emotional and psychological needs amid challenging teaching processes such as the pandemic online education. They might also encourage stakeholders of educational system to provide professional development support for EFL teachers by means of activities and trainings that will foster their emotional-regulative skills and crisis management abilities, which, in turn, might help raise their motivation and overall teacher self-efficacy beliefs.

Apart from the negative aspects of the pandemic online education, the process had one positive outcome for Turkish EFL teachers. The only aspect of the pandemic online education that EFL teachers had positive reflections on was that they understood better how the challenging online teaching process raised their awareness for their lacking abilities required for a better conduction and control of language teaching on a virtual

platform. Participant EFL teachers realized that online language teaching differed in many aspects from face-to-face education and that it required them to have more knowledge and practical ability as for how to implement technological devices, educational technologies and virtual materials in online courses through effective teaching and delivery strategies. As a result, most of the participants declared their willingness, interest and need for a substantial and applied in-service training that provides not only theoretical information but also opportunities for practical implementation of the online teaching methodology. Similar to this study's findings, in a study by Önal et al. (2022) about prospective EFL teachers' readiness for online teaching, participants revealed that "they expected their department/faculty to provide them with a more structured and efficient training in terms of improving their technology integration skills into their instruction" (p.109). We can consider such demands of EFL teachers for applied trainings as a call for help from decision makers and planners in the educational community to provide them professional development support for achieving more substantial online teaching practices. Therefore, it is crucial to prepare EFL teachers for unexpected situations that may force them to change or adapt their teaching activities in parallel with the requirements of new teaching environments. In this sense, as suggested both by the participants of this study and in the study of Civelek et al. (2021), "online instruction methodology should be integrated into teacher training programs and teachers should receive an in-service training about the related subject" (p. 87). In this way, EFL teachers might feel more confident and efficacious rather than feeling like a fish out of water when they encounter new situations about online teaching in their future professional life.

4.2. Implications

Several implications can be drawn upon the findings of this study both for EFL teachers and the decision makers in the educational community. First of all, regarding the fact that the effectiveness of EFL teachers' language teaching activities in online education platforms is highly dependent on the technical infrastructure and facilities offered to them, it is highly significant that they are supported and provided with required substantial infrastructure and more opportunities by school institutions and stakeholders of educational system. They need to focus more on EFL teachers' emotional, psychological and professional needs and invest more in applied and updated in-service and pre-service trainings for enhancement of their online language teaching

abilities so that EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for online teaching are fostered. In this sense, firstly they should go to renovations in the teacher education system at universities and update it to a contemporary equivalent system which incorporates applied education on online teaching in addition to face-to-face education. Moreover, refinements on EFL teachers' online working conditions need to be done to raise their motivation, job satisfaction, competence and self-efficacy levels in online teaching.

Also, female EFL teachers' needs for in-service trainings such as additional workshops and activities for them about technology usage and other requirements of online teaching need to be taken into consideration and provided by the educational institutions and decision makers so that female EFL teachers can catch up with male colleagues in their profession. It is also significant that female EFL teachers take part in such trainings and activities voluntarily and take advantage of every opportunity that might contribute to their personal and professional development. In this way, the negative influences of women's social gender roles on their professional lives can be mitigated to a certain degree.

Finally, it is vital that younger EFL teachers are supported both by the system holders and their experienced colleagues as for improving their abilities in student engagement, classroom management and instructional strategies in line with the requirements of both face-to-face education and online teaching platforms in order to compensate for their lacks of experience compared to their older experienced colleagues. All such refinements and contributions by decision makers and EFL teachers in their personal and professional development may reinforce them emotionally, psychologically and professionally. This might also foster their motivation, teacher self-efficacy and online teaching self-efficacy beliefs, help them demonstrate more positive attitudes towards their teaching practices, have more job satisfaction, be more flexible and open to sudden changes, and develop more effective strategies to cope with adversities and challenges in changing teaching environments within their profession.

4.3. Suggestions for Further Research

Several suggestions for further research can be made based on the implications and limitations of this research study. In this sense, a similar study with a larger scope of participants from different cities in Turkey might provide more comprehensive data about different aspects of Turkish EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy during the

Covid-19 pandemia. Moreover, a comparative study between EFL teachers who teach at state schools and those teaching at private schools might provide a better understanding of the differences between their online teaching self-efficacy levels regarding the impact of their students' different socio-economical backgrounds on the levels of student participation in online courses. Finally, a future research could be conducted by investigating both EFL teachers' and students' perspectives on the online education implemented during the Covid-19 pandemia, which would depict a more comprehensive picture of the process in terms of online English language teaching and learning facilities of EFL teachers and their learners.

4.4. Limitations of the Study

According to Price and Murnan (2004), the limitations in a research study are based on its methodological aspects and research design selection, which influence the results of the study significantly. In this sense, this research has several limitations which might have impacted the findings of the study. The first limitation is that the study was conducted with a limited scope of participants because the participants were chosen among EFL teachers from only one city of Turkey, that is Siirt province, due to lack of access to a larger scope of participants in other cities. This resulted both from the strict Covid-19 pandemic measurements applied at that time and the formal permission issues related with the conduction of the study itself. The study's limitation about participants also derives from the fact that it was conducted with only EFL teachers working at state schools, discluding those who worked at private schools. If the private school EFL teachers were included in the study, the findings might have shown differences due to the fact that students at private schools come from higher socio-economical backgrounds and thus they possess better opportunities for technological tools, etc, which would have increased student participation in online courses and thus affected EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy levels positively. For this reason, the findings might not represent and can not be generalised for all EFL teachers in Turkey. Therefore, a similar study with a larger scope of participants from different cities in Turkey involving EFL teachers from state and private schools equally would produce more comprehensive findings.

Secondly, data collection in this study was done by means of a scale and an interview, excluding observations due to the lockdowns during the Covid-19 pandemia. If observations on Turkish EFL teachers' online teaching practices were done, results

could have yielded more detailed information about their online teaching practices and self-efficacy during the pandemic.

Another limitation of this study is that students were excluded from the research and only EFL teachers' views were obtained. If students' views were included, a more in-depth understanding of English language teaching and learning during the pandemic online education process could have been attained.

