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Abstract

Teacher preparation programs at the Faculties of Education require student teachers to practice teaching practicum in schools, yet it was impossible to go to school because of the shutdown caused by COVID–19 outbreak. Accordingly, EFL student teachers were deprived of the actual classroom experience. Instead of face to face practicum, the Faculty of Education at October 6 University adopted e–practicum for the first time. Consequently, the aim of this study is to investigate the effect of e–practicum on developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance and online teaching self–efficacy. The study utilized pre and post one–group design. The participants were 84 male and female fourth year students majoring in English language at the Faculty of Education, October 6 University, Egypt. To collect the data for this study, an instructional performance observation sheet (IPOS) and a self–efficacy scale (SES) were developed. Descriptive statistics and independent sample t–test were used as a means for data analysis. Results revealed that while e–practicum was ineffective in developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance, it was effective in developing their online teaching self–efficacy. Accordingly, e–practicum needs more improvement to meet the required level of EFL student teachers’ instructional performance.
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INTRODUCTION

COVID–19 pandemic is recognized as a world crisis whose disruptive effects have impacted almost all aspects of life including education. Education has been severely influenced the pandemic. Whereas the normal place for formal education is schools and universities, many countries have closed schools and universities and moved to online learning in order to contain the spread of Coronavirus. Moving to online learning, all classes and learning activities were conducted virtually leaving behind the regular face-to-face classes. Due to infection risks, online emergency education has to proceed using available ICT infrastructure. During the second half of the second term of the academic year 2019/2020, almost all countries closed tertiary campuses and adopted e-learning. Likewise, Egypt suspended face-to-face teaching/learning activities and moved to online classes. As a result, millions of Egyptian students have to learn online at home.

The shift from face-to-face education to virtual learning was abrupt, so a lot of challenges emerged. While e-learning has many advantages (Mahyoob, 2020), rapid transformation from face-to-face education to online education encounters some challenges (Crawford, Butler, Rudolph & Glowatz, 2020). The current situation is not a planned digital transformation, it is a crisis learning (Pace, Pettit & Barke, 2020). Demuyakor (2020)
Dr. Drohamed Farrag mentions that universities have been forced to shift to e–learning regardless of their current digital infrastructure capacity. Whereas lack of modern technology restricts the capability of digital learning (Zhong, 2020), online learning is effective in digitally advanced countries (Basilaia & Kvavadze 2020). While e–learning is common in developed societies, it is rare in developing countries.

Since e–learning quality varies from one university to another and from one discipline to another, offering tertiary practical courses online represents an educational challenge. Elhadary, Gamil and Kilic (2020) are not pleased with the idea of offering tertiary practical courses online because some practical skills cannot be compensated by e–learning. Moreover, some practical skills are affected by the lockdown due to the crisis of COVID–19. According to Adedoyin and Soykan (2020) while online learning could be appropriate for teaching theoretical disciplines, it is less effective in teaching practical disciplines that require practical experiences. Due to COVID–19 pandemic, many universities were enforced to delay tertiary practical courses or to deliver them virtually.

Like other majors, EFL student teachers could not practice regular practicum in schools as usual. Accordingly, they practiced teaching training online at home depending on online guidance provided by expert supervisors. As an instructional innovation,
electronic practicum (henceforth, e–practicum) was the sole choice for EFL student teachers to complete practicum courses online. E–practicum is hoped to develop EFL student teachers’ instructional skills that enable them to teach EFL effectively. In addition, e–practicum is assumed to provide EFL student teachers with online experiences that may improve their online teaching self–efficacy. Although e–practicum is an innovative research area in EFL contexts, it has been marginalized by recent research. Basilaia and Kvavadze (2020) state that the quality of online learning needs more examination. In this respect, the current study could be one of the pioneer studies that examine the effectiveness of e–practicum in developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance and online teaching self–efficacy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teaching Practicum

As a core course in teacher education programs, practicum aims at familiarizing pre–service teachers with the future teaching context and its variables through collaboration with schools (Aghabarari & Rahimi 2020). In practicum, pre–service teachers spend an extended time observing teachers, and preparing and delivering lessons under their supervision (Walton & Rusznyak, 2013). Practicum is a compulsory part of any
teacher education program (Pang & Kean, 2018). In normal circumstances, student teachers have to attend schools to have a real life professional experience and develop their teaching skills under close supervision of expert mentors and supervisors.

