

**T.R.
ONDOKUZ MAYIS UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAMME**



A STUDY ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS FOR ONLINE TEACHING

Master's Thesis

Özge AYGÜN DAYANIR

Supervisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ceylan YANGIN ERSANLI

SAMSUN
2023

DECLARATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH SCIENTIFIC ETHICS

I hereby declare and undertake that I complied with scientific ethics and academic rules in all stages of my Master's Thesis , that I have referred to each quotation that I use directly or indirectly in the study and that the works I have used consist of those shown in the sources, that it was written in accordance with the institute writing guide and that the situations stated in the article 3, section 9 of the Regulation for TÜBİTAK Research and Publication Ethics Board were not violated.

Is Ethics Committee Necessary?

Yes ☒

No ☐

08 / 09 / 2023

Özge AYGÜN DAYANIR

DECLARATION OF THE THESIS STUDY ORIGINALITY REPORT

Thesis Title: A STUDY ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS FOR ONLINE TEACHING

As a result of the originality report taken by me from the plagiarism detection program on 21 /06 /2023 for the thesis titled above;

Similarity ratio : % 13

Single resource rate : % 1 has been released.

21 / 06 / 2023

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ceylan YANGIN ERSANLI

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN ÇEVİRİM İÇİ ÖĞRETİME YÖNELİK ÖZ YETERLİK İNANÇLARI

Özge AYGÜN DAYANIR
Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Programı
Yüksek Lisans, Haziran/2023
Danışman: Doç. Dr. Ceylan YANGIN ERSANLI

Bu çalışma, 2021-2022 Eğitim Öğretim yılında İngilizce öğretmenlerinin çevrim içi öğretime yönelik öz-yeterlik inançlarını incelemek amacıyla uygulanmıştır. Covid-19 gibi acil bir durumun gerekçesiyle dünya çapında olduğu gibi ülkemizde de yüz yüze öğretimden çevrim içi öğretime süreli bir geçiş yapılmıştır. Bu süre içerisinde İngilizce öğretmenlerinin çevrim içi öğretime yönelik öz-yeterlik inançlarını araştırma gereği doğmuştur. Bu çalışmada gereken veriler, Kişisel Bilgi Formu'nun yanı sıra Eğitimcilerin Çevrim İçi Öğretime Yönelik Öz- Yeterlik İnançları Ölçeği ile toplanmıştır. Çevrim içi öğretime yönelik öz-yeterlik inançlarıyla ilgili olarak dört alt boyut incelenmiştir. Bu boyutlar şu şekildedir: öğrenci katılımına yönelik yeterlik, öğretimsel stratejiler alanında yeterlik, sınıf yönetimi konusunda yeterlik ve bilgisayar kullanımına yönelik yeterlik. Her alt boyut 8 maddeden oluşmaktadır ve ölçekte toplamda 32 madde bulunmaktadır. Gaziantep ilindeki ilkokul, ortaokul ve lise seviyeleri olmak üzere devlet okullarında görev yapan 270 İngilizce öğretmeninden alınan yanıtlar yaş, cinsiyet, öğretim tecrübesi, mezuniyet bölümü, çalışılan okul türü, çevrim içi öğretim tecrübesi, verilen çevrim içi dersler, öğrenci katılımı ve alınan eğitimler olmak üzere birçok değişkene göre analiz edilmiştir. Analiz edilen sonuçlar tablolar aracılığıyla sunulmuştur. Sonuçlar, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Çevrim İçi öğretime yönelik orta seviye öz-yeterlik inançlarına sahip olduğuna işaret etmektedir. Bu bulgulara dayanarak öğretmenlerin öz-yeterlik inançlarının oluştuğu andan itibaren sabit kalabileceği düşünülmektedir. Ancak alınan eğitimler, öğretmenlerde çevrim içi öğretimin yetkinlikleri ve kendi çevrim içi öz-yeterlik inançları konusunda farkındalık oluşturmaya yardım ederek bu durumu değiştirebilir. Bu nedenle öğretmenler çevrim içi öğretime yönelik eğitimleri alması konusunda desteklenmelidir. Son olarak bu sonuçlara dayanarak öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Öz-yeterlik, Öğretmen öz-yeterliliği, Çevrim içi öğretim, 21. yüzyıl becerileri, Zorunlu uzaktan eğitim

ABSTRACT

A STUDY ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS FOR ONLINE TEACHING

Özge AYGÜN DAYANIR

Ondokuz Mayıs University

Institute of Graduate Studies

Department of Foreign Language Education

English Language Teaching Programme

Master, June/2023

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ceylan YANGIN ERSANLI

This study was conducted to investigate English Language Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs towards online teaching during 2021-2022 Academic Year. As in all around the world, the temporary shift from face-to-face teaching into online teaching has taken place in our country due to an emergent situation which is Covid-19. Within this period, a need emerged to examine English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for online teaching. In this study, the necessary data were collected through a Personal Information Form and The Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching Scale. Four sub-dimensions concerning online teaching self-efficacy beliefs are investigated, i.e., efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, efficacy in classroom management, efficacy in use of computers. Each sub-dimension is consisted of 8 items, which makes 32 items in total. The responses, which were provided from 270 state school English language teachers employed in elementary, secondary, and high schools in Gaziantep province- Turkey, were analysed referring to some variables such as age, gender, teaching experience, major of graduation, school type, online teaching experience, online courses taught, student participation and trainings received. The analyzed results were provided with tables. The results present that English language teachers have a moderate level of online teaching self-efficacy beliefs. Depending on the findings, self-efficacy belief level of teachers towards online teaching may remain static when they are taken shape. However, trainings may change this condition helping teachers be aware of online teaching competences and their online teaching self-efficacy beliefs. Therefore, teachers should be assisted with trainings concerning online teaching. In conclusion, recommendations were provided based on the results of the study.

Keywords: Self-efficacy, Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, Online teaching, 21st century skills, Emergency remote teaching (ERT)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my greatest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ceylan YANGIN ERSANLI for supporting me in every phase of the study with her everlasting kindness and patience. I would never come through this process without her invaluable guidance.

In addition, I owe special thanks my family who always support me throughout my life.

I am also grateful to my husband Tahir DAYANIR for his love, patience and endless encouragement to complete my thesis study.

Besides, I also would like to thank teachers who have participated this study voluntarily.

Özge AYGÜN DAYANIR

CONTENTS

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL OF THE THESIS.....	i
DECLARATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH SCIENTIFIC ETHICS.....	ii
DECLARATION OF THE THESIS STUDY ORIGINALITY REPORT	ii
ÖZET	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CONTENTS.....	vi
SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	vii
TABLES LEGENDS.....	viii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Problem Statement	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study	3
1.4. Statement of the Research Questions.....	3
1.5. Restrictions of the Study.....	4
1.6. Organization of the Thesis	4
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
2.1. Self-efficacy	5
2.1.1. Definition.....	5
2.1.2. Determinants of Self-Efficacy.....	5
2.1.3. Processes of Self Efficacy Beliefs	7
2.1.4. Teachers' Self Efficacy Beliefs.....	8
2.2. Online Teaching.....	11
2.2.1. Online Education Terminology	12
2.2.2. Challenges of Online Teaching	13
2.2.3. Online Teaching Competences addressing to 21 st Century Skills.....	14
2.3. Teachers' Self-efficacy Beliefs regarding Online Teaching.....	18
3. METHODOLOGY	20
3.1. Research Design.....	20
3.2. Sampling and Population	20
3.3. Data Collection Tools	21
3.3.1 Personal Information Form.....	21
3.3.2. The Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (MNESEOT) Scale	21
3.4. Data Collection Procedure	22
3.5. Statement of the Research Questions.....	22
3.6. Data Analysis	23
4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	25
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	43
5.1. Conclusion	43
5.2. Recommendations.....	44
REFERENCES.....	46
APPENDICES	52
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	60

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AOT	: Asynchronous Online Teaching
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ERT	: Emergency Remote Teaching
ICT	: Information and Communication Technology
MNESEOT	: The Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching
MoNE	: Ministry of National Education
SE	: Self-Efficacy
SOT	: Synchronous Online Teaching
SPSS	: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
TPACK	: Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge
TSE	: Teacher Self-Efficacy
TSES	: Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale
4C's	: Critical Thinking, Creativity, Collaboration, Communication

TABLES LEGENDS

Table 4.1. Socio-Demographic Data of the Participants.....	25
Table 4.2. Responses of Participants to Questions Regarding Online Teaching	26
Table 4.3. Evaluation of Expressions in the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching.....	27
Table 4.4. Descriptive Statistics of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching	29
Table 4.5. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Gender	30
Table 4.6. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Age	31
Table 4.7. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching	32
Table 4.8. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of the Major of Graduation	33
Table 4.9. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Level of School	34
Table 4.10. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Prior Online Teaching Experience	35
Table 4.11. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Online Teaching Time.....	36
Table 4.12. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Student Participation	37
Table 4.13. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Training received.....	39
Table 4.14. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Benefit of Training	40
Table 4.15. Evaluation of the Relationship Between The Sub-Dimensions of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching	41



To the precious teachers who lost their lives in the earthquakes on Feb. 6, 2023...

1. INTRODUCTION

Education supports the development of individuals in the society and leads them to keep pace with the society in which they spend their lives. In this context, education should be considered as a continuous process without any gap. The concept of teaching, which is a part of education, proceeds in a planned, programmed and purpose-oriented manner. Today online education which is an alternative to conventional teaching with the progress of technology and COVID-19 outbreak all around the world has begun to gain acceptance. In our country, online teaching has been gaining momentum due to the same circumstances as well.

1.1. Background of the Study

Teachers are responsible for a major part in teaching online as in face-to-face teaching. The better path to obey the link between conventional teaching and online education is to provide online teaching by fully qualified teachers who are passionate about online teaching which is based on a web enabled setting (Feenberg, 1998). A qualified teacher who teaches online should realize the type, necessities and differences of traditional teaching and online teaching and use it in online classrooms (Palloff & Pratt, 2011). Teachers who teach online should be able to effectively ensure student participation, interaction and collaboration in lessons (Palloff & Pratt, 2011). Dubins and Graham (2009) created 8 competence areas in terms of online teaching. These are skills for content management, technical skills, instructional design / strategies, leading students, managing assessment, social processes and presence, institutional knowledge, pedagogy and andragogy. At this stage, Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) which was created by Mishra and Koehler, comes into play (2006, 2008). TPACK is an enhanced form of pedagogical content knowledge developed by Shulman (1987). According to this model, for the effectiveness of teaching with technology, 3 information should be intertwined: content, pedagogy, and technology (Koehler, Mishra & Cain, 2013). The TPACK framework recognizes the knowledge and fields that teachers should gain competence while teaching in online setting since it is concerned with using technology along with appropriate pedagogy while teaching with technology adequately. In a study led by Bakar, Matt and Rosli (2020), it was revealed that self-efficacy beliefs of teachers concerning technology integration and TPACK are extremely interrelating.

In this study, teachers' computer skills throughout the process of teaching online, their competencies in terms of using online teaching strategies, online classroom management and their competencies for online student engagement were included. As it can be seen, the responsibilities and competencies expected from teachers are quite high. This study probes English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs referring to the dimensions mentioned for online teaching. In this way, it can be better understood whether the teachers fulfill these roles expected of them in online teaching.

Self-efficacy (SE hereafter) is described as the beliefs of human beings in relation to their faculty to accomplish an action that requires a certain performance (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy beliefs of teachers are mostly associated with their beliefs and evaluations about their competence in order to fulfill their duties (Ashton, 1984). These evaluations may leave a mark on successful attainment of the determined educational objectives. In relation to teaching process, teachers' self efficacy beliefs are remarkably significant. In the literature, many studies related to self-efficacy beliefs of teachers for face-to-face education exist; however, online teaching self-efficacy beliefs remain underexplored against self-efficacy beliefs of teachers towards face-to-face teaching. Knowledge or abilities of teachers which are useful for face-to-face teaching may not be transferred to online settings since these two types of teaching require different challenges for teachers. Therefore, self-efficacy belief levels of teachers may change depending on the type of teaching, i.e. face to face or online teaching (Dunbar & Malton, 2018). And these levels may have positive or negative effects on online teaching process. Teachers who have high level of SE beliefs may play much greater effective role during online teaching. On the other hand, the ones with low levels may not accomplish the necessities of online teaching.

