



**THE TUTOR'S ROLE IN THE ONLINE TRAINING OF
PRESERVICE TEACHERS: TUTOR AND TUTEE
PERSPECTIVES**

Gila Cohen Zilka

Bar-Ilan University and
Achva Academic College, Israel

gila.zilka@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Aim/Purpose	This study examined the perception of the role of tutors in online training of preservice teachers during the COVID period, from the perspective of preservice teachers and their tutors.
Background	Because of the COVID pandemic, learning in schools was conducted online, therefore preservice teachers' practicum also took place online, as did the tutoring process.
Methodology	The research question was: How did preservice teachers and their tutors perceive the experience of teaching during the COVID period perceived by them; specifically, what was their sense of self-efficacy and satisfaction, and what difficulties did they encounter? This was a quantitative study. The sample included 221 participants comprising 111 tutors and 110 preservice teachers. Data were collected in Israel in 2021.
Contribution	This study sheds light on the process of online tutoring of preservice teachers by their tutors.
Findings	The study found that preservice teachers and their tutors perceived the practicum during the COVID period to be helpful, answering preservice teachers' needs and providing professional assistance in their training. This was more so in the professional aspects of teaching, in the emotional aspects of the tutoring process, and in the process of shaping the preservice teachers' professional identity, and less so in the organizational aspects of the school. In both groups (tutors and preservice teachers), it emerged that during a complex period of social isolation, maintaining contact reinforces the sense of self-efficacy. Tutors who encountered fewer technical difficulties and thought the tutoring process was enjoyable expressed more satisfaction with the tutoring process. Tutors felt that they were able to get better acquainted personally with the preservice teachers they taught, and vice versa, and preservice teachers were able to get to know their tutors personally. Tutors thought that their interpersonal communication

Accepting Editor: Eli Cohen | Received: January 13, 2022 | Revised: April 7, 2022 |

Accepted: April 15, 2022

Cite as: Zilka, G. C. (2022). The tutor's role in the online training of preservice teachers: Tutor and tutee perspectives. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, 19, 71-93. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4949>

(CC BY-NC 4.0) This article is licensed to you under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). When you copy and redistribute this paper in full or in part, you need to provide proper attribution to it to ensure that others can later locate this work (and to ensure that others do not accuse you of plagiarism). You may (and we encourage you to) adapt, remix, transform, and build upon the material for any non-commercial purposes. This license does not permit you to use this material for commercial purposes.

	benefitted the preservice teachers, that they listened to their mentees, and understood them. Preservice teachers felt that tutors allowed them to voice their expectations and concerns about their teaching experiences.
Recommendations for Practitioners	One of the main goals of practicum in studies toward a teaching certificate is to prepare the students for their role as teachers. In the online tutoring process, emphasis should be placed on professional aspects (such as instruction and classroom management, identifying points for improvement and setting them as goals and challenges for the future) and on emotional aspects (such as promoting growth and personal development of preservice teachers in the process of shaping their professional identity).
Recommendations for Researchers	One of the findings of the study is that the tutor-mentee relationship should be preserved in remote tutoring. The findings showed a positive correlation between maintaining such contact and high self-efficacy for both tutors and preservice teachers. It was found that tutors who reported high self-efficacy felt that interpersonal communication benefitted the teachers they were guiding.
Impact on Society	Information collected in this study indicates that the tutors made a great effort to provide preservice teachers with meaningful coaching during the COVID period. In certain aspects, the tutoring was more successful and in other aspects less so, given the characteristics of the period, such as social distancing, no attendance of regular classes at school, and so forth.
Future Research	It is recommended to continue investigating the online tutoring process, both from the perspective of preservice teachers and of tutors, to explore in-depth the correlation between self-efficacy and interpersonal communication, with emphasis on feedback between the tutors and preservice teachers.
Keywords	clinical training, field experiences, preservice teacher, online teaching practices, COVID-19, practical experience, e-readiness, digital learning literacies, 21st century

INTRODUCTION

The spread of the COVID pandemic has caused a state of emergency, closures, isolation, and social distancing. Tutors and preservice teachers acquired digital and pedagogical knowledge for teaching and learning online, in real-time, through experience (Donitsa-Schmidt & Ramota, 2020; Nasri et al., 2020). Researchers (Donitsa-Schmidt & Ramota, 2020) found that preservice teachers and tutors collaborated in lesson planning and actual teaching. The collaboration between preservice teachers and tutors had a significant effect on the professional learning of preservice teachers (Donitsa-Schmidt & Ramota, 2020; Nasri et al., 2020). Practical experience (practicum) is part of teacher training programs (Aram & Ziv, 2018) and serves as a link between theory and educational practice (Caires et al., 2012). Preservice teachers are exposed to different models of educational approaches and practices, observe experienced professionals, experience teaching by themselves, and engage in reflective thinking (AACTE, 2010; McLean Davies et al., 2015; Shulman, 2005). The practicum experience is about teaching content, teaching methods, problem-solving, initiative, teamwork, and collection and analysis of evidence, which are of great importance (Douglas, 2014). Studies suggest a connection between a sense of caring and a sense of well-being and adjustment to school (Sammons, 2010).

This study examined the perception of the role of tutors in the training of preservice teachers, in the form of online tutoring during the COVID period, from the perspective of preservice teachers and their tutors.

TEACHING PRACTICUM IN THE SHADOW OF COVID

Because of the COVID pandemic, changes in teaching and learning were required at different stages of education (Donitsa-Schmidt & Ramota, 2020; Kreis et al., 2020; Lancker & Parolin, 2020; Nasri et al., 2020), and various learning technologies were adopted (Carrillo & Flores, 2020; Kreis et al., 2020; Wargadinata et al., 2020). In the training of preservice teachers, tutors attach great importance to the practical experience of preservice teachers in schools: teaching, working with students, dealing with the needs of different students, improving their teaching skills, and perfecting their ability to connect between theoretical and practical knowledge, to develop their self- and professional efficacy (Clark et al., 2014; Gardiner, 2011; Hoffman et al., 2015; Matteson et al., 2012). Researchers (Clark et al., 2014; Gardiner, 2011; Hoffman et al., 2015; Matteson et al., 2012) have noted that in the teacher training process, emphasis is placed on skill acquisition, participation, involvement, and reflection. Hoffman et al. (2015) reviewed the empirical studies that focus on interactions between preservice teachers and tutors and found that this is an activity characterized by intensive participation, learning, and reflection. The tutors are perceived as mediators between preservice teachers and school students, the school, and the theoretical knowledge acquired during the studies at the teacher training institutions. Researchers (Thompson et al., 2013, 2015; Zilka, 2020a, 2020b) have reported that providing feedback is the tool that tutors use to focus their conversations with preservice teachers primarily on teaching methods that support intellectual involvement and fairness-based teaching. Researchers have argued that focused conversations should be conducted to improve the required tools as well as the educational practices and routines.

Preservice teachers perceive the role of the tutors as one of great complexity, with a highly prominent human component; therefore, there is great importance in emphasizing emotional aspects, helping in coping with difficulties, and providing emotional and professional support to preservice teachers (Elaldi & Yerliyurt, 2016). Often deeply emotional relationships develop between preservice teachers and the tutors who coach them (Carr et al., 2005). As part of their job definition, tutors are expected to guide, advise, counsel, encourage, and be a source of personal and emotional support for preservice teachers (Lawson et al., 2015).

DEALING WITH DIFFICULTIES AND PROBLEMS, PERCEPTION OF SELF-EFFICACY, AND A SENSE OF SATISFACTION

This study examined coping with difficulties and problems, the perception of self-efficacy, and satisfaction with the practicum experience in the shadow of the COVID crisis, by preservice teachers and by tutors.

Motivation. Ford (1992) defined motivation as a psychological state that stimulates, directs, and preserves human behavior toward a particular goal. Motivation is an internal process that directs the person to perform an action and persevere in performing it (Law & Breznik, 2017; Law & Geng, 2018; Law et al., 2010; Reeves, 2006).

Dealing with difficulties and problems. According to Lazarus (2000), in the encounter between humans and the environment, humans may perceive the situation as “positive” or “stressful.” This cognitive process is affected by three factors: (a) the characteristics of the situation and the degree to which the situation is known or ambiguous; (b) factors relating to social norms, i.e., requirements, values, and customs; and (c) factors related to the individual’s personality. Researchers (e.g., Brown et al., 2015) have suggested that an online learning environment is an emotionally charged space. Learners report frustration, anger, rage, joy, enthusiasm, satisfaction, boredom, envy, hatred, love, and affection when describing the nature of learning in this environment.

Self-efficacy. Researchers (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1984, 1989) defined self-efficacy as people’s judgment regarding their ability to organize and successfully perform tasks and actions. They claimed that self-efficacy affects the choice of activities, effort, and perseverance of the learner. Those characterized by self-efficacy make an effort and persevere more so than do those who doubt their ability.

Self-efficacy stems from previous experience, receiving feedback, and physiological arousal. If the students feel that they can accomplish the task, their self-efficacy increases, and if they do not feel that way, their self-efficacy decreases (Bandura, 1995; Schneider & Preckel, 2017).

