Analyzing Japanese University English Teachers' Self-Efficacy to Teach Online

Nancy Shzh-chen Lee
Osaka University
Chie Ogawa
Kyoto Sangyo University

Reference Data

Lee, S. C. N., & Ogawa, C. (2021). Analyzing Japanese university English teachers' self-efficacy to teach online. In P. Clements, R. Derrah, & P. Ferguson (Eds.), *Communities of teachers & learners*. JALT. https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2020-11

The 2020 Covid-19 pandemic changed the delivery of many classes from face-to-face to online. This study was an attempt to investigate online English teaching self-efficacy by surveying 138 university English teachers in Japan during the pandemic. A survey with 30 Likert-scale items was developed to examine four latent constructs of online teaching self-efficacy: pedagogy, technology, communicative language teaching (CLT), and self-management. In addition, how these constructs correlated with each other as well as the relative contribution of the participants' background variables and questionnaire subscales to overall self-efficacy were examined. Results showed that teachers were highly self-efficacious about teaching online especially with the integration of technology but were not self-efficacious to manage themselves online especially with time usage. In addition, multiple linear regression analysis showed that the four constructs predicted the participants' overall self-efficacy, but their background variables did not impact their overall self-efficacy to teach online.

2020年Covid-19パンデミックで多くの授業が対面からオンラインに切り替わった。本研究では、日本の138名の大学英語教員へのアンケート調査によるオンライン授業に対する自己効力感を調査した。30項目のリッカート尺度を用いた質問項目では、自己効力感の四つの潜在的構成要素（教授法、テクノロジー、コミュニカティブ・ランゲージティーチング、自己管理）を調べた。加えて、これらの構成要素間の相関関係を調べ、さらに潜在構成要素と教員層データがオンライン授業全体に対する自己効力感にどの程度影響するのか分析を行った。結果、英語教員はオンライン授業に対しての自己効力感が高いことが明らかになった。教員がテクノロジーに対して高い自己効力感を持ったものの、自己管理、特に時間の利用に対しては自己効力感が低かった。また回帰分析では、四つの構成要素は英語教員の全体的な自己効力感を説明するが、教員層データは影響を及ぼさないことがわかった。

The Covid-19 pandemic brought many changes to the world, one of which was the transition of teaching from face-to-face to online. The abrupt change caused anxiety and stress for teachers (Ramlo, 2021) because it required extra preparation time, new knowledge and skills, plus specific professional development to organize themselves and conduct classes. In the Japanese context, online teaching was implemented in many schools after the national government declared a state of emergency in April, 2020 with many university classes continuing to be taught online despite the state of emergency being lifted in May, 2020. This teaching condition provided an unexpected opportunity to investigate online teaching self-efficacy among university English teachers. Teacher self-efficacy has been of interest to classroom research (e.g., Atay, 2007; Choi & Lee, 2016) because perceived self-efficacy affects behaviors, goals, aspirations, and outcome expectations (Bandura, 1997). In the EFL context, many studies have been conducted on teachers in different countries, such as Japan (Nishino, 2012; Thompson & Woodman, 2019), Venezuela (Chacon, 2005), and Turkey (Ortaçtepe & Akyel, 2015). However, these studies focused on face-to-face teaching and did not examine online teaching. Because

Correction Notice

This article is based on a study that was reported in the *Indonesian TESOL Journal* in May 2021, prior to the publication of the article in JALT's *Postconference Publication*. A citation and reference to that study was not included in the original version of this article. This information has now been added. JALT recommends that any citation of the study be a citation of the article in the Indonesian TESOL Journal (see below), unless the cited information can only be found in this article.

Lee, S. C. N., & Ogawa, C. (2021). Online teaching self-efficacy - How English teachers feel during the covid-19 pandemic. Indonesian *TESOL Journal, 3*(1), 1-17.

self-efficacy perceptions are highly situational and context specific (Bandura, 1997), online teaching self-efficacy needs to be researched separately from face-to-face teaching. We acknowledge that online teaching conducted during a pandemic is emergency remote instruction, but we will use the term online teaching in this paper. This study used an online questionnaire to examine university English teachers' online teaching self-efficacy by measuring their perceived ability related to technology, pedagogy, communicative language teaching (CLT), and self-management.