1.2. Problem Statement

Teachers play a huge role in providing effective online teaching. However, they face some difficulties throughout the process since online teaching has been practised for a limited time in our country, especially during COVID-19 process. The difficulties faced by teachers may directly affect teachers' SE beliefs. In this way, teachers may reason themselves about online teaching. Hence a desire emerged to inspect teachers' SE beliefs concerning online teaching which is an underexplored issue in the literature.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

Self-efficacy beliefs of English language teachers perform very essential roles in practical online teaching. The present study aims to discover English language teachers' SE beliefs for online teaching and contribute to teacher development so that they can see their deficiencies and reach a reflective teacher attitude which generally means being open to development. In this point, four main factors were taken into consideration to specify these teachers' SE beliefs for online teaching. These factors are related to *providing student engagement, teaching strategies use, classroom management and computer use* for online teaching setting. Paying special attention to these dimensions, other variables were also investigated. Participants' genders, ages, teaching experience years, majors of graduation, school levels worked, online teaching experience, online teaching trainings received by the participants were considered as the variables of this study. All these variables and factors shed light on this study and its gathered data. Following the literature review, it is aimed to provide current inputs to the field. A study which attempts to look into EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs towards online teaching referring to demographic variables may be an occasion in order to comprehend dimensions where teachers are confident and support teacher development.

1.4. Statement of the Research Questions

This research investigates online teaching self-efficacy beliefs of Gaziantep state school English language teachers in terms of 4 dimensions such as providing student engagement, use of instructional strategies, classroom management and computer use. In relation to this, the research questions are:

1. What are the level of online teaching self-efficacy beliefs of English language teachers in student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management and use of computers?
2. Does online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions differ depending on the participants' gender, age, teaching experience and major of graduation?
3. Is there a meaningful difference about online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions in terms of school level, online teaching experience, online courses taught in hours and student participation?

4. Is there a meaningful difference about online teaching self-efficacy belief levels considering 4 dimensions between the ones who have taken any trainings and the others who have not taken any trainings?
5. Do the trainings have an effect on teachers' online teaching self-efficacy beliefs regarding 4 dimensions?

1.5. Restrictions of the Study

Participants of the study are state school English language teachers who work in Gaziantep province of Turkey. It means that the study was conducted only in one city of Turkey. Therefore, obtained results of the present study may not be generalized for further settings throughout Turkey.

1.6. Organization of the Thesis

As the first step, related literature was reviewed and research questions were determined. In order to collect data validly, permissions were obtained from the researcher who design the scale used in the present study. The permission of Ondokuz Mayıs University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee was also obtained. Moreover, Gaziantep Provincial Directorate of National Education's permission was taken to gather data from the teachers working in Gaziantep state schools. After collecting data, analysis was made and results were discussed referring to the related literature analysis.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, two main terms, which are self-efficacy and online teaching, will be discussed addressing to the related literature. This part is essential in order to better understand the purpose of the study.

2.1. Self-efficacy

2.1.1. Definition

Self-efficacy (SE) which is also recognized as social cognitive theory or social learning theory is a critical term to be discussed in this study. Firstly, it is crucial that a clear definition should be given concerning this term. Perceived self-efficacy as stated by Bandura (1986) can be explained in a way that it is individuals' general beliefs concerning their capabilities in order to perform well and achieve desired performance. These beliefs concerned with self-efficacy have great roles in people's feelings, thoughts, motivation and behaviours. It is claimed that cognition has some effects on feelings and behaviours of people. On the other hand, people's behaviours and feelings have an impact on cognition. Furthermore, four processes come into play, i.e., cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes (Bandura, 1994). The level of these processes may change depending on the people's level of SE. Mainly high and low level of SE beliefs can be discussed. People who have strong sense of SE put in an intense effort while approaching the tasks even if they are difficult to achieve. They generally do not avoid challenging aims and have intrinsic motivation. On the contrary, the ones who have low level of SE beliefs consider difficult tasks as a personal threat. And they may tend to give up easily since failure is seen as a source of even depression (Bandura, 1994). That is to say, different human beings who have similar skills or similar people in the dissimilar situations may act in another ways depending on their level of SE beliefs (Bandura, 1997). Also, Hattie (2012) handles self-efficacy as having self-confidence which helps you carry into effect.

2.1.2. Determinants of Self-Efficacy

Humans' beliefs can be shaped depending on four primary factors according to Bandura (1994). To form strong self-efficacy beliefs can occur with *inactive mastery experiences* which is the first source. This is also called performance accomplishment and is considered as the most influential one since it is related to person's own successful experiences in the past. These experiences are generally related to person's

own success and failures. Success may create reinforced sense of SE while failures may erode it. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) looked into novice and experienced teachers' SE beliefs with regard to sources of SE. 255 teachers were participated in the study. And for experienced teachers, it was mastery experiences as the main source whereas social persuasion was the major source for novice teachers.

The next and second source of personal efficacy is *vicarious experiences* which are basically about success and failures of other people who are models. Level of similarity between the model and the person has an impact of perceived self-efficacy. When the person sees the model as so different from himself, the model's behaviours may not affect personal efficacy. However, the model's success and failures become more influential if the person believes that there is a huge similarity between the model and himself (Bandura & Adam, 1977). Also, high level of skills possessed by models are important for increasing perceived SE beliefs.

Social persuasion or *verbal persuasion* is the third self-efficacy source. This includes persuasion of people by telling them that they are skilled at tasks. In an experimental study carried out by Maddux and Rogers (1982), it is concluded that verbal persuasion possesses a substantial impact on changing SE beliefs of people. They try hard to achieve a task and improve their competencies or skills. Yet, unrealistic encouragements have negative impacts on people's sense of efficacy beliefs since they will cause people to fail in the end (Bandura, 2010). Therefore, social persuasion can be influenced by reliability, solidity and proficiency of persuaders (Tschannen Moran, Hoy & Hoy, 1998).

The fourth source of SE beliefs is *emotional arousal*. This is mainly about psychological states of people while facing stressful situations. People will most probably succeed as long as they are not in the condition of aversive arousal (Bandura, 1997). Perceptions of this source may change SE levels of people. The ones with high self efficacy beliefs regard their emotional stimulation as a developer for their performance although those with low levels accept it as a debilitating factor.

Some researchers have investigated teachers' sources of SE beliefs. Phan and Locke (2015) looked into 8 Vietnamese EFL teachers major sources of SE. The results showed that the main source was social persuasion for them. And vicarious experiences and emotional arousal follow respectively. In another research led by

Şahin and Atay (2010), the findings showed that 27 pre-service EFL teachers' SE beliefs sources are inactive mastery and vicarious experiences and verbal persuasion. In short, it can be inferred that sources of SE beliefs are significant for teachers since it will have a direct impact on teaching.

2.1.3. Processes of Self Efficacy Beliefs

Self-efficacy belief has an intense impact on motivation, learning and performance due to the fact that individuals endeavour to learn and fulfill the tasks that they think they can achieve promisingly (Bandura, 1986). So, learning and performance can be influenced by self-efficacy in some ways (Bandura, 1982). People with high SE beliefs make a bid for new tasks excessively in order to learn them. Contrarily, others with low SE beliefs make the slightest effort with the intent of learning the tasks. This is because they have doubts about succeeding. In other words, it can be stated that self-efficacy is a considerable determinant for performance (Bandura & Locke, 2003).

Self-efficacy beliefs control the way individuals feel and consider as well as their motivation and manners. Thus, four major psychological processes were reviewed in the scope of power of SE beliefs on human operation (Bandura, 1994). The first one is *Cognitive Processes* which can be described as thinking processes related to information. Thought is also emphasized in this point. The most important role of thought is to help people predict and regulate events or information affecting their lives. Hence it is needed efficacious cognitive processing. Another factor affected by self-efficacy is goal selection. It depends on the level of individuals' SE beliefs. Low level of SE beliefs may let individuals design low goals. On the contrary, high level of SE may bring about high goals. People with high levels of SE belief set the higher goals and devote themselves to these goals (Bandura, 1994).

The second one is *Motivational Processes*. Self-regulation and motivation depend on self-efficacy beliefs. People who are highly competent think that their failures occur because of their lacking endeavors. However, other people with low level of SE beliefs may ascribe their failures to their weak ability. And these attributions may concern motivational processes. In short, these processes detect and influence the efforts made by people, their intensity and perseverance for efforts.

The third one is *Affective Processes*. These are generally about feelings and making responses of these feelings apparent. Self-efficacy beliefs have a great role in affecting stress and depression states that people face in hard conditions. In relation to this, arousal of anxiety may bring out when people imagine frustrating thoughts. It relies on the level of SE beliefs of people. A low level of efficacy proceeds with anxiety and depression (Bandura et al., 2003).

The fourth psychological process is *Selection*. Personal SE beliefs inspire the activities and surroundings people select. It is very likely for some people not to select activities or circumstances which are beyond their capabilities. More challenging activities can be chosen as long as people have highly perceived SE beliefs according to Kavanagh and Bower (1985).

2.1.4. Teachers' Self Efficacy Beliefs

As is mentioned before, teachers' SE beliefs are mainly about their judgments and beliefs related to their abilities to complete their duties. Thus their self-efficacy beliefs may have an influence on using instructional strategies, being sufficient in classroom management and providing students participation. (Tschannen Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Following this explanation, it can be phrased that self-efficacy beliefs have a pivotal part in the process of teaching. One study which seeks to investigate the consequences of 20 EFL teachers' SE beliefs for teaching revealed that TSE beliefs have a great effect on their use of instructional strategies by supporting them to foster new teaching techniques so as to improve their practices (Alibakhshi et al., 2020). Another result of this study referring to computer use revealed that teachers with high SE beliefs use computers actively in teaching process. And the last result of the same study related to classroom management indicated that TSE has an important impact on classroom behaviour management. Teachers who are highly efficient may be more prepared throughout the operation of teaching in terms of using new instructional methods (Fullan, 2014). In one study conducted by Özder (2011), it was also concluded that teachers with high self-efficacy beliefs can foster instructional strategies and current techniques in teaching environments. Moreover, classroom management can be obtained successfully by highly efficacious teachers (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). And highly efficacious teachers in terms of self-efficacy beliefs are ready for new ideas and open to try current trends depending on students' needs (Aslan, 2013). And such teachers tend to utilize teaching strategies which center

around students unlike teachers who have low level of SE beliefs (Henson, 2001). This may be helpful for providing student participation and engagement as well. On the contrary, low SE beliefs of teachers may reduce students' assurance of their own skills (Pajares, 2002). In this point, negative effects on student engagement become inevitable. Self-efficacy in computer use is another important dimension for teaching. Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) mainly represents technology use in education process since it is technological knowledge contribution to content and pedagogical knowledge (Shulman, 1987). In a study carried out by Lee and Tsai (2010), it was revealed teachers working in Taiwan have absence of TPACK in terms of use of web. And it may affect other dimensions of TPACK.

Level of the dimensions for SE beliefs, i.e. *providing student engagement, instructional strategies use, classroom management and computer use*, may vary depending on many factors. On that point, Chacon (2005) carried out a research to investigate 100 EFL teachers self-efficacy beliefs in Venezuela. Findings revealed that self-efficacy beliefs of the participants concerning instructional strategies are higher compared to other dimensions like student engagement and classroom management. A different study carried out by Balçı, Sanal and Durak Üğüten (2019) to investigate 291 pre-service EFL teachers' SE beliefs revealed that participants most regard themselves as the highly efficient in terms of instructional strategies. And classroom management and student engagement efficacy follow it respectively.

TSE may also vary relying on *teaching experience*. In a study conducted by Indahyanti (2016), Indonesian EFL teachers' SE beliefs were investigated. It was revealed that experienced teachers are more efficacious than novice teachers. Another study carried out by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) revealed that particularly for classroom management and instructional strategies, novice teachers had lower self-efficacy belief levels compared to experienced teachers. In another study carried out by Akbari and Moradkhani (2010), differences between experienced and novice EFL teachers' SE beliefs were investigated and it was indicated that experienced teachers had remarkably greater SE beliefs related to managing classroom, students involvement and instructional strategy use than the novice ones. Further research in Turkey aiming to investigate the similarities and dissimilarities between pre-service and in-service EFL teachers' SE beliefs was conducted with 180 EFL teachers. In total score, pre-service teachers were slightly scored over against in-service teachers.

However, in the analysis of subdimension scales, in-service teachers were higher scored than pre-service teachers in the context of classroom management. Besides, for student involvement pre-service teachers' SE beliefs were higher (Caner & Dolgun, 2019). In Alagözülü's study (2016), 129 pre-service EFL teachers' SE beliefs were examined and it was found that they had quite high level of SE beliefs in concern with classroom management.

