Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies
Vol.3, No.2, October 2007

Socio-Demographic Predictors of EFL Teacher Efficacy

Şenay YAVUZ
senayavuz@hotmail.com

Abstract

Research on teachers' beliefs and their impact on teacher cognition has been a relevant topic for educational inquiry for some decades. Teachers' actions are tied to their beliefs, perceptions, assumptions and motivation levels. Thus, research on teachers' beliefs is crucial in determining the way teachers understand and organize instruction. One important belief that appears to be an important influence on teacher and student outcomes is teacher efficacy. In accordance with this view and due to the increasing demand for English as a foreign language education, the present study aimed to assess EFL teachers' efficacy level and explore the socio-demographic predictors of teacher efficacy in an EFL setting, i.e., Turkey. 226 EFL teachers working at the preparatory schools of public and private universities in Istanbul participated in this study. Data were collected by means of quantitative methods; i.e., the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (adapted from Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) and the School-Level Environment Questionnaire (Fisher & Fraser, 1990).Data collected by means of these instruments were submitted to correlation and regression analysis and independent samples t-tests. Results of the study showed that the number of professional activities teachers were involved in, average number of students in teachers' classes, working position, type of institution, and gender were the socio-demographic factors that predicted variations in EFL teachers' efficacy in this study.

Key words: teacher efficacy, institutional factors, student support, innovation

Özet

Öğretmen inançları ve bu inançların öğretmen bilişi üzerindeki etkileri son yıllarda eğitimin farklı alanlarında üzerinde durulan konulardan birisidir. Öğretmen inanç, algı, varsayım, ve motivasyon düzeyini saptamaya yönelik araştırmalar, söz konusu faktörlerin öğretmenin sınıf-içi davranış ve tutumları, ve eğitim-öğretime ilişkin

düşünceleri üzerindeki etkilerini anlamak açısından büyük önem taşımaktadır. Öğretmen yeterlik inancının, öğretmen ve öğrenci başarısı üzerinde önemli etkileri olduğu bilinmektedir. Bu görüş doğrultusunda ve yabancı dil olarak İngilizce eğitimine artan talep nedeniyle, bu çalışma İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği bir ortam olan Türkiye'de İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yeterlik seviyesini ölçmek ve yeterliklerini öngören kurumsal etkenleri araştırmak amacıyla yapılmıştır. İstanbul'daki devlet ve özel üniversitelerin hazırlık okullarında görev yapan 226 İngilizce öğretmeni bu çalışmanın denek grubunu oluşturdu. Çalışmanın verileri nicel metotlar kullanılarak toplanıldı. Çalışmada Ohio Eyaleti Öğretmen Yeterliği Ölçeği (Tschannen-Moran ve Hoy, 2001) ve Okul Düzeyi Çevre Anketi (Fisher & Fraser, 1990) kullanıldı. Bu araçlarla toplanan veriler korelasyon, regresyon ve t-testleri yoluyla analiz edilmiştir. Bu çalışmada elde edilen bulgular, öğretmenlerin profesyonel gelişim için yaptıkları aktivitelerin sayısı, sınıflardaki öğrenci sayısı, öğretmenlerin görevleri, kurum türü, ve cinsiyetin bu çalışmadaki İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yeterliğindeki değişimleri öngören sosyo-demografik etkenler olduğunu göstermiştir.
Anahtar Kelimeler: öğretmen yeterliği, kurumsal etkenler, öğrenci desteği, yeniliğe açıklık

1.0. INTRODUCTION

There has been an upsurge of academic interest on the teachers' sense of efficacy in the last few decades. The reason for this growing interest is the belief that efficacy is a potential source of differences in the judgmental, decisive, and behavioral patterns teachers follow and therefore, constitute one of the major effects on their instructional practices and their orientation toward the educational processes. This belief suggests that a thorough understanding of teacher efficacy and the underlying factors of this construct should be developed to improve teachers' instructional practices and educational outcomes in return (Pajares, 1992).