This study examined the perception of the role of tutors in training in-service teachers online during the COVID-19 period, from the perspective of the preservice teachers and their tutors.

RESEARCH QUESTION

How do preservice teachers and their tutors experience teaching during the COVID period, specifically, what was preservice teachers' sense of self-efficacy and self-satisfaction, and what were the difficulties they encountered?

METHOD

This was a quantitative study. The questionnaire was distributed online to preservice teachers studying at institutions of higher education in Israel and to tutors who guided them in their teaching practicum during the COVID period.

SAMPLE

The sample included 221 participants, 87% women, mean age of 38 years, and SD of 10.3.

The sample included two groups: (a) 111 tutors of preservice teachers, 26% with 4-10 years of teaching experience, 45% with 11-20 years of teaching experience, and 29% with 21+ years of teaching experience; and (b) 110 preservice teachers, in the last year of their studies toward a teaching certificate. The preservice teachers conducted their teaching practicum in high schools. The data were collected in Israel in 2021. The respondents expressed their consent to participate in the study, and the questionnaires were anonymous.

RESEARCH TOOLS

The questionnaire contained closed-ended and open-ended questions. It was based on several questionnaires used in previous studies: self-efficacy questionnaire, resilience questionnaire, motivation questionnaire, challenge/threat questionnaire, and the perception of the tutor's role questionnaire (Bandura, 1986; Kasalak & Dağyar, 2020; Lazarus & Folkman, 1988; Pintrich et al., 1991; Zilka, 2017a, 2017b, 2019a, 2019b; Zilka et al., 2019).

1. Demographic details, including age, gender, marital status, number of children, and years of teaching experience for tutors.
2. Have you encountered any technical glitches or difficulties in using the technology in the last few weeks? No - 1; Yes, a little - 2; Yes, a great deal - 3; Other - 4.
3. The transition from "face-to-face" to online training was for you: Simple - 1; Fun - 2; Challenging - 3; Exhausting - 4; Hard - 5; Other - 6.
4. Self-efficacy, difficulty, satisfaction. The statements are listed in Table 4 (Moti - Motivation). The questionnaire was based on existing questionnaires (Bandura, 1986; Lazarus & Folkman, 1988; Pintrich et al., 1991). I used this questionnaire to examine how tutors and preservice teachers experienced their self-efficacy, the degree to which they experienced difficulties, and how satisfied they were with the tutoring process. In each statement, participants were asked to rate the degree to which they identified with the statement on a scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very much). I calculated three clusters according to the averages of the statements, as listed below. A score close to 5 represents a higher skewness toward the meaning of the cluster.

Self-efficacy: consists of statements 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 38.

Difficulty: consists of statements 1, 2, 4, 7, 12, 18, 19, 22, 26, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Satisfaction with the process: consists of statements 5, 27, 28, 37.

In addition, statement 3 (“During this period it is important to maintain contact between the tutor and the preservice teacher”) and statements 9 and 16 were completed only by the tutors. Statement 9 assessed difficulty (“I feel pressure because of the student tutoring”), and statement 16 assessed efficacy (“I think that by and large I am succeeding in student tutoring during the COVID period.”)

5. Perception of the tutor’s role questionnaire, from the perspectives of the tutor and of the preservice teacher, feelings, and emotions (FEE). The statements are listed in Table 4. The questionnaire was based on the TALIS OECD (Kasalak & Dağyar, 2020). Respondents were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with each statement, on a scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very much). As shown in Table 4, respondents were divided into two groups: tutors, marked “T,” and preservice teachers (students), marked “S.”
6. Student Assistance Questionnaire (HE). The questionnaire clarifies the extent to which the preservice teachers received assistance with teaching in specific areas, regarding the definition of the tutor’s role, from the perspective of the tutor and of the preservice teacher. The statements are listed in Table 3. The questionnaire is based on TALIS OECD (Kasalak & Dağyar, 2020). Respondents were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with each statement, on a scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very much). As shown in Table 3, respondents were divided into two groups: tutors, marked “T” and preservice teachers (students) marked “S.”

STATISTICAL PROCESSING

Quantitative analysis. Continuous variables are reported as means and standard deviations, and categorical variables as frequencies and proportions. I calculated Pearson correlation coefficients between motivation scales and used univariate analysis to characterize the difference between groups (tutors vs. preservice teachers) with respect to demographics and motivation scales. I dichotomized motivation scales for high and low values; the cut-off value for level determination was the median of the scale in the sample. I used univariate analysis to characterize the difference between high and low values of motivation in other answers to the questionnaires. The analysis was conducted separately for each group. I used a Pearson chi-square test, post hoc pairwise comparisons, and Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment for multiple testing to characterize the differences between teaching years groups (4-10, 11-20, 21+) and feedback about the process. A p-value of 0.05 was considered significant. All statistical analyses were performed using SAS for Windows version 9.4.

Qualitative analysis. Discourse analysis was performed on the collected data, based on the approach of Adler and Adler (2008), Atkinson and Delamont (2006), and Hammersley (2008). The process was iterative and continuous, and in the end, data were consolidated into particular issues, showing sensitivity to context and its place in the construction of reality.

FINDINGS

This section presents the findings regarding self-efficacy, difficulty, and satisfaction; differences between the groups (tutors vs. preservice teachers); correlations between scales; and correlations between seniority in teaching and the various scales.

SELF-EFFICACY, DIFFICULTY, AND SATISFACTION

In this questionnaire, I examined how preservice teachers and tutors experienced their self-efficacy, how much difficulty they experienced, and how satisfied they were with the tutoring process. In each statement, participants were asked to rate the degree to which they identified with the statement on a scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very much). I calculated three clusters according to the

averages of the statements, as listed below. A score close to 5 represents a higher skewness toward the meaning of the cluster.

Self-efficacy. Consists of statements 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 38

Difficulty. Consists of statements 1, 2, 4, 7, 12, 18, 19, 22, 26, 33, 34, 35, 36

Satisfaction with the process. Consists of statements 5, 27, 28, 37

In addition, statement 3 (“During this period it is important to maintain contact between the tutor and the preservice teacher”) and statements 9 and 16 were completed only by the tutors. Statement 9 assessed difficulty (“I feel pressure because of the student tutoring”), and statement 16 assessed efficacy (“I think that by and large I am succeeding in student tutoring during the COVID period.”).

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations between the different clusters of the self-efficacy, difficulty, and satisfaction questionnaire. The results show a weak but significant positive correlation ($r = 0.13, p < .05$) between the difficulty scale and the self-efficacy scale, which means that persons who regard themselves as highly capable can also experience difficulty in tutoring. I examined this correlation in the two groups separately and found that in the preservice teacher group there was a positive correlation between difficulty in the process and self-efficacy ($r = 0.29, p = 0.003$), i.e., those who experienced difficulty in the process often experienced themselves as capable, whereas in the group of tutors there was no correlation between the scales (those who experience difficulty regarded themselves as highly capable or not). There was a positive correlation between satisfaction with the tutoring process and self-efficacy ($r = 0.22, p < .01$). When examining this correlation in each group, in the group of tutors I found a positive correlation between self-efficacy and satisfaction ($r = 0.39, p < .001$), whereas in the preservice teacher group no correlation was found – a student may be capable yet not at all satisfied, and vice versa. There was a positive correlation between statement 3, maintaining a relationship, and high self-efficacy ($r = 0.30, p < .001$). No correlation was found between difficulty in the tutoring process and satisfaction from it.

Table 1. Totals for the motivation scales, descriptive statistics, and Pearson correlation coefficients

	N	M	ST	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Difficulty	221	2.15	0.62	(0.85)					
2. Self-efficacy	221	3.80	0.42	0.14 ¹	(0.79)				
3. Satisfaction	221	3.07	0.79	-0.05	0.22 ²	(0.66)			
4. Motivation3 'keep in touch'	221	4.39	0.99	0.14	0.30 ³	-0.13	1.00		

Notes: ¹ $p < .05$, ² $p < .01$, ³ $p < .001$. Cronbach's alpha is provided in parentheses.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GROUPS (TUTORS VS. PRESERVICE TEACHERS)

Table 2 presents a comparison of demographic data and mean scales of self-efficacy, difficulty, and satisfaction between the two groups. The tutors' group contained a higher percentage of married participants. Regarding the “Transition from face-to-face (FTF) to online,” in the preservice teachers' group, a significantly high percentage thought that it was “simple and fun,” whereas a high percentage of tutors found it to be challenging, exhausting, and difficult. Preservice teachers showed a higher average on the difficulty scale than did the tutors: it was more important for the tutors to keep in touch with the preservice teachers than vice versa (Motivation3). No statistical difference was found for the self-efficacy and satisfaction scales.