Background

Teacher Self-Efficacy

Teacher self-efficacy is the belief teachers have in their capability to effectively handle tasks, obligations, and challenges related to their teaching activities (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). It can influence teaching outcomes (e.g., students' achievement and motivation) as well as teachers' well-being (Chacon, 2005). Teachers who perceive themselves to be self-efficacious tend to create more positive relationships with their students, conduct more student-centered classes, and cope more effectively with problematic behaviors in class (Zee & Koomen, 2016).

Teacher self-efficacy beliefs are multidimensional as previous studies on EFL teachers found that years of teaching experience, amount of faculty development received, perceived pedagogical capabilities, and English proficiency levels all affected self-efficacy (Atay, 2007; Choi & Lee, 2016). In addition, teachers have different levels of self-efficacy towards different areas of language teaching. One researcher found EFL high school teachers have high self-efficacy toward instructional strategies and perceived themselves to be more capable of designing pedagogical instructions than motivating their students to learn English (Chacon, 2005).

Teacher Self-Efficacy for Using Technology

Teachers need technological knowledge and the ability to utilize technology when teaching (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Results from previous studies on teacher self-efficacy found that technological knowledge is required along with subject matter knowledge and pedagogical strategies (e.g., Ferdig, 2006; Koehler & Mishra, 2005; Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Researchers have established the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TRCK) model to be an effective measure of teacher efficacy because it separates technological self-efficacy from pedagogical and content self-efficacy (Ferdig, 2006; Koehler & Mishra, 2005; Mishra & Koehler, 2006).

Besides off-line technology, teachers also need the ability to use online technology because the Internet is a specialized technology for contemporary education (Lee & Tsai, 2010). Rapid online technology developments have created new teaching possibilities, which are different from using off-line technology. Online technology offers innovative ways of acquiring teaching resources as well as alternative instruction methods, such as synchronous, asynchronous, autonomous, and collaborative modes of teaching and learning (Jain & Getis 2003; Neo, 2003). Lee and Tsai (2010) suggested a Web component should be added to the existing TPCK model because teaching with online technology requires different abilities from teaching with off-line technology.

Online Teacher Self-Efficacy

More teachers are teaching online, especially in higher education (Martin et al., 2019). However, many teachers have reported that they are not prepared because they have not received training nor support for online teaching (Martin et al., 2019). Teachers' lack of ability to effectively manage time was found to be an influencing factor of self-efficacy because online teaching is more time-consuming than traditional classroom teaching because the online format requires more specific and structured planning (Bacow et al., 2012; Martin et al., 2019; Tomei, 2006). Tomei further stated that a minimum of 14% more time was needed when teaching online, most of which was spent on presenting instructional content. Therefore, teachers need to develop abilities to effectively manage time when teaching online because synchronous classes are more intensive compared to face-to-face classes (Shi et al., 2006).

Online teaching self-efficacy is influenced by teacher background variables (Corry & Stella, 2018). While different studies have produced different results, Horvitz et al. (2015) found online teaching self-efficacy is determined by the number of semesters taught online, gender, satisfaction with teaching online, and academic discipline. It was further found by Lee and Tsai (2010) that teachers with more Web experience have higher self-efficacy in using the Web while older teachers have lower self-efficacy. Reversely, Robinia and Anderson (2010) found age and gender did not determine teacher self-efficacy. To our knowledge, the influence of the amount of professional development received on teachers' online self-efficacy has not been researched. However, how teachers perceive professional development has been found to be an important factor related to online course design (Martin et al, 2019). In addition, previous studies have found professional development positively affects general teaching self-efficacy (Chai et al., 2010; Graham, et al., 2012; Woodcock et al., 2015).