2.0. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The construct of self-efficacy primarily comes from Bandura's social cognitive theory which postulates that the beliefs people hold about their efficacy influence the choices they make, their aspirations, level of effort and perseverance, resilience to adversity, vulnerability to stress and depression, and performance accomplishments (Bandura,1977; 1997). That is, efficacy beliefs influence whether people think

optimistically or pessimistically, the goals they set for themselves, and their commitment to them, how much effort they put forth in given endeavors, and how much stress and depression they experience in coping with the environmental demands, and the accomplishments they realize (Bandura, 2000; Pajares, 1997). Applied to the context of teacher education, teacher efficacy has been defined as the extent to which teachers believe they can affect student learning.

Over the two decades of research, findings indicated that teacher efficacy acts as an indicator of commitment to teaching (Coladarci, 1992), and that it cultivates teachers' coping skills with stressful situations, and therefore, reduces stress and burnout (Dick & Wagner, 2001). Teachers' efficacy also affects teachers' control orientations and control behaviors, their use of classroom discussions and innovative teaching practices, their responses to learners who are difficult to teach, their level of stress and their satisfaction with the teaching profession (Guskey, 1988; Pajares, 1997; Ross, 1998; Smylie,1988).

As a consequence of these behavioral differences, teachers' self efficacy has important formative effects on student outcomes such as achievement, motivation and students' own sense of efficacy across various areas and levels (Mingley, Feldlaufer, & Eccless, 1989; Moore & Esselman, 1992; Ross, 1992)

The array of research showing that teacher efficacy is linked to teachers' behaviors and educational outcomes suggest that it would be reasonable to search for ways of diagnosing the factors that predict variations in teachers' efficacy perceptions. The underlying idea of this assumption is that such an investigation may provide guidance for further attempts to improve teacher efficacy and educational outcomes in return (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Fuller, Wood, Rapoport, & Dornbusch, 1982; Henson, 2001; Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1991;Smylie, 1988; Pajares, 1996).

3.0. THE STUDY

In accordance with the view summarized above and due to the increasing demand for English as a foreign language education, the present study aimed to explore the socio-demographic factors that predict variations in the efficacy perceptions of the EFL teachers working at different universities in Turkey, a context that has not been explored in the relevant literature so far. The study addressed the following research questions:

1.What is the efficacy level of EFL teachers working at public and private universities in Turkey?

2.What are the socio-demographic factors that predict variations in EFL teachers' efficacy?

3.1. Participants

The population of this study comprised 226 EFL teachers, 51 male and 175 female, working at the preparatory schools of 13 public and private universities in Istanbul. A hundred and eleven of the teachers were married while 115 were single. Thirty-one of the teachers were native English speakers whereas the rest (195) were Turkish teachers of English. The teachers showed a wide range of variance with respect to their age and teaching experience as well. Table 1 shows the distribution of the sample according to age and years of teaching experience.

Table 1

Distribution of the Sample According to Age and Teaching Experience

	Age						Years of Teaching Experience					
	20-25	1-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-	26-31	32-37	38-43	44-49	50-55	56 -
N.	15	75	76	30	24	21	58	75	29	21	16	12

N: # of teachers

Furthermore, the target sample showed variation in their educational backgrounds, the number of professional activities they were involved in, and teaching hours per week. Table 2 illustrates the distribution of the sample according to their educational background, the number of professional activities involved in, and teaching hours per week.

Table 2

Distribution of the Sample according to Educational Background, Professional Interest, and Teaching Hours

	Education					Number of Professional Activities Involved in					Teaching Hours				
	Degree			Department											
	BA	MA	Ph.D	ELT	Other	0	1	2	3	4	5-	1-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-
N.	126	90	10	96	130	23	49	76	50	21	7	12	23	100	75	16

Note. N: # of teachers

Moreover, the participating teachers who made up the sample worked in different types of institutions and had different positions. Eighty-seven teachers worked in public universities whereas 139 teachers worked in private universities. Sixteen teachers worked as both instructors and administrators and 210 teachers worked only as instructors.

Finally, the sample showed variance in regard to the number of classes they were responsible for and the average number of students in their classes (see Table 3).

Table 3

Distribution of the Sample According to Number of Classes and Average Number of Students

	Number of Classes					Average Number of Students					
	1	2	3	4	5-	1-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-
N.	49	66	63	28	20	23	41	77	57	23	5

N: # of teachers

As can be seen, a great deal of variance was computed among the group with respect to the socio-demographic variables assessed, and therefore, the target group is considered to be a representative sample.