Despite such limitations, this study is significant for the fact that participant EFL teachers had variant demographical characteristics about age, gender, teaching experience, online teaching experience, and in-service/pre-service training on use of educational technologies. Moreover, multiple data collection tools were utilized to gather both quantitative and qualitative data. Therefore, findings of this study might open up new perspectives for researchers about the relationship between the aforementioned variables of participants and their online teaching self-efficacy, and it may provide a substantial depiction of Turkish EFL teachers' reflections on such a challenging process as pandemic online education. Moreover, the implications of the study might raise awareness about how to refine EFL teachers' working conditions and increase their professional development opportunities for online education so that they can keep up with the requirements of new trends in education and adapt to changing teaching environments as highly self-efficacious teachers.

REFERENCES

- Afsaneh, G., & Safoura, J. (2015). An exploration of EFL learners' perceptions of classroom activities and their achievement goal orientations. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 4(3), 33-45.
- Alemi, M., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2013). Efl teachers' self-efficacy beliefs in teaching literature. *The International Journal of Literacies*, 19(2), 25-36.
- Alkan, C. (1987). *Open Education: A Contrastive Study of Distance Education Systems*. Ankara: Ankara University Educational Sciences Faculty Publications, No: 157.
- Alolaywi, Y. (2021). Teaching online during the COVID-19 pandemic: Teachers' perspectives. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(4), 2022-2045. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.146
- Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers sense of efficacy and student achievement*. Longman.
- Aydın, C. Ç., & Tırkes, G. (2010). Open source learning management systems in distance learning. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(2), 175-184.
- Bakioğlu, B., & Çevik, M. (2020). Science Teachers' Views on Distance Education in the COVID-19 Pandemic Process. *Turkish Studies*, 15(4), 109-129. <https://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.43502>
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 248-287.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self - efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2(1), 21-41.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(3) 75-78.
- Bartosiewicz, A., Łuszczki, E., Zaręba, L., Kuchciak, M., Bobula, G., Dereń, K., & Król, P. (2022). Assessment of job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and the level of professional burnout of primary and secondary school teachers in Poland during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PeerJ*, 10(13349). <http://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.13349>
- Bates, A. W. (1999). *Managing technological change: Strategies for college and university leaders*. Jossey-Bass.

- Bates, A. W. (2005). *Technology, e-Learning and Distance Education*. Routledge.
- Berman, P., McLaughlin, M., Bass, G., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1977). *Federal programs supporting educational change: Factors affecting implementation and continuation* (Vol. 7). Rand.
- Black, M. R. (2019). *A Comparative Analysis Of Teacher Self-Efficacy Scores Of Online Business Faculty Based On Educational Background*. [Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University]. <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/2136/>
- Brosnan, M. (1998). *Technophobia: The psychological impact of informational technology*. Routledge.
- Caner, M. (2012). The definition of blended learning in higher education. In P. S. Anastasiades (Ed.), *Blended Learning Environments for Adults: Evaluations and Frameworks*. (pp. 19-34). IGI Global.
- Caner, M. (2016). Distance Language Education: Teaching Beyond the Walls. In İ. Yaman, E.
- Ekmekçi, & M. Şenel (Eds), *Current Trend in ELT* (pp. 214-225). Nüans Publishing.
- Cantrell, M. J. (1982). An assessment of attitudes, needs, and delivery system for microcomputer applications by agricultural and extension educators in Mississippi. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 43, 3488A.
- Cascio, M. I., Magnano, P., Elastico, S., Costantino, V., Zapparrata, V., & Battiato, A. (2014). The Relationship among Self-Efficacy Beliefs, External Locus of Control and Work Stress in Public Setting Schoolteachers. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(11), 149-156. doi:10.4236/jss.2014.211021
- Chacon, T. C. (2005). Teacher' perceived efficacy among EFL teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(3), 257-272.
- Chen, T. C. (2002). A survey of practices and beliefs of fifth and sixth grade English teachers concerning elementary English education in Taiwan. UMI Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, USA.
- Chen, K. T. (2012). Elementary Efl teachers' computer phobia and computer self-efficacy in Taiwan. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 11(2), 100-107.
- Chua, S. L., Chen, D., and Wong, A. F. L. (1999). Computer anxiety and its correlates: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 15(5), 609–623.

- Civelek, M., Toplu, I., and Uzun, L. (2021). Turkish EFL teachers' attitudes towards online instruction throughout the Covid-19 outbreak. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 4(2), 87-98.
- Compeau, D. R., & Higgins, C. A. (1995). Computer self-efficacy: Development of a measure and initial test. *MIS Quarterly*, 19(2), 189–211.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. SAGE publications.
- Culp-Roche, A., Hardin-Fanning, F., Tartavouille, T., Hampton, D., Hensley, A., Wilson, J. L., and Wiggins, A. T. (2021). Perception of online teacher self-efficacy: A multi-state study of nursing faculty pivoting courses during COVID 19. *Nurse Education Today*, 106(105064), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2021.105064>
- Cutri, R. M., Mena, J., & Whiting, E. F. (2020). Faculty readiness for online crisis teaching: transitioning to online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 523-541. DOI: 10.1080/02619768.2020.1815702
- Çağlar, F. Ö. (2019). Relationships among possible selves, motivations and self-efficacy beliefs of senior student teachers of English. Ph.D. Dissertation. <http://www.openaccess.hacettepe.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/handle/11655/8052>
- Dellinger, A. B., Bobbett, J. J., Olivier, D. F., & Ellett, C. D. (2008). Measuring teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Development and use of the TEBS-Self. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(3), 751-766.
- Demiray, U., Inceelli, A., and Candemir, O. (Eds.). (2008). *A Review Literature on The Open Education Faculty (1982-2007) A Revised and Expanded Fifth Edition*. Anadolu University, Open Education Faculty Publications, No: 1015/558. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED504437.pdf>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edvardsson I. R., & Oskarsson, G. K. (2008). Distance education and academic achievement in business administration: The case of the university of Akureyri. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 9(3), 1-12. <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/542/1150>