The only language teacher online self-efficacy study that we know about was conducted with 33 teachers in the United States (Lin & Zheng, 2015). Survey items measured four constructs of perception of teaching practices, instructional self-efficacy, technological self-efficacy, and professional development. The researchers found a correlation between the constructs of instructional self-efficacy and technological self-efficacy (Lin & Zheng, 2015). All of the aforementioned studies have added to our understanding of online teacher efficacy, but more research is needed. How English teachers in the Japanese EFL context perceive their own ability to teach online remains unknown. Three research questions were investigated in this study:

1. How efficacious do Japanese university English teachers feel when they teach online?
2. Is there any significant relationship between the latent online teaching self-efficacy constructs (pedagogy, technology, CLT, and self-management)?
3. What are the relative contributions of the participants' background variables and latent self-efficacy constructs to their overall online teaching self-efficacy?

Methods

Participants

The participants were 138 English teachers (native speakers and non-native speakers) from Japanese universities. They reported teaching a variety of English courses, such as skill-development teaching (i.e., reading, listening, speaking, and writing), communicative language teaching (CLT), task-based language teaching (TBLT), or content-based teaching. Participants' background data is shown in Table 1. There were 82 female and 56 male teachers with most having at least a master's degree. Most participants were 30 years or older and their years of teaching experience were fairly evenly distributed. Of the participants, 118 stated that it was their first time teaching online.

Table 1
Participant Background Data

	Variables	N
Gender	Female	82
	Male	56
Age	Under 25	2
	25-29	2
	30-39	34
	40-49	48
	50-59	32
	60+	20
Education Degree	Bachelor	4
	Masters	91
	Doctorate	43
Teaching Experience	1-10 years	25
	11-20 years	59
	21-30 years	28
	over 30 years	26
Online teaching experience	This is first semester	118
	Less than 2 years	6
	Less than 5 years	1
	Less than 10 years	3
	Less than 20 years	1
	More than 20 years	0
	I don't teach online real-time classes	9
Online teaching PD received	None	42
	1-5 hours	57
	6-10 hours	19
	More than 11 hours	20

Questionnaire

The teaching self-efficacy questionnaire was developed in English by referring to the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge-Web model (Lee & Tsai, 2010). Five English teachers proofread the questionnaire to ensure there were no ambiguities in the wording. The questionnaire consisted of six background items (gender, age, educational background, teaching experience, online teaching experience, and professional development) and 30 six-point Likert-scale items (See Appendix). Twenty-nine items were used to measure four latent constructs: pedagogy (ten items); technology (seven items); CLT (six items); and self-management (six items). Pedagogical self-efficacy is the belief teachers have in their ability to use pedagogical instructions, technological self-efficacy is the belief in their ability to utilize technology, CLT self-efficacy is the belief in their ability to conduct communicative language teaching, and self-management efficacy is belief in their ability to manage time and teaching related work. The final item was used to elicit overall online teaching self-efficacy. In addition, three open-ended questions were included for the participants to explain their choice of response for items 1 and 30, as well as to make comments on their overall teaching online experience. The questionnaire was distributed to university English teachers in Japan through JALT Facebook pages, language conference mailing lists, and emails using Google Forms.

Analysis

In order to confirm the construct unidimensionality of the four latent constructs, Rasch model analysis was conducted on the raw data collected from the questionnaire using WINSTEPS version 3.64.2 (Linacre & Wright, 2007). A total of six items (items 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, and 29) were deleted from the analysis because they did not fit the minimum model criteria. In addition, seven participants were deleted because they were determined to be outliers, giving us a final participant number of 131. The four latent constructs of pedagogy, technology, CLT, and self-management were confirmed by their item fit to the Rasch model as well as construct dimensionality, reliability, and to produce interval measures. Reliability analysis was conducted on the four constructs with Cronbach's alpha for Pedagogy (α= .76), Technology (α= .86), CLT (α= .87), and Self-management (α= .84).