3.2. Data collection instruments

In this study data were collected by means of two questionnaires: The teacher background questionnaire developed by the researchers (Appendix A) and the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES) developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy's (2001) (Appendix B).

The background questionnaire aimed to collect socio-demographic information about the participants and included items asking for the gender, marital status, age, educational background, years of experience in teaching, and professional interest of the teachers.

Besides these items, a second set of items related to institutional factors was added to the teacher background questionnaire as it is suggested that teachers' work load and classroom context reflect teachers' task environments and the intensity of teaching and thus, could affect teachers' efficacy beliefs (Smylie, 1988; Riehl & Sipple, 1996).

OSTES (Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale) was used to measure teachers' efficacy. This scale requires teachers to indicate how effectively they can carry out teaching tasks or activities on a 9-point scale. Higher total scores on this scale reflect higher levels of perceived efficacy.

OSTES has three sub-scales, i.e., efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. Each sub-scale is assessed by eight items. However, item 22 in the student engagement sub-scale, i.e., "How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?" was

removed from the questionnaire since teachers working at university level do not usually interact with the students' families or assist them. Henceforth, the resulting scale consisted of twenty-three items and had three sub-scales.

Both questionnaires were pilot tested with 20 teachers and layout of the questionnaires was designed accordingly before the actual study. Reliability of the scale was assessed by Cronbach alpha coefficient, which resulted in .935. Reliabilities for the sub-scales were computed as .865 for efficacy in student engagement, .849 for efficacy in instructional strategies, and .874 for efficacy in classroom management.

3.3. Procedure

The present study was conducted during the spring semester of 2004-2005 academic year. Using the convenience sampling method, the researchers contacted only the twenty universities in Istanbul which had English preparatory schools. The heads of the preparatory schools were informed about the study and only 13 accepted to take part in this study.

A total of 232 teachers who volunteered to contribute to the study were given the questionnaires. Out of the 232 questionnaires gathered back, 6 incomplete questionnaires were regarded as invalid.

3.4. Data analysis procedure

Data collected from the above-mentioned instruments were analyzed by the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS) 13.0. Two main statistical processes were undertaken for the purposes of this study. First, the mean scores of the participating teachers on the OSTES were calculated to find out the level of EFL teachers' efficacy.

Second, multiple regression analyses were carried out on the quantitative data gathered from the teacher background questionnaire, OSTES, and its sub-scales to diagnose the socio-demographic factors that predicted changes in EFL teachers' efficacy perceptions. In order to have an idea about the best socio-demographic factors that could predict variations in teachers' overall efficacy or any dimensions of it, correlations between all socio-demographic factors and teachers' overall efficacy, and its three dimensions were calculated first. Multiple regression analyses were carried out on the basis of data gathered from the correlation analyses. The same procedure was

applied to find out the socio-demographic factors that predicted variations in the dimensions of EFL teachers' efficacy perceptions as well.

4.0 RESULTS

Descriptive analyses of the data gathered from the OSTES and its sub-scales are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of the OSTES and Its Sub-Scales

	N	Min.	Max.	M	Sd.
OSTES	226	3.70	9.00	7. 0277	.93556
Efficacy in student engagement	226	1.57	9.00	6.6643	1.16141
Efficacy in instructional strategies	226	3.88	9.00	7.052	.94200
Efficacy in classroom management	226	2.75	9.00	7.1681	1.07397

As can be seen in Table 7, EFL teachers' overall sense of efficacy ranged between 3.70 and 9 and the average teacher's mean of overall efficacy was 7.0277 on a 9-point scale. Moreover, variance was realized in the dimensions of EFL teachers' efficacy. The differences in the means of sub-scales displayed that teachers reported greater levels of efficacy for managing student behavior and applying instructional strategies than for motivating and engaging students in the learning process.

As previously stated, correlation and multiple regression analyses were employed in order to diagnose the socio-demographic factors that predicted changes in EFL teachers' efficacy. Two socio-demographic factors correlated significantly with teachers' overall efficacy; the number of activities teachers were involved in for professional development ($r= .262$, $p< .001$), and working position ($r= .165$, $p< .014$). However, teachers' working position did not have a statistically significant beta value in the multiple regression model conducted. That is why, it was excluded from the regression model and a final model was conducted with only the number of activities for professional development as the predictor ($F=16.520$, $p<.001$). This model is provided in Table 5.