- Erarslan, A. (2021). English language teaching and learning during Covid-19: A global perspective on the first year. *Journal of Educational Technology & Online Learning*, 4(2), 349-367.
- Eslami, Z. R., & Fatahi, A. (2008). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies: A study of nonnative EFL teachers in Iran. *TESL-EJ*, 11(4), 1-19. <http://tesl-ej.org/ej44/a1.html>
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. (6. Ed.) McGraw Hill.
- Ghaith, G., & Yaghi, H. (1997). Relationships among experience, teacher efficacy, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(4), 451-458. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(96\)00045-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(96)00045-5)
- Ghanbari N., & Nowroozi S. (2021). The practice of online assessment in an EFL context amidst COVID-19 pandemic: views from teachers. *Language Testing in Asia*, 11(27), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-021-00143-4>
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 569–582.
- Graziano, K. J., Collier, S., & Barber, D. (2023). Teachers taking it online: Measuring teachers' self-efficacy to teach online after completing a training program on distance education. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*. DOI: [10.1080/21532974.2023.2210319](https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2023.2210319)
- Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(1), 63–69.
- Harrington, K. V., McElroy, J. C., and Morrow, P. C. (1990). Computer anxiety and computer-based training: A laboratory experiment. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 6(3), 343-358.
- Hebebcı, M. T., Bertiz, Y., and Alan, S. (2020). Investigation of views of students and teachers on distance education practices during the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science (IJTES)*, 4(4), 267-282.
- Heinssen, R. K., Glass, C. R., and Knight, L. A. (1987). Assessing computer anxiety: Development and validation of the computer anxiety rating scale. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 3(1), 49-59.

- Henson, R. K. (2001). Teacher Self-Efficacy: Substantive Implications and Measurement Dilemmas, Paper Submitted in *Annual Educational Research Exchange Conference*, Texas A. M. University, 1-43.
- Herman, K. (2019, April 30). 10 Important Roles of A Good Teacher. International TEFL and TESOL Training. <https://www.teflcourse.net/blog/10-important-roles-of-a-good-teacher-ittt-tefl-blog/>
- Hismanoglu, M. (2012). Prospective EFL Teachers' Perceptions of ICT Integration: A Study of Distance Higher Education in Turkey. *Educational Technology & Society*, 15(1), 185–196.
- Holmberg, B. (1989). *Theory and practice of distance education*. London: Routledge.
- Huangfu, W. (2012). Effects of EFL Teachers' Self-efficacy on Motivational Teaching Behaviors. *Asian Social Science*, 8(15), 68-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n15p68>
- Joe, V.A. (1971). Review of the internal-external control construct as a personality variable. *Psychological Reports*, 28(21), 619-640.
- Karadağ, E., & Yücel, C. (2020). Yeni Tip Koronavirüs Pandemisi Döneminde Üniversitelerde Uzaktan Eğitim: Lisans Öğrencileri Kapsamında Bir Değerlendirme Çalışması (Distance Education at Universities during the Novel Coronavirus Pandemic: An Analysis of Undergraduate Students' Perceptions). *Yükseköğretim Dergisi / Journal of Higher Education*, 10(2), 181-192.
- Krish, P. (2008). Language learning in the virtual world: instructors' voices. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 4(4), 113-129.
- Lane, J., Lane, A., M., and Kyprianou, A. (2004). Self-Efficacy, Self-Esteem And Their Impact On Academic Performance. *Social Behavior And Personality*, 32(3), 247-256. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2004.32.3.247
- Liu, M. H., & Kleinsasser, R. C. (2015). Exploring EFL teachers' CALL knowledge and competencies: In-service program perspectives. *Language Learning & Technology*, 19(1), 119–138. <http://lt.msu.edu/issues/february2015/liukleinsasser.pdf>
- Ma, K., Chutiyami, M., Zhang, Y., & Nicoll, S. (2021). Online teaching self-efficacy during COVID-19: Changes, its associated factors and moderators. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(3-4), 1-23. 10.1007/s10639-021-10486-3.

- Maddux, J. E., & Gosselin, J. T. (2012). Self-efficacy. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 198-224). The Guilford Press.
- MEB [Republic of Turkey Ministry of Education] (2020). Bakan Selçuk, Koronavirüs'e karşı Eğitim alanında alınan tedbirleri açıkladı [Minister Selçuk announced the measures taken in the field of education against coronavirus]. <http://www.meb.gov.tr/bakan-selcuk-koronaviruse-karsi-egitim-alanindaalanan-tedbirleri-acikladi/haber/20497/tr>
- Mercer, S. (2011). *Towards an Understanding of Language Learner Self-Concept*. Lier, L. V., & Hult, F. M. (Eds). *Educational Linguistics*,12. New York, NY: Springer. doi:[10.1007/978-90-481-9569-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9569-5)
- Mercer, S., & Williams, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Multiple Perspectives on the Self in SLA*. UK: Multilingual Matters.
- McIsaac, M.S., & Gunawardena, C.N. (1996). Distance education. In D.H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology: a project of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology*. 403-437. Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- Moore, M. G., & Kearsley, G. (1996). *Distance education: A systems view of online learning*. (3rd ed). Wadsworth.
- Ozkul, A. (2003). E-Öğrenme ve Mühendislik Eğitimi (E-Learning and Engineering Education), Paper presented at the meeting of the Elektrik, Elektronik, Bilgisayar Mühendislikleri Eğitimi 1. Ulusal Sempozyumu (First National Symposium on Electric, Electronic, Computer Engineering Education) Ankara, Turkey.
- Önal, A., Küçükhayrat, C., & Doğanay, E. (2022). Pre-service English Language Teachers' Readiness for Online Teaching. *Language Teaching and Educational Research*, 5(2), 109-125. DOI: [10.35207/later.1129519](https://doi.org/10.35207/later.1129519)
- Özer, M. (2020). Educational policy actions by the ministry of national education in the times of COVID-19. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 28(3), 1124-1129. doi: [10.24106/kefdergi.722280](https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.722280)
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research* 66(4), 543-578. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.932.3251&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

- Pajares, F. (2002). *Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy*.
<http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/eff.html>
- Poe, M., & Stassen, M.L.A. (Eds). (n.d.). *Teaching and Learning Online: Communication, Community, and Assessment. A Handbook for UMass Faculty*.https://www.umass.edu/oapa/sites/default/files/pdf/handbooks/teaching_and_learning_online_handbook.pdf
- Pregowska, A., Masztalerz, K., Garlińska, M., & Osial, M. (2021). A Worldwide Journey through Distance Education - From the Post Office to Virtual, Augmented and Mixed Realities, and Education during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Educ. Sci.*, *11*(118), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11030118>
- Price, J. H., & Murnan, J. (2004). Research limitations and the necessity of reporting them. *American Journal of Health Education*, *35*(2), 66.
- Rachman, S. (1998). *Anxiety*. Psychology Press Ltd.
- Raofi, S., Tan, B. H., and Chan, S. H. (2012). Self-efficacy in second/ foreign language learning contexts. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(11), 60-73.
- Robinia, K. (2008). Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale.
- Romi, S., & Leyser, Y. (2006) Exploring inclusion pre-service training needs: A study of variables associated with attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *21*(1), 85-105.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monograph*, *80*(1), 1-28. (whole No.609).
- Ruzgar, N. S. (2004). Distance Education in Turkey. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *5*(2), 22-32.
- Sales, G. C. (2009). Preparing Teachers to Teach Online In *Encyclopedia of Distance Learning, Second Edition*. 1665-1672. doi:10.4018/978-1-60566-198-8.ch244
- Schroeder, S. L. (2013, December 24). The Remarkable Human Self. Association for Psychological Science. <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/the-remarkable-human-self>
- Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2009). Self-efficacy theory. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 35-53), Routledge.
- Sharma, U., Loreman, T., and Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *12*(1), 12-21.