Next, the logit scores from WINSTEPS were used to calculate participants' four latent online teaching self-efficacies using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. A correlation analysis was conducted to understand the relationship between the four self-efficacy constructs using Pearson correlation coefficients. Plonsky and Oswald (2014) suggested that an *r-value* close to .25 is a small effect, .40 is a medium effect, and .60 is a large effect in the field of second language research. Furthermore, a hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relative weights of background variables and the four self-efficacy constructs on the participants' overall self-efficacy. The background variables and four self-efficacy constructs were used as the predictor variables and their response of item 30 was used as the dependent variable. For the hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis, participants' background variables (gender, education background, teaching experiences, and amount of online teaching training received) were entered for the first step, and the four self-efficacy constructs were entered for the second step. In order to avoid multicollinearity, age was removed from the analysis because it was highly correlated to teaching experience. The requirements for normality and multicollinearity were met.

Results

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of each construct in the unit of logits where they ranged from approximately -5.00 to +6.00. The negative logits indicate their relative distance from the positive logits on the Wright map. Participants had the highest mean score for Technology (*M* = 1.60), followed by CLT (*M* = 1.26), Pedagogy (*M* = .87), and the lowest mean score for Self-management (*M* = .01). Participants responded positively to all technology related self-efficacy items, especially toward item 16, *I can use appropriate software (e.g., spreadsheets, electronic portfolios) to manage student performance data*, where 42.1% of participants responded, *I strongly agree* (6), and 24.3% of participants responded, *I agree* (5). On the other hand, only six participants responded, *I strongly disagree* (1), and seven participants answered, *I disagree* (2).

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Four Online Teaching Self-Efficacy Constructs

	Pedagogy	Technology	CLT	Self- Management
Minimum	-1.22	-2.32	-2.36	-4.49
Maximum	5.14	5.92	5.73	5.17
M	.87	1.60	1.26	.01
95% CI	[.65, 1.09]	[1.28, 1.92]	[.96, 1.54]	[-.27, .29]
SD	1.31	1.85	1.67	1.63

N = 131, CI = Confidence Interval, SD = Standard deviation

Table 3 presents the results of the correlation analysis for the four constructs. There were two high correlation coefficients, Technology and CLT correlated at $r = .72$, $p < .01$, and Technology and Self-management correlated at $r = .61$, $p < .01$. There was a medium correlation coefficient between CLT and Self-management at $r = .56$, $p < .01$.

Table 3

Correlation Coefficients Among the Four Online Teaching Self-Efficacy Constructs

	Pedagogy	Technology	CLT	Self-Management
Pedagogy	-			
Technology	.13	-		
CLT	.22**	.72**	-	
Self-Management	.04	.61**	.56**	-

Note. ** Correlation is significant at $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

The mean score of item 30, *Overall, I am capable of teaching language classes online* was 4.56 (SD = 1.22). The regression result showed that the participants' background did not account for a significant amount of their overall online teaching self-efficacy, adjusted $R^2 = .04$, $F(4, 126) = 2.26$, $p = .07$. The four self-efficacy constructs accounted for a significant amount of overall online teaching self-efficacy, adjusted $R^2 = .53$, $F(8, 122) = 19.16$, $p < .01$. The second model shows that 53% of variance explains their overall self-efficacy. Table 4 reports the degree to which each variable included in the model contributes to the prediction of overall online teaching self-efficacy. The standardized regression coefficients show that the technology construct was the strongest predictor ($\beta = .39$, $p < .01$).

Table 4

Results of Regressions Predicting Overall Self-Efficacy

	Model 1		Model 2	
	β		*β*	
(Constant)				
Background variables				
Gender (Male=1)	-.23	**	-.06	
Education	.06		-.01	
Teaching experiences	.10		.05	
Online training hours (PD)	.60		-.03	
Latent constructs				
Pedagogy			-.05	
Technology			.39	***
CLT			.25	**
Self-management			.19	**
Adjusted R^2		.04		.53