Teaching practice is called practicum which familiarizes student teachers with teaching environment and variables. Pokhrel (2020) states that the introduction of practicum is highly valued component in teacher preparation program. It provides student teachers with the opportunity to be in the classroom and prepares them to develop classroom teaching skills. Pokhrel (2020) comes to the conclusion that teaching practicum empowered the student teachers to eliminate fear. Becoming EFL prospective teachers is something challenging, especially when they face teaching practicum program in real schools with real students. During this period, student teachers share their knowledge in teaching situation according to the theories and the best practice they have ever read or seen (Riesky, 2013).

In EFL context, practicum is intended to develop EFL student teachers’ instructional performance by providing opportunities for them to apply the knowledge, skills, and values they have been acquiring at the university. During the first weeks of the practicum course, EFL student teachers’ are normally required to observe the teaching performance of an in–service
EFL teacher and then they observe the teaching performance of their colleagues in a real classroom to be well-acquainted with actual classroom teaching situations. Afterwards, they start their own instruction in the classroom for four semesters. During the teaching practicum, university staff and school teachers are assigned to supervise EFL student teachers. The teacher is assigned to supervise the student teachers on a daily basis while the staff member is assigned to provide further assistance. Furthermore, both the school teacher and the university staff assess and grade the student teachers’ performance at the end of each semester. To sum up, during practicum student teachers spend an extended time observing teachers, and preparing and delivering lessons under their supervision (Walton & Rusznyak, 2013).

In Egypt, teaching practicum is conducted in the third and fourth years of the four-year teacher preparation programs at the Faculties of Education. It is an important stage in the process of teacher training. Teaching practicum gives student-teachers a chance to have contact with the real world of their profession. As a practical course, teaching practicum helps student-teachers reinforce, expand and improve what they have learnt at the faculties of education. Student-teachers are sent to schools in
groups under the supervision of university lecturers and experienced school teachers.

**E–Teaching Practicum**

E–practicum, during the COVID–19 outbreak, was the only option to train EFL student teachers in teaching EFL classes. To make up for the absence of the practicum in EFL context, electronic practicum was adopted to equip EFL student teachers with the prescribed skills of teaching EFL. Accordingly, actual class videos taken from Youtube were uploaded and EFL student teachers had to watch, analyze and imitate. Then, EFL student teachers were asked upload videos displaying their teaching simulations. EFL student teachers were asked to upload some samples of their lesson plans as pictures (Appendix 3 CD). While e–practicum was proceeding, many EFL student teachers expressed their dissatisfaction with their online experience. Others reported that they lost the chance of practicing real teaching in schools.

Regular practicum shifted to electronic practicum or e–practicum because of COVID–19 pandemic has changed the future of the education (Rose, 2020). In July 2020, about 98.6% of learners worldwide were affected by the pandemic, representing 1.725 billion children and youth, from pre–primary to higher education, in 200 countries (United Nations, 2020).
Staying home strategies have been adopted to control the transmission of the pandemic (Sintema, 2020). E-practicum was recognized as a new concept by many pre-service teachers. This concept would be of great help to pre-service teachers in familiarizing them with virtual instruction on a digital platform and gaining experience with such instruction. In e-practicum, the supervision of the university supervisor acts as the “e-mentor” on behalf of the cooperating teacher (Ersin & Atay (2020).

E-mentoring provides teachers with support and guidance via distance learning eliminating space and time constraints (Redmond, 2015). According to Spanorriga, Tsiotakis, and Jimoyiannis (2018), e-mentoring is expected to create an informal, participatory and interactive environment which offers continuous communication and interaction of individual mentees with their mentors, without space and time restrictions, to provide guidance, advice, support, protection, encouragement and assistance as well as peer support among teachers by sharing common interests, educational experiences, teaching material, knowledge, and resources. Accordingly, it is hoped that e-practicum could help student teachers couple theory to practice which in turn promotes their professional skills. However, the digitalization of tertiary level practical courses is one of the central challenges of e-learning. Rose (2020) mentions the online
simulation can enhance the theoretical concepts, but it will not provide the students with the real experiences. Accordingly, the feasibility of e–practicum needs more investigations.

**Instructional Skills**

It is difficult to define the components that constitute a qualified teacher. The qualified teacher as a term changes depending on different contexts. EFL teachers’ instructional performance skills involve classroom management, error correction, teaching grammar communicatively, teaching listening, teaching reading, teaching writing, teaching speaking, vocabulary pronunciation and lesson planning (Novozhenina & Pinzon, 2018). Teaching or instructional performance is the corner stone of being a qualified EFL teacher. Instructional performance is understood as the observable pedagogical practice that the teacher manifests to demonstrate his/her competency to achieve levels of excellence in teaching and maintain the expected learning outcomes (Suarez & Peru 2018). Mizell (2010) states that educational research has shown that teaching quality and school leadership are the most important factors in raising student achievement. Instructional performance development includes the processes that support professional knowledge, skills, values and attitudes (Latif, 2019). Instructional performance development
starts with the pre-service period and continues into in-service teaching (Kuzu 2014).

Graduating qualified teachers depends on how well they are prepared. Effective EFL teachers have to meet the standards including what they should know, do and believe. Therefore, instructional performance is supposed to consider these standards. Ben-Peretz (2000) states that much of the perceived failure of schooling is attributed to teachers who are thought to be ill prepared for their task because teacher education is deficient. According to Aghabarari and Rahimi (2020), preparing student teachers to become members of teaching community within a given context and assisting them to develop their pedagogical skills is assumed to be the core of teacher education programs. Whichever definition one agrees with, there are always numerous reasons why teachers’ professional performance should be the focal topic in pre-service and in-service teachers’ training programs.

The first and most obvious reason is the fact that good teaching performance results in good learning outcomes. Simply, instructional performance refers to EFL student teachers’ content delivery procedures. This means that EFL student teachers’ instructional performance includes stating smart objectives, preparing effective EFL lesson plan, delivering effective EFL
warming-up, delivering effective EFL presentation, creating effective EFL learning activities, asking purposeful EFL questions, incorporating you-tube films in EFL lessons, making good wrap-up, using clear voice, and achieving lesson objectives. In spite of the fact that instructional performance is a central practicum, little research investigated the effectiveness of e-practicum in developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance.

**Teacher Self-efficacy**

EFL teacher education is a complex process that has a set of interrelated variables among which teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge, teachers’ professional performance skills and teachers’ career beliefs. Central to teachers’ psychological and pedagogical preparation is self-efficacy. According to Bandura (2006), self-efficacy operates through its impact on cognitive, motivational, affective, and decisional processes. Megawati and Astutik (2018) state that self-efficacy refers to one’s belief that he can achieve assigned missions or tasks successfully and easily. Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett (2002) mention that elementary logic behind self-efficacy theory is that high self-efficacy individuals are more likely to engage in activities more than those who have low self-efficacy. Evidently, self-efficacy is not based on one’s actual ability to do a task, but rather on that person’s perceived ability to complete that task (Sharp, Brandt,
Tuft, & Jay; 2016). Hence, one may state that self-efficacy refers to the teacher’s believed answer of the question: How competent am I? In this sense, one’s success in his future career is affected by his self-efficacy quality level. Consequently, it could be stated that pre-service teachers believing that they are incapable of coping with the demands of teaching, they may quit their future career. Elstad and Christophersen (2017) remark that student teachers with low self-efficacy may lack the initiative or motivation needed to improve or may leave the field altogether.

Because of self-efficacy affects not only the teaching performance but also learning performance, self-efficacy becomes a never ending topic in pedagogical research. Watt and Richardson (2008) concluded that self-efficacy regarding learning and teaching is highly related to motivational and self-regulating processes. The same result was confirmed by Iaochite et al. (2011) where self-efficacy correlated with teaching career satisfaction, teaching duration, commitment, effort, and persistence even in the most difficult and unmotivated classes.

Concerning teaching quality, Pan and Newfields (2011) assert that teachers with high self-efficacy could design interesting and challenging programs to motivate students, create a better learning atmosphere, state different educational objectives and adjust the difficult level of the curriculum for
students. Similarly, the study of Daal, Donche, and Maeyer (2014) went in line with the previous results confirming that teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs have been repeatedly associated with positive teaching behaviors and student outcomes. Self-efficacy is even a stronger positive predictor for self-regulation. Likewise, Ersanli (2015) concluded that self-efficacy has positive correlation with teachers’ success and motivation.

EFL teachers’ self-efficacy research results go in line with the results of the research carried on teachers of other majors. Ucar and Yazıcı (2016) studied the EFL student teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs, goal orientations, and participations in an online learning environment. Results showed several positive associations between teachers’ goal orientations and self-efficacy beliefs. Nugroho (2017) studied the student EFL teachers’ perception of self-efficacy and their English proficiency toward their preparedness for the teaching practicum program. Results showed that the EFL student teachers have medium to high self-efficacy toward their teaching of EFL. Another study documented that when the pre-service teachers have moderate or high self-efficacy, they tend to be highly motivated and more creative in teaching. Pre-service teachers who have low self-efficacy will be more stressful when facing teaching time (Moradkhani, Raygan & Moein, 2017). Begum and Hamzah
(2018) proved that increasing teachers’ efficacy is significantly effective in improving teaching and learning English.

More recently, Aghabarari and Rahimi (2020) investigated EFL teachers’ conceptions of their professional development during practicum course. The results revealed that the participants had roughly positive retrospective perceptions of the practicum course and its role in their professional development. Rezaeian and Abdollahzadeh (2020) attempted to discover whether age, gender, and experience can significantly influence perceptions of collective and teachers’ self-efficacy. Results revealed that no significant difference between the English instructors’ collective teacher efficacy and teacher self-efficacy. Finally, Ersin and Atay (2020) investigated teachers’ competence and online teaching readiness through e-practicum during the COVID-19 Outbreak. The findings revealed that EFL teachers found the e-practicum useful because it helped them overcome online teaching fears.

Based on this review, it could be stated that EFL teachers’ self-efficacy is a crucial variable affecting teachers’ performance and students’ achievement. Self-efficacy is a rich educational research area. Reviewing the literature revealed that no previous research investigated the effectiveness of e-practicum in EFL student teachers’ self-efficacy. The present study used
questionnaire since most of the previous research used the same instrument.

**The problem of the study**

As a reaction to COVID-19 pandemic, the Faculty of Education at October 6 University moved to e-practicum for the first time instead of the regular practicum courses. However, the effectiveness of such innovation in developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance and online teaching self-efficacy has not been tested.

**Questions of the study**

The study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What is the effect of e-practicum on developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance?
2. What is the effect of e-practicum on developing EFL student teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy?

**Aims of the study**

The present study aimed at investigating the effect of e-practicum on developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance and self-efficacy.

**Significance of the study**

The findings of this study are of great importance since there is a paucity of previous research regarding e-practicum during COVID-19 pandemic. Moreover, the significance of the
present study is of three fold. Firstly, the study targets teaching practicum or internship which represents the core practical course in teacher preparation programs. For student teachers, practicum is a prerequisite for graduation. Secondly, the significance of the present study stems from the claim that online learning is no longer an optional or fashionable mode of study, it has become an educational necessity during COVID–19 pandemic. Lastly, the study tackles one of the most challenging issues of e–learning, which is e–practicum where the faculties of education offer online practical courses online for the first time. Thus, the insights gained on the effectiveness of e–practicum would help improve e–practicum practices in EFL context.

**Hypotheses of the study**

The study attempted to test the following hypotheses:

1. There are statistically significant differences in EFL student teachers’ mean scores on the instructional performance observation sheet.

2. There are statistically significant differences in EFL student teachers’ mean scores on the pre–post self–efficacy scale favoring EFL student teachers’ mean scores on the efficacy scale post self.
METHOD

Participants

The total number of the fourth year EFL students enrolled in practicum (4) at the Faculty of Education, October 6 University was 140 students. Only 84 EFL fourth year students were willing to participate in the study. The study participate were (51) male and (33) female student teachers. All the participants were Egyptians. Participants’ age was ranging from 21 to 22 years old. Age and gender were beyond the scope of the study.

Design of the Study

The study utilized pre and post one-group design. The participants were pre-assessed before the intervention and post-assessed after the intervention. Zoom platform and WhatsApp were used as a workspace.

Instruments

A–Instructional Performance Observation Sheet (IPOS)

Aim of the (IPOS)

The EFL student teachers’ instructional performance observation sheet (IPOS) was developed to evaluate EFL student teachers’ instructional performance quality. The (IPOS) was prepared to pre-evaluate the EFL student teachers’ instructional performance quality in the fifth week that preceded practicum shift from face to face practicum to online. EFL student teachers’
instructional performance was post–evaluated in the tenth and last week of e–practicum.

**Content of the (IPOS)**

The content of the (IPOS) was prepared in the light of the standards and criteria mentioned in the available literature related to teachers’ instructional and professional performance. The (IPOS) consisted of ten performance indicators; namely, stating objectives, lesson planning, warming up, lesson presentation, teaching activities, learning activities, questioning, using ICT, wrap up and voice (Appendix 1).

**Validity of the (IPOS)**

The content validity of the (IPOS) was determined by a panel of TEFL experts. Having the IPOS modified in the light of the experts’ remarks, the final version of the IPOS proved valid in terms of its aim and content.

**Reliability of the (IPOS)**

Concerning the reliability of the (IPOS), three TEFL university lecturers were asked to use the observation sheet to individually judge the EFL student teachers’ instructional performance. The correlation among the three ratings was calculated. The reliability coefficient for the (IPOS) was ($r = 71$). This value means that the test displayed a reasonable level of reliability.
Implementation of the (IPOS)

The second term of the academic year 2019/2020 started normally where EFL student teachers practiced practicum in schools. At the end of the fourth week, face to face teaching was suspended because of the spread of COVID-19. After one week of implementing e-practicum, EFL student teachers’ instructional performance was evaluated using the (IPOS). By the end of the e-practicum, EFL student teachers’ instructional performance of the tenth week was re-evaluated. Pre and post evaluation ratings were compared and statically calculated.

Scoring the (IPOS)

EFL student teachers’ instructional performance was rated and scored according to a rubric of 5 indicators. Where the maximum score of each item is 5 points and the total number of items number of the IPOS is 10 and its maximum is 50 points.

B–Self–Efficacy Scale (SES)

Aim of the (SES)

The EFL student teachers’ self-efficacy scale (SES) was developed to evaluate EFL student teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy. The (SES) was prepared to evaluate the EFL student teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy in the fifth week that preceded practicum shift from face to face practicum to
EFL student teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy was post-evaluated in the tenth and last week of e-practicum.

**Content of the (SES)**

The content of the (SES) was prepared in light of the standards and criteria mentioned in the available literature related to EFL student teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy. The SES consisted of 20 performance items (Appendix 2).

**Validity of the (SES)**

The content validity of the (SES) was determined by a panel of TEFL experts. Having the (SES) modified in light of the experts’ remarks, the final version of the (SES) proved to be valid in terms of its aim and content.

**Reliability of the (SES)**

Concerning the reliability of the (SES), 25 EFL student teachers were asked to respond to the self-efficacy scale. After 12 days, the same EFL student teachers were asked to respond again to the self-efficacy scale. The correlation between the ratings of the two administrations was calculated. The reliability coefficient for the (SES) was \((r = 0.68)\). This value means that the test displayed an acceptable level of reliability.

**Implementation of the (SES)**

During the fifth week of the practicum, the SES was pre-administered to the study participants. In the tenth week of the
e–practicum, the SES was post–administered. Pre and post response ratings were compared and statically calculated.

_Scoring the (SES)_

EFL student teachers’ (SES) was rated and scored according to a rubric of 5 grades. Since the maximum score of each item is 5 points and the total number of items of the (SES) is 20, its maximum is 100 points.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

_Results of EFL Student Teachers’ Instructional Performance_

**Figure 1**

Pre Instructional Performance Mean and Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required M.</th>
<th>Obtained M.</th>
<th>Required %</th>
<th>Obtained %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**

EFL Student Teachers’ Instructional Performance Observation Sheet (Post)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>420/4200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–Stating SMART objectives.</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–Preparing effective EFL lesson plan.</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–Delivering effective EFL warming–up.</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–Delivering effective EFL presentation.</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–Creating effective EFL learning activities.</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–Asking purposeful EFL questions.</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–Incorporating you–tube films in EFL lessons.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–Making good wrap up.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–Using clear voice.</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–Achieving lesson objectives.</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**

Post Instructional Performance Mean and Percentage
As shown in figures 1, 2 and the mean score of the pre-
EFL student teachers’ instructional performance observation
sheet is 2 points, while the required mean score is 3.5 points.
Likewise, the mean score of the post EFL student teachers’
instructional performance observation sheet is 2.7 points, while
the required mean scores is 3.5 points, e–practicum has no
significant effect on EFL student teachers’ instructional
performance is less than 3.5 points, thus e–practicum has no
significant effect on EFL student teachers’ instructional
performance. Similarly, the obtained percentages are 40% and
54%, while the accepted percentage is 70%. Such percentages
confirm the same conclusion of the gained mean scores. Table
(1) shows the mean score of each item.

**Figure 3**
Mean Score of EFL Student Teachers’ Instructional
Performance
As shown in figure (3), the obtained mean score of stating SMART objectives is ($\bar{x}=2.6$), the mean score of lesson planning is ($\bar{x}=2.5$), the mean score of warming-up is ($m=3.1$), the mean score of presentation is ($\bar{x}=2.8$), the mean score of learning activities is ($\bar{x}=3.2$), the mean score of questioning is ($\bar{x}=2.5$), the mean score of using Youtube videos is ($\bar{x}=0.24$), the mean score of wrap up is ($m=3$), the mean score of teachers’ voice is ($\bar{x}=4.2$) and the mean score of achieving lesson is ($\bar{x}=2.9$). Almost all the indicators’ means are less than the required mean ($\bar{x}=3.5$) except the mean score of the teachers’ voice that is ($\bar{x}=4.2$). The teachers’ voice is the only indicator that exceeded the required mean score ($\bar{x}=3.5$ points). The reason behind this
score is that the teachers’ voice does not require more sophisticated training or prior knowledge.

**Table 2**
Pre and Post Instructional Performance Effect Size Cohen's d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Cohen's d Result</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre: Fifth Week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.259</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post: Tenth Week</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Cohen's d effect size value (-0.259), displayed in table (2), the effect size of e–practicum on developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance observation is insignificant. Thus, e–practicum has trivial significant effect on EFL student teachers’ instructional performance. In turn, the first hypothesis that there are statistically significant differences in EFL student teachers’ mean scores on the instructional performance observation sheet is rejected and replaced by the hypothesis that there are no statistically significant differences in EFL student teachers’ mean scores on the instructional performance observation sheet. This result, may be attributed to the instructors ‘and students’ technological abilities to access online platforms (Kim, 2020). As a remedial measure, the researcher re–taught
the focal topics of the course practicum (3) while teaching practicum (4) via blended learning during the first term of the academic year 2020/2021. This means that e–practicum is ineffective in developing EFL student teachers’ performance concerning stating smart objectives, preparing lesson plan, performing effective warming–up, delivering lesson presentation, stating learning activities, forming questions, using you–tube, performing wrap up, functioning clear voice and achieving objectives.

Results of EFL Student Teachers’ Self–Efficacy

Figure 4

Mean Score on Pre & Post Self–Efficacy Scale

Figure 4 revealed that the mean score of EFL student teachers on the self–efficacy pre–scale is 2.45 points and their mean score on the self–efficacy post–scale is 4.05 points.
Evidently, the mean score of the EFL student teachers on the self-efficacy post-scale is higher than their mean score on the EFL student teachers’ self-efficacy pre-scale. Seemingly, e-practicum practice has a positive effect on developing EFL student teachers’ self-efficacy.

**Table 3**
EFL Student Teachers’ Pre and Post Scores on Self-Efficacy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Gained Score</th>
<th>$\bar{x} - 5$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>P &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 3, the mean score of the participants on the post scale administration ($\bar{x} = 4.05$, SD = 1.03) is higher than their mean score on the pre scale administration ($\bar{x} = 2.45$, SD = 1.23). The t-value is −6.42 and the p-value is <.00001. Statistically, the result is significant at p<.05. Therefore, it could be stated that EFL student teachers’ online teaching self-efficacy was improved as a result of the experiences they gained during e-practicum activities (during the second term of the academic year 2019/2020 in COVID-19 time).
In other words, e-guidance and activities offered to the EFL pre-service teachers and their online practices familiarized them with online teaching. This finding is consistent with the findings reached by the study of Ersin, Atay and Mede (2020) who came to the conclusion that e-practicum helped EFL pre-service teachers to overcome online teaching fears and improved their online teaching self-efficacy. E-practicum enabled student teachers to overcome technical problems with abundant online teaching experience, and the advantages of digital integration. Another supporting evidence is that practicum enabled the pre-service teachers to eliminate fear (Pokhrel, 2020). Therefore, the second hypothesis is accepted as stated: There are statistically significant differences in EFL student teachers’ mean scores on the pre and post self-efficacy scale favoring EFL student teachers’ mean scores on the post self-efficacy scale.

This result reveals that the study participants believe that they are able to communicate via emails, chat online, use social networking website, use learning management systems for EFL teaching, use presentation software for EFL instruction, can use online resources to prepare EFL lessons, create EFL lessons using podcasts, incorporate online you-tube films in EFL lessons, use EFL virtual learning environments, create EFL digital portfolios, prepare EFL e-lesson plans, deliver EFL e-lessons,
prepare EFL e–tests and e–assignments, communicate with my EFL learners online, use Zoom for EFL teaching/learning purposes, use Edmodo for EFL teaching/learning purposes, use WhatsApp for EFL teaching/learning purposes, use Teams for EFL teaching/learning purposes, produce EFL M–videos, and prepare EFL lessons.

CONCLUSION

The shift from face–to–face education to virtual education was abrupt, so a lot of challenges emerged. While e–learning has many advantages (Mahyoob, 2020), rapid transformation from face–to–face education to online education encounters some challenges (Crawford, Butler, Rudolph & Glowatz, 2020). The current situation is not a planned digital transformation, it is rather a crisis learning (Pace, Pettit & Barke, 2020). Demuyakor (2020) mentions that universities have been forced to shift to e–learning regardless of their current digital infrastructure capacity. At October 6 University, theoretical courses were smoothly moved to online platforms like Skype and Zoom. However, moving practical courses to online was not an easy job. Therefore, the present study attempted to explore the feasibility of e–practicum for developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance and e–teaching self–efficacy.
The main findings of the study revealed that e–practicum was effective in developing EFL student teachers’ e–teaching self–efficacy. Elstad and Christophersen (2017) remark that student teachers with low self–efficacy may lack the initiative or motivation needed to improve or may leave the field altogether. Because of self–efficacy affects not only the teaching performance but also learning performance, self–efficacy becomes a never ending topic in pedagogical research. On the other hand, e–practicum was ineffective in developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance. More online modeling sessions should be integrated into e–practicum so that it can be effective in developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance. Finally, the findings of the present study highlighted one of the recommendations of the study of Carrillo and Floresb (2020) that there is a need for a comprehensive view of the pedagogics of online education that integrates technology to teaching and learning. Moreover, it is recommended that both instructors’ and students’ technological abilities need to be developed via more online training to access online platforms.

IMPLICATIONS

One of the practical contributions of the present study is the estimation of the feasibility of e–practicum for developing EFL
student teachers’ instructional performance and e–teaching self–efficacy. Another pedagogical implication of the present study is that e–practicum was not effective in developing EFL student teachers’ instructional performance, which is the core objective of teachers’ education. Accordingly, e–practicum needs more improvement to meet its desired goals. In its current state, e–practicum is an unreliable mode of study for preparing EFL student teachers for future career. Moreover, e–practicum improved EFL student teachers’ e–teaching self–efficacy, which is one of the crucial variables of teaching/learning processes. This finding provides a solid pedagogical evidence to use e–practicum for developing EFL student teachers’ self–efficacy. Finally, While EFL teachers’ voice gained the highest rate \((X=4.2\, \text{out of } 5)\), using Youtube videos in teaching EFL was the lowest rate \((0.24\, \text{out of } 5)\). Accordingly EFL student teachers need more training on using ready–made videos. More research is required to enhance the feasability of e–practicum in teacher prepartion programs.

LIMITATIONS

Among the limitions that should considred concerning the generalization of the findings of the present study is that the study participants were limited to one Faculty of Education. In addition, some participants did not respond to all the required activities.
because of the low capacity of the Internet facilities in the locations they live in. Other participants were either infected or stressed.
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### Appendix 1

EFL Student Teachers’ Instructional Performance Observation Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–Stating SMART objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2–Preparing effective EFL lesson plan.

3–Delivering effective EFL warming-up.

4–Delivering effective EFL presentation.

5–Creating effective EFL learning activities.

6–Asking purposeful EFL questions.

7–Incorporating you–tube films in EFL lessons.

8–Making good wrap up.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9–Using clear voice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10–Achieving lesson objectives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total

**Appendix 2**

EFL Student Teachers’ Online Teaching Self–Efficacy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kindly, tick (✓) the response that fits you well in light of your E–practicum experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I can communicate via emails.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can chat online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I can use social networking website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can use learning management systems for EFL teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I can use presentation software for EFL instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can use online resources to prepare EFL lessons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I can create EFL lessons using podcasts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I can incorporate online you–tube films in EFL lessons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I can use EFL virtual learning environments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can create EFL digital portfolios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I can prepare EFL E–lesson plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I can deliver EFL E–lessons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I can prepare EFL E–tests and E–assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I can communicate with my EFL learners online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I can use Zoom for EFL teaching/learning purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I can use Edmodo for EFL teaching/learning purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I can use WhatsApp for EFL teaching/learning purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I can use Teams for EFL teaching/learning purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I can produce EFL M–videos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I can prepare EFL lessons with my colleagues online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>