- Song, L., Singleton, E. S., Hill, J. R., & Koh, M. H. (2004). Improving online learning: Student perceptions of useful and challenging characteristics. *Internet and Higher Education*, 7, 59-70.
- Smylie, M. A., & Denny, J. W. (1989). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, San Francisco, CA. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013161X90026003003>
- Stein, M. K., & Wang, M. C. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(2), 171–187.
- Şenel, M. (2013). Professional self-efficacy beliefs of 4th grade ELT students at Ondokuz Mayıs University. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 4, 8-13.
- Telli Y. G., & Altın, D. (2020). The coronavirus and rising of online education. *Journal of University Research*, 3(1), 25-34.
- Todman, J. (2000). Gender differences in computer anxiety among university entrant since 1992. *Computers and Education*, 34(1), 27–35.
- Torkzadeh, G., & Angula, I. E. (1992). The concept and correlates of computer anxiety. *Behavior and Information Technology*, 11(2), 99-108.
- Toussi, M. T. M. (2012). A Study of EFL Teachers' Locus of Control and Self-regulation and the Moderating Role of Self-efficacy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(11), 2363-2371. doi:10.4304/tpls.2.11.2363-2371
- Trentham, L., Silvern, S., and Brogdon, R. (1985). Teacher Efficacy and Teacher Competency Ratings. *Psychology in the Schools*, 22(3). 343-352.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., and Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944-956. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003>
- Ucar, H., & Bozkaya, M. Y. (2016). Pre-service Efl Teachers' Self-efficacy Beliefs, Goal Orientations, and Participations in an Online Learning Environment. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 17(2), 15-29. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/222602>

- Ulug, Feyzi. (1994). Uzaktan Öğretimde Eğitim Ortamları. MEB Film Radyo ve Televizyonla Eğitim Başkanlığı (FRTEB), Ankara.
- Weisi, S., Azizifar, A., Gowhary, H., and Jamalinesari, A. (2014). The Relationship between Iranian EFL Teachers' Empowerment and Teachers' Self-Efficacy. Paper presented at 3rd World Conference on Psychology and Sociology. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 185(2015), 437–445. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.362>
- Weil, M. M., & Rosen, L. D. (1995). The psychological impact of technology from a global perspective: a study of technological sophistication and technophobia in university students from twenty three countries. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 11(1), 95–133.
- WHO [World Health Organization] (2020). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report – 1. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200121-sitrep1-2019-ncov.pdf?sfvrsn=20a99c10_4
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 361-384.
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 82-91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.81>
- Woolfolk, A. E., Rosoff, B., and Hoy, W. K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6(2), 137-148. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(90\)90031-Y](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(90)90031-Y)
- Xu, Z. (2012). The blended ELT environment and the changing roles of teachers and students in Hong Kong. *ELT Research Journal*, 1(1), 3-10.
- Zhang J., Li J., and Liu F. (2014) An Empirical Research on Teachers' Self-Efficacy in Distance Learning. In S.K.S. Cheung, J. Fong, J. Zhang, R. Kwan & L. F. Kwok (Eds.) *Hybrid Learning. Theory and Practice*. ICHL 2014. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 8595. pp: 335-343. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08961-4_31
- Zhong, R. (2020). The coronavirus exposes education's digital divide. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/17/technology/china-schools-coronavirus.html>

Zhou, L., Wu, S., Zhou, M., and Li, F. (2020). 'School's Out, But Class' On', The Largest Online Education in the World Today: Taking China's Practical Exploration During The COVID-19 Epidemic Prevention and Control As an Example. *Best Evid Chin Edu*, 4(2), 501-519. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3555520>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Ethical Permission Letter