Another study conducted by Klassen and Chiu (2010) examined 1430 teachers' SE beliefs with reference to *gender and teaching experience*. It has revealed that SE beliefs of teachers increased in time from the first career years; however, it started to decrease at about at the end of teaching career. Further result of this study is about gender. Male teachers had higher SE beliefs especially for classroom management than female teachers. In a study of Değirmencioğlu (2021), it was indicated that 64 EFL teachers had adequately high TSE beliefs. Yet, age and gender were not regarded as factors affecting SE beliefs depending on the results. Teaching experience was an essential variable through this research since it showed that novice teachers had the lowest levels of SE beliefs. And it was revealed that highly efficacious teachers fostered more current techniques during their teaching.

Another study conducted by Demirel (2017) investigated SE beliefs of 208 pre-service EFL teachers referring to *age and gender* as variables of the study. A significant difference was not found out concerning both efficacy in instructional strategies and in managing classroom between male and female pre-service teachers. Nonetheless, the female teachers had higher SE belief levels for engaging students compared to the males. In the context of age, there was no significant difference among age categories. In a study conducted by Tok and Tok (2016), classroom management SE beliefs of 85 novice teachers were examined and the results were revealed taking gender into consideration. Male novice teachers get high scores for classroom management SE beliefs when it is compared to the scores of female ones. In another study conducted by Özkara (2019), SE beliefs of 118 EFL teachers were compared depending on gender. It was revealed that significant difference was not found between female and male teachers. Moreover, in relation to age, three categories were formed, i.e. 23-35, 36-45 and 46-55. According to the analysis, 36-45 age group was much higher in SE beliefs than the other age groups. And it was found no significant difference between SE beliefs of teachers and their teaching experience in years. For

the last variable of the Özkara's study, which is the average student number, there was no significant difference among the categories for this variable. Yet, class size may have an effect on TSE beliefs in a way that it may push teachers to have higher SE beliefs when they have large number of students (Lee et al.,1991).

And *level of the school* may be influential in TSE beliefs. In Taimalu and Oim's study (2005), it was presented that teachers working with younger students are expected to be more efficacious than the ones working in high level of schools.

Consequently, teachers' SE beliefs possess a vital role in teaching process with regards to providing student involvement, use of instructional strategies, classroom management and computer use in relation to some variables. High level of SE of teachers may improve the standards of teaching by making all the difference. Therefore, it is an important issue to discuss.

2.2. Online Teaching

Online teaching has gained momentum all around the world due to some unexpected situations, i.e. especially COVID-19. It is not deniable that COVID-19 had a critical impact on health, economy and education of all countries. In the field of education, a transition from face-to-face teaching to online education has emerged. After the first case of COVID-19 is reported in March 2020 in our country, the rapid transition from face-to-face education to online teaching setting has affected several teachers and students as well as education policy. A related term to this situation, which is Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT), emerged in the literature. ERT is a temporary shift of educational instructions so as to find a way related to a remote education for some urgent circumstances (Hodges et al., 2020). Teachers and students who play indispensable roles in educational field have been forced to participate the transition from conventional class settings to online classrooms with no opportunity to find adequate time supporting the adaptation of these changes (Skyes, 2020). In short, it can be stated that online teaching became an essential part of education. This new online teaching model, especially in COVID-19 period, pushes the teachers for using many technological tools while teaching even if they have little or no experience to use these tools or platforms efficiently. From this point of view, some challenges may be faced by teachers.

2.2.1. Online Education Terminology

Online education is a process which takes place synchronous and asynchronous ways by the Internet, not in the classroom setting traditionally (Öztürk, 2021). So, it can be stated that some of the mostly used terms in online education are synchronous and asynchronous online teaching. Synchronous online teaching (SOT) refers to virtual instructional settings where teachers and students take place and actively participate in interaction. It can take place on Zoom, Google Meet and other virtual settings through live questions and answers, etc. However, in asynchronous online teaching (AOT), students and teachers' active participation are not needed to be simultaneous since they can communicate through asynchronous tools such as online discussion boards and e-mails, etc.

Murphy, Rodríguez-Manzanares, and Barbour (2011) described synchronous and asynchronous models. In SOT, teachers teach their students at the same time even though they are in a remote classroom which means physically not being together. In SOT, geographic restrictions are not available; however, temporal restraints are available. SOT tools can be instant messaging and video or audio conferencing. Yet, in AOT, teacher and students do not work together in terms of time and space due to the fact that neither geographic nor temporal restrictions are available. Tools for AOT involve content materials, fax machines, social media like blogs and wikis, etc.

Another term Emergency Remote Teaching abbreviated as ERT is temporary shift of educational providing to another delivery style because of urgent situations such as crisis, etc (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2010). There is a dissimilarity between ERT and teaching online in the literature. Online teaching is regarded as an alternative option of face-to-face teaching although ERT is considered as an obligation (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2010). Golden (2020) indicated that especially at the very beginning of COVID-19 ERT should be taken into account as a temporary solution towards an urgent problem. ERT is not characteristically planned because it emerges in case of emergency situations. And, it generally returns to the normal condition which is face-to-face education when the extraordinary situations end. However, online teaching requires very detailed planning and preparation unlike ERT. Also, ERT is not necessarily designed for online teaching. But it may take place in online setting as in COVID-19 process due to urgent crises such as pandemic, natural disasters, etc (Hodges et al., 2020).

2.2.2. Challenges of Online Teaching

There are obviously some differences between online and traditional teaching. In traditional setting, teachers and students are physically in the classrooms; however, online teaching can be described in a way that it is teaching content with the help of some platforms through Internet technology (Zhou, Wu, Zhou, & Li, 2020). So, presence of technology in online teaching is obvious. One challenge concerning online teaching may be communication. It may be much more difficult compared to conventional education where face-to-face communication is available. Furthermore, online teaching may be interrupted by lack of TPACK of teachers, low attendance, and high cost of the Internet (Noor et al., 2020). In this point, teachers' digital literacy is needed in order to teach effectively. During teaching online, technical problems may occur and teachers should be competent in solving them alongside using online teaching platforms. And, they must know how to overcome these problems that may occur in online teaching (Aliyyah et al., 2020). Any deficiencies in these factor can affect teachers' SE beliefs towards online teaching.

In one study conducted by Noor et al (2020), perceptions of 10 teachers towards their online teaching experiences in COVID-19 process are examined. According to the results, challenges faced by the teachers are poor content development, preparing creative courses, lack of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) knowledge and teachers' low confidence in technology use. Sarı and Aras (2022) in their study related to online teaching experiences of 12 teachers revealed that teachers had negative practices especially in technical issues. In another study carried out by Erdoğan and Yazıcı (2022), challenges faced by 155 EFL teachers in online teaching were investigated. Depending on the analysis, it was revealed that technological problems were mostly experienced followed by interaction, monitoring, student motivation, classroom management, lack of technology related opportunities, student participation and time management. A recent study conducted by Şevik and Yücedağ (2021) examined the online education views of 40 EFL teachers who work secondary and high schools in Turkey. The research indicated that common difficulties faced by the teachers were Internet connectivity, lack of Internet and technological devices and technical hitches. Civelek and Uzun (2021), in their study, looked into the obstacles faced by 70 Turkish EFL teachers in terms of online teaching. Prevalent challenging obstacles were lack of online facilities, lack of required Internet- based skills, low

student motivation, deficiencies in virtual online teaching platforms and lack of communication. In another study Ekiz (2022), 61 English language instructors' online teaching experiences during COVID-19 pandemic were investigated. The most disadvantaged part of it was technical problems. And Internet loss, maintaining interaction with students, low student participation and motivation, designing effective online materials followed it respectively. These challenges may play a role in SE beliefs of teachers.

2.2.3. Online Teaching Competences addressing to 21st Century Skills

When the challenges experienced by teachers are taken into consideration, it is obvious that teachers must possess some skills in order to teach effective online courses. Since face-to-face teaching and online teaching are different from each other, skills that teachers should have in face-to-face setting may not be adequate for online instruction. Therefore, 21st century teachers should have competences beyond only teaching content. It is also fundamental that teachers of 21st century should be skilled particularly at technology integration and online teaching platforms which are synchronous and asynchronous. Cooper, Farah and Mrstik (2020) point out that teachers must be equipped with the knowledge for technology integration along with being ready for teaching online. Today 21st century skills gained importance especially in educational field. Accordingly, teachers should master these skills so as to teach online effectively. In a study conducted by Erdoğan (2019), results indicated that 21st century skills are the competences that should be specialised by teachers along with its necessity to be taught to the students.

Schleicher (2012) made a list of 21st century skills as critical thinking, creativity, problem solving, decision-making and learning under the thinking category, cooperation and communication under the category of working, Information and Communication Technology, Information literacy under the category of working tools and lastly citizenship, life and career, individual and social responsibility under the category of living skills. With regards to this, it may be claimed that teachers with 21st century skills may be highly self-efficacious teachers in terms of online teaching since some of the skills of 21st century are provided in the scale used for the present study. In this study, communication, collaboration, creativity, critical thinking shortened as 4C's and digital literacy as 21st century skills will be discussed in details. It is important

to remind that teachers must possess these mentioned skills so that they can integrate them into their online courses.

Starting with communication, it is briefly related to expressing ourselves. Teachers must have high communication skills to exchange information where interaction begins. This happens not only by talking to people around us but also interacting with students using technology in online platform. Therefore, teachers should learn how to fulfill ICT tools to create interactive communication. In their study, Ananiadou and Claro (2009) point out that ICT tools support communication apart from developing collaboration among students. Another way improving interactive communication can be using e-mails, chat rooms, blogs and online classrooms, etc.

Collaboration, which is another dimension of 4C's, can be defined as skilfully working together in order to develop skills. Creating goals, sharing ideas and responsibilities, being contributors, making co-decisions and taking roles in positive disagreements are necessary for collaboration (Johnson & Johnson, 2013). Lauron (2008) indicated 10 mostly used collaboration tools for online instruction in their study. They are synchronous conferencing, electronic mail, instant messaging, voicemail, forums on the Internet, online chatting, video conference, data conferencing, application sharing, electronic meeting systems. Having collaboration skills is very essential for teachers and they can collaborate with their colleagues to improve the skills of their students as well as their own skills.

Creativity is another 21st century skill that teachers should have while teaching online. Teachers should provide right conditions in order to develop students' creativity in online teaching. Use of creative online tools may improve creativity level of students. According to Andy (2018), teachers must be aware of different learning styles possessed by students while trying to develop students' creativity. Therefore, various online tools can be fostered referring to this point.

Teachers of 21st century should have critical thinking skills. In online teaching, teachers and students try to comprehend and figure out the instructions, make evaluations related to information and find solutions for the problems. Teachers should also assist students' higher order thinking skills in some ways. Questions in well-organized discussions and in online forums may help students reach high level of

critical thinking (Turdieva, 2022). In their study, Frederickson, Lunney, McDuffie and Spark (2008) demonstrated a table concerning teaching strategies facilitating critical thinking in online teaching. Some of them are asking questions which request information seeking, asking students to tell their reading with their own words, motivating students to give efforts by grading criteria, triggering students to give examples and reinforcing critical thinking use of students.

In a study conducted by Ekiz (2022), the findings concluded that language teachers should be supported for critical thinking and collaboration among teacher support groups to adapt online teaching. Furthermore, EFL teachers should foster thinking skills, support learning transfer, promote collaborative works, encourage creativity and make use of technology in the teaching process (Saavedra & Opfer, 2012). In another study conducted by İşman, Altınay and Altınay (2004), roles of teachers concerning teaching online were presented. Depending on the results, teachers must have technological competence, communicative skills, qualifications related to collaboration and material design skills taking individual differences into account. Munoz Carril et al. (2013) in their study revealed some competences related to teachers performing online. These competences are “pedagogical, social, evaluator, manager, technologist, advisor, personal and researcher” (p. 469-470). For pedagogical role, teachers should be competent in instructional design, content, tutoring and organizing. Social roles require teachers to design learning environments alongside promoting student interactions. And it is required assessing and monitoring students as an evaluator and managing time and online course establishing rules as a manager. As a technologist, teachers should have knowledge for technical procedures and synchronous and asynchronous communication tools. As an advisor, they should guide students depending on their needs and motive them. It is needed adopting positive attitudes towards online education for personal roles and carrying out research concerning teaching for a researcher. Erdoğan and Yazıcı (2022) looked into competency levels of 155 EFL teachers in online teaching. The findings demonstrated that teachers felt less capable of maintaining interaction with learners.