Note 1: ***$p < .01$, ** $p < .05$

Discussion

Our first research question was how efficacious Japanese university English teachers feel when they teach online. Overall, the teachers in this study reported a high level of self-efficacy to teach online because they expressed positive responses toward the usage of technology, pedagogy, and CLT. This result supports previous studies that found teachers to be self-efficacious in their own teaching (Atay, 2007; Choi & Lee, 2016). In particular, participants in this study reported having high technological self-efficacy such as using appropriate software to manage student performance, with 66.4% of participants responding very positively. This finding does not corroborate previous studies that found a lack of technological self-efficacy in teachers using online technology for teaching (e.g., Dawley et al., 2010; Mishra & Koehler, 2006). One possible reason for this difference is that online technology has become more prevalent compared

to one decade ago when the above previous studies were conducted, so it is reasonable to assume that more teachers have become more familiar with the integration of technology into teaching. On the other hand, participants in this study had the lowest level of self-efficacy for self-management. This finding supports previous studies (e.g., Lin & Zheng, 2015; Martin et al., 2019; Tomei, 2006) that found teachers struggle with time management when teaching online. One of the reasons is because teachers need more time (minimum of at least 14% increase as suggested by Tomei, 2006) in presenting the content online as well as more time to prepare for online lessons (Martin et al., 2019). Since many of the participants reported they had not received professional development concerning how to teach online, these results suggest they have not developed the abilities to effectively manage themselves for online classes. As suggested by Shi et al. (2006), separate abilities are needed to manage time when teaching online and thus teachers need the opportunity and support to develop these abilities.

In answering our second research question, we found there were strong relationships between the latent self-efficacy constructs of pedagogy, technology, CLT, and self-management, which suggest that there was an interplay among them. For example, a strong relationship (r = .72) was found between technological self-efficacy, which is the belief in the ability to utilize technology and CLT self-efficacy. This result indicates that the teachers believed they could easily utilize technology in CLT lessons, or that the nature of CLT classes matches better with the technology used, such as Zoom.

Self-management efficacy correlated the most with the other three constructs of online teaching self-efficacy. A high correlation between self-management efficacy and technological self-efficacy (r = .61) suggests that when these teachers felt efficacious using technology for teaching, they were able to effectively manage themselves online and vice versa. Finally, a medium correlation between self-management efficacy and CLT self-efficacy (r = .56) suggests that when teachers were able to manage themselves online more effectively, they were also able to manage more interactive activities online such as managing pair and group work and vice versa.

Our last research question investigated whether any of the participants' background variables influenced their overall online teaching self-efficacy. The results of the hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis showed that the participants' background variables did not significantly explain their overall online teaching self-efficacy. This finding differs from previous studies (e.g., Corry & Stella, 2018; Horvitz et al., 2015; Lee & Tsai, 2010), which found online teaching self-efficacy to be determined by teachers' background demographics. This finding is encouraging because there might be a false assumption that senior teachers are not as good at utilizing online technology in their classrooms as compared to younger teachers (e.g., Lee & Tsai, 2010; van Driel et al., 1998). Teaching experience did not determine teachers' online self-efficacy because most teachers who responded to this study were teaching online for the first time and thus they might have similar outlooks and beliefs when it comes to this unfamiliar teaching style. Adapting online teaching urgently under the pandemic situation is such a unique experience that teachers' previous experiences from regular classroom settings might not have impacted on their overall self-efficacy or might have impacted all these teachers equally regardless of their previous teaching experience.

On the other hand, the four online teaching self-efficacy constructs impacted positively on teachers' overall self-efficacy. In particular, technological self-efficacy was the strongest predictor, indicating that the participants' self-efficacy of utilizing technology appeared to significantly explain their overall self-efficacy. Because the spring semester of 2020 was the first experience to teach online classes for most of the participants, familiarizing themselves and becoming more comfortable with the technology platform, devices, and apps impacted their overall self-efficacy to teach online. Being capable of utilizing technology in teaching appears to be the key for overall online teaching self-efficacy.

Some of the participants took initiative to make sense of how to utilize technology in their new experiences. They commented, "It's hard in the beginning but you get used to it. Like riding a bicycle"; "I have somehow been able to have effective classes online despite lack of preparation time and support"; and "It's been a sharp learning curve, with some mistakes here and there, but it has not been a total disaster. So I guess that I am capable, even though I don't love doing it." These comments suggest that the firsthand experience of teaching online gave teachers the opportunity to gain confidence in their online teaching despite some of their differences in background.

Conclusion

This exploratory study aimed to investigate how efficacious English teachers felt when they were suddenly forced out of their usual teaching environment and navigating through an unfamiliar online teaching environment. The English teachers who participated in this study were highly self-efficacious about their teaching online especially toward the integration of technology into teaching. However, they were not self-efficacious with using their time effectively when teaching online. The results of the regression model showed the latent constructs were interrelated and strongly correlated with teachers' overall online self-efficacy. Finally, teachers' background variables did not

influence their overall online teaching self-efficacy. Although the teachers had limited time for preparation, once they started the actual online classes, it gave them practical experiences which made them feel capable of their teaching online as shown by their comments. By experiencing how online platforms worked, how the online materials were utilized, and how students responded to their teaching, these teachers were able to sense *their class is working*.

We would like to conclude with some implications for teachers, program directors, and researchers. Teachers need sufficient training in using technology as technological self-efficacy is a strong predictor of their overall online self-efficacy. In addition, teachers who are able to effectively manage themselves online are able to improve as teachers as they can select suitable instructions for teaching. Therefore, it is important for future teacher professional development to focus on teacher self-management, so teachers learn how to balance content with the time constraints of each lesson. This training could aim to help teachers develop detailed lesson plans for teaching online. Despite showing high levels of efficacy with technology, the same participants had the lowest level of self-efficacy for self-management. This finding reinforces the notion that these skills need to be addressed separately when planning future professional-development programs.

This study however is not without limitations as it was an initial attempt to examine university English teachers' online teaching self-efficacy during the Covid-19 pandemic. First, the survey was distributed online through snowball sampling and it was possible that only teachers who were comfortable with working online responded to this survey and produced biased results. Second, there were few younger age participants in this study and many of our participants had many years of teaching experience so that we were unable to determine if age or amount of teaching experience would determine teacher online self-efficacy. Future studies should seek a more balanced representation of teaching experience and age in a random sample selection. Third, a Japanese version of the survey was not developed. Participants might have responded to the survey differently if it was delivered in Japanese. Fourth, although this study aimed to research online teaching self-efficacy, it was a study that was conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic where online teaching was used as an emergency remote teaching measure. Therefore, caution needs to be taken when interpreting results of this study for future online teaching. More studies need to be conducted to provide more insights into general online teaching practices.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to Xia Shiming at Doshisha University for helping with the statistical analysis and to all teachers for helping with the survey in this study.

Bio Data

Nancy Shzh-chen Lee teaches English and applied linguistics at the Graduate School of Language and Culture at Osaka University. She is currently interested in ELF speaking proficiency development and online teaching self-efficacy research. <leenancy@lang.osaka-u.ac.jp>

Chie Ogawa teaches English and Language Pedagogy at Kyoto Sangyo University. Her research interests are teacher education, task-based language teaching, and speaking assessment. <chieog@cc.kyoto-su.ac.jp>

References

Atay, D. (2007). Beginning teacher efficacy and the practicum in an EFL context. *Teacher Development, 11*(2), 203-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530701414720

Bacow, L. S., Bowen, G. B., Guthrie, K. M., Lack, K. A., & Long, M. P. (2012). *Barriers to adoption of online learning systems in U.S. higher education*. Ithaka.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.

Chacon, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 257-272. https://doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.001

Chai, C. S., Koh, J. H. L., & Tsai, C. C. (2010). Facilitating preservice teachers' development of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge (TPACK), *Educational Technology & Society, 13*(4), 63-73.

Choi, E., & Lee, J. (2016). Investigating the relationship of target language proficiency and self-efficacy among nonnative EFL teachers. *System, 58,* 49-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.02.010

Corry, M., & Stella, J. (2018). Teacher self-efficacy in online education: A review of the literature. *Research in Learning Technology,* 26, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.25304/rlt.v26.2047

Dawley, L., Rice, K., & Hinck, G. (2010). *Going virtual! The status of professional development for K-12 online teachers*. Boise State University. Retrieved from http://edtech.boisestate.edu/goingvirtual/goingvirtual3.pdf

Ferdig, R. E. (2006). Assessing technologies for teaching and learning: Understanding the importance of technological pedagogical content knowledge. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 37,* 749-760. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00559.x

Graham, C. R., Borup, J., & Smith, N. B. (2012). Using TPACK as a framework to understand teacher candidates' technology integration decisions, *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 28,* 530-546. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2011.00472.x

Horvitz, B. S., Beach, A. L., Anderson, M. L., & Xia, J. (2015). Examination of faculty self-efficacy related to online teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 40*(4), 305-316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755- 014-9316-1

Jain, C., & Getis, A. (2003). The effectiveness of internet-based instruction: An experiment in physical geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 27*, 153-167. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098260305679

Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (2005). What happens when teachers design educational technology? The development of technological pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 32*(2), 131-152. https://doi.org/10.2190/0EW7-01WB-BKHL-QDYV

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), 1-21. https://dog.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9075-4

Lee, S. C. N., & Ogawa, C. (2021). Online teaching self-efficacy - How English teachers feel during the covid-19 pandemic. Indonesian *TESOL Journal, 3*(1), 1-17.

Lin, C. H., & Zheng, B. (2015). Teaching practices and teacher perceptions in online world language courses. *Journal of Online Learning Research, 1*(3), 275-303.

Linacre, J. M., & Wright, B. D. (2007). *WINSTEPS: Multiple-choice, rating scale, and partial credit Rasch analysis* [Computer software]. MESA.

Martin, F., Wang, C., Jokiaho, A., May, B., & Stuttgart, S. G. (2019). Examining faculty readiness to teach online: A comparison of US and German educators. *European Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning, 22*(1), 53-69. https://doi.org/10.2478/eurodl-2019-0004

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1017-1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

Neo, M. (2003). Developing a collaborative learning environment using a web-based design. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 19*, 462-473. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0266-4909.2003.00050.x

Nishino, T. (2012). Modeling teacher beliefs and practices in context: A multimethods approach. *The Modern Language Journal, 96*(3), 380-399. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01364.x

Ortaçtepe, D. & Akyel, A.S. (2015). The effects of a professional development program on English as a foreign language teachers' efficacy and classroom practice. *TESOL Journal, 6*(4), 680-706. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.185

Plonsky, L., & Oswald, F. L. (2014). How big is "big"? Interpreting effect sizes in L2 research. *Language Learning, 64*(4), 878-912. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.1207

Ramlo, S. (2021). The Coronavirus and higher education: Faculty viewpoints about universities moving online during a worldwide pandemic. *Innovative Higher Education,* 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-020-09532-8

Robinia, K. A., & Anderson, M. L. (2010). Online teaching efficacy of nurse faculty. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 26*(3), 168-175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2010.02.006

Shi, M., Bonk, C. & Magjuka, R. (2006). Time management strategies for online teaching. *International Journal for Technology and Distance Learning*. Retrieved from http://itdl.org/journal/feb_06/article01.htm

Thompson, G., & Woodman, K. (2019). Exploring Japanese high school English teachers' foreign language teacher efficacy beliefs. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 47*(1), 48-65. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2018.1498062

Tomei, L. A. (2006). The impact of online teaching on faculty load: computing the ideal class size for online courses. *Technology and Teacher Education, 14*(3), 531-541. Retrieved from https://www.utm.edu/departments/ncate/documents/onlinefacultyload.pdf

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-051x(01)00036-1

van Driel, J. H., Verloop, N., & de Vos, W. (1998). Developing science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35*(6), 673-695. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(199808)35:6<673::AID-TEA5>3.0.CO;2-J

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. https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2015.05.1.02

Zee, M., & H. M. Y. Koomen. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 981-1015. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801

Appendix

Online English Teaching Questionnaire

Please check the focus of your class(es)

☐ Skill-based ☐ Listening ☐ Speaking ☐ Reading
☐ Writing ☐ TOEIC or other proficiency test preparation
☐ Content-based
☐ CLT/TLBT (Communicative language teaching/Task-based language teaching)
☐ Others ( )