T.C	
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ	
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ	
TEZ / ARAŞTIRMA / ANKET / ÇALIŞMA İZİNİ / ETİK KURULU İZİNİ TALEP FORMU VE ONAY TUTANAK FORMU	
ÖĞRENCİ BİLGİLERİ	
T.C. NOSU	
ADI VE SOYADI	ÇİĞDEM ŞEKER
ÖĞRENCİ NO	20198031
TEL. NO.	
E - MAIL ADRESLERİ	
ANA BİLİM DALI	İngiliz Dili Ana Bilim Dalı
HANGİ AŞAMADA OLDUĞU (DERS / TEZ)	TEZ
İSTEKDE BULUNDUĞU DÖNEME AİT DÖNEMLİK KAYDININ YAPILIP YAPILMADIĞI	2022 / 2023 GÜZ DÖNEMİ KAYDIMI YENILEDİM.
ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ BİLGİLER	
TEZİN KONUSU	Covid-19 Pandemi Sürecinde Uzaktan Eğitimde İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Çevrimiçi Öğretim Öz Yeterlikleri ve Buna Etki Eden Değişkenler
TEZİN AMACI	Bu çalışmanın amacı, Covid-19 pandemi sürecinde uzaktan eğitimde İngilizce öğretmenlerinin çevrimiçi öğretim öz-yeterliklerini incelemek ve bunun yaş, cinsiyet, öğretim deneyim yılı, çevrimiçi öğretim deneyimi, eğitim teknolojileri kullanımıyla ilgili hizmet içi eğitime katılım ve hizmet öncesi eğitim sırasında eğitim teknolojileri ile ilgili derslerin mevcudiyeti gibi değişkenlerle ilişkisini bulmaktır. Siirt ilindeki 160 İngilizce öğretmeninden oluşan amaçlı bir örnekleme karma çalışma araştırma tasarımı uygulanacaktır. Sıralı bir açıklayıcı model şeklinde iki veri toplama aracı kullanılacaktır. Michigan Hemşire Eğitimcilerinin Çevrimiçi Öğretim İçin Yeterlik Duygusu Ölçeği (MNESEOTS) nicel veri toplamak için uygulanırken, destekleyici ve açıklayıcı bilgi olarak kullanılacak nitel verileri toplamak için MNESEOTS sonuçları doğrultusunda bir rapor hazırlanıp uygulanacaktır. MNESEOTS ölçeğinin ismi bu çalışmadaki katılımcı İngilizce öğretmenlerini yanlış yönlendirmemek için İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Çevrimiçi Öğretim İçin Yeterlik Duygusu Ölçeği (ETSEOTS) olarak değiştirilecektir. Nicel verilerin analizi SPSS (Sosyal Bilimler için İstatistik Paketleri) üzerinde tanımlayıcı istatistikler ve çıkarımsal istatistikler yoluyla yapılacak, nitel verilerin içerik analizi kapsamında katılımcıların raporlarındaki yanıtlardan ortaya çıkan temalar kodlanıp yorumlanacaktır. Sonuçlar, çalışmadaki araştırma sorularını yanıtlamak için kullanılacaktır. Bulgular objektif bir şekilde ifade edilecek ve araştırmacı tarafından tartışılacaktır. Pandemi sürecinde çevrimiçi eğitimde dil öğretim ve öğrenim olanaklarına katkı sağlamak için çalışmanın bulguları doğrultusunda İngilizce öğretmenleri için önerilerde bulunulacaktır. Anahtar Sözcükler: öz yeterlik, öğretmen öz yeterliği, çevrimiçi öğretim, çevrimiçi öğretim öz yeterliği, uzaktan eğitim, Covid-19 pandemi, Türk İngilizce öğretmenleri
ARAŞTIRMA YAPILACAK OLAN SEKTÖRLER/ KURUMLARIN ADLARI	Eğitim / Siirt İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü
İZİN ALINACAK OLAN KURUMA AİT BİLGİLER (KURUMUN ADI, ŞUBESİ/ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ - İLİ - İLÇESİ)	Siirt İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü - Merkez / Siirt
YAPILMAK İSTENEN ÇALIŞMANIN İZİN ALINMAK İSTENEN KURUMUN HANGİ İLÇELERİNE/ HANGİ KURUMUNA/ HANGİ BÖLÜMÜNDE/ HANGİ ALANINA/ HANGİ KONULARDA/ HANGİ GRUBA/ KİMLERE/ NE UYGULANACAĞI GİBİ AYRINTILI BİLGİLER	Bu çalışma, Siirt ilinde görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Covid-19 pandemisinde uzaktan eğitimde çevrimiçi öğretim öz yeterlik duygularını ölçmeye ve bunun yaş, cinsiyet, öğretim deneyim yılı, çevrimiçi öğretim deneyimi, eğitim teknolojileri kullanımı ile ilgili hizmet içi eğitime katılım ve hizmet öncesi eğitim sırasında eğitim teknolojileri ile ilgili derslerin mevcudiyeti gibi değişkenlerle ilişki bulmaya yönelik yapılacak bir çalışmadır. Çalışmada nicel veri toplamak için Michigan Hemşire Eğitimcilerinin Çevrimiçi Öğretim İçin Yeterlik Duygusu Ölçeği (MNESEOTS), GOOGLE FORMS üzerinden online olarak uygulanırken, nitel veri toplamak için MNESEOTS sonuçları doğrultusunda bir rapor hazırlanıp ZOOM vb. çevrimiçi görüşme araçları üzerinden katılımcılarla çevrimiçi görüşmeler şeklinde uygulanacaktır. MNESEOTS ölçeğinin ismi bu çalışmadaki katılımcı İngilizce öğretmenlerini yanlış yönlendirmemek amacıyla İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Çevrimiçi Öğretim Öz Yeterlik Duygusu Ölçeği (ETSEOTS) olarak değiştirilecektir.
UYGULANACAK OLAN ÇALIŞMAYA AİT ANKETLERİN/ ÖLÇEKLERİN BAŞLIKLARI/ HANGİ ANKETLERİN - ÖLÇELERİN UYGULANACAĞI	1- Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (MNESEOTS) >>> Bu ölçeğin ismi
EKLER (ANKETLER, ÖLÇEKLER, FORMLAR, ... V.B. GİBİ EVRAKLARIN İŞİMLERİYLE BİRLİKTE KAÇ ADET/SAYFA OLDUKLARINA AİT BİLGİLER İLE AYRINTILI YAZILACAKTIR)	1) On (10) sayfa --- Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (MNESEOTS) (EK-1) >>> Bu ölçeğin ismi çalışmada "EFL Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale (ETSEOTS) (İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Çevrimiçi Öğretim Öz Yeterlik Duygusu Ölçeği) olarak değiştirilecektir. 2) İki (2) sayfa rapor hazırlama formu >>> (Bu görüşme formu ETSEOTS ölçeğinden elde edilecek veriler doğrultusunda hazırlanıp uygulanacaktır)
ÖĞRENCİNİN ADI - SOYADI: ÇİĞDEM ŞEKER	ÖĞRENCİNİN İMZASI: Enstitü Müdürlüğü'nde evrak aslı ıslak imzalıdır TARİH: 21 / 01 / 2021
	TARİH: ... / ... / 20...