Table 5

Model Summary of the Regression Analysis of the Number of Activities for Professional Development and Teachers' Overall Efficacy

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate

1	.262(a)	.069	.065	.90487

The R square value obtained (.069) indicated that the number of activities teachers were involved in explained 6.9% of the variation in EFL teachers' reported sense of overall efficacy. The beta value of this factor is provided in Table 6.

Table 6

Independent Ability of the Number of Activities for Professional Development in Predicting Variations in Teachers' Overall efficacy

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	6.438	.157		41.009	.000
	Number of Activities for Professional Development	.190	.047	.262	4.065	.000

As the table shows, the beta value calculated indicated that there was a positive relationship between the number of professional activities teachers were involved in and teachers' overall efficacy. In other words, it was found out that the number of the activities teachers were involved in could be a significant predictor of teachers' overall efficacy.

Correlations were also obtained between all socio-demographic factors and teachers' efficacy for student engagement, the first dimension of teachers' efficacy. The results showed that four factors, i.e., the number of activities for professional development ($r=.257$, $p<.001$), average number of students in teachers' classes ($r=.160$, $p<.017$), teachers' working position ($r=.157$, $p<.020$), and teachers' majors ($r=.132$, $p<.049$) correlated significantly with teachers' efficacy for student engagement. However, in the regression model conducted two factors, i.e., teachers' majors and teachers' working position, were not computed as statistically significant. As a result, these factors were eliminated from the model and a second model was computed with the other two factors, i.e., number of students in class and number of professional activities ($F=11.350$, $p<.001$). This model is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Model Summary of the Regression Analysis of the Number of Activities for Professional Development, Average Number of Students in Teachers' Classes, and Teachers' Efficacy for Student Engagement

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,304(a)	,092	,084	1,11141

As presented in Table 7, these two socio-demographic factors, as a group, explained 9.2% of the variation in EFL teachers' sense of efficacy for student engagement. Table 8 summarizes the contribution of each factor to the predictive ability of the model.

Table 8

Independent Abilities of the Number of Activities for Professional Development and Average Number of Students in Teachers' Classes in Predicting Variations in Teachers' Efficacy for Student Engagement

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5,449	,275		19,834	,000
	Number of Activities for Professional Development	,233	,057	,259	4,054	,000
	Average Number of Students in Teachers' Classes	,157	,062	,162	2,540	,012

As illustrated, the number of professional activities teachers were involved in had a greater contribution to the ability of the model in explaining variations in EFL teachers' efficacy for student engagement. Nonetheless, the beta weight of average number of students in teachers' classes revealed that it could account for variations in teachers' efficacy for student engagement significantly as well.

Next, correlations between socio-demographic factors and teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies, the second dimension of teachers' efficacy were computed. Results showed that the number of activities for professional development ($r=.261$, $p<.001$), teachers' working position ($r=.167$, $p<.013$), and type of institutions teachers worked at ($r=145$, $p<.030$) correlated significantly with teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies. Therefore, these factors were included in the multiple regression model ($F=8.878$, $p<.001$). The summary of the model is presented in Table 9

Table 9

Model Summary of the Regression Analysis of the Number of Activities for Professional Development, Working Position, Type of Institution, and Teachers' Efficacy for Instructional Strategies

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,327(a)	,107	,095	,89611

As shown in Table 9, the number of activities teachers were involved in, teachers' working position, and the type of institutions teachers worked at explained 10.7% of the variation in EFL teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies as one group. Table 10 summarizes the predictive ability of each factor

Table 10

Independent Abilities of the Number of Activities for Professional Development, Working Position, and Type of Institution in Predicting Variations in Teachers' Efficacy for Instructional Strategies

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5,890	,283		20,831	,000
	Number of Activities for Professional Development	,171	,047	,235	3,643	,000
	Working Position	,265	,121	,141	2,183	,030
	Type of institution	,299	,123	,155	2,430	,016

As can be seen, teachers' professional interest was identified, as the most important predictor of teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies.