Please indicate the nature of your online classes

☐ I provide students with videos
☐ I provide students with slides
☐ I provide students with readings
☐ I ask students to submit assignments
☐ I provide real time (synchronous) sessions using platforms such as Zoom, MS Teams, Webex
☐ Other (Please specify)

Part 1 Background Information

1. What is your gender? ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Other
2. What is your age group? ☐ under 25 ☐ 25-29 ☐ 30-39 ☐ 40-49 ☐ 50-59 ☐ 60+
3. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?
   ☐ Bachelor degree ☐ Master degree ☐ Doctoral degree
4. How long have you been working as a teacher?
   ☐ This is my first year ☐ 1-2 years ☐ 3-5 years
   ☐ 6-10 years ☐ 11-15 years ☐ 16-20 years ☐ More than 20 years
5. How long have you been teaching online real time (synchronous) courses?
   ☐ This is my first semester ☐ 1-2 years ☐ 3-5 years
   ☐ 6-10 years ☐ 11-15 years ☐ 16-20 years ☐ More than 20 years ☐ I don't teach online real-time courses
6. Roughly how many hours of online teaching workshops (seminars) have you taken before you started teaching online this year?
   ☐ None ☐ Less than 2 hours ☐ Less than 5 hours
   ☐ Less than 10 hours ☐ Less than 20 hours ☐ More than 20 hours

Part 2 About Teaching Online

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with statements using the scale below:

- 1 – Strongly disagree
- 2 – Disagree
- 3 – Slightly disagree
- 4 – Slightly agree
- 5 – Agree
- 6 – Strongly agree

Online Pedagogical Self-Efficacy

1. I can teach online even though I cannot provide face to face support.

1b. Please give reasons for this answer. Please provide details.

2. I can lead students on different learning tasks online.
3. I can develop students' language proficiency online.
4. I can motivate students online who show a low interest in language learning.
5. I can coordinate students' collaboration online.
6. I can motivate students online to do homework.
7. I can provide individual instruction to cater for students' individual needs online.
8. I can use summative (end-point) assessments to evaluate student learning online.
9. I can use formative (in-progress) assessments to evaluate student learning online.
10. I can develop creative ways to teach online.

Online Technological Self-Efficacy

11. I can use an online technology platform (e.g., Blackboard, Google Classroom Moodle, MS Teams, Zoom) for teaching.

12. I can help students when they have difficulty with devices (e.g., computers, tablets, smartphones).
13. I can use an online technology platform (e.g., Blackboard, Google Classroom Moodle, MS Teams, Zoom) to motivate students to participate.
14. I can use an online technology platform (e.g., Blackboard, Google Classroom Moodle, MS Teams, Zoom) to mentor students.
15. I can use an online technology platform (e.g., Blackboard, Google Classroom Moodle, MS Teams, Zoom) to conduct evaluations.
16. I can use software (e.g., spreadsheets, electronic portfolios) to manage student performance data.
17. I can find additional technological tools (e.g., apps, platforms) to support my teaching online.

Online Communicative Language Teaching Self-Efficacy

18. I can manage group work activities online.
19. I can manage pair work activities online.
20. I can organize meaning-focused activities online (i.e., not focusing on linguistic forms).
21. I can organize task-based learning activities online (e.g., decision-making group work, information-gap task).
22. I can give corrective feedback to students online (e.g., correcting linguistic forms).
23. I can evaluate performance-based assessments online (e.g., oral presentation).

Online Self-Management Efficacy

24. I can manage my workload when teaching online.
25. I can find help when I have difficulties teaching online.
26. I can find teacher development resources to improve my online teaching ability.
27. I can balance the demands of teaching and research when teaching online.
28. I can balance the demands of teaching and personal life when teaching online
29. I can allocate enough time to give individual feedback to students online.
30. Overall, I am capable of teaching language classes online.

30b. Please give reasons for this answer.

Do you have any comments and/or questions?

Please provide your email if you would be willing to share your thoughts or experience with teaching online. We might contact you for some follow up questions.