TEZ/ ARAŞTIRMA/ANKE/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ DEĞERLENDİRME SONUCU				
1. Seçilen konu Bilim ve İş Dünyasına katkı sağlayabilecektir.				
2. Anılan konu English Language Education faaliyet alanı içerisine girmektedir.				
1.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI	2.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI (VARSA)	SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRÜNÜN ONAYI	A.B.D. BAŞKANININ ONAYI	
Adı - Soyadı: Gürcan Demiroğlan	Adı - Soyadı:	Adı - Soyadı: Murat Koç	Adı - Soyadı: Şehnaz ŞahinKarakas	
Unvanı : Dr. Öğrt. Üyesi	Unvanı:	Unvanı: Doç. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	
İmzası: Enstitü Müdürlüğünde aslı ıslak imzalıdır.	İmzası:	İmzası: Onay maili enstitü müdürlüğünde saklıdır.....	İmzası: Onay maili enstitü müdürlüğünde saklıdır.....	
..... / / 20..... / / 20..... / / 20..... / / 20.....	
ETİK KURULU ASIL ÜYELERİNE AİT BİLGİLER				
Adı - Soyadı: Mustafa BAŞARAN	Adı - Soyadı: Yücel ERTEKİN	Adı - Soyadı: Deniz Aynur GÜLER	Adı - Soyadı: Ali Engin OBA	Adı - Soyadı: Mustafa Tevfik ODMAN
Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.
İmzası : Onay maili enstitü müdürlüğünde saklıdır.....	İmzası : Onay maili enstitü müdürlüğünde saklıdır	İmzası : Onay maili enstitü müdürlüğünde saklıdır.....	İmzası : Onay maili enstitü müdürlüğünde saklıdır.....	İmzası : Onay maili enstitü müdürlüğünde saklıdır.....
..... / / 20..... / / 20..... / / 20..... / / 20..... / / 20.....
Etik Kurulu Jüri Başkanı - Asıl Üye	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi	Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi
OY BİRLİĞİ İLE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Çalışma yapılacak olan tez için uygulayacak olduğu Anketleri/Formları/Ölçekleri Çağ Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu Asıl Jüri Üyelerince İncelenmiş olup, / / 20..... - / / 20..... tarihleri arasında uygulanmak üzere gerekli iznin verilmesi tarafımızca uygundur.		
OY ÇOKLUĞU İLE	<input type="radio"/>			
AÇIKLAMA: BU FORM ÖĞRENCİLER TARAFINDAN HAZIRLANDIKTAN SONRA ENSTİTÜ MÜDÜRÜNE ONAYLATILARAK ENSTİTÜ SEKRETERLİĞİNE TESLİM EDİLECEKTİR. AYRICA YAZININ PUNTOSU İŞE 12 (ON İKİ) PUNTO OLACAK ŞEKİLDE YAZILARAK ÇIKTI ALINACAKTIR.				

APPENDIX B: Bilgilendirilmiş Onam Formu

Tarih: 21.01.2021

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
ETİK KURULU

BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ ONAM FORMU

Bu formun amacı araştırma ile ilgili olarak sizi bilgilendirmek ve katılmanız ile ilgili izin almaktır.

Bu kapsamda "Exploring Turkish EFL Teachers' Online Teaching Self-efficacy During Covid-19 Pandemia" başlıklı araştırma "Çiğdem ŞEKER" tarafından **gönüllü katılımcılarla** yürütülmektedir. Araştırma sırasında sizden alınacak bilgiler gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırma amaçlı kullanılacaktır. Araştırma sürecinde konu ile ilgili her türlü soru ve görüşleriniz için aşağıda iletişim bilgisi bulunan araştırmacıyla görüşebilirsiniz. Bu araştırmaya **katılmama** hakkınız bulunmaktadır. Aynı zamanda çalışmaya katıldıktan sonra çalışmadan **çıkabilirsiniz**. Bu formu onaylamanız, **araştırmaya katılım için onam verdiğiniz** anlamına gelecektir.

Araştırmayla İlgili Bilgiler:

Araştırmanın Amacı: Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Covid-19 pandemisi sırasındaki çevrimiçi öğretim özyeterlik seviyelerini, bunun bazı kişisel değişkenlerle olan bağlantısını ve bu öğretmenlerin pandemik çevrimiçi öğretim sürecine dair yansımalarını irdelemektir.

Araştırmanın Nedeni: İngilizce öğretmenlerinin pandemiyle birlikte ani bir şekilde mesleki hayatlarına giren çevrimiçi öğretime hazır olup olmadıklarının irdelenmek istenmesi ve böylesi bir durumla ilgili araştırmaya ihtiyaç duyulması.

Araştırmanın Yürütüleceği Yer: SIİRT

Çalışmaya Katılım Onayı:

Araştırmanın amacını, nedenini, yürütüleceği yer ile ilgili bilgileri okudum ve gönüllü olarak üzerime düşen sorumlulukları anladım. Araştırma ile ilgili ayrıntılı açıklamalar yazılı ve sözlü olarak tarafıma sunuldu. Bu araştırmaya ile ilgili faydalar ve riskler ile ilgili bilgilendirildim.

Bu araştırmaya kendi isteğimle, hiçbir baskı ve zorlama olmaksızın katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcının (Islak imzası ile^{***})

Adı-Soyadı:

İmzası^{***}:

Araştırmacının

Adı-Soyadı: Çiğdem ŞEKER

e-posta:

İmzası:

^{***}Online yapılacak uygulamalarda, ıslak imza yerine, bilgilendirilmiş onam formunun anketin ilk sayfasındaki en üst bölümüne yerleştirilerek katılımcıların kabul ediyorum onay kutusunu işaretlemesinin istenilmesi gerekmektedir.

APPENDIX C: Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY ELT MA PROGRAMME

RESEARCH TITLE: An Analysis of Turkish EFL Teachers' Online Teaching Self-efficacy
during Covid-19 Pandemia

RESEARCHER NAME: Çiğdem ŞEKER

TEL:

E-MAIL:

NAME OF THE PARTICIPANT:

Thank you for your approval and interest for participating in this research. The purpose of this study is to examine Turkish EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy during the Covid-19 pandemic. You are asked to participate in this study by answering scale questions / interview questions about the study. The information provided by you will be used for research purposes only. It will not be used in a manner which would allow identification of your individual responses. This consent form will be retained by the researcher. You are expected to take part in this study voluntarily, therefore, you are allowed to withdraw from the study at any part you wish. You may ask questions about anything you do not understand or want to know more about. If you decide that you want to participate, please sign this consent form.

Participant's Signature: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX D: Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale

Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale

Revised from: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Teaching Scale (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy; 2001) by Kristi Robinia.

Directions: You are invited to participate in this study as to reflect on your online teaching efficacy during the ongoing pandemic distance education.

You meet the parameters of the sample set for this study if you are indeed teaching online courses as an EFL teacher in Siirt province in the distance education process during the Covid-19 pandemic. This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the current self-perceptions EFL teachers hold regarding their abilities to successfully teach in online environments.

Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

Questions 1-32 are concerned with understanding how EFL teachers judge their current capabilities for teaching online English language courses. Even if you have little or no experience with online teaching, please try to answer each question. A helpful prefix to each answer is, "**I can do...**"

1. How much can you do to help your students think critically in an online class?

Nothing	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

2. How much can you do to get through to disengaged students in an online class?

(e.g. passive learners who might lurk online, but fail to actively contribute to their own learning.)