The type of institution teachers worked at and working position also had significant beta weights which confirmed that they could predict variations in teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies as well. However, as these variables were categorical variables, the beta values could not provide information on which type of institution or which working position predicted positive variations in teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies. To explore this, independent samples t-tests were conducted. Independent samples t-test conducted to find if there were any differences between the teachers working at private and public universities produced a statistically significant t value ($t= -2.192$, $p<.05$). Values indicated that teachers working at private universities ($m=7.3129$) had higher efficacy scores than their colleagues working in the public universities ($m=7.0330$). Thus, it could be concluded that the ability of the type of institutions teachers worked at in predicting positive changes in teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies favored private universities.

Similarly, the independent samples t-test conducted to find if there were any differences between the teachers with and without administrative roles produced a statistically significant t value (t= -4.439, p<.001) and indicated that teachers with administrative roles reported greater efficacy for instructional strategies (m=7.7833) than teachers without any administrative roles (m=7.1619). In light of this information, it could be concluded that administrative roles cultivated teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies.

Correlation coefficients computed for the final dimension of teachers' efficacy, namely, efficacy for classroom management showed that number of activities teachers were involved in for professional development (r=.184, p<.006), teaching experience (r=. 155, p<.021), age (r=.140, p<.037), and gender (r=.135, p<.043) were the socio-demographic factors that had a significant relationship with teachers' efficacy for classroom management.. However, the beta values obtained for age and years of teaching experience in the regression analyses were not statistically significant. As a result, these socio-demographic factors were excluded from the model and a second model was conducted with the number of activities for professional development and gender as the predictors (F=6.250, p<.05). Table 11 illustrates the model computed.

Table 11

Model Summary of the Regression Analysis of the Number of Activities for Professional Development, Gender, and Teachers' Efficacy for Classroom Management

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,230(a)	,053	,045	1,04975

As illustrated, the number of activities for professional development and gender explained 5.3% of variation in EFL teachers' efficacy perceptions for classroom management as a group. The beta values of each socio-demographic variable are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

Independent Abilities of the Number of Professional Activities for Professional Development and Gender in Predicting Variations in Teachers' Efficacy for Classroom Management

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.

		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	6,059	,350		17,308	,000
	Number of Activities for Professional Development	,155	,054	,186	2,861	,005
	Gender	,354	,167	,138	2,119	,035

As shown, the regression model computed confirmed that the number of activities for professional development could predict variations in EFL teachers' efficacy for classroom management significantly as well. This analysis also confirmed that age could act as a significant predictor of teachers' efficacy for classroom management. However, as gender is a categorical variable an independent samples t-test had to be conducted to find out whether male or female teachers could be expected to have higher efficacy which resulted in a statistically significant t value ($T= -2.044$, $p<.05$). Values obtained indicated that female teachers reported greater efficacy ($m=7.2464$) than their male colleagues ($m=6.8995$).

To summarize, the number of professional activities that the EFL teachers were involved in were found as the most important socio-demographic factor in predicting variations in teachers' overall efficacy and all dimensions of it. In addition, average number of students in teachers' classes was found to lead to variations in teachers' efficacy for student engagement. Moreover, teachers' working position and type of institutions teachers worked at were found out to be factors that predicted variations in the second dimension of teachers' efficacy, namely, efficacy for instructional strategies. Finally, gender was identified as a socio-demographic factor that predicted changes in the final dimension of teachers' efficacy, i.e., efficacy for classroom management.

5.0. DISCUSSION

This study aimed to assess the efficacy level of EFL teachers working in preparatory schools of public and private universities in Istanbul. It also attempted to investigate whether there were any differences between the three dimensions of efficacy, namely, efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. Finally, it focused on the socio-demographic and institutional factors that predicted variations in teachers' efficacy and its dimensions.

Descriptive statistics showed that the sample group of EFL teachers' average efficacy was 7.0277 on a 9-point scale. This score indicated that the teachers self-reported a great deal of overall efficacy for teaching English.

As to differences in the three dimensions of teacher efficacy, the means computed for each sub-scale indicated that teachers were more assured of their capabilities and showed greater efficacy for classroom management (7.1681) and instructional strategies (7.052) than for student engagement (6.6643). The same result was found by Chacon (2005) in her study with EFL teachers in Venezuela.

There appears to be three possible reasons for the relatively low values obtained for teachers' efficacy for student engagement. The first possibility may be the negative effects caused by the inhibition of teacher autonomy by set curricula, standardized tests, and imposed teaching methods revealed earlier by Dörnyei (2001). That is, teachers may be aware of students' needs and interest but, still have difficulties in selecting and implementing the tasks and activities that they believe will motivate their students due to their tight schedules, structured lesson plans, and the testing oriented teaching they have to carry. Therefore, they may be realizing that they cannot motivate their students and engage them in learning successfully and decreasing their efficacy in this respect.

The second possibility can be the complicated nature of motivating students. As known, how to motivate students has always been a relevant topic for educational inquiry and several studies have attempted to explore the best ways of maintaining high student motivation in classes. However, no recipes that can be applied for motivating all student profiles can be suggested as each group of students and each context of teaching create different problems that the teachers have to handle specifically. On the other hand, basic patterns to be followed for effective classroom management emerge from the literature and the teachers follow these patterns with assurance. Similarly, the literature provides a great variety of strategies and activities that teachers can choose and apply to many of their classes with ease. Thus, it seems quite possible for the EFL teachers to feel more assured of their knowledge and skills in applying instructional strategies and classroom management than engaging their students in learning.

The final possibility can be the student profile teachers' work with. It is a fact that not all students choose to study at preparatory schools to learn English but some do so as a prerequisite of their universities. Therefore, it is possible for teachers to face with some students who display respect to teachers' management and instructional strategies but still show low motivation to learn the language. When these possible effects are considered, it seems natural for the EFL teachers working at the preparatory schools of universities feel less efficacious in motivating students and getting them engaged in language learning.

Another aim of this study constituted the identification of socio-demographic factors that predicted variations in EFL teachers' efficacy. Results of the study have shown that professional interest of the teachers was the most significant factor due to its ability in predicting variations in teachers' overall efficacy and all three dimensions of it. The more activities EFL teachers got involved in, the more efficacious they felt. This finding confirms the positive correlation between teacher efficacy and openness to professional development revealed by earlier research (Guskey, 1988; Smylie, 1988).

Moreover, the average number of students in teachers' classes was identified as a socio-demographic factor that accounted for the variations in EFL teachers' efficacy for student engagement. This finding can be considered as surprising since one would normally assume that it would be more difficult to teach, control and engage students in learning in large classes. This difficulty would cause teachers to question their efficacy and may decrease their efficacy for student engagement. However, as self-efficacy theory suggests, people form their efficacy beliefs on the basis of their previous experiences (Bandura). Then, it might be possible that the EFL teachers with more students in this study had positive mastery experiences of engaging students in learning and therefore, reported higher levels of efficacy for student engagement.

What is more, teachers' working position, whether teachers had administrative roles or not, predicted variations in EFL teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies. Teachers with administrative roles reported greater levels of efficacy. This finding confirms what Raudenbush, Rowan, and Cheong (1992) and Moore and Esselman (1992) have suggested earlier on the basis of the results they obtained. That is, teachers who can participate in the decision-making processes and feel that they have higher levels of influence on instructional conditions and school-based decision making display greater teacher efficacy. If this is the case, teachers with administrative roles would naturally be expected to show higher efficacy than the teachers without any administrative roles since the latter group may not have as many possibilities as the ones with administrative roles to control and change their teaching context for the better they believe.

Type of institution was also identified as a socio-demographic factor with significant ability in predicting variations in EFL teachers' efficacy for instructional strategies. EFL teachers working in the preparatory schools of private universities reported greater levels of efficacy for applying the instructional strategies assessed in the scale than their colleagues working in the preparatory schools of public universities. This difference might have been caused by the relative distribution of negative and positive

influences on teaching in each type of institution as the analysis of the influence of constraints imposed in the teaching context against the available resources that can be used to facilitate learning constitutes the first step of the formulation of teachers' efficacy.

Finally, gender was found out to be a socio-demographic factor that could predict variations in EFL teachers' efficacy for classroom management-the final dimension. Female teachers displayed greater efficacy for classroom management as compared to the male teachers. This finding is supported by a line of literature on gender and occupational efficacy. To start with, Bussey and Bandura (1999) state that gender related efficacy patterns arise from the stereotype linkage rather than actual capabilities. The study by Bandura et al. (2001) verifies this claim as the results revealed that occupational efficacy is related to traditionality of career choice. That is, boys have a higher sense of efficacy for science and technology than girls and girls display greater efficacy for careers in education and health-related fields than boys. Similarly, Schunk and Pajares (2002) note that boys and man report more confidence in mathematics, science, and technology than girls despite the fact that there are almost no achievement differences in these areas, which, once more, can be explained by the traditionality of career choice.

When studies with teachers are considered, the study by Evans (1986) on perceived teaching problems, self-efficacy, and commitment to teaching lends support to the findings of this study. Evans found that female pre-service teachers display greater efficacy as compared to their male counterparts. She concluded that the gender difference, favoring females, can be caused by a belief that school teaching is largely a feminine task. In light of these findings and suggestions, it can be concluded that female EFL teachers in this study displayed greater efficacy than male teachers because of a common belief that language teaching is a feminine task and because this field is usually dominated by female teachers as can be understood from the number of female and male teachers in this study.

6.0. IMPLICATIONS FOR EFL TEACHING

The findings of this study offer several implications for EFL teaching. To start with, To start with, lower values obtained for efficacy for student engagement indicate that educational policies adopted at preparatory schools should be developed after a through exploration of student needs and interests. That is, the needs and interests of the learner profile at an institution should be investigated via questionnaires administered to

teachers and students and the instructional processes should be shaped accordingly. In this way, the difficulties teachers face in carrying out the set curricula and maintaining student motivation at the same time can be minimized. Moreover, such an investigation may provide information for the formulation of in-service training programs focusing on the ways of motivating the learner profile in the specific teaching context which may add to EFL teachers' efficacy for student engagement. The positive influences of these in-service programs may be enhanced if teachers apply the knowledge and skills they acquire in their classes (mastery experience), observe their colleagues who are successful in motivating learners (vicarious experience), receive constructive feedback from their administrators and colleagues after being observed (social persuasions), and consequently feel more confident and less stressed for getting their students engaged in learning (emotional state).

Secondly, the significance of professional development in predicting variations in teachers' overall efficacy and all three dimensions of it reveal that ways of evoking professional interest in teachers should be searched for. Encouraging teachers to take part in activities for professional development and creating a sense of enthusiasm to carry on with those activities may increase their efficacy.

Moreover, the differences identified in the efficacy perceptions of teachers with and without administrative roles indicate that teachers should be assigned administrative roles as much as possible or at least should be kept as a part of decision making processes. A way of achieving this can be distributing administrative roles to groups of teachers and changing these roles on a year-round basis. Such a distribution of administrative roles may lead to a greater feeling of control in teachers and cultivate their efficacy throughout their career because people feel more assured of their capabilities and view themselves as more powerful agents when they can exert some influence and control their environment, as social-cognitive theory suggests.

The findings and implications of this study should be viewed in the light of its limitations. First, the findings of this study should be cross-validated by qualitative data as well to gain better insights to the efficacy perceptions of EFL teachers and for the results to be more reliable. Secondly, cultural and cross-cultural studies should be conducted with similar samples in order to compare and contrast the findings and see if they are generalizable. Finally, the link between L2 proficiency of Turkish EFL teachers and their efficacy should be explored to enlarge our knowledge of teacher efficacy and

ways of improving it, an aspect that was out of the scope of this study but constitutes major importance in teacher efficacy research.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TEACHER BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete or put a tick in the blanks.

1. Gender ( ) Male ( ) Female
2. Marital Status ( ) Single ( ) Married
3. Age ( ) 20-25 ( ) 26-31 ( ) 32-37 ( ) 38-43
   ( ) 44-49 ( ) 50-55 ( ) 56 and above
4. Education

	Department	Institution	Year of Graduation
BA			
MA			
PHD			

5. Years of experience in teaching ( ) 1-6 ( ) 7-12 ( ) 13-18
   ( ) 19-24 ( ) 25 and above

6. Current institution you work at: ( ) Public ( ) Private

7. Your position: ( ) Teacher ( ) Administrator ( ) Both

8. The number of classes you are teaching: 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )
   5 and above( )

9. The average number of students in your classes:
   ( ) 1-14 ( ) 15-19 ( ) 20-24 ( ) 25-29
   ( ) 30-34 ( ) 35 and above

10. Teaching hours per week: ( ) 1-6 ( ) 7-12 ( ) 13-18
( ) 19-24 ( ) 25 and above

11. Any activities for professional development:
( ) attend in-service courses regularly
( ) attend conferences
( ) read books and journals on ELT
( ) carry out research in class
( ) other_____

APPENDIX B

OHIO STATE TEACHER EFFICACY SCALE (OSTES)*

Please indicate your personal opinion about each of the statements below by circling the appropriate response at the right of each statement. Your answers will help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities.	Nothing / Very little / Some Influence / Quite Bit / A Great Deal								
1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?									
2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?									
8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?									
10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?									
12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13. How much can you do to get students to follow classroom rules?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
21. How well can you respond to students who show no respect to you?									
22. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
23. **How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students**?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

*Sub-scales: Efficacy in student engagement (1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14), efficacy in instructional strategies (7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23) , efficacy in classroom management (3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21)

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change, *Psychological Review,* 84 (2): 191-215.

Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy, *Current Directions in Psychological Science,* 9, 75-78.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (2001). Self-efficacy beliefs as shapers of children's aspirations and career trajectories, *Child Development,* 72 (1): 187-206.

Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation, *Psychological Review,* 106, 676-713.

Chacon, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela, *Teaching and Teacher Education***.** http:///www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6VD8-4FJTPOW-1

Coladarci, T. (1992). Teachers' sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching, *Journal of Experimental Education,* 60 (4): 323-337.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice, *Academy of Management Review,* 13 (3): 471-482.

Dick, R. V., & Wagner, U. (2001). Stress and strain in teaching, *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 71 (2): 243-259.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation***.** Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Evans, E. D. (1986). Perceived teaching problems, self-efficacy, and commitment to teaching among preservice teachers, *Journal of Educational Research,* 80 (2): 81-85.

Fuller, B., Wood, K., Rapoport, T., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1982). Organizational context of individual efficacy, *Review of Educational Research,* 52 (1): 7-30.

Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation, *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 4 (1): 63-69.

Henson, R. K. (2001). The effects of participation in teacher research on teacher efficacy, *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 17, 819-836.

Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools, *The Elementary School Journal,* 93 (4): 355-372.

Lee, V. E., Dedrick, R. F., & Smith, J. B. (1991). The effect of the social organizations of schools on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction, *Sociology of Education,* 64: 190-208.

Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school, *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 81 (2): 247-258.

Moore, W., & Esselman, M. (1992). *Teacher efficacy, power, school climate and achievement: A desegregating district's experience.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Newmann, F. M., Rutter, R. A., & Smith, M. S. (1989). Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community, and expectations, *Sociology of Education,* 62 (4): 221-238.

Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct, *Review of Educational Research,* 62 (3): 307-332.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings, *Review of Educational Research,* 66 (4): 543-578.

Pajares, F. (1997). *Current directions in self-efficacy research*. In M. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement.* (Vol.10, pp. 1-49). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Raudenbush, S. W., Rowan, B., & Cheong, Y. F. (1992). Contextual effects on the self-perceived efficacy of high school teachers, *Sociology of Education,* 65 (2): 150-167.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement, *Psychological Monographs,* 80, 1-28.

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). *The development of academic self-efficacy.* In A. Wigfiled & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation.* (pp. 16-31). San Diago: Academic Press.

Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change, *American Educational Research Journal,* 25 (1): 1-30.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct, *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 17 (7): 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2002, April). *The influence of resources and support on teachers' efficacy beliefs.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Şenay Yavuz received her B.A. in ELT at Hacettepe University in 1999. Since 1999, she has been working as an instructor at Maltepe University. She has recently completed her MA degree in ELT at Marmara University, with her study the socio-demograprahic and institutional predictors of variations in EFL teachers' efficacy perceptions.
e-mail: senayavuz@hotmail.com