Digital literacy is clarified as the capacity to reach, control, comprehend, integrate, evaluate and form information securely by use of technologies and it is related to some competences such as media literacy, data literacy, ICT literacy and computer literacy (UNESCO, 2018). And digital literacy is an urgent need for online

teaching since technological developments become a part of the education. During pandemic and post-pandemic process, technology use in online classrooms as well as face-to-face courses has increased. Therefore, teachers must have digital literacy skills to meet the new trends. In a study, Polat (2021) indicated that there was a relationship between the levels of digital literacy of pre-service teachers and their thoughts related to distance education which makes technological dimensions come to the fore. In study conducted by Yustika and Iswati (2020), it was revealed that online learners especially with limited computer skills do not comprehend online classes and high level of digital literacy leads high student performance followed by sufficient outputs. In this scope, it can be stated that teachers must have digital literacy skills so as to teach their students. In the end, online learning can be effective for students.

Digital literacy is also associated with 21st century skills which are communication, collaboration, creativity and critical thinking including problem solving skills. In a study conducted by Kesici (2022), the results indicated that digital literacy level possesses a remarkable influence on creative thinking. Also, collaboration and communication occur with the help of utilizing digital tools which require digital literacy. In a study (Fauzan et al., 2022), some digital tools used by teachers and students for academic purposes do refer to collaboration in online setting and communication which are interlinked with digital literacy. Furthermore, critical thinking skills and digital literacy share common perspectives. MacKnight (2000) indicated that online discussions including e-mails, bulletin boards, chatrooms play important roles in improving students' critical thinking skills. These online discussion tools most likely necessitate digital literacy skills that should be taught by teachers. MoNE (2021) indicated the 21st century skills as components of digital literacy creating a relationship between them and proposed guidelines for teachers in this sense.

The skills and competences mentioned above exemplify high level of expectations requested from teachers in online teaching. It may burden on teachers' shoulder, which may affect the level of teachers' SE beliefs for online teaching. Furthermore, these competences may be a manifesto for teachers' SE beliefs towards online teaching.

2.3. Teachers' Self-efficacy Beliefs regarding Online Teaching

Teachers' SE beliefs towards online teaching are little-known as it is compared to face-to-face teaching SE beliefs of teachers. In relation to this, there are a few studies examining teachers' SE beliefs about online teaching referring to demographic variables. In existing studies, generally Likert type scales are used to rate teachers' SE beliefs in different dimensions. An instrument designed by Tschannen Moran and Hoy (2001) in order to look into teachers' SE beliefs in face-to-face educational atmosphere is Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). It is consisted of 3 dimensions which are efficacy in students engagement (.87), efficacy in instructional strategies (.91) and efficacy in classroom management (.90). Each dimension has 8 related items and in total it makes 24 items (.94) ranging from 1 to 9. The scale TSES was modified by Robinia and Anderson (2010) so as to specifically examine SE beliefs towards *online* teaching. This scale called as The Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (MNESEOT) by the researchers. This scale is adopted in the present research. In total, it is consisted of 32 items which 24 of them are revised form of the TSES by changing the expression "in your classroom" into "in your online classroom." Also, 8 new items are added to address to computer use self-efficacy which includes technical infrastructure, using both synchronous and asynchronous discussions to promote interaction and collaboration, e-mail communication, word processing, providing links and sources. All items are confirmed by a factor analysis: "self-efficacy in online student engagement (.93), self-efficacy in online instructional strategies (.94), self-efficacy for online classroom management (.93), self-efficacy in the use of computers (.86) and a total score for the entire instrument (.93)."

In one study used the scale MNESEOT as an instrument, Robinia and Anderson (2010) demonstrated that there was not found a significant difference in online SE levels in terms of gender as well as age. As another variable, in this study it was found a correlation between online teaching experience and SE belief levels. However, in other studies, male teachers have less SE belief level in engaging students compared to female teachers (Xia & Beach, 2015; Horvitz *et al.*, 2015).

In another study led by Dolighan and Owen (2021), teachers' SE beliefs regarding online teaching were investigated with the scale MNESEOT. The findings signified that no significant relationship was found between online teaching SE belief levels and the variables which are age, face-to-face teaching experience, online

teaching experience. Furthermore, it was indicated that teachers who took trainings for online teaching were highly efficacious in online teaching. In the study, computer use SE beliefs had the highest score followed by efficacy in instructional strategy use, efficacy in classroom management and efficacy in student engagement respectively.

Aşçı, Yıldırım and Topal (2022) conducted a research with 446 pre-service teachers. With the object of investigating their online teaching effectiveness which may create link with their SE beliefs. Depending on the findings, it was shown that there was no a significant difference in their online teaching effectiveness depending on the gender and their majors.

Furthermore, there are some other studies concerning changes in teachers' online self-efficacy levels. In Chai, Koh and Tsai's study (2010), an ICT training was provided pre-service teachers and the study findings indicated that the training had positive effects on the participants' online teaching. Another study in this scope conducted by Moore-Adams and Jones (2015) included an online certificate program courses for teachers. This program is consisted of some courses titled "Facilitating Digital Tools, Instructional Design of Online Environments, Assessment and Evaluation in Online Environments, Course Development Practicum and Time and Course Management (p. 1496-1497)" The outcomes showed that the trainings were beneficial for teachers' efficacy in online teaching. One study looked into whether synchronous technology is an influential tool in terms of teachers' competence (Woodcock, Sisco & Eady, 2015). 53 teachers attended a course in this study. At the end of the research, it was revealed that e-learning synchronous technology was important in order to develop teachers' skills at course content, technological competence and self-efficacy beliefs for online settings. Wright (2011) in his study looked into whether the training workshop was effective on online SE beliefs of teachers. The results indicated that teachers' perceived efficacy beliefs for designing, developing and implementing online courses increased after the trainings received.

3. METHODOLOGY

The main objective of this chapter is to represent the research design along with the participants and sampling method, data collection as well as data analysis tools.

3.1. Research Design

The present study adopts a quantitative research methodology, characterized by the generation of numerical data. This approach is implemented through the utilization of data collection tools such as questionnaires and surveys, which aim to measure variations and estimate relationships among variables (Burns & Grove, 2005). The study employs descriptive type of quantitative study to examine the self-efficacy beliefs of English language teachers about online teaching referring to the variables under the study. The participants in this study are 270 state school EFL teachers working in Gaziantep province, Turkey, who voluntarily provided responses to the questionnaire items.

3.2. Sampling and Population

The study was conducted during both the pandemic and post-pandemic periods. The target population consisted of 270 state school EFL teachers employed in elementary, secondary, and high schools in Gaziantep province, Turkey. To determine the appropriate sample size for the study, the formula proposed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) was employed. Considering the total number of EFL teachers affiliated with the Gaziantep Provincial Directorate of National Education, an average sample size of 250 was determined. To account for potential missing data, a total of 270 data were collected. The participants were selected using a convenience sampling approach, which falls under the category of nonprobability sampling. Convenience sampling involves selecting readily available individuals to participate as respondents until the desired sample size is achieved from those who happen to be accessible and available at the given time (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

Among the participants, 166 teachers were female (61.5%), while 104 were male (38.5%). Regarding the distribution of participants based on school levels, 52 teachers (19.3%) worked in elementary schools, 113 teachers (41.9%) worked in secondary schools, and 105 teachers (38.9%) worked in high schools in Gaziantep.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

In order to gather the necessary data, two instruments were employed: a Personal Information Form and The Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (MNESEOT) Instrument.

3.3.1 Personal Information Form

The Personal Information Form was utilized to collect data pertaining to various participant characteristics, including gender, age, teaching experience, major of graduation, school level worked, prior experience with online teaching (in months), and weekly online courses taught (in hours). Additionally, participants were asked to provide information regarding the number of students attending their online classes and any relevant trainings they had undergone in relation to online teaching. The Personal Information Form served as a means to gather additional information from the participants.

3.3.2. The Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (MNESEOT) Scale

In the present study, a questionnaire with 32 items was used to get quantitative data. This scale called “The Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (MNESEOT)” developed by Robinia and Anderson (2010) has 4 dimensions in order to examine online SE beliefs in student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management and computers use. All the dimensions are related to online teaching setting. This scale was developed on the basis of another scale called Teacher’s Sense of Self-Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) in order to greater adjust online teaching setting. 24 items of the scale are modified by adding an expression “in your online class.” Moreover, 8 items, which make total number of the items 32, were developed concerning the dimension of SE in computer use by the researchers. MNESEOT is a nine-point Likert type scale. Responses from the participants ranges from 1 (Nothing) though 9 (A Great Deal) respectively. The greater self-efficacy sense occur as the cumulative score is higher. All items are confirmed by a factor analysis: self-efficacy in online student engagement (.93), self-efficacy in online instructional strategies (.94), self-efficacy for online classroom management (.93), self-efficacy in the use of computers (.86) and a total score for the entire instrument (.93). Cronbach’s Alpha value was found as .97 by the researcher.

One example item from the scale is given for each dimension. For the dimension called as online SE beliefs in student engagement, an example item is *“How much can you do to help your students think critically in an online class?”* For the dimension related to online SE beliefs in instructional strategies, an example item is *“How well can you respond to difficult questions from online students?”* Another example item for the third dimension called online SE beliefs in classroom management is *“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?”* For the last dimension of the survey, *“How well can you use computers for word processing, internet searching and e-mail communication?”* is an example for online SE beliefs in computers use.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

Data through the questionnaire were gathered during 2021-2022 academic year. A necessary permission concerning to use the instrument was taken from the developers (Appendix 1) Before collecting the data, permission of Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee by Ondokuz Mayıs University was obtained (Appendix 2). Gaziantep Provincial Directorate of National Education was also obtained so as to gather data from the EFL teachers who work in state schools of Şahinbey and Şehitkamil- Gaziantep. Data were gathered in school settings. It took 10-15 minutes of teachers to answer all items in the questionnaire. Ethical rules related to the research were explained to the volunteer participants.

3.5. Statement of the Research Questions

This research investigates online teaching self-efficacy beliefs of Gaziantep state school English language teachers in terms of 4 dimensions such as providing student engagement, use of instructional strategies, classroom management and computer use. In relation to this, the research questions are:

1. What are the level of online teaching self-efficacy beliefs of English language teachers in student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management and use of computers?
2. Does online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions differ depending on the participants' gender, age, teaching experience and major of graduation?

3. Is there a meaningful difference about online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions in terms of school level, online teaching experience, online courses taught in hours and student participation?
4. Is there a meaningful difference about online teaching self-efficacy belief levels considering 4 dimensions between the ones who have taken any trainings and the others who have not taken any trainings?
5. Do the trainings have an effect on teachers' online teaching self-efficacy beliefs regarding 4 dimensions?

3.6. Data Analysis

Gathered data were analysed through SPSS v23 programme. Missing data were eliminated and accuracy is provided in the data gathered. Yet, the variables online teaching experience in months and online course taught in hours were grouped so as to perform better statistical analysis. Related categories of online teaching experience is shaped like 0-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-24 and 24+ months depending on the answers which were given to the open-ended questions by the participants. Another category was formed for online courses taught in hours. It is categorized as 0-10, 11-20, 20-30 and 30+ hours by taking the answers for the open-ended questions into account. Descriptive statistics were used with the aim of providing information concerning English language teachers' level of online SE beliefs, socio-demographic data and their answers regarding online education such as prior online teaching experience, number of courses taught online, student participation, trainings taken for online teaching and effects of trainings. Furthermore, the normality test was conducted for the study. Also, independent sample T-test was used to examine English language teachers' online SE beliefs regarding 4 dimensions such as "efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, efficacy in classroom management and efficacy in use of computers" in terms of the variables gender and trainings taken. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also used so as to evaluate the differences in teachers' online SE beliefs regarding 4 dimensions according to age, teaching experience, level of the school worked, prior online teaching experience in months, online courses taught in hours. Furthermore, ANOVA was used in order to analyse teachers' online SE beliefs according to major of graduation and Hochbergs GT2 post hoc for determining the source of difference. ANOVA was also used to analyse teachers' online SE beliefs according to student participation and Gabriel post

hoc for determining the source of difference. Moreover, the Games Howell post hoc was used to identify the source for difference in evaluating effects of received trainings depending on teachers' online SE beliefs. And Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted with the aim of looking into the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the scale. In order to analyse significance, .05 (p) level was used throughout the study.



4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, findings of the study are provided in details through Tables. The findings are discussed referring to the research questions and related literature analysis.

Table 4.1 shows the descriptive results of socio-demographic data of the participants. Table 4.2 analyses the responses of participants to questions regarding online education via Personal Information Form. Other analysis referring to research questions of the present study were provided in Table 4.3, Table 4.4, Table 4.5, Table 4.6, Table 4.7, Table 4.8, Table 4.9, Table 4.10, Table 4.11, Table 4.12, Table 4.13, Table 4.14 and Table 4.15.

Table 4.1. Socio-Demographic Data of the Participants

		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Gender	Female	166	61,5
	Male	104	38,5
Age	21-25	47	17,4
	26-30	86	31,9
	31-35	62	23,0
	36-40	37	13,7
	41-45	23	8,5
	46+	15	5,6
Teaching Experience	0-5	104	38,5
	6-10	90	33,3
	11-15	39	14,4
	16-20	12	4,4
	20+	25	9,3
Graduation	English Language Teaching	200	74,1
	English/American Language and Literature	55	20,4
	English Linguistics	15	5,6
School Level	Elementary School	52	19,3
	Secondary School	113	41,9
	High School	105	38,9
	Total	270	100,0

When the distribution of socio-demographic data of the participants in the research is evaluated, 61.5% of the participants were female, 31.9% were aged 26-30, 38.5% had 0-5 years of teaching experience, 74.1% had education English Language Teaching and 41.9% of the school level was found as Secondary School.

Table 4.2. Responses of Participants to Questions Regarding Online Teaching

		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
How long do you have prior online teaching experience?	0-4 m	33	12,2
	5-8 m	77	28,5
	9-12 m	94	34,8
	13-24 m	30	11,1
	24 m +	36	13,3
How many courses have you taught per week in online teaching?	0-10 h	57	21,1
	11-20 h	67	24,8
	20-30 h	136	50,4
	30 h+	10	3,7
Approximately how many students have attended your online courses?	0-5	71	26,3
	6-10	95	35,2
	11-15	56	20,7
	16-20	22	8,1
	20+	26	9,6
Have you ever had a training that focused on skills, techniques, problems and/or preparations for online teaching?	Yes	114	42,2
	No	156	57,8
The trainings adequately prepare you in the skills needed for online teaching.	Strongly Disagree	2	,7
	Slightly Disagree	14	5,2
	Neutral	37	13,7
	Agree	43	15,9
	Strongly Agree	18	6,7
	None	156	57,8
	Total	270	100,0

When the answers provided by the participants to the questions about online education were evaluated, it was determined that 34.8% of the participants had 9-12

months of online teaching experience, 50.4% had 20-30 hours of weekly online teaching and 35.2% had 6-10 student participation. It was revealed that 42,2% of the participants received “trainings focusing on skills, techniques, problems and/or preparations related to online teaching.” To the item “The trainings adequately prepare you in the skills needed for online teaching”, 15,9% of the participants answered *Agree* and 13,7% of the participants answered *Neutral*. And 57,8% of the participants are not required to answer the item since they did not take any trainings in this scope.

Table 4.3. Evaluation of Expressions in the scale concerning Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching

Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching Scale		Mean	Sd.
1.	How much can you do to help your students think critically in an online class?	4,76	2,023
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.)	4,07	2,019
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?	5,00	2,230
4.	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in online work?	4,83	1,930
5.	To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior in an online class?	5,10	1,938
6.	How much can you do to get students to believe that they can do well in an online class?	5,45	2,038
7.	How well can you respond to difficult questions from online students?	6,16	2,123
8.	How well can you establish routines (e.g. facilitate or moderate student participation) in coursework to keep online activities running smoothly?	5,41	1,956
9.	How much can you do to help online students’ value learning?	5,10	2,006
10.	How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught in an online course?	5,13	1,850
11.	How well can you craft questions or assignments that require students to think by relating ideas to previous knowledge and experience?	5,24	1,875
12.	How much can you do to foster individual student creativity in an online course?	4,73	1,882
13.	How much can you do to get students to follow the established rules for assignments and deadlines during an online class?	5,20	2,082
14.	How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing in an online class?	4,84	1,875

15. How much can you do to control students dominating online discussions?	5,34	2,106
16. How well can you establish an online course (e.g. convey expectations; standards; course rules) with each group of students?	5,31	1,879
17. How much can you do to adjust your online lessons for different learning styles?	5,27	2,033
18. How much can you do to use a variety of assessment strategies for an online course?	5,24	1,954
19. How well can you develop an online course that facilitates student responsibility for online learning?	5,17	1,930
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students in an online class seem to be confused?	5,73	2,025
21. How well can you respond to defiant students in an online setting?	5,32	2,038
22. How well can you structure an online course that facilitates collaborative learning?	4,84	1,987
23. How well can you structure an online course that provides good learning experiences for students?	5,50	1,960
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students in an online environment?	5,51	1,971
25. To what extent can you use knowledge of copyright law to provide resources for online students?	4,96	2,065
26. How well can you navigate the technical infrastructure at your institution to successfully create an online course?	5,05	2,047
27. How well can you navigate the technical infrastructure at your institution to successfully teach an established online course?	4,98	2,015
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)	4,63	2,036
29. To what extent can you use synchronous discussions (e.g. same time chat rooms) to maximize interaction between students in an online course?	4,89	2,135
30. How well can you use computers for word processing, Internet searching and e-mail communication?	6,48	2,255
31. To what extent does your comfort level with computers facilitate participation in online teaching?	6,19	2,230
32. How well can you navigate the Internet to provide links and resources to students in an online course?	6,32	2,269

1: Nothing – 9: A Great Deal

When the average scores of the expressions used in the scale concerning online teaching self-efficacy beliefs are evaluated, “How well can you use computers for word processing, internet searching and e-mail communication?” (avg: 6.48) and “How well can you navigate the Internet to provide links and resources to students in

an online course?” (avg:6.32) were determined to be the expressions with the highest mean scores.

The expressions with the lowest average score are “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)” (avg: 4.63) and “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.)” (avg: 4.07) expressions.

Table 4.4. Descriptive Statistics of the scale concerning Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching

	Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Sd.
Efficacy in Student Engagement	270	1	9	4,83	1,579
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	270	1	9	5,47	1,648
Efficacy in Classroom Management	270	1	9	5,23	1,644
Efficacy in Use of Computers	270	1	9	5,44	1,693
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	270	4	36	20,97	6,232
Valid N (listwise)	270				

When sub-dimensions are evaluated one by one, the highest level of SE beliefs among them is “Efficacy in Instructional Strategies (avg: 5.47)” followed by “Efficacy in Use of Computers (avg: 5,44)”, “Efficacy in Classroom Management (avg: 5,23)” and “Efficacy in Student Engagement (avg: 4.83)” respectively. According to the results, it can be stated that English language teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs towards online teaching is at a moderate level. The maximum achievable score is 288 (32x9) and the minimum score is 32(32x1). Teachers’ overall online teaching SE beliefs are at the level of 5.24. This value equals to 168 (5.24x32). It can also be stated that this value is equivalent to 58 out of 100 (168/288), which is at a moderate level. Overall, the participants believed they could do “Some” concerning online teaching requirements such as planning, preparation, teaching and evaluating.

This finding addresses to the first research question “What are the level of online teaching self-efficacy beliefs of English language teachers in student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management and use of computers?”

Table 4.5 demonstrates Independent samples T-test results conducted to investigate the differences in online teaching SE beliefs of teachers in terms of the gender variable.

Table 4.5. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Gender

	Gender	n	Mean	Sd.	t	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Female	166	4,64	1,573	-2,499	,013
	Male	104	5,13	1,548		
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Female	166	5,23	1,706	-3,046	,003
	Male	104	5,85	1,482		
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Female	166	4,94	1,645	-3,802	,000
	Male	104	5,70	1,537		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Female	166	5,17	1,728	-3,396	,001
	Male	104	5,87	1,546		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	Female	166	19,98	6,363	-3,367	,001
	Male	104	22,56	5,697		

*Independent Samples t test

When the scale concerning online teaching self-efficacy beliefs is evaluated in terms of gender, the values are “Efficacy in Student Engagement (p=0.013), Efficacy in Instructional Strategies (p=0.003), Efficacy in Classroom Management (p=0.000), Efficacy in Use of Computers (p=0.001) for sub-dimensions and Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching (p=0.001)” A statistically significant difference in favour of male teachers was determined across the scale (p=0.001). According to the result, it was determined that male teachers have higher scores than female teachers in the scale and its sub-dimensions. This finding may be identified with the circumstance that males feel more self-secure than female teachers due to some cultural or social norms. Previous research indicated different level of online teaching SE beliefs depending on gender variable. Some studies demonstrated that male teachers have less online SE beliefs especially for Student Engagement in comparison with female teachers (Xia & Beach, 2015; Horvitz *et al.*, 2015). However, this could not be demonstrated in this research since the results are in favour of male teachers. The results of the study shows parallelism with a different study (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). These findings are the

response to the second research question “Does online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions differ depending on the participants’ *gender*, age, teaching experience and major of graduation?”

Table 4.6 shows the one-way ANOVA results investigating the differences in online teaching SE beliefs of teachers in terms of age groups.

Table 4.6. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Age

	Age	n	Mean	Sd.	f	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	21-25	47	4,89	1,820	,345	,885
	26-30	86	4,82	1,465		
	31-35	62	4,88	1,520		
	36-40	37	4,92	1,681		
	41-45	23	4,79	1,885		
	46+	15	4,33	,864		
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	21-25	47	5,55	1,874	,790	,558
	26-30	86	5,58	1,508		
	31-35	62	5,49	1,584		
	36-40	37	5,55	1,734		
	41-45	23	5,17	1,902		
	46+	15	4,78	1,320		
Efficacy in Classroom Management	21-25	47	5,43	1,960	,853	,513
	26-30	86	5,28	1,518		
	31-35	62	5,32	1,504		
	36-40	37	5,20	1,718		
	41-45	23	4,93	1,915		
	46+	15	4,55	1,142		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	21-25	47	5,72	1,847	1,305	,262
	26-30	86	5,47	1,600		
	31-35	62	5,40	1,626		
	36-40	37	5,62	1,729		
	41-45	23	5,16	1,984		
	46+	15	4,55	1,269		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	21-25	47	21,59	7,175	,812	,542
	26-30	86	21,14	5,653		
	31-35	62	21,09	5,848		
	36-40	37	21,29	6,639		
	41-45	23	20,05	7,563		
	46+	15	18,22	4,415		

*ANOVA

When the scale concerning online teaching self-efficacy beliefs was evaluated in terms of age, no statistically significant difference was found between the age groups. Depending on the the results, it was determined that the scale and its sub-dimensions did not differ in terms of age variable. This result is parallel with other studies (Robinia & Anderson, 2010; Dolighan & Owen, 2021; Değirmencioğlu, 2021; Demirel, 2017, Tweed, 2013). This finding forms an answer for the second research question “Does online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions differ depending on the participants’ gender, *age*, teaching experience and major of graduation?”

Table 4.7 indicates the results of one-way ANOVA conducted to investigate the differences in online teaching SE belief levels of teachers depending on teaching experience variable.

Table 4.7. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Teaching Experience

	Experience	n	Mean	Sd.	f	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	0-5	104	4,80	1,635	,945	,439
	6-10	90	5,04	1,595		
	11-15	39	4,67	1,288		
	16-20	12	4,27	1,738		
	20+	25	4,69	1,621		
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	0-5	104	5,61	1,685	1,212	,306
	6-10	90	5,57	1,641		
	11-15	39	5,34	1,427		
	16-20	12	4,80	1,701		
	20+	25	5,07	1,786		
Efficacy in Classroom Management	0-5	104	5,30	1,705	1,215	,305
	6-10	90	5,41	1,610		
	11-15	39	5,09	1,474		
	16-20	12	4,59	1,774		
	20+	25	4,83	1,666		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	0-5	104	5,54	1,651	1,359	,248
	6-10	90	5,58	1,796		
	11-15	39	5,42	1,461		
	16-20	12	4,84	1,629		
	20+	25	4,86	1,797		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	0-5	104	21,25	6,273	1,181	,319
	6-10	90	21,60	6,342		

11-15	39	20,52	5,250
16-20	12	18,51	6,706
20+	25	19,44	6,735

*ANOVA

When the scale concerning online teaching self-efficacy beliefs was evaluated in terms of teaching experience, no statistically significant difference was found between the groups. According to the results, it was determined that the scale and its sub-dimensions did not differ in terms of teaching experience variable. This result is similar to the results of some other studies (Dolighan & Owen, 2021; Fadley & Alshasab, 2018; Özkara, 2019, Tweed, 2013). Yet, other research which put a relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and teaching experience are also available (Akbari & Moradkhani, 2010; Değirmencioğlu, 2021; Indanyanti, 2016; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Opposite results are also found in some studies (Caner & Dolgun, 2019; Klassen & Chiu, 2010). This result also correlates with another variable of the present study, which is age. These two variables may be interrelated since it is expected that teaching experience increases with age. This finding of the present study answers the second research question “Does online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions differ depending on the participants’ gender, age, *teaching experience* and major of graduation?”

Table 4.8 shows the results of ANOVA and Hochbergs GT2 post hoc test conducted to look into difference in online teaching self-efficacy beliefs of teachers regarding major of graduation.

Table 4.8. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of the Major of Graduation

	Major of Graduation	n	Mean	Sd.	f	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	English Language Teaching	200	4,81	1,570	,479	,620
	English/American Language and Literature	55	4,80	1,597		
	English Linguistics	15	5,22	1,685		
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	English Language Teaching	200	5,49	1,627	,797	,452
	English/American Language and Literature	55	5,30	1,714		
	English Linguistics	15	5,90	1,713		

Efficacy in Classroom Management	English Language Teaching	200	5,27	1,638	,668	,513
	English/American Language and Literature	55	5,02	1,653		
	English Linguistics	15	5,48	1,735		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	English Language Teaching	200	5,47	1,675	3,307	,038
	English/American Language and Literature	55	5,10	1,689		
	English Linguistics	15	6,33	1,685		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	English Language Teaching	200	21,03	6,167	1,142	,321
	English/American Language and Literature	55	20,23	6,429		
	English Linguistics	15	22,93	6,312		

*ANOVA *Hochbergs GT2 post hoc

When the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching was evaluated in terms of the major of graduation, a statistically significant difference was found in the Efficacy in Use of Computers sub-dimension ($p=0.038$). Hochbergs GT2 post hoc analysis was applied by evaluating the Levene test to determine the group which has the difference. According to the results, it was identified that graduates of English Linguistics had higher scores in Use of Computers compared to other groups. However, there are no significant difference found in the total mean scores of "Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Strategies and Efficacy in Classroom Management." These findings answer the second research question "Does online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions differ depending on the participants' gender, age, teaching experience and *major of graduation*?"

Table 4.9 indicates the results of ANOVA conducted to examine difference in online teaching self-efficacy beliefs of teachers in terms of school levels that they work.

Table 4.9. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Level of School

	Level	n	Mean	Sd.	f	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Elementary School	52	4,79	1,596	,876	,418
	Secondary School	113	4,70	1,586		
	High School	105	4,98	1,564		

Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Elementary School	52	5,40	1,617	1,015	,364
	Secondary School	113	5,34	1,640		
	High School	105	5,65	1,672		
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Elementary School	52	5,13	1,510	,664	,516
	Secondary School	113	5,15	1,699		
	High School	105	5,38	1,653		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Elementary School	52	5,36	1,583	1,165	,314
	Secondary School	113	5,29	1,636		
	High School	105	5,63	1,799		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	Elementary School	52	20,69	5,980	1,012	,365
	Secondary School	113	20,48	6,231		
	High School	105	21,64	6,352		

*ANOVA

When the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching was evaluated in terms of the level of school, no statistically significant difference was found between the groups. According to the results, it was determined that the scale and its sub-dimensions did not differ in terms of school level variable. Opposite results were found in Taimalu and Oim's study (2005). And this finding is related to the third research question "Is there a meaningful difference about online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions in terms of *school level*, online teaching experience, online courses taught in hours and student participation?"

Table 4.10 shows the results of ANOVA examining difference in online teaching self-efficacy beliefs of teachers depending on prior online teaching experience.

Table 4.10. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Prior Online Teaching Experience

	Experience	n	Mean	Sd.	f	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	0-4 m	33	4,64	1,342	,809	,520
	5-8 m	77	4,77	1,658		
	9-12 m	94	4,86	1,599		
	13-24 m	30	4,62	1,468		
	24 m +	36	5,21	1,652		
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	0-4 m	33	5,13	1,513	2,088	,083
	5-8 m	77	5,43	1,696		
	9-12 m	94	5,50	1,633		
	13-24 m	30	5,12	1,587		
	24 m +	36	6,11	1,655		
	0-4 m	33	4,95	1,537	1,135	,340

Efficacy in Classroom Management	5-8 m	77	5,12	1,655		
	9-12 m	94	5,31	1,683		
	13-24 m	30	5,05	1,622		
	24 m +	36	5,68	1,618		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	0-4 m	33	5,01	1,595	2,277	,061
	5-8 m	77	5,40	1,700		
	9-12 m	94	5,49	1,700		
	13-24 m	30	5,08	1,615		
	24 m +	36	6,09	1,689		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	0-4 m	33	19,74	5,587	1,664	,159
	5-8 m	77	20,72	6,416		
	9-12 m	94	21,16	6,293		
	13-24 m	30	19,86	5,823		
	24 m +	36	23,08	6,318		

*ANOVA

When the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching was evaluated in terms of prior online education experience, no statistically significant difference was found between the groups. According to the results, it was determined that the scale and its sub-dimensions did not differ in prior online education experience variable. In Robinia and Anderson's study (2010), a correlation was found between online teaching experience and self-efficacy beliefs. Yet, this finding has not been proven in this research. The results are parallel to the results of Dolighan and Owen (2021) And this finding refers to the third research question "Is there a meaningful difference about online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions in terms of school level, *online teaching experience*, online courses taught in hours and student participation?"

Table 4.11 shows the results of one-way ANOVA conducted to examine difference in online teaching SE beliefs of teachers depending on online courses taught in hours.

Table 4.11. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Online Teaching Time

	Teaching	n	Mean	Sd.	f	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	0-10 h	57	4,52	1,490	1,317	,269
	11-20 h	67	4,99	1,579		
	20-30 h	136	4,84	1,602		
	30 h+	10	5,35	1,669		

Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	0-10 h	57	5,13	1,601	1,833	,141
	11-20 h	67	5,52	1,602		
	20-30 h	136	5,53	1,671		
	30 h+	10	6,34	1,707		
Efficacy in Classroom Management	0-10 h	57	4,87	1,619	1,811	,146
	11-20 h	67	5,40	1,663		
	20-30 h	136	5,25	1,638		
	30 h+	10	5,94	1,532		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	0-10 h	57	5,07	1,683	2,275	,080
	11-20 h	67	5,62	1,670		
	20-30 h	136	5,43	1,712		
	30 h+	10	6,41	1,219		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	0-10 h	57	19,59	6,060	1,943	,123
	11-20 h	67	21,53	6,183		
	20-30 h	136	21,05	6,297		
	30 h+	10	24,04	5,683		

*ANOVA

When the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching was evaluated in terms of online teaching time, no statistically significant difference was found between the groups. According to the results, it was identified that the scale and its sub-dimensions did not differ in online teaching time variable. This result concerns the third research question "Is there a meaningful difference about online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions in terms of school level, online teaching experience, *online courses taught in hours* and student participation?"

Table 4.12 indicates the results of one-way ANOVA and Gabriel test to examine whether there is a meaningful differ in online teaching SE beliefs of teachers in terms of student participation in online courses.

Table 4.12. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Student Participation

	Students	n	Mean	Sd.	f	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	0-5	71	4,91	1,485	1,966	,100
	6-10	95	4,78	1,613		
	11-15	56	5,09	1,538		
	16-20	22	4,01	1,491		
	20+	26	4,91	1,736		
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	0-5	71	5,52	1,610	2,549	,040
	6-10	95	5,47	1,657		

	11-15	56	5,85	1,571		
	16-20	22	4,55	1,557		
	20+	26	5,34	1,764		
Efficacy in Classroom Management	0-5	71	5,33	1,653		
	6-10	95	5,21	1,663		
	11-15	56	5,57	1,510	2,543	,040
	16-20	22	4,30	1,621		
	20+	26	5,08	1,654		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	0-5	71	5,53	1,638		
	6-10	95	5,36	1,675		
	11-15	56	5,80	1,694	2,249	,064
	16-20	22	4,57	1,751		
	20+	26	5,45	1,695		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	0-5	71	21,29	6,043		
	6-10	95	20,82	6,259		
	11-15	56	22,31	5,969	2,541	,040
	16-20	22	17,43	6,188		
	20+	26	20,78	6,509		

*ANOVA **Gabriel

When the the scale concerning online teaching self-efficacy beliefs was evaluated in terms of student participation in online teaching, a statistically significant difference was determined in “Efficacy in Instructional Strategies ($p=0.040$)”, “Efficacy in Classroom Management ($p=0.040$)” sub-dimensions and “Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching scale ($p=0.040$).” In order to determine the group which has the difference, Levene test was evaluated and Gabriel post hoc analysis was applied. According to the results, it was determined that the scale scores obtained with the participation of 16-20 students were lower than the participation of 11-15 students. However, there are no significant difference found in “Efficacy in Student Engagement and Efficacy in Use of Computers” sub-dimensions regarding student participation. These findings are related to the third research question “Is there a meaningful difference about online teaching self-efficacy belief levels referring to 4 dimensions in terms of school level, online teaching experience, online courses taught in hours and *student participation?*”

Use of various instructional strategies may encourage student participation in an enthusiastic way. Since teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy beliefs towards instructional strategy use in this study is determined as a moderate level, they may not use a variety of instructional strategies. And this may decrease enthusiastic student

participation, which can create a negative effect on teachers' self-efficacy levels. Therefore, attitudes of students participating online classes are important as well as their numbers in order to determine SE belief levels of teachers.

Table 4.13 includes the results of Independent Samples T-test conducted with the aim of investigating the differences between the ones who took any trainings and the ones who did not take any trainings about online teaching.

Table 4.13. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Training received

	Training	n	Mean	Sd.	t	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Yes	114	5,05	1,699	1,948	,050
	No	156	4,67	1,470		
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Yes	114	5,53	1,771	,499	,618
	No	156	5,43	1,557		
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Yes	114	5,26	1,720	,268	,789
	No	156	5,21	1,591		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Yes	114	5,44	1,815	,025	,980
	No	156	5,44	1,604		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	Yes	114	21,28	6,756	,700	,485
	No	156	20,75	5,831		

*Independent Samples t test

When the the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching was evaluated in terms of trainings received, a statistically significant difference was found in the Efficacy in Student Engagement sub-dimension ($p=0.050$). According to the results, it was determined that those who received education had higher Efficacy in Student Engagement sub-dimension scores. However, there was no significant difference in other dimensions. This may be because trainings taken are generally related to Student Engagement. The answer of the fourth research question "Is there a meaningful difference about online teaching self-efficacy belief levels considering 4 dimensions between the ones who have taken any trainings and the others who have not taken any trainings?"

Table 4.14 shows the results of one-way ANOVA and Games Howell pos hoc analysis conducted to examine the way of training effects on online teaching SE beliefs of teachers.

Table 4.14. Evaluation of the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching in terms of Benefit of Training

	Benefit of Training	n	Mean	Sd.	f	p*
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Strongly Disagree	2	3,69	2,386	6,837	,000
	Slightly Disagree	14	4,64	1,162		
	Neutral	37	4,02	1,371		
	Agree	43	4,95	1,608		
	Strongly Agree	18	6,24	1,793		
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Strongly Disagree	2	4,25	3,182	4,687	,002
	Slightly Disagree	14	4,83	1,077		
	Neutral	37	4,69	1,646		
	Agree	43	5,62	1,756		
	Strongly Agree	18	6,60	1,880		
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Strongly Disagree	2	3,75	2,475	5,777	,000
	Slightly Disagree	14	4,55	1,113		
	Neutral	37	4,39	1,556		
	Agree	43	5,43	1,720		
	Strongly Agree	18	6,40	1,864		
Efficacy in Use of Computers	Strongly Disagree	2	4,63	3,712	4,403	,002
	Slightly Disagree	14	4,54	1,230		
	Neutral	37	4,59	1,638		
	Agree	43	5,36	1,863		
	Strongly Agree	18	6,56	1,916		
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	Strongly Disagree	2	16,31	11,756	5,703	,000
	Slightly Disagree	14	18,56	4,230		
	Neutral	37	17,69	5,907		
	Agree	43	21,36	6,674		
	Strongly Agree	18	25,81	7,240		

*ANOVA **Games Howell pos hoc

When the the scale concerning Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching was evaluated in terms of the benefit of trainings to be provided in online teaching, "Efficacy in Student Engagement (p=0.000)", "Efficacy in Instructional Strategies (p=0.002)", "Efficacy in Classroom Management (p=0.000)", "Efficacy in Use of Computers (p=0.002)" sub-dimensions and "Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching (p=0.000)." A statistically significant difference was determined in the scale. In order to determine the group which creates difference, Levene test was evaluated and Games Howell post hoc analysis was applied. According to the results, it was determined that the groups who think that trainings are useful (Strongly Agree- Agree) have higher

scale and sub-dimension scores than those who think that trainings are not useful (Strongly Disagree- Slightly Disagree). These results are parallel to the findings of other studies (Chai, Koh & Tsai, 2010; Moore-Adams & Jones, 2015; Woodcock, Sisco & Eady, 2015; Wright, 2011). And the results adress to the fifth research question “Do the trainings have an effect on teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy beliefs regarding 4 dimensions?”

Table 4.15 shows the results of Pearson correlation analysis in order to examine the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the scale.

Table 4.15. Evaluation of the Relationship Between The Sub-Dimensions of the scale concerning Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching

		“Efficacy in Student Engagement”	“Efficacy in Instructional Strategies”	“Efficacy in Classroom Management”	“Efficacy in Use of Computers”	“Self- efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching”
Efficacy in Student Engagement	r	1	,891**	,880**	,801**	,939**
	p		,000	,000	,000	,000
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	r	,891**	1	,923**	,869**	,970**
	p	,000		,000	,000	,000
Efficacy in Classroom Management	r	,880**	,923**	1	,848**	,961**
	p	,000	,000		,000	,000
Efficacy in Use of Computers	r	,801**	,869**	,848**	1	,928**
	p	,000	,000	,000		,000
Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching	r	,939**	,970**	,961**	,928**	1
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	

*Pearson Correlation Analysis

When the relationship between the sub-dimensions is evaluated, the values are self-efficacy beliefs for online teaching with “Efficacy in Student Engagement sub-dimension ($r=.939$ $p=.000$)”, “Efficacy in Instructional Strategies ($r=.970$ $p=.000$)” sub-dimension, “Efficacy in Classroom Management ($r=.961$ $p=.000$)” sub-dimension and “Efficacy in Use of Computers ($r=.928$ $p=.000$)” sub-dimension. A highly statistically significant positive correlation was determined. It means that a teacher

who is highly efficacious in one of the dimensions is expected to have high scores in other dimensions of online teaching self-efficacy scale.



5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the present study is summarized and comes to end. Moreover, recommendation especially for teachers, teacher training programmes, instructors as well as future research are provided.

5.1. Conclusion

In the literature, previous studies related to SE beliefs towards face-to-face teaching exist in details. However, studies concerning SE beliefs about online teaching are underexplored. A few studies are available referring to differences in teachers' online self-efficacy belief levels depending on demographic variables.

In the present research, it was aimed to investigate English language teachers' SE beliefs towards online teaching in the scope of four dimensions which are efficacy in classroom management, efficacy in instructional strategies, efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in use of computer.

The design of the study is consisted of quantitative data that were collected with 270 English language teachers who work in state schools in Gaziantep- Turkey. The data were gathered through Personal Information Form and the Michigan Nurse Educators Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (MNESEOT) scale. Data analysis were conducted via SPSS version 23. And the analyses include “descriptive statistics, Independent sample T-tests, One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Hochbergs GT2, Gabriel post hoc test, Games Howell post hoc test and Pearson Correlation Test.”

Analyses demonstrated that English language teachers had moderate levels of SE beliefs towards online teaching. The dimension with the highest score is “Efficacy in Instructional Strategies (avg: 5.47)” followed by “Efficacy in Use of Computers (avg: 5,44)”, “Efficacy in Classroom Management (avg: 5,23)” and “Efficacy in Student Engagement (avg: 4.83)” respectively. Also, the results were examined regarding variables such as gender, age, teaching experience, major of graduation, school level, online teaching experience, online courses taught in hours, student participation, trainings received and effects of trainings.

In terms of gender, male teachers had higher scores in online teaching SE beliefs in comparison with female teachers. Besides, no significant difference was found between teachers' online teaching self-efficacy beliefs and the other variables which are age and teaching experience.

When the relationship between teachers' online teaching SE beliefs and major of graduation was examined, English linguistics graduates had higher scores in Efficacy in Use of Computers sub-dimension. However, no significant difference was found in other dimensions of the scale depending on major of graduation.

The analysis related to level of schools, online teaching experience and online courses taught revealed no significant differences. In terms of the another variable which is student participation, a significant difference was found in Efficacy in Instructional Strategies, Efficacy in Classroom Management and Self-efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching scale. In other sub-dimensions, no significant difference was found in Efficacy in Student Engagement and Efficacy in Use of Computers sub-dimensions in terms of student participation.

The analysis concerning trainings received revealed that trainings have positive effects on online teaching SE beliefs of teachers as it is compared to teachers who did not take any trainings. Furthermore, another analysis which aims to investigate how trainings affect teachers' online SE beliefs indicated that the teachers who think that trainings are useful had higher level of online SE belief scores compared to those who think trainings are not useful.

In sum, the results above show online teaching self-efficacy beliefs of English language teachers within the sub-dimensions in terms of the variables. For some variables, it was found a significant difference referring to teachers' online SE beliefs; however, no significant relationship was found for some of the other dimensions in the present research.

5.2. Recommendations

The present study investigated the online teaching self-efficacy belief levels of English language teachers working in Gaziantep- Turkey. The findings showed that the teachers had a moderate level of self-efficacy beliefs towards online teaching. In this sense, it is recommended for teachers to improve their online teaching SE belief levels because online teaching is a major part of education. Depending on the results of the study, trainings are very helpful in this regard. In other words, teachers can make use of trainings to improve their online self-efficacy beliefs. Also, they may take sources of self-efficacy beliefs into consideration in their favour. And it should be

given importance to 21st century skills by teachers since they are likely to be in line with improving self-efficacy belief levels as well as the quality of online teaching.

For teacher training program developers, some courses related to online teaching can specifically be designed for the curriculum of teacher training programmes since teaching online comes into prominence especially in ERT conditions or in unexpected situations. The results of the study revealed that English language teachers have a moderate level of SE beliefs towards online teaching. On this point, providing detailed courses concerning online teaching may develop prospective teachers' online SE beliefs.

And the last recommendation for the future research, this study can be replicated in larger settings of Turkey in order to get more generalizable results. Since there are a few studies related to English language teachers' SE beliefs towards online teaching, more research are needed in the related literature. Also, a different investigation into the relationship between EFL teachers' online SE beliefs and learner outcomes in online setting may create new inputs. Thus, effects of teachers' SE beliefs can be investigated in relation to online teaching effectiveness and student outcomes throughout online teaching process.

REFERENCES

- Akbari, R., & Moradkhani, S. (2010). Iranian English teachers' self-efficacy: Do academic degree and experience make a difference? *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-ye Khareji*, 56(1), 25-47.
- Alagözlü, N. (2016). Pre-service EFL Teachers' Professional Self-concept: English Teaching Efficacy, Self Reported English Proficiency and Pedagogical Strategies: A Case Study in Turkish Context. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232, 196-200.
- Al-Fadley, A., & Alghasab, M. (2018). Measuring The Self-efficacy of EFL Teachers in Elementary Governmental Schools in Kuwait: Exploring Years of Teaching Experience. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(4), 28-47.
- Alibakhshi, G., Nikdel, F., & Labbafi, A. (2020). Exploring the consequences of teachers' self-efficacy: a case of teachers of English as a foreign language. *Asian. J. Second. Foreign. Lang. Educ*, 5, 23. doi: 10.1186/s40862-020-00102-1
- Ananiadou, K., & M. Claro (2009). 21st Century Skills and Competences for New Millennium Learners in OECD Countries. *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 41, OECD Publishing, Paris. doi: 10.1787/218525261154
- Andy, H. (2018). 21st Century Skills and the "4Cs" in the English Language Classroom. *University of Oregon*.
- Aslan, E. (2013). *The Role of Teacher Efficacy Over English Language Teaching*, (MA Thesis). Mersin: Çağ University, Institute of Social Sciences, English Language Teaching Department.
- Ashton, P. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35 (5), 28- 32.
- Aşçı, M., Yıldırım, R., & Topal, T. (2022). Examination of online teaching effectiveness in terms of various variables. *International Technology and Education Journal*, 6(1), 43-50.
- Bakar, N. S. A., Maat, S. M., & Rosli, R. (2020). Mathematics teacher's self-efficacy of technology integration and technological pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, 11(2), 259–276.
- Balcı, Ö., Şanal, F., & Durak Ügüten, S. (2019). An investigation of pre-service English language teaching teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. *International Journal of Modern Education Studies*, 3(1), 41-53.
- Bandura, A. & Adams, N.E. (1977). Analysis of self-efficacy theory of behavioral change. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 1(4), 287-310.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*. 4, 71-81. New York: Academic Press
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.
- Bandura, A., & Locke, E. (2003). Negative Self-Efficacy and Goal Effects Revisited. *The Journal of applied psychology*, 88(1), 87-99 .

- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Gerbino, M., & Pastorelli, C. (2003). Role of Affective Self-Regulatory Efficacy in Diverse Spheres of Psychosocial Functioning. *Child Development*, 74, 769-782. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00567
- Bandura, A. (2010). Self-Efficacy. I.B. Weiner and W.E. Craighead (Ed.) in *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology* (p.1-3). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Burns, N., & Grove, S. (2005). *The practice of nursing research*. St. Louis, Mo.: Elsevier/Saunders.
- Chacón, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(3), 257-272.
- Civelek, M., Toplu, I., & Uzun, L. (2021). Turkish EFL teachers' attitudes towards online instruction throughout the Covid-19 outbreak. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 4(2), 87-98.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London New York: Routledge.
- Cooper, R., Farah, A., & Mrstik, S. (2020). Preparing teacher candidates to teach online: A case study of one college's design and implementation plan. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 19(2), 125-137.
- Değirmencioğlu, Ü. L. (2021). The Impact of Teacher Self-efficacy on Teaching Techniques: Traditional or Contemporary? *European Journal of English Language Teaching*. 6 (3). doi:10.46827/ejel.v6i3.3662
- Dubins, B. H., & Graham, M. B. (2009, August). Training instructors to teach online: Research on competencies/best practices. *25th Annual Conference on Distance Teaching and Learning*, Madison, WI.
- Dunbar, M., & Malton, Teri D. (2018) Self-Efficacy and Training of Faculty Who Teach Online. In *Book: Self-Efficacy in Instructional Technology Contexts*. 15-33.
- Dolgun, H., & Caner, M. (2019). Self-efficacy belief profiles of pre-service and in- service EFL teachers. *Journal of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Faculty of Education* (48), 602-623.
- Dolighan, T., & Owen, M. (2021). Teacher Efficacy for Online Teaching During the Covid-19 Pandemic. *A Journal of Educational Research and Practice*. 20 (1). 95-116.
- Ekiz, T. (2022). Online Teaching Experiences of Turkish EFL Instructors during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *First International Language-for-All Conference '22*, 42-50.
- Ercan Demirel, E. (2017). Investigating pre-service EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. *Selçuk University Social Sciences Institute Journal*, (38), 221-232.
- Erdoğan, V. (2019). Integrating 4C Skills of 21st Century into 4 Language Skills in EFL Classes. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 7(11), 113-124.
- Erdoğan, P., & Yazıcı, E. (2022). From the eyes of EFL teachers in turkey: Synchronous and asynchronous online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 12(1), 61-77.
- Fauzan, F., Arifin, F., Lubis, M. A., & Firdaus, F. M., (2022). Lecturer's digital literacy ability in the pandemic. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 17(4), 1130-1142. doi: 10.18844/cjes.v17i4.7122
- Feenberg, A. (1998). The Written World: On the Theory and Practice of Computer Conferencing. In Mason, R. and Kaye, A. (Eds), *Mindweave: Communication, Computers, and Distance Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 22-39.

- Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.
- Golden, C. (2020). *Remote teaching: The glass half-full*. EDUCAUSE.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Henson, R.K. (2001). *Teacher Self-efficacy: Substantive Implications and Measurement Dilemmas*.
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The Difference Between Emergency Remote Teaching and Online Learning. *Recuperado*.
- Horvitz, B. S., Beach, A., Anderson, M., & Xia, J. (2015). Examination of faculty Self-efficacy related to online teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 40., 305–316. doi: 10.1007/s10755-014-9316-1
- Indahyanti, R. (2016). Indonesian EFL teachers' self-efficacy and their successful teaching performance. *English and Literature Journal*, 3(2), 173-181.
- Isman, A., Altınay, Z., & Altınay, F. (2004). Roles of the students and teachers in distance education. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education – TOJDE*, 5 (4), 105-115.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (2013). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (11th ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kavanagh, D. J., & Bower, G. H. (1985). Mood and self-efficacy: Impact of joy and sadness on perceived capabilities. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 9(5), 507-525. doi: 10.1007/BF01173005
- Kesici, A. (2022). The Effect of Digital Literacy on Creative Thinking Disposition: The Mediating Role of Lifelong Learning Disposition. *Journal of Learning and Teaching in Digital Age*, 7(2), 260-273.
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741–756.
- Koehler, M.J., & Mishra, P. (2008). Introducing TPACK. AACTE Committee on Innovation and Technology (Ed.), *The handbook of technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPCK) for educators*. 3-29. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., & Cain, W. (2013). What Is Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK)? *Journal of Education*, 193(3), 13-19.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610. doi:10.1177/001316447003000308
- Lauren, A.G. (2008). Fostering Collaboration to enhance Online Instruction. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE*. 9 (2).
- Lee, V. E., Dedrick, R. F., & Smith, J. B. (1991). "The effect of the social organization of schools on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction". *Sociology of Education*. 64(3),190-208.
- Lee, M. H., & Tsai, C. C. (2010) Exploring teachers' perceived self-efficacy and technological pedagogical content knowledge with respect to educational use of the World Wide Web. *Instructional Science*, 38, 1–21.
- Lunney, M. Frederickson, K. Spark, A., & McDuffie, G. (2008). Facilitating Critical Thinking Through Online Courses. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 2, 3-4.

- Maddux, J. E., & Rogers, R. W. (1983). Protection motivation and self-efficacy: A revised theory of fear appeals and attitude change. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 469-479.
- MEB. (2021). *Dijital okuryazarlık öğretmen klavuzu*. Ankara: MEB.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M.J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for integrating technology in teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017-1054.
- Moore-Adams, B. L., & Jones, W. M. (2015). 'Lessons learned from the development of an online teaching certificate program for K-12 teachers', *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference*, Charleston, SC, 1492–1499.
- Munoz Carril, P. C., Gonzalez Sanmamed, M., & Hernandez Selles, N. (2013). Pedagogical roles and competencies of university teachers practicing in the elearning environment. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 14(3).
- Murphy, E., Rodríguez-Manzanares, M. A., & Barbour, M. (2011). Asynchronous and synchronous online teaching: Perspectives of Canadian high school distance education teachers. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(4), 583-591.
- Noor, S., Isa, F. Md., & Mazhar, F. F. (2020). Online Teaching Practices During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 9(3), 169-184. doi: 10.22521/edupij.2020.93.4
- Özder, H. (2011). Self-efficacy beliefs of novice teachers and their performance in the classroom. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36 (5), 1-15.
- Özkara, B. (2019). An Investigation into the Relationship between Turkish EFL Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Burnout Level. *Journal of Family, Counseling, and Education*, 4(1), 12-24.
- Öztürk, M. (2021). Open and Distance Education Perceptions of Pre-Service Teachers: Asynchronous and Synchronous Online Learning, *Journal of Ahmet Keleşoğlu Education Faculty*, 3(2), 216–230. doi:10.38151/akef.2021.18
- Pajares, F. (2002). Gender and Perceived Self-Efficacy in Self-Regulated Learning. *Theory into Practice*, 41, 116-225. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4102_8
- Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2011). *The excellent online instructor: Strategies for professional development*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Phan, N. T. T., & Locke, T. (2015). Sources of self-efficacy of Vietnamese EFL teachers: A qualitative study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 52, 73-82.
- Polat, M. (2021). Pre-Service Teachers' Digital Literacy Levels, Views on Distance Education and Pre-University School Memories. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 17(5).
- Robinia, K.A., & Anderson, M.L. (2010). Online teaching efficacy of nurse faculty. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 26, 168-175.
- Robinia, K. A. (2008). Online Teaching Self-Efficacy of Nurse Faculty Teaching in Public, Accredited Nursing Programs in The State of Michigan. *Dissertations*. 811.
- Saavedra, A. R., & Opfer, V. D. (2012). Learning 21st-century skills requires 21st-century teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(2), 8-13.
- Sarı, M. H., & S. Aras, İ. (2022). A Case Study on Online Teaching during the Covid-19 Pandemic Perceived by Primary School Teachers. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 2022, 9(2), 440-449

- Schleicher, A. (2012). *Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st century: Lessons from around the world*. OECD Publishing. doi: 10.1787/9789264174559-en
- Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analysis. *Applied Psychology*, 57(S1), 152-171. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00359
- Shulman, L. S. (1987) Knowledge and teaching: foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Education Review*, 57, 1–21. doi: 10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411
- Sykes, D. (2020). Online education during a pandemic: Teaching and learning in home spaces. *Literacies and Language Education: Research and Practice, Special Issue*, 86-88.
- Şahin, F. E., & Atay, D. (2010). Sense of efficacy from student teaching to the induction year. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 337-341.
- Şevik, M. & Yucedag, Z. (2021). An evaluation of distance education during the Coronavirus 19 pandemic: the views of Turkish EFL teachers . *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi* , 9 (11) , 171-190 .
- Taimalu, M., & Oim, O. (2005). Estonian teachers' beliefs on teacher efficacy and influencing factors. *Trames*. 9(2), 177-191.
- Tok, T. N., & Tok, Ş. (2016). Novice teachers' classroom management self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(3), 5595-5601. doi:10.14687/jhs.v13i3.4178
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A.W., & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning and Measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self- efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944-956.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher Efficacy: Capturing an Elusive Construct. *Teaching and teacher education*, 17(7), 783–805.
- Tuckman, B. W., & Sexton, T. L. (1990). The relation between self-beliefs and self-regulated performance. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 5(5), 465-472.
- Turdieva, R. (2022). Transformative Learning and Critical Thinking in Online Education. *European Journal of Business Startups and Open Society*. 2(1).
- Tweed, S. R. (2013). Technology Implementation: Teacher Age, Experience, Self-Efficacy, and Professional Development as Related to Classroom Technology Integration. *Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis East Tennessee State University*, 1-110.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2018). A Global Framework of Reference on Digital Literacy Skills for Indicator 4.4.2.
- Woodcock, S., Sisco, A., & Eady, M. (2015). The learning experience: training teachers using online synchronous environments. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 5(1), 21–34.
- Wright, J. M. (2011). Effect of quality matters training on faculty's online self efficacy. *Annual Distance Learning Administration Conference*, Jekyll Island, GA, 1–5.
- Yustika, G. P., & Iswati, S. (2020). Digital Literacy in Formal Online Education: A Short Review. *Dinamika Pendidikan*, 15(1), 66-76.

Zhou, L., Wu, S., Zhou, M., & 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* 2020; 4(2), 501-519.



APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Dear Participants,

This study was conducted by Özge AYGÜN DAYANIR in the consultancy of Assoc. Prof. Dr.Ceylan YANGIN ERSANLI. The study investigates English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for online teaching in the state schools of Gaziantep. Two sections are included in the questionnaire. First section is concerned with Personal Information Form and the second section is the main survey which consists of 32 questions. Approximately 8 minutes are required to answer the questions. Gathered data will only be used for scientific and research purposes. Your answers will be kept confidential. Please indicate your opinion for each statement below.

Özge AYGÜN DAYANIR

Ondokuz Mayıs University, Graduate Student

PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM

Dear Participants,

This part of the questionnaire is designed to get background information about your demographic features and online teaching experience. Please indicate your opinion for each statement below.

1. Gender: Female (☐) Male (☐)
2. Age:
(☐) 21-25 (☐) 26-30 (☐) 31-35 (☐) 36-40 (☐) 41-45 (☐) 46-50
3. Years of Teaching Experience:
(☐) 0-5 (☐) 6-10 (☐) 11-15 (☐) 16-20 (☐) 20+
4. Major you graduated from: English Language Teaching (☐)
English/ American Language and Literature (☐) English Linguistics (☐)
5. Level of School you work:
Elementary School(☐) Secondary School (☐) High School (☐)
6. How long do you have prior online teaching experience (in months)?
- 0-4 (☐)
- 5-8 (☐)
- 9-12 (☐)
- 13-24 (☐)
- 24+ (☐)
7. How many courses have you taught per week in online teaching (in hours)?
- 0-10 (☐)
- 11-20 (☐)
- 20-30 (☐)
- 30+ (☐)

8. Approximately how many students have attended your online courses?

- 0-5 ()
- 6-10 ()
- 11-15 ()
- 16-20 ()
- 20+ ()

9. Have you ever had a training that focused on skills, techniques, problems and/or preparations for online teaching?

Yes ()

No ()

(Participants answering “yes” please direct to question 10; all others please go to the following questionnaire.)

10. The trainings adequately prepare you in the skills needed for online teaching.

Strongly
Disagree

1

Slightly
Disagree

2

Neutral

3

Agree

4

Strongly
Agree

5

MICHIGAN NURSE EDUCATORS' SENSE OF EFFICACY FOR ONLINE TEACHING (MNESEOT) SCALE AND PERMISSION LETTER

Dear participants,

This questionnaire aims to better understand state school English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for online teaching. Gathered data will only be used for scientific and research purposes. Your answers will be kept confidential. Please indicate your opinion for each statement below.

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

Thank you for your participation!

Permission to use "Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (MNESEOT) Scale"

Gelen Kutusu x



Özge Aygün <ozgeayy1@gmail.com>

Alıcı: krobiniia

13 Eylül Paz 16:18 (5 gün önce)



Dear Professor Robinia,

I am a Master's student at English Language Education department of Ondokuz Mayıs University in Turkey. For my master's thesis I am planning to conduct a study on English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for online teaching. Therefore, I would like to ask your permission to use your scale entitled "Michigan Nurse Educators' Sense of Efficacy for Online Teaching (MNESEOT)" in my research. I ensure that I will cite the source. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,
Özge Aygün



Kristi Robinia

Alıcı: ben

14 Eylül Paz 15:31 (4 gün önce)



Dear Özge Aygün:

You are most welcome to use and modify if necessary the tool for your research. Best wishes on your work,

Kristi

Kristi Robinia PhD, RN
Associate Dean and Director | School of Nursing
Northern Michigan University
906-227-2042
1401 Presque Isle Ave, Marquette, MI 49855
*Located on the beautiful shores of Lake Superior upon the ancestral homelands of the Anishinaabeg



Appendix 2



ONDOKUZ MAYIS ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER ETİK KURUL KARARLARI

KARAR TARİHİ	TOPLANTI SAYISI	KARAR SAYISI
30.10.2020	9	2020/620

KARAR NO: 2020/620
Üniversitemiz Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Özge AYGÜN' ün Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ceylan YANGIN ERSANLI danışmanlığında "A Study English Language Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching (İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Çevrim İçi Öğretime Yönelik Öz Yeterlilik İnançları Üzerine Bir Çalışma)" isimli Yüksek Lisans Tezine ilişkin anket çalışmasına ilişkin anket çalışmasını içeren 30811 sayılı dilekçesi okunarak görüşüldü.

Üniversitemiz Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Özge AYGÜN' ün Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ceylan YANGIN ERSANLI danışmanlığında "A Study English Language Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Online Teaching (İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Çevrim İçi Öğretime Yönelik Öz Yeterlilik İnançları Üzerine Bir Çalışma)" isimli Yüksek Lisans Tezine ilişkin anket çalışmasına ilişkin anket çalışmasının kabulüne oy birliği ile karar verildi.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Özge AYGÜN DAYANIR graduated from Keşap Anatolian High School in 2015. After high school graduation, she studied English Language Teaching at Ondokuz Mayıs University. Following her bachelor's degree in 2019, she started a master's degree programme in English Language Teaching at Ondokuz Mayıs University in the same year. Now, she has been teaching English at a high school in Turkey. (17.07.2023).

Contact Information

ORCID ID : 0000-0003-0906-2032

Publications:

1. Aygün, Ö. & Yaman, İ. (2019). Book Review on Critical Pedagogy in ELT: Reunderstanding the Teacher Roles. Journal of Language Research, 3(1), 40-41. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/jlr/issue/50599/666970>.