Nothing	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior (e.g. disrespectful posting or failure to adhere to outline policies for posting) in an online environment?)

Nothing	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in online work?

Nothing	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior in an online class?

Nothing	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

6. How much can you do to get students to believe that they can do well in an online class?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from online students?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

8. How well can you establish routines (e.g. facilitate or moderate student participation) in coursework to keep online activities running smoothly?)

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

9. How much can you do to help online students' value learning?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught in an online course?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

11. How well can you craft questions or assignments that require students to think by relating ideas to previous knowledge and experience?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

12. How much can you do to foster individual student creativity in an online course?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

13. How much can you do to get students to follow the established rules for assignments and deadlines during an online class?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing in an online class?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
---------	-------------	--	------	--	-------------	--	--------------	--

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

15. How much can you do to control students dominating online discussions?

Nothing Very Little Some Quite a Bit A Great Deal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

16. How well can you establish an online course (e.g. convey expectations; standards; course rules) with each group of students?

Nothing Very Little Some Quite a Bit A Great Deal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

17. How much can you do to adjust your online lessons for different learning styles?

Nothing Very Little Some Quite a Bit A Great Deal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

18. How much can you do to use a variety of assessment strategies for an online course?

Nothing Very Little Some Quite a Bit A Great Deal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

19. How well can you develop an online course that facilitates student responsibility for online learning?

Nothing Very Little Some Quite a Bit A Great Deal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students in an online class seem to be confused?

Nothing Very Little Some Quite a Bit A Great Deal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

21. How well can you respond to defiant students in an online setting?

Nothing Very Little Some Quite a Bit A Great Deal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

22. How well can you structure an online course that facilitates collaborative learning?

Nothing Very Little Some Quite a Bit A Great Deal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

23. How well can you structure an online course that provides good learning experiences for students?

Nothing Very Little Some Quite a Bit A Great Deal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students in an online environment?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

25. To what extent can you use knowledge of copyright law to provide resources for online students?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

26. How well can you navigate the technical infrastructure at your institution to successfully create an online course?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

27. How well can you navigate the technical infrastructure at your institution to successfully teach an established online course?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

28. To what extent can you use asynchronous discussions to maximize interactions between students in an online course? (Asynchronous means not online at the same time)

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

29. To what extent can you use synchronous discussions (e.g. same time chat rooms) to maximize interaction between students in an online course?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

30. How well can you use computers for word processing, internet searching and e-mail communication?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

31. To what extent does your comfort level with computers facilitate participation in online teaching?

Nothing	Very Little		Some		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

32. How well can you navigate the internet to provide links and resources to students in an online course?

Nothing	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	

Hang in there- you have completed over 50% of the survey! Thank you for your participation! The next section will ask for demographic information from participants. All information collected is confidential.

Demographic Information Section

33. What type of institution do you work for?

Primary School _____

Secondary School _____

High School _____

University _____

34. Please indicate your gender:

Male _____

Female _____

35. What was your age on your last birthday?

36. Please identify the highest degree that you hold:

Bachelor's _____

Master's _____

Doctorate _____

37. How many years of experience do you have teaching English courses?

38. Have you ever taught an English course online before the pandemic situation?

Yes _____

No _____

39. Please feel free to type in any other comments related to your experiences or perceptions of teaching English courses online.

40. Please type in a contact email address if you wish to have a copy of the summarized results from this survey.

Thank you for your participation in this survey!

Directions for Scoring the Educators' Sense of Online Teaching Efficacy Scale (Questions 1-32)

Scoring: Responses vary along a nine-point scale defined by the categories "Nothing", "Very little", "Some Influence", "Quite A Bit", and "A Great Deal." (1 through 9 respectively). The higher the cumulative score on the scale, the greater sense of efficacy for that aspect of online teaching. Calculating the means of the subscales and add these means to find an overall online teaching efficacy score between 4 through 36. Higher scores indicate greater overall teachers' sense of efficacy for online teaching.

Subscale Scores: To determine the *Efficacy in Online Student Engagement*, *Efficacy in Online Instructional Practices*, *Efficacy in Online Classroom Management*, and *Efficacy in Use of Computers* subscale scores:

Efficacy in Student Engagement:

Add Score from Items: $1 + 2 + 4 + 6 + 9 + 12 + 14 + 22 =$

Total Score divided by 8 to get mean score

Efficacy in Instructional Strategies:

Add Score from Items: $7 + 10 + 11 + 17 + 18 + 20 + 23 + 24 =$

Total Score divided by 8 to get mean score

Efficacy in Classroom Management:

Add Score from Items: $3 + 5 + 8 + 13 + 15 + 16 + 19 + 21 =$

Total Score divided by 8 to get mean score

Efficacy in Use of Computers:

Add Score from Items: $25 + 26 + 27 + 28 + 29 + 30 + 31 + 32 =$

Total Score divided by 8 to get mean score

APPENDIX E: Interview Questions

In this interview you will be asked questions about research results obtained from a scale which was applied to 160 EFL teachers working in Siirt province. The study aimed at understanding EFL teachers' self perceptions about their efficacy in online teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic distance education process and seeing its relation with variables such as the type of school they work at (primary, secondary or high school), their gender, age, education level (bachelor's, master's, doctorate's) years of teaching, online teaching experience before the pandemia, and pre-service education and in-service training on use of educational technologies. In this sense, the scale included items that asked EFL teachers about their online teaching self-efficacy and its sub-dimensions of efficacy in student engagement (adding students to the lesson), efficacy in instructional strategies, efficacy in classroom management and efficacy in use of computers.

1. On the research results it was observed that the average online teaching self-efficacy of the participant EFL teachers was at a medium level. So,
 - a. What could be the reasons for the participant EFL teachers feeling relatively less efficient when teaching on-line?