Table 2. Group demographics and motivation differences

	Preservice teachers N = 110	Tutors N = 111	P value
Gender:			0.105
F	91 (82.7%)	101 (91.0%)	
M	19 (17.3%)	10 (9.01%)	
Age	33.0 (10.2)	43.1 (7.54)	< 0.001
Marital status:			< 0.001
divorced	7 (6.36%)	10 (9.01%)	
married	71 (64.5%)	98 (88.3%)	
single	32 (29.1%)	2 (1.80%)	
widowed	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.90%)	
TEC:			0.052
few	47 (42.7%)	44 (39.6%)	
many	0 (0.00%)	6 (5.41%)	
no	63 (57.3%)	61 (55.0%)	
FTF:			0.001
simple	33 (30.0%)	20 (18.3%)	
fun	35 (31.8%)	19 (17.4%)	
challenging	36 (32.7%)	49 (45.0%)	
exhausting	4 (3.64%)	12 (11.0%)	
difficult	2 (1.82%)	9 (8.26%)	
Motivation (Mot) difficulty	2.24 (0.61)	2.07 (0.63)	0.040
Motivation (Mot) ability	3.81 (0.43)	3.79 (0.40)	0.704
Motivation (Mot) satisfaction	3.11 (0.81)	3.03 (0.77)	0.492
Motivation3 'keep in touch'	4.06 (1.25)	4.72 (0.45)	< 0.001

Tables 3 and 4 summarize the distribution of agreement (in percentages) of preservice teachers (S) and tutors (T) with each statement according to the questionnaire respondent completed. The degree of agreement with the statement was rated on a scale ranging from 1 (Do not agree at all) to 5 (Agree completely). A rating greater than or equal to 3 indicates moderate or stronger agreement with the statement, and a rating greater than 4 indicates great or stronger agreement with the statement. In each table, the columns “3 >=” and “4 >=” indicate the percentage of the respondents in the sample who identified with the statement moderately or stronger, or greatly or stronger, respectively.

Table 3 describes the distribution of preservice teachers' answers to the question: “To what extent do you feel that the tutor assisted you in the following aspects, during the COVID period?” and of the tutors' answers to the question: “To what extent did you assist the preservice teachers in the following aspects, during the COVID period?”

In over 50% of the sample, both the tutors and the preservice teachers thought that a lot of assistance had been provided in various aspects. In aspect 17, “Assimilating 21st century skills required in the process of learning in digital environments” only 51% of tutors felt that they helped to a great

extent, and only 40% of preservice teachers believed that assistance was provided to a great extent and above. The aspects regarding which both the tutors and the preservice teachers believed that the greatest assistance was provided were 4 (“Adapting teaching methods to the needs of the students and the period”) and 8 (“Dealing with teaching difficulties”). In the aspect in which both the tutors and the preservice teachers believed that the least assistance was provided was statement 17 (“Assimilation of 21st century skills required in the learning process in digital environments”), only 40% of preservice teachers and 51% of tutors believed that great and above assistance was given.

In all aspects except statements 13 and 14, the tutors believed that more assistance was given than the preservice teachers thought they received. For statements 13 (“Parental involvement”) and 14 (“Integration into the school staff”), the percentage of preservice teachers who believed that they received a great deal of assistance was higher than that of the tutors.

I examined where there was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$, comparing the groups in a comparison test of proportions between the “ ≥ 4 ” percentages) in the perception of assistance by the preservice teachers and tutors. A significant difference was found in statements 4 and 10. In statement 4 (“Adapting teaching methods to the needs of the students and the period”), 87% of tutors, compared with 73% of preservice teachers, felt that they gave/received assistance in “Dealing with teaching diversity” greatly or more. In statement 10 (“Management and planning of teaching”), 76% of tutors, compared to 56% of preservice teachers, felt that they have given/received assistance greatly or more.

Table 3. Agreement patterns for the assistance questionnaire (HE)

#	Description	Group	1	2	3	4	5	≥ 3	≥ 4
1	Discipline knowledge	T	3	5	19	34	39	92	73
		S	9	4	28	27	33	87	60
2	Classroom management	T	0	9	26	37	28	91	65
		S	13	7	25	28	27	80	55
3	Ethical code and professional conduct	T	0	5	31	50	14	95	64
		S	15	6	16	38	25	79	63
4	Adapting teaching methods to the needs of the preservice teachers and the period	T	1	2	10	40	48	97	87
		S	7	5	15	43	30	88	73
5	Evaluating preservice teachers and monitoring their progress	T	3	14	30	24	30	84	54
		S	14	10	20	30	26	76	56
6	Familiarity with the curriculum	T	5	5	23	38	30	90	68
		S	8	6	28	23	35	85	57
7	Familiarity with the organizational culture of the school	T	2	2	36	40	20	96	61
		S	14	14	21	31	20	72	51
8	Dealing with teaching difficulties	T	1	1	16	51	31	98	82
		S	10	2	18	41	28	88	70
9	Addressing differences between students	T	0	7	29	35	29	93	64
		S	13	3	34	32	18	84	50
10	Management of teaching and planning	T	1	1	23	39	37	98	76
		S	5	9	30	25	31	86	56

#	Description	Group	1	2	3	4	5	>=3	>=4
11	Cultivating a sense of belonging to the school	T	0	6	29	44	21	94	65
		S	9	10	19	39	23	81	62
12	Building a teacher-student relationship	T	1	5	37	32	24	94	57
		S	7	19	29	22	22	73	44
13	Parental involvement	T	4	30	26	24	16	67	41
		S	6	13	23	23	35	81	58
14	Integration into the school staff	T	0	18	23	39	20	82	59
		S	23	0	13	44	19	77	63
15	Development of educational initiatives	T	5	14	32	33	17	82	50
		S	11	22	17	22	28	67	50
16	Management of synchronous lessons on conference calls such as Zoom	T	4	10	28	31	28	86	59
		S	23	6	22	27	22	71	49
17	Assimilation of 21st century skills required for the learning process in digital environments	T	2	13	34	34	17	86	51
		S	17	19	25	23	17	65	40
18	Dealing with teaching in a hybrid, online, and face-to-face learning environment	T	4	6	26	38	26	90	64
		S	12	15	15	33	25	73	58

Note: T=tutor, S=preservice teacher

Table 4 describes the distribution of preservice teachers' answers to the questions presented below. Several questions were formulated in the same way in the tutors' and preservice teachers' questionnaires, and at times the wording was slightly different. It can be seen that 70% of the participants agreed greatly or stronger with all the statements.

The statements with which the tutors identified most (≥ 4 , 85%+) were: 1 ("Do you think you were able to get to know personally the preservice teacher you tutored?"), 5 ("How much do you feel your interpersonal communication benefitted the preservice teacher?"), 6 ("How much do you understand the preservice teacher, in your opinion?"), and 7 ("How much do you feel you listen to the preservice teacher?")

The statements with which the preservice teachers identified most (≥ 4 , 85%+) were: 1 ("Do you think you were able to get to know your tutor personally?"), 2 ("Have you been able to get acquainted with the school structure, regulations, and staff members in various positions?"), 4 ("Do you feel that your tutor let you express your expectations and concerns at the beginning of your work at school?"), and 7 ("How much do you listen to what your students are saying?").

Eighty-five percent of preservice teachers believed to a great extent and stronger that "the tutor managed to convey a sense of acceptance and willingness to help."

The statements with which the tutors indicated a relatively low identification (≥ 4 , 80%-) were: 8 ("Do you think that you were able to acquaint the preservice teacher with the school structure, regulations, and staff members in various positions?"), 3 ("Do you feel that you were able to coordinate expectations regarding the work process throughout the year with the preservice teacher?"), 2 ("How much could you manage your emotions in interaction with the preservice teacher?"), and 9 ("To what extent do you set goals for each workday?")

The statements with which the preservice teachers indicated a relatively low identification (≥ 4 , 80%–) were: 8 (“How much do you think you understand your students?”), 6 (“Managing your emotions in interaction with the class?”), and 9 (“To what extent do you set goals for each workday?”)

I examined where there was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$, comparing the groups in a test of proportions between the “ ≥ 4 ” percentages) in the feeling between the preservice teachers and the tutors. A significant difference was found in statements 2 and 8. Regarding statement 2 (“Do you think that you were able to acquaint the preservice teacher with the school structure, regulations, and staff members in various positions?”), only 77% of the tutors answered “greatly,” whereas 89% of the preservice teachers responded “to a great extent or more” to the question “Do you feel that your tutor let you express your expectations and concerns at the beginning of your work at school?” On statement 8, 79% of the tutors answered the statement “managing your emotions in interaction with the preservice teacher” with “to a great extent or more,” whereas only 59% of the preservice teachers thought that they “managed their emotions in interaction with the class” to a “great extent or more.”

Table 4. Agreement patterns for answers to the FEE Perception of the Tutor's Role Questionnaire

I	Description	Group	1	2	3	4	5	≥ 3	≥ 4
1	Do you think you were able to get to know the preservice teacher you tutored personally?	T	0	0	12	61	27	100	88
	Do you think you were able to get to know your tutor personally?	S	6	5	5	25	60	89	85
2	Do you think you were able to acquaint the preservice teacher with the school structure, regulations, and staff members in various positions?	T	2	5	17	46	31	94	77
	Do you think you were able to get acquainted with the school structure, regulations, and staff members in various positions?	S	2	5	5	55	35	94	89
3	Do you feel that you were able to coordinate expectations regarding the work process throughout the year with the preservice teacher?	T	1	4	19	46	31	96	77
	Do you feel that you were able to coordinate expectations regarding the work process throughout the year with your tutor?	S	6	5	8	33	48	89	81
4	Do you feel that you allowed the preservice teachers to voice their expectations and concerns?	T	1		16	41	42	99	83
	Did you feel that the tutor allowed you to voice your expectations and concerns?	S	11	0	0	33	56	89	89

I	Description	Group	1	2	3	4	5	>=3	>=4
4+	Do you feel that the tutor managed to convey a sense of acceptance and willingness to help?	S	11	0	5	28	56	89	85
5	How much do you feel your interpersonal communication helped the preservice teacher advance?	T	2	2	6	39	51	96	90
	How much do you feel your interpersonal communication helped you advance?	S	15	0	4	38	44	85	82
6	How much do you feel you understand the preservice teacher?	T	2	5	8	36	50	94	85
	How much do you feel you understand your students?	S	2	8	14	55	21	90	76
7	How much do you feel you listen to the preservice teacher?	T	3	0	6	27	64	97	91
	How much do you feel you listen to your students?	S	2	4	5	66	23	94	89
8	To what degree were you able to manage your emotions in interaction with the preservice teacher?	T	4	4	14	38	41	93	79
	To what degree were you able to manage your emotions in interaction with the class?	S	2	4	35	43	16	95	59
9	To what extent do you set goals for each workday?	T	0	4	19	52	25	96	77
		S	2	8	18	59	13	90	72

Note: T=teacher, S=student

CONNECTION BETWEEN MOTIVATION SCALES AND QUESTIONNAIRES, PERCEPTION OF THE TEACHER'S ROLE (FEE) AND ASSISTANCE (HE)

The Self-efficacy, Difficulty, and Satisfaction scales were divided into two values, high and low, at the median value. Values higher than or equal to the median were set as a high value of the scale (high self-efficacy, high difficulty, high satisfaction), and values lower than the median as a low value of the scale.

Tables 5-7 show a characterization of these value differences in relation to demographic data and answers to the other questionnaires in this study, in the groups of tutors and preservice teachers. The answers to the FEE questionnaires (Perception of the Tutor's Role questionnaire), and HE (Assistance to the Preservice Teacher in Various Aspects questionnaire) appear as percentages of the respondents who agreed with the statements strongly or strongly and more (4+ scores).

Table 5.1 shows that, regarding HE questions, the tutors who reported difficulty in the process provided less assistance to preservice teachers in statement 1 ("Discipline knowledge") and more assistance in statements 14 and 16 ("School staff integration" and "Synchronous classroom instruction").

Regarding the FEE questions, the tutors who reported difficulty in the process appear to show lower agreement in statements 1 "Acquaintance with the preservice teacher" and 6 "Understanding the preservice teacher."

Table 5.1. Comparison between teachers who reported high vs. low levels of difficulty in the process

Value	Low difficulty N=65	High difficulty N=46	p-value
Years of teaching:			0.840
4-10	16 (24.6%)	13 (28.3%)	
11-20	29 (44.6%)	21 (45.7%)	
21+	20 (30.8%)	12 (26.1%)	
TEC:			0.185
few	23 (35.4%)	21 (45.7%)	
many	2 (3.08%)	4 (8.70%)	
no	40 (61.5%)	21 (45.7%)	
FTF:			0.290
1	13 (20.0%)	7 (15.9%)	
2	15 (23.1%)	4 (9.09%)	
3	26 (40.0%)	23 (52.3%)	
4	7 (10.8%)	5 (11.4%)	
5	4 (6.15%)	5 (11.4%)	
HE1>=4	53 (81.5%)	28 (60.9%)	0.028
HE2>=4	42 (64.6%)	30 (65.2%)	1.000
HE3>=4	38 (58.5%)	33 (71.7%)	0.217
HE4>=4	56 (86.2%)	41 (89.1%)	0.861
HE5>=4	34 (52.3%)	26 (56.5%)	0.806
HE6>=4	45 (69.2%)	30 (65.2%)	0.811
HE7>=4	37 (58.7%)	29 (63.0%)	0.797
HE8>=4	56 (86.2%)	34 (75.6%)	0.244
HE9>=4	38 (58.5%)	33 (71.7%)	0.217
HE10>=4	47 (72.3%)	37 (80.4%)	0.448
HE11>=4	40 (61.5%)	32 (69.6%)	0.502
HE12>=4	33 (50.8%)	30 (65.2%)	0.187
HE13>=4	25 (38.5%)	20 (43.5%)	0.738
HE14>=4	31 (47.7%)	34 (73.9%)	0.010
HE15>=4	32 (49.2%)	24 (52.2%)	0.910
HE16>=4	30 (46.2%)	35 (76.1%)	0.003
HE17>=4	31 (47.7%)	26 (56.5%)	0.469
HE18>=4	46 (70.8%)	25 (54.3%)	0.115
FEE1>=4	57 (90.5%)	39 (84.8%)	0.544
FEE2>=4	58 (89.2%)	27 (58.7%)	<0.001
FEE3>=4	54 (83.1%)	31 (67.4%)	0.090
FEE4>=4	56 (86.2%)	36 (78.3%)	0.406
FEE5>=4	60 (92.3%)	40 (87.0%)	0.521
FEE6>=4	60 (92.3%)	33 (75.0%)	0.026
FEE7>=4	61 (93.8%)	40 (87.0%)	0.314
FEE8>=4	54 (83.1%)	34 (73.9%)	0.349
FEE9>=4	54 (83.1%)	32 (69.6%)	0.148

Table 5.2. Comparison between students who reported high vs. low levels of difficulty in the process on demographic data and additional measures

Value	Low difficulty N=52	High difficulty N=58	P-value
TEC:			0.098
few	27 (51.9%)	20 (34.5%)	
no	25 (48.1%)	38 (65.5%)	
FTF:			0.354
1	16 (30.8%)	17 (29.3%)	
2	19 (36.5%)	16 (27.6%)	
3	14 (26.9%)	22 (37.9%)	
4	3 (5.77%)	1 (1.72%)	
5	0 (0.00%)	2 (3.45%)	
HE1>=4	34 (66.7%)	31 (53.4%)	0.227
HE2>=4	24 (46.2%)	37 (63.8%)	0.096
HE3>=4	29 (55.8%)	40 (69.0%)	0.218
HE4>=4	32 (61.5%)	48 (82.8%)	0.023
HE5>=4	30 (57.7%)	32 (55.2%)	0.941
HE6>=4	38 (73.1%)	25 (43.1%)	0.003
HE7>=4	25 (48.1%)	31 (54.4%)	0.641
HE8>=4	38 (73.1%)	38 (66.7%)	0.604
HE9>=4	29 (55.8%)	26 (45.6%)	0.386
HE10>=4	31 (59.6%)	30 (53.6%)	0.661
HE11>=4	35 (67.3%)	32 (57.1%)	0.374
HE12>=4	26 (50.0%)	22 (39.3%)	0.355
HE13>=4	19 (37.1%)	11 (19.0%)	0.049
HE14>=4	16 (30.8%)	17 (29.3%)	1.000
HE15>=4	26 (50.0%)	28 (48.3%)	1.000
HE16>=4	31 (59.6%)	22 (37.9%)	0.055
HE17>=4	21 (40.4%)	22 (37.9%)	1.000
HE18>=4	31 (59.6%)	32 (55.2%)	0.948
FEE1>=4	47 (90.4%)	46 (79.3%)	0.180
FEE2>=4	47 (90.4%)	51 (87.9%)	0.916
FEE3>=4	42 (80.8%)	47 (81.0%)	1.000
FEE4>=4	47 (90.4%)	51 (87.9%)	0.916
FEE5>=4	47 (90.4%)	43 (74.1%)	0.050
FEE6>=4	41 (78.8%)	39 (67.2%)	0.686
FEE7>=4	47 (90.4%)	43 (74.1%)	0.917
FEE8>=4	29 (55.8%)	36 (62.1%)	0.634
FEE9>=4	35 (67.3%)	44 (75.9%)	0.433
FEE4_plus>=4	0.90 (0.30)	0.79 (0.41)	0.105

Table 6.1 shows that regarding HE questions (Assistance to the Student in Various Aspects questionnaire), tutors who reported high efficacy also reported the extensive assistance they provide to pre-service teachers (3, 6, 10, 17 and 18: “Ethical code and professional conduct,” “Familiarity with the curriculum,” “Management of teaching and planning,” “Implementing 21st century skills required in

the learning process in digital environments,” and “Dealing with teaching in hybrid, online, and face-to-face learning environments.”

Regarding the FEE questions (Perception of the Tutor's Role questionnaire), tutors who reported high efficacy appeared to show stronger agreement in statement 5 (“Your interpersonal communication benefitted the preservice teacher”).

Table 6.1. Comparison between teachers who reported high levels of self-efficacy vs. those who reported lower levels on demographic data and additional measures

Value	Low efficacy N=55	High efficacy N=56	P-value
Teaching years:			0.075
4-10	16 (29.1%)	13 (23.2%)	
11-20	19 (34.5%)	31 (55.4%)	
21+	20 (36.4%)	12 (21.4%)	
TEC:			0.902
few	23 (41.8%)	21 (37.5%)	
many	3 (5.45%)	3 (5.36%)	
no	29 (52.7%)	32 (57.1%)	
FTF:			0.592
1	10 (18.9%)	10 (17.9%)	
2	12 (22.6%)	7 (12.5%)	
3	23 (43.4%)	26 (46.4%)	
4	4 (7.55%)	8 (14.3%)	
5	4 (7.55%)	5 (8.93%)	
HE1>=4	36 (65.5%)	45 (80.4%)	0.12
HE2>=4	34 (61.8%)	38 (67.9%)	0.64
HE3>=4	29 (52.7%)	42 (75.0%)	0.025
HE4>=4	46 (83.6%)	51 (91.1%)	0.371
HE5>=4	28 (50.9%)	32 (57.1%)	0.639
HE6>=4	40 (72.7%)	35 (62.5%)	0.343
HE7>=4	25 (45.5%)	41 (75.9%)	0.002
HE8>=4	46 (83.6%)	44 (80.0%)	0.805
HE9>=4	35 (63.6%)	36 (64.3%)	1
HE10>=4	36 (65.5%)	48 (85.7%)	0.023
HE11>=4	31 (56.4%)	41 (73.2%)	0.097
HE12>=4	31 (56.4%)	32 (57.1%)	1
HE13>=4	20 (36.4%)	25 (44.6%)	0.487
HE14>=4	32 (58.2%)	33 (58.9%)	1
HE15>=4	24 (43.6%)	32 (57.1%)	0.218
HE16>=4	29 (52.7%)	36 (64.3%)	0.297
HE17>=4	18 (32.7%)	39 (69.6%)	<0.001
HE18>=4	29 (52.7%)	42 (75.0%)	0.025
FEE1>=4	48 (87.3%)	48 (88.9%)	1
FEE2>=4	39 (70.9%)	46 (82.1%)	0.241
FEE3>=4	39 (70.9%)	46 (82.1%)	0.241
FEE4>=4	43 (78.2%)	49 (87.5%)	0.293

Value	Low efficacy N=55	High efficacy N=56	P-value
FEE5>=4	45 (81.8%)	55 (98.2%)	0.01
FEE6>=4	44 (80.0%)	49 (90.7%)	0.189
FEE7>=4	49 (89.1%)	52 (92.9%)	0.527
FEE8>=4	42 (76.4%)	46 (82.1%)	0.605
FEE9>=4	39 (70.9%)	47 (83.9%)	0.157

Table 6.2 shows that regarding HE questions (Assistance to the Student in Various Aspects questionnaire), preservice teachers who reported high self-efficacy also reported having received extensive assistance from their tutors (statements 2 and 4: “Classroom management” and “Adapting teaching methods to students and period”). Participants felt that they have received less assistance from their tutor in statement 11 (“Cultivating a sense of belonging to the school”).

Regarding the FEE questions (Perception of the Tutor’s Role questionnaire), the tutors who reported high self-efficacy appeared to show stronger agreement in statements 8 (“Managing your emotions in class”) and 9 (“Setting goals for each work day”).

Table 6.2. Comparison between students who reported high levels of self-efficacy vs. those who reported lower levels on demographic data and additional

Value	Low self-efficacy N=60	High self-efficacy N=50	P value
TEC:			0.06
few	31 (51.7%)	16 (32.0%)	
no	29 (48.3%)	34 (68.0%)	
FTF:			0.355
Simple	15 (25.0%)	18 (36.0%)	
Fun	21 (35.0%)	14 (28.0%)	
Challenging	21 (35.0%)	15 (30.0%)	
Exhausting	3 (5.00%)	1 (2.00%)	
Hard	0 (0.00%)	2 (4.00%)	
HE1>=4	38 (64.4%)	27 (54.0%)	0.364
HE2>=4	27 (45.0%)	34 (68.0%)	0.026
HE3>=4	42 (70.0%)	27 (54.0%)	0.126
HE4>=4	38 (63.3%)	42 (84.0%)	0.027
HE5>=4	35 (58.3%)	27 (54.0%)	0.792
HE6>=4	39 (65.0%)	24 (48.0%)	0.109
HE7>=4	28 (46.7%)	28 (57.1%)	0.37
HE8>=4	44 (73.3%)	32 (65.3%)	0.485
HE9>=4	32 (53.3%)	23 (46.9%)	0.637
HE10>=4	38 (63.3%)	23 (47.9%)	0.158
HE11>=4	43 (71.7%)	24 (50.0%)	0.035
HE12>=4	28 (46.7%)	20 (41.7%)	0.745
HE13>=4	17 (60.7%)	13 (54.2%)	0.845
HE14>=4	16 (57.1%)	17 (70.8%)	0.463
HE15>=4	29 (48.3%)	25 (52.1%)	0.846
HE16>=4	33 (55.0%)	20 (41.7%)	0.237
HE17>=4	24 (40.0%)	19 (39.6%)	1

Value	Low self-efficacy N=60	High self-efficacy N=50	P value
HE18>=4	35 (58.3%)	28 (58.3%)	1
FEE1>=4	50 (83.3%)	43 (86.0%)	0.904
FEE2>=4	55 (91.7%)	43 (86.0%)	0.521
FEE3>=4	46 (76.7%)	43 (86.0%)	0.319
FEE4>=4	55 (91.7%)	43 (86.0%)	0.521
FEE5>=4	51 (85.0%)	39 (78.0%)	0.484
FEE6>=4	45 (75.0%)	35 (77.8%)	0.921
FEE7>=4	51 (85.0%)	39 (95.1%)	0.192
FEE8>=4	29 (48.3%)	36 (72.0%)	0.02
FEE9>=4	35 (58.3%)	44 (88.0%)	0.001
FEE4_plus>=4	0.83 (0.38)	0.86 (0.35)	0.701

Table 7.1 shows that tutors who expressed more satisfaction with the process encountered fewer technical difficulties (TEC) and thought that the process was simple and enjoyable.

Regarding the HE questions (Assistance to the Student in Various Aspects questionnaire), the tutors who reported high satisfaction appear to have helped preservice teachers most (statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 15, and 18: “Discipline knowledge,” “Classroom management,” “Ethical code and professional behavior,” “Adapting teaching methods to the needs of the students and the period,” “Parental involvement,” “Developing educational initiatives,” and “Dealing with teaching in hybrid, online, and face-to-face learning environments”).

Regarding the FEE questions (Perception of the Tutor's Role questionnaire), tutors who reported high satisfaction appeared to show stronger agreement in statement 9 (“Setting goals for each work day”).

Table 7.1. Comparison between teachers who reported high levels of satisfaction vs. those who reported lower levels on demographic data and additional measures

Value	Low satisfaction N=56	High efficacy N=55	P value
Teaching years:			0.253
4-10	14 (25.0%)	15 (27.3%)	
11-20	22 (39.3%)	28 (50.9%)	
21+	20 (35.7%)	12 (21.8%)	
TEC:			0.004
few	26 (46.4%)	18 (32.7%)	
many	6 (10.7%)	0 (0.00%)	
no	24 (42.9%)	37 (67.3%)	
FTF:			0.003
Simple	8 (14.8%)	12 (21.8%)	
Fun	5 (9.26%)	14 (25.5%)	
Challenging	34 (63.0%)	15 (27.3%)	
Exhausting	5 (9.26%)	7 (12.7%)	
Hard	2 (3.70%)	7 (12.7%)	
HE1>=4	35 (62.5%)	46 (83.6%)	0.022
HE2>=4	30 (53.6%)	42 (76.4%)	0.021
HE3>=4	29 (51.8%)	42 (76.4%)	0.012

Value	Low satisfaction N=56	High efficacy N=55	P value
HE4>=4	45 (80.4%)	52 (94.5%)	0.049
HE5>=4	25 (44.6%)	35 (63.6%)	0.069
HE6>=4	33 (58.9%)	42 (76.4%)	0.079
HE7>=4	32 (59.3%)	34 (61.8%)	0.938
HE8>=4	42 (76.4%)	48 (87.3%)	0.216
HE9>=4	32 (57.1%)	39 (70.9%)	0.189
HE10>=4	42 (75.0%)	42 (76.4%)	1.000
HE11>=4	38 (67.9%)	34 (61.8%)	0.640
HE12>=4	32 (57.1%)	31 (56.4%)	1.000
HE13>=4	17 (30.4%)	28 (50.9%)	0.044
HE14>=4	35 (62.5%)	30 (54.5%)	0.511
HE15>=4	22 (39.3%)	34 (61.8%)	0.029
HE16>=4	31 (55.4%)	34 (61.8%)	0.618
HE17>=4	26 (46.4%)	31 (56.4%)	0.391
HE18>=4	27 (48.2%)	44 (80.0%)	0.001
FEE1>=4	48 (88.9%)	48 (87.3%)	1.000
FEE2>=4	42 (75.0%)	43 (78.2%)	0.864
FEE3>=4	44 (78.6%)	41 (74.5%)	0.782
FEE4>=4	46 (82.1%)	46 (83.6%)	1.000
FEE5>=4	48 (85.7%)	52 (94.5%)	0.215
FEE6>=4	49 (87.5%)	44 (83.0%)	0.697
FEE7>=4	52 (92.9%)	49 (89.1%)	0.527
FEE8>=4	41 (73.2%)	47 (85.5%)	0.175
FEE9>=4	38 (67.9%)	48 (87.3%)	0.026

Table 7.2 shows that the tutors who expressed greater satisfaction with the process also thought that they provided preservice teachers with less assistance in “Dealing with teaching in hybrid, online, and face-to-face learning environments” (HE18).

Regarding the FEE questions (Perception of the Tutor’s Role questionnaire), tutors who reported high satisfaction appeared to show less agreement in statements 8 and 9 (“Management of emotions in the classroom” and “Setting goals for every work day”).

Regarding the FEE questions, the tutors who reported high satisfaction appeared to show greater agreement in statement 9 (“Setting goals for every work day”).

Table 7.2. Comparison between students who reported high levels of satisfaction vs. those who reported lower levels of satisfaction

Value	Low satisfaction N=52	High satisfaction N=58	P value
TEC:			0.621
few	24 (46.2%)	23 (39.7%)	
no	28 (53.8%)	35 (60.3%)	
FTF:			0.097
1	11 (21.2%)	22 (37.9%)	
2	19 (36.5%)	16 (27.6%)	
3	21 (40.4%)	15 (25.9%)	

Value	Low satisfaction N=52	High satisfaction N=58	P value
4	1 (1.92%)	3 (5.17%)	
5	0 (0.00%)	2 (3.45%)	
HE1>=4	30 (57.7%)	35 (61.4%)	0.842
HE2>=4	30 (57.7%)	31 (53.4%)	0.799
HE3>=4	34 (65.4%)	35 (60.3%)	0.728
HE4>=4	38 (73.1%)	42 (72.4%)	1.000
HE5>=4	28 (53.8%)	34 (58.6%)	0.755
HE6>=4	24 (46.2%)	39 (67.2%)	0.041
HE7>=4	27 (52.9%)	29 (50.0%)	0.909
HE8>=4	36 (70.6%)	40 (69.0%)	1.000
HE9>=4	23 (45.1%)	32 (55.2%)	0.391
HE10>=4	25 (48.1%)	36 (64.3%)	0.133
HE11>=4	27 (51.9%)	40 (71.4%)	0.059
HE12>=4	22 (42.3%)	26 (46.4%)	0.813
HE13>=4	11 (47.8%)	19 (65.5%)	0.317
HE14>=4	14 (60.9%)	19 (65.5%)	0.956
HE15>=4	26 (50.0%)	28 (50.0%)	1.000
HE16>=4	22 (42.3%)	31 (55.4%)	0.245
HE17>=4	23 (44.2%)	20 (35.7%)	0.480
HE18>=4	37 (71.2%)	26 (46.4%)	0.016
FEE1>=4	42 (80.8%)	51 (87.9%)	0.439
FEE2>=4	47 (90.4%)	51 (87.9%)	0.916
FEE3>=4	43 (82.7%)	46 (79.3%)	0.836
FEE4>=4	47 (90.4%)	51 (87.9%)	0.916
FEE5>=4	39 (75.0%)	51 (87.9%)	0.132
FEE6>=4	44 (84.6%)	36 (67.9%)	0.075
FEE7>=4	48 (92.3%)	42 (85.7%)	0.457
FEE8>=4	40 (76.9%)	25 (43.1%)	0.001
FEE9>=4	44 (84.6%)	35 (60.3%)	0.009
FEE4_plus>=4	0.81 (0.40)	0.88 (0.33)	0.309

CORRELATION BETWEEN SENIORITY IN TEACHING AND THE VARIOUS SCALES

Table 8 presents a comparison between seniority groups in relation to feedback questions about the process. I show the results that remained significant even after post hoc tests.

I found a significant association with the transition to FTF online tutoring. The table shows that for tutors with low seniority (4-10 years), similar percentages characterized the process as fun and challenging. For tutors with medium seniority, similar percentages characterized the process as “enjoyable,” “challenging,” and “exhausting.” Among tutors with 21+ years of experience, one-third regarded the process as “enjoyable” and two-thirds as “challenging” or “exhausting.”

Tutors with low seniority (4-10 years) identified much less with statements HE10 (“Teaching management and planning”), HE11 (“Cultivating a sense of belonging to the school”), and HE14 (“Integration into the school staff”) than veteran teachers did.

Tutors with seniority of 21+ identified less with the FEE4 statement (“Did you feel that you were able to allow the preservice teachers to voice their views and concerns at the beginning of the practicum?”) than tutors with lower seniority did.

Table 8. Correlation between seniority groups and feedback on the process

	4-10 N=29	11-20 N=50	21+ N=32	P value
TEC:				0.09
few	9 (31.0%)	17 (34.0%)	18 (56.2%)	
many	1 (3.45%)	5 (10.0%)	0 (0.00%)	
no	19 (65.5%)	28 (56.0%)	14 (43.8%)	
FTF1:				<0.001
Fun	13 (48.1%)	15 (30.0%)	11 (34.4%)	
Challenging	11 (40.7%)	17 (34.0%)	21 (65.6%)	
Exhausting	3 (11.1%)	18 (36.0%)	0 (0.00%)	
HE1_4	19 (65.5%)	35 (70.0%)	27 (84.4%)	0.207
HE2_4	21 (72.4%)	36 (72.0%)	15 (46.9%)	0.041
HE3_4	14 (48.3%)	38 (76.0%)	19 (59.4%)	0.038
HE4_4	25 (86.2%)	45 (90.0%)	27 (84.4%)	0.761
HE5_4	21 (72.4%)	23 (46.0%)	16 (50.0%)	0.065
HE6_4	19 (65.5%)	30 (60.0%)	26 (81.2%)	0.129
HE7_4	15 (51.7%)	28 (58.3%)	23 (71.9%)	0.251
HE8_4	21 (72.4%)	42 (85.7%)	27 (84.4%)	0.307
HE9_4	23 (79.3%)	27 (54.0%)	21 (65.6%)	0.076
HE10_4	15 (51.7%)	45 (90.0%)	24 (75.0%)	0.001
HE11_4	10 (34.5%)	40 (80.0%)	22 (68.8%)	<0.001
HE12_4	11 (37.9%)	33 (66.0%)	19 (59.4%)	0.049
HE13_4	10 (34.5%)	20 (40.0%)	15 (46.9%)	0.613
HE14_4	11 (37.9%)	29 (58.0%)	25 (78.1%)	0.006
HE15_4	15 (51.7%)	28 (56.0%)	13 (40.6%)	0.392
HE16_4	16 (55.2%)	31 (62.0%)	18 (56.2%)	0.798
HE17_4	14 (48.3%)	31 (62.0%)	12 (37.5%)	0.089
HE18_4	21 (72.4%)	34 (68.0%)	16 (50.0%)	0.138
FEE1_4	27 (93.1%)	46 (92.0%)	23 (76.7%)	0.097
FEE2_4	20 (69.0%)	41 (82.0%)	24 (75.0%)	0.406
FEE3_4	22 (75.9%)	44 (88.0%)	19 (59.4%)	0.012
FEE4_4	26 (89.7%)	39 (78.0%)	27 (84.4%)	0.448
FEE5_4	26 (89.7%)	45 (90.0%)	29 (90.6%)	1
FEE6_4	23 (85.2%)	40 (80.0%)	30 (93.8%)	0.247
FEE7_4	26 (89.7%)	43 (86.0%)	32 (100%)	0.066
FEE8_4	26 (89.7%)	41 (82.0%)	21 (65.6%)	0.056
FEE9_4	21 (72.4%)	38 (76.0%)	27 (84.4%)	0.506
mot_diff_high	13 (44.8%)	21 (42.0%)	12 (37.5%)	0.84
mot_ability_high	13 (44.8%)	31 (62.0%)	12 (37.5%)	0.075
mot_satisfaction_high	15 (51.7%)	28 (56.0%)	12 (37.5%)	0.253

DISCUSSION

The study examined the perception of the tutors' role in the training of preservice teachers in online tutoring during the COVID period, from the perspective of both preservice teachers and tutors.

21ST CENTURY SKILLS

One of the salient findings that emerged from this study was the difficulty regarding 21st-century skills (Tables 3, 6.1). Tutors and preservice teachers noted the difficulty in implementing 21st-century skills in distance learning. Synchronous Zoom sessions were used extensively, both in the instruction meetings of tutors with the preservice teachers and in the practicum classes taught by the preservice teachers, but there was less integration of 21st-century skills. Only 51% of tutors and 40% and above of preservice teachers thought that a great deal of assistance was provided in applying 21st-century skills required in the process of learning in digital environments. This can be explained by the excessive load that the teachers felt during the crisis period, and by educational regularities in distance teaching: there was no time to learn new tools, new distance learning skills, and so forth. Nevertheless, acquiring 21st-century skills is of great importance. Teachers' ability to deploy online environments and 21st-century skills depends largely on their experience, knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Holmes et al., 2018; Kennedy, 2016; Lampert, 2010; Zilka, 2021). "Twenty-first-century skills" refers to skills required and acquired for the use of digital environments, according to the OECD outline in the LifeLongLearning (LLL) program (OECD, 2018, 2019a, 2019b). These skills include assessment of the need for information, information retrieval, information identification, information evaluation, writing, processing, merging information from a variety of digital texts using diverse and advanced digital tools, use of collaborative tools such as forums, shared files, open content repositories, and understanding the characteristics, benefits, and limitations of digital environments.

EMOTIONAL ASPECTS IN THE PROCESS OF EXPERIENCING TEACHING AND SHAPING PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

Our findings (Table 1) show a positive correlation in both tutors and preservice teachers between maintaining contact between the tutor and the preservice teacher and high self-efficacy ($r = 0.30$, $p < .001$). Therefore, I conclude that in difficult times and in a period of social isolation, maintaining contact strengthens the sense of self-efficacy in tutors and preservice teachers. This finding supports previous ones suggesting a connection between care and development, sense of wellbeing, and adaptation to school (Sammons, 2010). A strong feeling of satisfaction and self-efficacy and an ability to cope with difficulties are likely to shape the preservice teacher's professional identity as individuals who can cope positively during complex periods. The findings of this study reinforce previous findings that preservice teachers with mental resilience coped effectively during the epidemic and the researchers' assumption that they will be able to cope successfully with future crisis situations (Donitsa-Schmidt & Ramota, 2020; Fullan et al., 2020). Researchers (Nasri et al., 2020) found that during the COVID period, preservice teachers showed increased empathy for their students and placed emphasis on ensuring a successful learning process.

Both preservice teachers and tutors (Table 4), found it difficult to set goals and objectives in this complex period. Tutors who reported high satisfaction were also found to think to a greater extent than others that they set objectives for each workday (FEE questionnaire, statement 9).

PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL ASPECTS

Our results show (Table 2) that in the preservice teachers' group a significantly high percentage of participants thought that the transition from face-to-face to online teaching (FTF questionnaire) was simple and enjoyable, whereas among the tutors a high percentage saw the transition as challenging, exhausting, and difficult. More tutors with high seniority in teaching indicated the process as exhausting than did tutors with fewer years of teaching experience. At the same time, a comparison between

the groups found that preservice teachers had a higher average on the “difficulty” scale than did the tutors. This may be explained by the fact that it was more important for the tutors to keep in touch with the preservice teachers than the other way around. Because of the difficulty of maintaining contact during a period of social distancing, the tutors found the transition to tutoring the preservice teachers online difficult.

I found (Table 7.1) that tutors who expressed more satisfaction with the tutoring process were the ones who encountered fewer technical difficulties (TEC questionnaire) and thought the tutoring process was simple and enjoyable.

On the questions to what extent did preservice teachers feel that the tutors assisted them during the COVID period (Table 3), and to what extent did the tutors feel that they assisted the preservice teachers in professional aspects (e.g., teaching, classroom management, class composition, addressing differences between students) and organizational aspects (e.g., integration and getting to know work culture at school), I found that over 50% of respondents in the sample, both preservice teachers and tutors, thought that much assistance was provided in various aspects. Both preservice teachers and tutors believed that most assistance had been given in the following aspects: 4 (Adapting the teaching methods to the needs of the students and the period) and 8 (Dealing with difficulties in teaching). The assistance provided to preservice teachers focused mainly on conducting synchronous lessons, especially in Zoom, and not on lessons where students were required to have high skills, 21st-century skills, diversity in learning processes, inclusion of thought-provoking and challenging tasks, and more. At the same time, difficulties were addressed, such as a deeper study of the content, supplying content for the lessons, and so on. In all aspects, except 13 and 14, the tutors felt that preservice teachers were given more assistance than the latter thought they had received from the tutors. In aspects 13 (Parental involvement) and 14 (Integration into the school staff), a higher percentage of preservice teachers thought that they had received a great deal of assistance than tutors thought they had provided. This may be due to the fact that the tutors were more aware of the complexities of parental involvement and integration into the school staff than were the preservice teachers. Possibly, the impression of the preservice teachers who had received a great deal of assistance in the aspect of parental involvement was due to the fact that during this period of online instruction, parental involvement was routinely required because the students did not attend school. A significant difference between the groups was found in statements 4 and 10. In statement 4 (Adapting teaching methods to students’ needs and period), 87% of tutors, compared to 73% of preservice teachers, thought they had provided assistance to a greater extent in “Dealing with teaching diversity.” In statement 10 (Management and planning of teaching), 76% of tutors, compared to 56% of the preservice teachers, thought that they had provided assistance to a great extent or more. The differences between the tutors and the preservice teachers in the perception of the situation can be explained by the degree of consolidation of their professional identity and by the difference in their teaching experience. Preservice teachers felt they needed more help than they had received from the tutors.

It can be seen (Table 4) that 70% of the respondents identified strongly and more with all the statements regarding feelings and emotions associated with the tutoring process (FEE questionnaire). The tutors felt that they have been able to become personally acquainted with the preservice teachers they tutored, and the latter also felt that they have been able to get to know their tutors personally. Tutors thought that interpersonal communication advanced the preservice teachers and that they listened to and understood their mentees. Preservice teachers felt that the tutors allowed them to voice their expectations and concerns regarding their teaching experiences. In addition, preservice teachers felt that they, in their teaching experiences, were attentive to their students during this complex period. This finding is consistent with those of other researchers (Nasri et al., 2020) that during the COVID period preservice teachers showed increased empathy toward their students.

In conclusion, it emerged that the teaching practicum of preservice teachers during the COVID period was perceived by preservice teachers and their tutors as helpful, meeting preservice teachers’ needs and providing professional assistance in their training – more so in the professional aspects of

teaching and classroom management, in the emotional aspects of the tutoring process, and in the process of shaping the preservice teachers' professional identity, and less so in organizational aspects at the school. I found that during the complex period of social isolation, for both tutors and preservice teachers maintaining contact reinforced the sense of self-efficacy. Tutors who expressed greater satisfaction with the tutoring process were the ones who encountered fewer technical difficulties and thought that the tutoring process was enjoyable. Tutors felt that they were better able to get to know personally the preservice teachers they guided, and vice versa, preservice teachers were able to get to know personally their tutors. Tutors thought that their interpersonal communication benefitted the preservice teachers, that they listened to their mentees and understood them. Preservice teachers felt that tutors allowed them to voice their expectations and concerns about their teaching experiences.

In studies conducted before the COVID period on the teaching experiences of preservice teachers, the researchers pointed out deficiencies in various aspects of the tutoring process and noted that the main problems were revealed at the professional, personal, and interpersonal levels (Hoffman et al., 2015; Korthagen, 2001a, 2001b; Woodgate-Jones, 2012). Our study demonstrated that, unlike in previous research conducted before the epidemic, during the COVID period emphasis was placed on emotional and professional aspects. During the COVID period, tutoring sessions took place over Zoom, where discussions of concepts and in-depth knowledge of the profession were more efficient than were discussions of organizational aspects in school and classroom, in accordance with the spirit of the period and the resources available to the tutors and preservice teachers. One of the main goals of teaching practicum, as part of the studies toward a teaching certificate, is to prepare the preservice teachers for their role as teachers. Emphasis should therefore be placed on three central aspects: (a) the professional aspect relating to teaching and classroom management, identifying and setting future goals for improvement, and so on; (b) the organizational aspect, such as integration with school staff and familiarity with the work culture at school; and (c) the emotional aspects of the teaching experience, promoting the growth and personal development of preservice teachers in the process of shaping their professional identity.

REFERENCES

- AACTE (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education). (2010). *The clinical preparation of teachers: A policy brief teacher preparation: Who needs It?* www.aacte.org
- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (2008). Of rhetoric and representation: The four faces of ethnography. *The Quarterly Sociological*, 49(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2007.00104.x>
- Aram, D., & Ziv, M. (2018). Early childhood education in Israel. History, policy, and practice. In J. L. Roopnarine, J. E. Johnson, S. F. Quinn, M. M. Patte (Eds.), *Handbook of international perspectives on early childhood education* (pp. 101-114). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315562193-8>
- Atkinson, E., & Delamont, S. (2006). In the roiling smoke: Qualitative inquiry and contested fields. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(6), 747-755. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390600975974>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527692>
- Brown, M., Hughes, H., Keppell, M., Hard, N., & Smith, L. (2015). Stories from students in their first semester of distance learning. *Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 16(4). <https://doi.org/10.19173/rodl.v16i4.1647>
- Caires, S., Almeida, L., & Vieira, D. (2012). Becoming a teacher: Student teachers' experiences and perceptions about teaching practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(2), 163-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2011.643395>
- Carr, J. F., Herman, N., & Harris, D. E. (2005). *Creating dynamic schools through tutoring, coaching, and collaboration*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Carrillo, C., & Flores, M. A. (2020). COVID-19 and teacher education: A literature review of online teaching and learning practices. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 466-487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1821184>
- Clark, A., Triggs, V., & Nielsen, W. (2014). Cooperating teacher participation in teacher education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(2), 163-202. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313499618>
- Donitsa-Schmidt, S., & Ramot, R. (2020). Opportunities and challenges: Teacher education in Israel in the Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 46(4), 586-595. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1799708>
- Douglas, A. S. (2014). *Student teachers in school practice: An analysis of learning opportunities*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137268686>
- Elaldi, S., & Yerliyurt, N. S. (2016). Preservice preschool teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and attitudes toward teaching profession. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(7), 345-357. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2016.2648>
- Fullan, M., Quinn, J., Drummy, M., & Gardner, M. (2020). *Education reimagined: The future of learning*. A collaborative position paper between New Pedagogies for Deep Learning and Microsoft Education. <http://aka.ms/HybridLearningPaper>
- Ford, M. E. (1992). *Human motivation: Goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483325361>
- Gardiner, W. (2011). Tutoring in an urban teacher residency: Tutors' perceptions of yearlong placements. *New Educator*, 7(2), 153-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2011.574591>
- Hammersley, M. (2008). *Questioning qualitative research: Critical essays*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857024565>
- Hoffman, J. V., Wetzel, M., Maloch, B., Greeter, E., Taylor, L., DeJulio, S., & Vlach, S. H. (2015). What can we learn from studying the coaching interactions between cooperating teachers and preservice teachers? A literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 52, 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.09.004>
- Holmes, W., Anastopoulou, S., Schaumburg, H., & Mavrikis, M. (2018). *Technology-enhanced personalised learning: Untangling the evidence*. Robert Bosch Stiftung. <http://oro.open.ac.uk/56692/>
- Kasalak, G., & Dağyar, M. (2020). The relationship between self-efficacy and teacher job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the teaching and learning international survey (TALIS). *Educational Science: Theory & Practice*, 20(3), 16-33. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1261816.pdf>
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945-980. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626800>
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2001a). *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410600523>
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2001b). Building a realistic teacher education program. In F. A. J. Korthagen, J. Kessels, B. Koster, B. Langerwarf & T. Wubbels (Eds.), *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education* (pp. 69-87). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410600523>
- Kreis, Y., Haas, B., Reuter, R. & Meyers, C. (2020). Reflections on our teaching activities in the initial teacher training during the COVID-19 crisis: From “onsite classes” to “schooling at home”. In G. Mein & J. Pause (Eds.), *Self and society in the corona crisis: Perspectives from the humanities and social sciences* (pp. 611-631). Melusina Press. https://orbilu.uni.lu/bitstream/10993/44692/1/eoh_02_kreis_reflection.pdf
- Lampert, M. (2010). Learning teaching in, from, and for practice: What do we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 21-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347321>
- Lancker, W., & Parolin, Z. (2020). COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: A social crisis in the making. *The Lancet*, 5(5), 243-244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30084-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30084-0)
- Law, K. M. Y., Lee, V. C. S., & Yu, Y. T. (2010). Learning motivation in e-learning facilitated computer programming courses. *Computers & Education* 55(1), 218-228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.01.007>

- Law, K. M. Y., & Breznik, K. (2017). Impacts of innovativeness and attitude on entrepreneurial intention: Among engineering and non-engineering students. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education* 27, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-016-9373-0>
- Law, K. M. Y., & Geng, S. (2018). How innovativeness and handedness affect learning performance of engineering students? *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 29, 897-914. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-018-9462-3>
- Lawson, T., Çakmak, M., Gündüz, M., & Busher, H. (2015). Research on teaching practicum – A systematic review. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(3), 392-407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2014.994060>
- Lazarus, R. S. (2000). Toward better research on coping. *American Psychologist*, 55(6), 665-673. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.55.6.665>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1988). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. Springer.
- Matteson, M., Eilerston, T. V., & Rorrison, D. (Eds.) (2012). *A practicum turn in teacher education*. Sense Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-711-0>
- McLean Davies, L., Dickson, B., Rickards, F., Dinham, S., Cornoy, J. & Davis, R. (2015). Teaching as a clinical profession: Translation practices in initial teacher education – An international perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 41(5), 514- 528. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2015.1105537>
- Nasri, N. M., Husnin, H., Mahmud, S. N. D., & Halim, L. (2020). Mitigating the COVID-19 pandemic: A snapshot from Malaysia into the coping strategies for pre-service teachers' education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 46(4), 546-553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1802582>
- OECD. (2018). *The future of education and skills. Education 2030*.
- OECD. (2019a). Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners. *TALIS 2018 results (Volume I)*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c9813405-ar>
- OECD. (2019b). *Trends shaping educating 2019*. https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/trends_shaping_education_tracey_burns.pdf
- Pintrich, P., Smith, D., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. (1991). A manual for the use of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ). *Technical Report No. 91-B-004*. The University of Michigan. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED338122.pdf>
- Sammons, P. (2010). The contribution of mixed methods to recent research on educational effectiveness. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods research* (2nd ed., pp. 697-723). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506335193.n27>
- Schneider, M., & Preckel, F. (2017). Variables associated with achievement in higher education: A systematic review of meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143, 565–600. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000098>
- Schunk, D. H. (1984). Enhancing self-efficacy and achievement through rewards and goals: Motivational and informational effects. *Journal of Educational Research*, 78, 29-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1984.10885568>
- Schunk, D. H. (1989). Self-efficacy and cognitive skill learning. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education* (Vol. 3, pp. 13-44). Academic Press.
- Shulman, L. S. (2005). *The signature pedagogies in the professions of law, medicine, engineering and the clergy: Lessons from the education of teacher*. Paper presented at the Teacher Education for Effective Teaching and Learning Conference, NRC Center of Education.
- Thompson, J., Hagenah, S., Lohwasser, K., & Laxtonm K. (2015). Problems without ceiling: How tutors and novices frame and work on problems of practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(4), 363-381. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115592462>
- Thompson, J., Windschitl, M., & Braaten, M. (2013). Developing a theory of ambitious early-career teacher practice. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50, 574-615. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213476334>

- Wargadinata, W., Maimunah, I., Dewi, E. & Rofiq, Z. (2020). Student's responses on learning in the early COVID-19 pandemic. *Tadris: Journal of Education and Teacher Training*, 5(1), 141-153. <https://doi.org/10.24042/tadris.v5i1.6153>
- Woodgate-Jones, A. (2012). The student teacher and the school community of practice: An exploration of the contribution of the legitimate peripheral participant. *Educational Review*, 64(2), 145-160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2011.590180>
- Zilka, G. C. (2017a). Awareness of eSafety and potential online dangers amongst children and teenagers. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 16, 319-338. <https://doi.org/10.28945/3864>
- Zilka, G. C. (2017b). Awareness of ICT capabilities, digital literacy, and use of reflective processes in children who received their first home computer. *Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 9(1), 80-98. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTEL.2017.084074>
- Zilka, G. C. (2019a). The digital divide: Implications for children and adolescents' eSafety. *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 11(1), 20-35. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTEL.2019.096736>
- Zilka, G. C. (2019b). The use of mobile technologies by immigrant adolescents in coping with the new language and with their formal studies. In A. Forkosh-Baruch, & H. Meishar-Tal (Eds.), *Mobile technologies in educational organizations* (pp. 192-210). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-8106-2.ch010>
- Zilka, G. C. (2020a). Openness and development or self-criticism of preservice teachers watching videos of themselves teaching a lesson. *Review of European Studies*, 12(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/res.v12n4p1>
- Zilka, G. C. (2020b). The experience of receiving and giving public oral and written peer feedback on the teaching experience of preservice teachers. In M. Jones (Ed.), *Proceedings of InSITE 2020: Informing Science and Information Technology Education*, pp. 1-13. Informing Science Institute. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4502>
- Zilka, G. C. (2021). Distance learning during the COVID-19 crisis, as perceived by preservice teachers. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, 18, 141-159. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4795>
- Zilka, G. C. Rahimi, I. D., & Cohen, R. (2019). Sense of challenge, threat, self-efficacy, and motivation of students learning in virtual and blended courses. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 33(1), 2-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2019.1554990>

AUTHOR



Gila Cohen Zilka, Ph.D., Israel. Zilka is affiliated with Bar-Ilan University as lecturer and researcher, the Director of the Department for Teaching Social Science and Communication and with Achva Academic College as Head of the Academic Department of Education.

Zilka's research focuses mainly on ICT, children in the digital environment, and communication in the diversified media. Zilka published two books that offer ways to empower children, parents, and educators in our age. For parents: *Empowering Parents in the Social Media Age – The Three-Element Way*. For educators and mentors: *Empowering Educators and Mentors in the Social Media Age – The Three-Element Way*.