2. The results revealed that EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy levels did not change according to most of the variables. For instance, there were not significant differences in scale scores of participant EFL teachers regardless of whether or not they got pre-service courses or in-service training on use of educational technologies. So,
 - a. How would you explain this situation? Why do you think having taken pre-service courses or in-service training on use of educational technologies did not have a

- significant effect on participant EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy during the pandemic online education process?
3. The results showed that male EFL teachers' self-efficacy in use of computers during online courses is higher than that of female EFL teachers.
 - a. What do you think about this situation? What do you think the reason is?
 4. The research results indicated that older EFL teachers who are at 36-40 and 41-45 age ranges have a higher level of self-efficacy in adding students to online lessons (student engagement) compared to younger EFL teachers especially those at the 26-30 age range.
 - a. What do you think the reason is for such a difference in the older and younger EFL teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement during online courses?
 5. The self-efficacy theories generally point out the idea that if one person has successful previous fulfillments in an activity, they have a higher level of self-efficacy in doing that activity compared to those who do not have successful previous fulfillments in the same activity. However, results in this study showed that online teaching self-efficacy of the participant EFL teachers did not show difference regardless of whether or not they had online teaching experience before the pandemic distance education process. In this sense,
 - a. How would you explain the reason for the research results about this situation? Why do you think having online teaching experience before the pandemic did not have an important impact on participant EFL teachers' online teaching self-efficacy after the pandemic online education process started?
 6. How do you think your overall teacher self-efficacy changed during this pandemic online education compared with the times during face-to-face education before the pandemic? Why?

7. How do /did you generally feel during online lessons? Why?
8. Do/did you face any problems during online courses? If yes, what are the problems about (instructional delivery, student engagement, classroom management, use of computer, internet, educational technologies, etc)? Explain, please.
 - a. How do/ did you overcome those problems? What solutions do you find and apply?
 - b. How do / did you think such problems influence your teacher self-efficacy?
9. Which language skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening) do / did you find harder and which ones easier to teach in your online English courses? Why?
10. How does / did online teaching influence your self-efficacy about English language teaching? Why?
11. Would you like to attend an in-service training for online education in the next period?
For example, considering the possibility of continuing online education, would you like to adopt and participate in an in-service training to increase your online teaching proficiency?
12. Do you think there is a relationship between the problems experienced by EFL teachers in online education during the pandemic and the ongoing conventional teacher education system at universities? If yes, how would you explain it?

APPENDIX F: Approval from Çağ University



T.C.
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Sayı : E-23867972-044-2100000321
Konu : Çiğdem ŞEKER'e Ait Tez Anket
İzni Hakkında

17.01.2021

DAĞITIM YERLERİNE

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında 20198031 numaralı öğrencimiz olan **Çiğdem ŞEKER**, "**İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Covid-19 Pandemi Sürecinde Uzaktan Eğitimde Çevrimiçi Öğretim Öz Yeterlikleri ve Buna Etki Eden Değişkenler**" konulu tez çalışmasını Üniversitemiz Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi öğretim üyesi **Prof. Dr. Jülide İNÖZÜ** danışmanlığında halen yürütülmektedir. Adı geçen öğrencinin tez çalışması kapsamında **Siirt İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğüne bağlı halen görev yapmakta olan İngilizce öğretmenlerini** kapsamak üzere kopyası Ek'lerde sunulan bir anket uygulamasını çevrimiçi görüşme araçları üzerinden yapmayı planlamaktadır. Üniversitemiz Etik Kurulunda yer alan üyelerin kurumsal mail adreslerinden onaylar online olarak alınmış olup, gerekli iznin verilmesini arz ederim.

Prof. Dr. Ünal AY
Rektör

Ek : 3 sayfa tez etik kurul izin formu, 13 sayfa Form ve Ölçekler, 61 sayfa katılım kabul formu, dilekçe, veri toplama araçları, tez önerisi, 4 sayfa tez etik kurul izin onay e-postaları.

Dağıtım:

Gereği: Bilgi:
SIIRT İL MİLLİ EĞİTİM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE Siirt Valiliğine

APPENDIX G: Approval from Siirt Provincial Directorate of National Education



T.C.
SİİRT VALİLİĞİ
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : E-10861109-355.01-19508583
Konu : Öğrenci Çiğdem ŞEKER
Tez Anket İzin Hakkında

22.01.2021

DAĞITIM YERLERİNE

- İlgi : a) Mersin İli Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü' nün 17.01.2021 tarihli ve 2100000321 sayılı yazınız.
b) Valilik Makamının 21.01.2021 tarihli ve 19488135 sayılı oluru

Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngilizce Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında 20198031 numaralı öğrencisi olan Çiğdem ŞEKER' in "**İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Covid-19 Pandemi Sürecinde Uzaktan Eğitimde Çevrimiçi Öğretim Öz Yeterlilik ve Buna Etki Eden Değişkenler**" konulu tez çalışmasını ilçenizde ve okulunuzda görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerine uygulanması hakkındaki Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü' nün ilgi (a) yazı ve ekleri ile Valilik Makamının ilgi (b) izin Olur' u ilişikte sunulmuştur.

Bilgi ve gereğini rica ederim.

Deniz EDİP
Vali a.
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürü

Eki: İlgi yazılar ve Valilik Oluru

Dağıtım:
Gereği;
- 6 İlçe Kaymakamlığına
(İlçe Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü)

-Merkez Resmî ve Özel İlkokul-Ortaokul
ve Lise Okul Müdürlüklerine

Bilgi;
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
(Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü)
Ankılı Karayolu Üzeri Adana-Mersin
Otoyolu 33800
Tarsus/MERSİN



T.C.
SİİRT VALİLİĞİ
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : E-10861109-355.01-19488135
Konu : Öğrenci Çiğdem ŞEKER
Tez Anket İzin Hakkında

21.01.2021

VALİLİK MAKAMINA
SİİRT

İlgi : Mersin İli Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü' nün 17.01.2021 tarihli ve 2100000321 sayılı yazıları.

Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngilizce Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında 20198031 numaralı öğrencisi olan Çiğdem ŞEKER' in "**İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Covid-19 Pandemi Sürecinde Uzaktan Eğitimde Çevrimiçi Öğretim Öz Yeterlilik ve Buna Etki Eden Değişkenler**" konulu tez çalışmasını İlimiz merkez ve ilçelere bağlı okullarda görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerine uygulayabilmesi için; okul müdürlüklerince yapılacak bir program kapsamında ve sorumluluğunda eğitim öğretimi aksatamayacak şekilde uygulanması müdürlüğümüzce uygun görülmektedir.

Makamlarınızca da uygun görülmesi halinde olurlarınıza arz ederim.

Ahmet Mithat SARAÇOĞLU
İl Millî Eğitim Şube Müdürü

OLUR
Deniz EDİP
Vali a.
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürü