



## Study on Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy Levels in Relation to Some Independent Variables\*

İsmail Fırat ALTAY\*\*

Article Information	ABSTRACT
<i>Received:</i> 14.09.2023	This study aimed to investigate prospective EFL teachers' (n=151) efficacy levels in relation to some independent variables. To achieve this aim, the adapted version of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale developed by Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) was administered to the participants. The results of the study revealed that prospective EFL teachers had high level of efficacy in the subscales of student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management. Related to gender, undergraduate major, CGPA and practicum experience, the results of this study showed that there was significant relationship between these variables and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy levels in terms of the subscales of student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management. <b>Keywords:</b> Self-efficacy, teacher efficacy, prospective EFL teachers, English language teaching, teacher education
<i>Accepted:</i> 03.10.2023	
<i>Online First:</i> 22.10.2023	
<i>Published:</i> 31.10.2023	
doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2023.507	Article Type: Research Article

**Citation Information:** Altay, İ. F. (2023). Study on prospective EFL teachers' efficacy levels in relation to some independent variables. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 38(4), 505-515. doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2023.507

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Teacher efficacy is one of the most prominent factors that determines teacher effectiveness in the EFL classroom. Due to its great impact on student achievement (Caprara et al., 2006; Shaughnessy, 2004; Tournaki & Podell, 2005) and motivation (Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989), teacher efficacy has been one of the most widely researched topics in the field of teacher education in recent years. Tschannen Moran et al. (1998) define the concept of teacher efficacy as 'a teacher's beliefs or perceptions about his or her ability to teach students with different kinds of needs and to bring about desired changes in students' achievement'. Undoubtedly, a teacher's beliefs about his/her teaching competence affects not only his/her teaching performance but also the students' learning performance (Munoz, Palacio & Escobar, 2012). In this vein, EFL teachers should believe they can perform what they desire so that they can teach English effectively and be adequately motivated to take the necessary actions when experiencing difficulties in their teaching (Bandura, 2006).

The reason why we have focused on teacher efficacy in this paper is that teacher efficacy is one of the key factors for effective foreign language teaching. Hence, to investigate prospective EFL teachers' efficacy levels on teaching English as a foreign language in relation to some independent variables, this research aims to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What are prospective EFL teachers' efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management?
- 2) Are there statistically significant differences between male prospective EFL teachers and female prospective EFL teachers in relation to their efficacy?
- 3) Is there a significant relationship between undergraduate majors and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy?
- 4) Is there a significant relationship between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy?
- 5) Are there statistically significant differences between prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience and prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience in relation to their efficacy?

\* Ethics Committee Number: Approval for this research was obtained from the Hacettepe University Ethics Committee, on 26.09.2023. The number of the decision: E-66777842-900-00003101584

\*\* Assist. Prof. Dr., Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Teaching, Division of English Language Teaching, Ankara-TÜRKİYE. e-mail: [ifaltay@hacettepe.edu.tr](mailto:ifaltay@hacettepe.edu.tr) (ORCID: 0000-0003-0567-1818)

## 1.1. Underlying Theories Related to the Concept of Teacher Efficacy

Rotter's social learning theory, Bandura's (1997) social cognitive theory and Achievement goal theory are three main theories that have connections to the concept of teacher efficacy. The first theory that is related to the concept of teacher efficacy is Rotter's social learning theory. This theory, which is also termed as Rotter's locus of control, define teacher efficacy based on internal locus of control and external locus of control. While teachers having internal locus of control believe that their own actions control the outcomes they get, teachers having external locus of control believe that their experiences are not controlled by themselves but by sources like chance, and fate that are outside themselves (Ucar & Bozkaya, 2016).

The second theory that is related to the concept of teacher efficacy is Bandura's social cognitive theory. Social cognitive theory is made up of three components: human agency, outcome expectancy and efficacy belief. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy belief is "the beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to produce given attainments". Since teachers' efficacy beliefs are generally open to change during the pre-service time, this construct should be investigated deeply (Bandura, 1997).

The third theory that is related to the concept of teacher efficacy is achievement goal theory. As Dweck & Leggett (1988) indicate, this theory is about the purposes and motives that the individuals get in achievement task. Achievement goal theory consists of four constructs, which are mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance achievement goal orientations (Elliot & Murayama, 2008). While prospective teachers having approach goals have confidence in their ability to design learning tasks well, those having avoidance goals do not believe in their ability to design learning tasks well. Hence, it can be stated that achievement goal construct may also be beneficial for defining motivation of prospective teachers (Retelsdorf et al., 2010).

## 1.2. Studies on Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy

In recent years, researchers have begun to focus on investigating prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs (Alcı & Yüksel, 2012; Baykara, 2011; Bergil & Sarıçoban, Çelik & Zehir Topkaya, 2017). Most of these researchers have found that while teachers having a high level of self-efficacy are more effective in their teaching and more likely to meet the learning needs and expectations of all their students, those having a low level of self-efficacy are less effective in their teaching and less likely to help all their students to reach their potential (Bergil & Sarıçoban, 2017).

Researchers have revealed that teachers having a high level of efficacy establish a better classroom atmosphere for their students (Deemer, 2004; Yost, 2002), are more engaged in teaching (Ware & Kitsantas, 2007) and enjoy higher levels of job satisfaction (TschannenMoran & Hoy, 2002). Moreover, efficacious teachers are more creative in using new teaching techniques (Wertheim & Leyser, 2002), utilize their class time most effectively (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), support powerful collegial ties (Friedman & Kass, 2002) and develop students' achievement (Shaughnessy, 2004; Wallik, 2002), set high standards for themselves and continue when encountering difficulties (Ross & Bruce, 2007). Hence, it can be stated that if a teacher has a higher level of efficacy, s/he will be more efficient in her/his teaching.

Relevant to prospective EFL teachers' levels of self-efficacy, while most of the researchers (e.g., Baykara, 2011; Balcı, Şanal & Ügüten, 2019) have found that prospective EFL teachers have high level teacher self-efficacy perceptions, some researchers (e.g. Çelik & Zehir Topkaya, 2017; Çankaya, 2018) have found that prospective EFL teachers have moderately high teaching efficacy perceptions. For instance, Balcı, Şanal & Ügüten (2019) investigated 291 prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. The results of the study indicated that prospective EFL teachers had relatively high-level teacher self-efficacy perceptions in general and for classroom management, student engagement and instructional strategies subscales. The results of the study also revealed that juniors had significantly higher scores than sophomores in both total scale and student engagement subscale. In another study, Çelik & Topkaya (2017) explored 145 prospective EFL teachers' teaching efficacy perceptions before and after field experience. The results of the study revealed that prospective EFL teachers significantly developed positive and higher teaching efficacy perceptions after field experience.

Related to the relationship between gender and prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, while some researchers (e.g., Baykara, 2011; Oğuz & Kalkan, 2011) have found that gender does not significantly affect prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, other researchers (e.g. Demirel, 2017) have revealed that female prospective EFL teachers were superior to male prospective EFL teachers in terms of efficacy in student engagement. For instance, Baykara (2011) explored 172 prospective EFL teachers' teacher efficacy perceptions by utilizing the adapted version of the teacher efficacy scale developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk (2001). The results of the study revealed that the level of teacher efficacy perceptions did not show a difference depending on sex. In another study, Demirel (2017) examined 208 prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs by using the teacher efficacy scale developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk's (2001). It was found in the study that there was a significant difference between female and male prospective EFL teachers in favor of females in terms of efficacy in student engagement.

Related to the link between undergraduate major and prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, researchers (e.g., Ülkümen, 2013) have found that undergraduate major is not linked with prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. For example,

Ülkümen (2013) investigated 285 prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs in relation to university type, years of teaching experience, mastery experience, undergraduate major, colleague support, and administration support. The results of the study showed that mastery experience, years of teaching experience, administration support, and university type were the statistically significant predictors of teacher efficacy of EFL instructors. However, undergraduate major was not the statistically significant predictor of teacher efficacy of EFL instructors.

With respect to the link between student achievement and prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, many researchers (e.g., Egel, 2009; Tilfarlioğlu & Ciftci, 2011; Lee, Cawthon & Dawson, 2013; Kırmızı, 2015) have found that student achievement is positively linked with teacher self-efficacy. To illustrate, Egel (2009) investigated 67 prospective EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs by using Hoy and Woolfolk's short form of the "Teacher Efficacy Scale," and Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's short form of the "Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale". The results of the study revealed that the prospective EFL teachers with a GPA of 3.00-4.00 scored higher in the mean scores for efficacy in instructional practices and classroom management than the ones with a GPA of 2.00-2.99 did.

Relevant to the relationship between practicum experience and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy, many researchers (e.g., Atay, 2007; Sevimeş & Subaşı, 2018; Faez & Valeo, 2012) have found that the practicum is highly effective in enhancing prospective EFL teachers' efficacy beliefs. For example, Atay (2007) investigated the relationship between pre-service teacher efficacy and their practicum experience in Turkey and revealed that prospective EFL teachers having a high level of efficacy learned much from the mentor teachers' teaching practices and from feedback on their own teaching. Likewise, Faez and Valeo (2012) found that language teachers' readiness can be enhanced by assisting them in getting experience in the classroom that can be guaranteed through adequate practicum and real teaching experiences.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1. Sample Characteristics

The study was conducted with the participation of 151 Turkish EFL students in English Language Teaching (ELT), English Language and Literature (ELL) and English Linguistics (EL) Departments at two state universities located in the western and central parts of Turkey. The subjects were randomly selected. Fifty-seven were males and ninety-four were females. Fifty-eight students were at ELT Department, forty-six students were at ELL Department and forty-seven students were at EL Department. Sixty-two students had CGPA level between 2.00-2.49, thirty students had CGPA level between 2.50-2.99, forty-five students had CGPA level between 3.00-3.49 and fourteen students had CGPA level between 3.50-4.00. While fifty-eight students had practicum experience, ninety-three students did not have practicum experience. Seventeen students had overseas experience and one hundred and thirty-four students did not have overseas experience. The demographic properties of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

*Distribution of Participants According to Gender, Undergraduate Major, CGPA and Practicum Experience*

		Frequency	Percentage (%)
<b>Gender</b>	Male	57	37.7
	Female	94	62.3
<b>Undergraduate Major</b>	English Language Teaching (ELT)	58	38.4
	English Language and Literature (ELL)	46	30.5
	English Linguistics (EL)	47	31.1
<b>Cumulative Grade Point Average Level (CGPA)</b>	2.00 - 2.49	62	41.1
	2.50 - 2.99	30	19.9
	3.00 - 3.49	45	29.8
	3.50 - 4.00	14	9.3
<b>Practicum Experience</b>	Yes	58	38.4
	No	93	61.6
<b>Total</b>		151	100

### 2.2. Instrument and Data Collection

To collect data about prospective EFL Teachers' efficacy levels in relation to some independent variables, the researcher utilized the adapted version of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale developed by Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy (2001). The scale consisted of two parts. The first part asked about personal information such as gender, academic field, CGPA and taking school experience course at university and doing practice at school. The second part of the scale contained twenty-four items based on a 5-point Likert scale graded as (1=inadequate, 2=very little adequate, 3=a little adequate, 4=quite adequate and 5=very adequate). In the scale, items numbered 1,2,4,6,9,12,14,22 were related to student engagement, items numbered

7,10,11,17,18,20,23,24 were related to instructional strategies and items numbered 3,5,8,13,15,16,19,21 were related to classroom management.

In the original scale, the reliability value of the total scale was found to be .94, for student engagement, it was found to be .87, for instructional strategies, it was found to be .91, for classroom management, it was found to be .90 (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). In the present study, the reliability value of the total scale was found to be .95, for student engagement, it was found to be .87, for instructional strategies, it was found to be .89, for classroom management, it was found to be .89.

The paper questionnaires were administered to the prospective EFL teachers at two state universities (N=151) at the end of the Fall Semester of 2019-2020 Academic Year. The questionnaire required about 10 min to complete, and it was administered in the students' regular English class. Before students filled out the questionnaire, they were told that their responses to the questionnaire would remain confidential. Moreover, they were asked to give their responses as clearly as possible.

### 2.3. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS. 23). The demographic variables for this study were discrete data (nominal and ordinal); therefore, descriptive statistics were utilized to run for frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation (Beins, 2004; Heiman, 2001; Sekaran, 2003). A series of independent samples t-tests were employed to explore (a) whether there were significant differences between male prospective EFL teachers and female prospective EFL teachers in relation to their efficacy and (b) whether there were significant differences between prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience and prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience in relation to their efficacy. The ANOVA tests were conducted to reveal (a) whether there was a significant relationship between academic fields and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy and (b) whether there was a significant relationship between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1. Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy in Student Engagement

Table 2.

*Distribution of Mean Scores of Items with Respect to Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy in Student Engagement (N=151)*

<b>Efficacy in student engagement subscale</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	3.31	0.95
2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?	3.81	0.86
4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?	3.90	0.95
6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?	3.85	1.00
9. How much can you do to help your students' value learning?	3.80	0.95
12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?	3.81	0.97
14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	3.79	0.96
22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	3.76	1.04
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>0.96</b>

As seen in table 2, the results of the questionnaire indicated that although prospective EFL teachers were a little adequate regarding getting through to the most difficult students (scoring 3.31 on item 1 in the questionnaire), most of these prospective EFL teachers were quite adequate regarding (a) helping their students think critically (item 2, M=3.81; SD=0.86), (b) motivating students who show low interest in school work (item 4, M=3.90; SD=0.95), (c) getting students to believe they can do well in school work (item 6, M=3.85; SD=1.00), (d) helping their students' value learning (item 9, M=3.80; SD=0.95), (e) fostering student creativity (item 12, M=3.81; SD=0.97), (f) improving the understanding of a student who is failing (item 14, M=3.79; SD=0.96), (g) assisting families in helping their children do well in school (item 22, M=3.76; SD=1.04). That is, they generally indicated high level of efficacy in student engagement by scoring higher than 3.50 on most of the items on the five-point scale.

Table 3.

*Distribution of Mean Scores of Items with Respect to Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy in Instructional Strategies (N=151)*

<b>Efficacy in instructional strategies subscale</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	3.70	0.96
10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	3.84	0.95
11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	3.71	1.04
17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	3.61	1.00
18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	3.69	0.93
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	3.78	0.99
23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	3.74	1.01
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	3.76	0.98
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>0.98</b>

As seen in table 3, the results of the questionnaire showed that all of these prospective EFL teachers were quite adequate regarding (a) responding to difficult questions from their students (item 7,  $M=3.70$ ;  $SD=0.96$ ), (b) gauging student comprehension of what they have taught (item 10,  $M=3.84$ ;  $SD=0.95$ ), (c) crafting good questions for their students (item 11,  $M=3.71$ ;  $SD=1.04$ ), (d) adjusting their lessons to the proper level for individual students (item 17,  $M=3.61$ ;  $SD=1.00$ ), (e) using a variety of assessment strategies (item 18,  $M=3.69$ ;  $SD=0.93$ ), (f) providing an alternative explanation or example when students are confused (item 20,  $M=3.78$ ;  $SD=0.99$ ), (g) implementing alternative strategies in their classroom (item 23,  $M=3.74$ ;  $SD=1.01$ ) and (h) providing appropriate challenges for very capable students (item 24,  $M=3.76$ ;  $SD=0.98$ ). That is, they generally stated a high level of efficacy in instructional strategies by scoring higher than 3.50 on all of the items on the five point scale.

Table 4.

*Distribution of Mean Scores of Items with Respect to Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy in Classroom Management (N=151)*

<b>Efficacy in classroom management subscale</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	3.73	0.95
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	3.88	1.01
8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	3.74	0.90
13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	3.83	1.00
15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	3.61	1.09
16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	3.57	0.99
19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	3.70	1.06
21. How well can you respond to defiant students?	3.66	1.01
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>1.00</b>

As seen in Table 4, the results of the questionnaire indicated that all of these prospective EFL teachers were quite adequate regarding (a) controlling disruptive behavior in the classroom (item 3,  $M=3.73$ ;  $SD=0.95$ ), (b) making their expectations clear about student behavior (item 5,  $M=3.88$ ;  $SD=1.01$ ), (c) establishing routines to keep activities running smoothly (item 8,  $M=3.74$ ;  $SD=0.90$ ), (d) getting children to follow classroom rules (item 13,  $M=3.83$ ;  $SD=1.00$ ), (e) calming a student who is disruptive or noisy (item 15,  $M=3.61$ ;  $SD=1.09$ ), (f) establishing a classroom management system with each group of students (item 16,  $M=3.57$ ;  $SD=0.99$ ), (g) keeping a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson (item 19,  $M=3.70$ ;  $SD=1.06$ ) and (h) responding to defiant students (item 21,  $M=3.66$ ;  $SD=1.01$ ). That is, they generally stated high level of efficacy in classroom management by scoring higher than 3.50 on all of the items on the five point scale.

### 3.2. Gender and Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy

Table 5.

*Mean Differences Between Male Prospective EFL Teachers and Female Prospective EFL Teachers in Relation to Their Efficacy*

Items	Subscale	Male (n=57) (M, SD)	Female (n=94) (M, SD)	t-value	p
5	Efficacy in classroom management	3.63 (1.14)	4.03 (0.90)	-2.375	.019*
6	Efficacy in student engagement	3.54 (1.16)	4.04 (0.84)	-3.043	.003*
8	Efficacy in classroom management	3.49 (0.98)	3.90 (0.81)	-2.784	.006*
9	Efficacy in student engagement	3.59 (1.04)	3.93 (0.86)	-2.155	.033*
10	Efficacy in instructional strategies	3.56 (1.16)	4.02 (0.74)	-2.956	.004*
11	Efficacy in instructional strategies	3.47 (1.15)	3.86 (0.94)	-2.249	.026*
12	Efficacy in student engagement	3.61 (1.16)	3.93 (0.82)	-1.986	.049*
16	Efficacy in classroom management	3.35 (1.09)	3.71 (0.91)	-2.191	.030*
17	Efficacy in instructional strategies	3.31 (1.13)	3.79 (0.87)	-2.926	.004*
18	Efficacy in instructional strategies	3.49 (1.10)	3.81 (0.78)	-2.123	.035*
22	Efficacy in student engagement	3.45 (1.13)	3.95 (0.93)	-2.938	.004*
23	Efficacy in instructional strategies	3.46 (1.11)	3.92 (0.90)	-2.819	.005*

\* p < 0.05

To reveal whether there were significant differences between male prospective EFL teachers (n=57) and female prospective EFL teachers (n=94) in relation to their efficacy, a series of independent samples t-tests were performed to compare the means of these two groups. Based on the results of the independent samples t-tests, it was revealed that there were significant differences between male prospective EFL teachers' mean scores and female prospective EFL teachers' mean scores with respect to the items numbered 5 [t (149)= -2.375, p= .019, p <0.05], 6 [t (149)= -3.043, p= .003, p <0.05], 8 [t (149)= -2.784, p= .006, p <0.05], 9 [t (149)= -2.155, p= .033, p <0.05], 10 [t (149)= -2.956, p= .004, p <0.05], 11 [t (149)= -2.315, p= .026, p <0.05], 12 [t (149)= -1.986, p= .049, p <0.05], 16 [t (149)= -2.191, p= .030, p <0.05], 17 [t (149)= -2.926, p= .004, p <0.05], 18 [t (149)= -2.123, p= .035, p <0.05], 22 [t (83)= -2.938, p= .004, p <0.05] and 23 [t (83)= -2.819, p= .023, p <0.05].

That is to state that female prospective EFL teachers had higher level of efficacy than male prospective EFL teachers with respect to the items numbered 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 22 and 23. To illustrate, female prospective EFL teachers (M=4.03, SD=0.90) indicated that they made their expectations clear about student behavior more than male prospective EFL teachers did (M=3.63, SD=1.14) with respect to item 5 (Subscale: Efficacy in classroom management). Similarly, female prospective EFL teachers (M= 4.04, SD= 0.84) stated that they could get students to believe they could do well in school work more than male prospective EFL teachers did (M=3.54, SD= 1.16) with respect to item 6 (Subscale: Efficacy in student engagement). Likewise, female prospective EFL teachers (M= 4.02, SD= 0.74) stated that they could gauge student comprehension of what they had taught more than male prospective EFL teachers did (M=3.56, SD= 1.16) with respect to item 10 (Subscale: Efficacy in instructional strategies). Hence, it can be stated female prospective EFL teachers had higher level of efficacy in classroom management, student engagement and instructional strategies than male prospective EFL teachers.

### 3.3. Undergraduate Major and Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy

Table 6.

*Prospective EFL Teachers' Different Undergraduate Majors in Relation to Their Efficacy*

Items	Subscale	Undergraduate Majors			F (ANOVA) Scheffe Test
		(1) English Language Teaching (n= 58) (M, SD)	(2) English Language & Literature (n= 46) (M, SD)	(3) English Linguistics (n= 47) (M, SD)	
6	Ef. in St. Eng.	4.10 (0.80)	3.86 (0.85)	3.53 (1.24)	.014*
12	Ef. in St. Eng.	4.05 (0.60)	3.78 (0.98)	3.55 (1.24)	(1) > (2) > (3) .031*
17	Ef. in Ins. Str.	3.55 (0.90)	3.95 (0.94)	3.36 (1.11)	(1) > (2) > (3) .013*
23	Ef. in Ins. Str.	3.98 (0.71)	3.86 (0.93)	3.34 (1.27)	(2) > (1) > (3) .003*
					(1) > (2) > (3)

\* p < 0.05

To reveal whether there was a significant relationship between undergraduate majors and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy, the ANOVA tests were conducted. The results of ANOVA tests revealed that there was a significant relationship (a) between undergraduate major and prospective EFL teachers' getting students to believe they can do well in school work (item 6, subscale: Efficacy in Student Engagement, F=4.418, p= .014), (b) between undergraduate major and prospective EFL teachers'

fostering student creativity (item 12, subscale: Efficacy in Students Engagement,  $F=3.540$ ,  $p=.031$ ), (c) between undergraduate major and prospective EFL teachers' adjusting their lessons to the proper level for individual students (item 17, subscale: Efficacy in Instructional Strategies,  $F= 4.454$ ,  $p=.013$ ) and (d) between undergraduate major and prospective EFL teachers' implementing alternative strategies in their classroom (item 23, subscale: Efficacy in Instructional Strategies,  $F= 6.057$ ,  $p=.003$ ).

After the ANOVA tests, a series of post hoc tests (Scheffe tests) were performed to make multiple comparisons among three undergraduate majors. These post hoc tests revealed (a) that students of English Language Teaching Department had significantly higher level of efficacy in student engagement than those who were in other departments regarding getting students to believe they can do well in school work (item 6,  $p=.014$ ,  $p < .05$ ), (b) that students of English Language Teaching Department had significantly higher level of efficacy in student engagement than those who were in other departments regarding fostering student creativity (item 12,  $p=.031$ ,  $p < .05$ ), (c) students of English Language and Literature Department had significantly higher level of efficacy in instructional strategies than those who were in other departments regarding adjusting their lessons to the proper level for individual students (item 17,  $p=.013$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and (d) students of English Language Teaching Department had significantly higher level of efficacy in instructional strategies than those who were in other departments regarding implementing alternative strategies in their classroom (item 23,  $p=.003$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

### 3.4. CGPA and Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy

Table 7.

*Prospective EFL Teachers' Different Cumulative Grade Point Average Levels in Relation to Their Efficacy*

Items	Subscale	Cumulative Grade Point Average Levels				F (ANOVA) Scheffe Test
		(1) 2.00-2.49 (n= 62) (M, SD)	(2) 2.50-2.99 (n= 30) (M, SD)	(3) 3.00-3.49 (n= 45) (M, SD)	(4) 3.50-4.00 (n= 14) (M, SD)	
2	Ef. in St. Eng.	3.59 (0.99)	3.80 (0.84)	3.97 (0.62)	4.28 (0.72)	.020* (4) > (3) > (2) > (1)
5	Ef. in Cl. Man.	3.69 (1.11)	3.70 (1.02)	4.08 (0.90)	4.42 (0.64)	.028* (4) > (3) > (2) > (1)
6	Ef. in St. Eng.	3.62 (1.10)	3.66 (0.88)	4.06 (0.88)	4.57 (0.64)	.003* (4) > (3) > (2) > (1)
12	Ef. in St. Eng.	3.54 (1.22)	3.80 (0.80)	4.11 (0.64)	4.07 (0.61)	.019* (3) > (4) > (2) > (1)
13	Ef. in Cl. Man.	3.64 (1.16)	3.63 (1.03)	4.02 (0.72)	4.50 (0.65)	.010* (4) > (3) > (1) > (2)
23	Ef. in Ins. Str.	3.51 (1.18)	3.63 (0.92)	3.91 (0.79)	4.50 (0.51)	.005* (4) > (3) > (2) > (1)

\*  $p < 0.05$

To reveal whether there was a significant relationship between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy, the ANOVA tests were conducted. The results of ANOVA tests revealed that there was a significant relationship (a) between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' helping their students think critically (item 2, subscale: Efficacy in Student Engagement,  $F=3.367$ ,  $p=.020$ ), (b) between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' making their expectations clear about student behavior (item 5, subscale: Efficacy in Classroom Management,  $F=3.111$ ,  $p=.028$ ), (c) between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' getting students to believe they can do well in school work (item 6, subscale: Efficacy in Student Engagement,  $F=4.791$ ,  $p=.003$ ), (d) between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' fostering student creativity (item 12, subscale: Efficacy in Student Engagement,  $F=3.405$ ,  $p=.019$ ), (e) between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' getting children to follow classroom rules (item 13, subscale: Efficacy in Classroom Management,  $F=3.883$ ,  $p=.010$ ) and (f) between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' implementing alternative strategies in their classroom (item 23, subscale: Efficacy in Instructional Strategies,  $F=4.444$ ,  $p=.005$ ).

After the ANOVA tests, a series of post hoc tests (Scheffe tests) were performed to make multiple comparisons among four CGPA levels. These post hoc tests revealed (a) that prospective EFL teachers having CGPA between 3.50 and 4.00 had significantly higher level of efficacy in student engagement than those having lower CGPA regarding help their students think critically (item 2,  $p=.020$ ,  $p < .05$ ), (b) that prospective EFL teachers having CGPA between 3.50 and 4.00 had significantly higher level of efficacy in classroom management than those having lower CGPA regarding making their expectations clear about student behavior (item 5,  $p=.028$ ,  $p < .05$ ), (c) that prospective EFL teachers having CGPA between 3.50 and 4.00 had significantly higher level of efficacy in student engagement than those having lower CGPA regarding getting students to believe they can do well in school work (item 6,  $p=.003$ ,  $p < .05$ ), (d) that prospective EFL teachers having CGPA between 3.00 and 3.49 had significantly higher level of efficacy in student engagement than those having lower CGPA regarding fostering student creativity (item 12,  $p=.019$ ,  $p < .05$ ), (e) that prospective EFL teachers having CGPA between 3.50 and 4.00 had significantly higher level of efficacy in classroom management than those having lower CGPA regarding getting children to follow classroom rules (item 13,  $p=.010$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and (f) that prospective EFL teachers having CGPA between 3.50 and 4.00 had significantly higher level of efficacy in instructional strategies than those having lower CGPA regarding implementing alternative strategies in their classroom (item 23,  $p=.005$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

### 3.5. Practicum Experience and Prospective EFL Teachers' Efficacy

Table 8.

*Mean Differences Between Prospective EFL Teachers with Practicum Experience and Prospective EFL Teachers Without Practicum Experience in Relation to Their Efficacy*

Items	Subscale	Prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience (n=58)	Prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience (n=93)	t-value	p
6	Efficacy in student engagement	4.10 (0.80)	3.69 (1.08)	2.451	.015*
12	Efficacy in student engagement	4.05 (0.60)	3.66 (1.12)	2.396	.018*

\* p < 0.05

To reveal whether there were significant differences between prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience (n=58) and prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience (n=93) in relation to their efficacy, a series of independent samples t-tests were performed to compare the means of these two groups. Based on the results of the independent samples t-tests, it was revealed that there were significant differences between the mean scores of these two groups with respect to the items numbered 6 [ $t(149) = 2.451, p = .015, p < 0.05$ ] and 12 [ $t(149) = 2.396, p = .018, p < 0.05$ ].

That is to state that prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience had higher level of efficacy than prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience with respect to the items numbered 6 and 12. To illustrate, prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience (M=4.10, SD=0.80) indicated that they got students to believe they can do well in school work more than prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience did (M=3.69, SD=1.08) with respect to item 6 (Subscale: Efficacy in student engagement). Similarly, prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience (M= 4.05, SD= 0.60) stated that they fostered student creativity more than prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience did (M=3.66, SD= 1.12) with respect to item 12 (Subscale: Efficacy in student engagement). Hence, it can be stated prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience had higher level of efficacy in student engagement than prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience.

#### 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of this study showed that prospective EFL teachers had a high level of efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management. These results were in line with the results of some of the previous studies done in various EFL/ESL learning environments (e.g., Baykara, 2011; Balcı, Şanal & Üğüten, 2019).

Relevant to the relationship between gender and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy, this study revealed that female prospective EFL teachers had higher level of efficacy in classroom management, student engagement and instructional strategies than male prospective EFL teachers. These findings were in consonance with those of the study done by Demirel (2017).

With respect to the relationship between undergraduate major and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy, this study unearthed that students of English Language Teaching Department had significantly higher level of efficacy in student engagement than those who were in other departments regarding (a) getting students to believe they can do well in schoolwork and (b) fostering student creativity. Moreover, this study also showed that students of English Language Teaching Department had significantly higher level of efficacy in instructional strategies than those who were in other departments regarding implementing alternative strategies in their classroom. On the other side, this study exhibited that students of English Language and Literature Department had significantly higher level of efficacy in instructional strategies than those who were in other departments regarding adjusting their lessons to the proper level for individual students. These findings were contrary to those of the study done by Ülkümen (2013).

Regarding the relationship between CGPA and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy, the present study revealed that prospective EFL teachers having CGPA between 3.50 and 4.00 had significantly higher level of efficacy in student engagement than those having lower CGPA regarding (a) helping their students think critically, (b) getting students to believe they can do well in schoolwork and (c) fostering student creativity. The present study also showed that that prospective EFL teachers having CGPA between 3.50 and 4.00 had significantly higher level of efficacy in classroom management than those having lower CGPA regarding (a) making their expectations clear about student behavior and (b) getting children to follow classroom rules. Additionally, the present study indicated that prospective EFL teachers having CGPA between 3.50 and 4.00 had significantly higher level of efficacy in instructional strategies than those having lower CGPA regarding implementing alternative strategies in their classroom. These findings provided evidence in support of the researchers (e.g., Egel, 2009; Tilfarlioğlu & Ciftci, 2011; Lee, Cawthon & Dawson, 2013; Kırmızı, 2015) who found that student achievement was positively linked with teacher self-efficacy.

Relevant to the relationship between practicum experience and prospective EFL teachers' efficacy, the results of this study indicated that prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience got students to believe they can do well in schoolwork more than prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience did. The results of this study also indicated that prospective EFL



teachers with practicum experience fostered student creativity more than prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience did. Thus, it can be indicated prospective EFL teachers with practicum experience had higher level of efficacy in student engagement than prospective EFL teachers without practicum experience. These findings were in line with those of other researchers (e.g., Atay, 2007; Sevimele & Subaşı, 2018; Faez & Valeo, 2012) who found that the practicum was highly effective in enhancing prospective EFL teachers' efficacy beliefs.

In conclusion, it can be stated that one of the most prominent factors of effective foreign language teaching is the teacher. It is very crucial that teacher education programs ensure teacher quality by adequately preparing their students to be effective teachers throughout their career. If student teachers do not receive the necessary courses which prepare and enhance their professional development, it will be a de-motivating challenge for them to meet the high level of performance demanded of them (Egel, 2009).

As Bakar, Mohamed and Zakaria (2012) indicate, high quality teaching is not dependent only on what teachers know but also on what they do in the EFL classroom. Because teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy have a strong effect on classroom management, teaching, motivation and communication with students and course organization, investigating teachers' self-efficacy beliefs may have important implications for language teaching field (Can & Daloglu, 2021).

### Research and Publication Ethics Statement

This study complies with research and publication ethics. Approval for this research was obtained from the Hacettepe University Ethics Committee, on 26.09.2023. The number of the decision: E-66777842-900-00003101584.

### Contribution Rates of Authors to the Article

This is a single-authored article.

### Statement of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

## 5. REFERENCES

- Alcı, B., & Yuksel, G. (2012). An Examination Into Self-Efficacy, Metacognition and Academic Performance of Pre-Service ELT Students: Prediction and Difference. *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(1), 143-165.
- Atay, D. (2007). Beginning teacher efficacy and the practicum in an EFL context. *Teacher Development*, 11(2), 203-219.
- Balcı, Ö., Şanal, F., & Ügüten, S.D. (2019). An investigation of pre-service English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. *International Journal of Modern Education Studies*, 3(1), 41-53.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Social cognitive theory. In S. Rogelberg (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Baykara, K. (2011). A study on teacher efficacy perceptions and metacognitive learning strategies of prospective teachers. *Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 40, 80-92.
- Beins, B. C. (2004). *Research methods. A Tool for Life*. Boston: Pearson.
- Bergil, A. S., & Sarıçoban, A. (2017). The use of EPOSTL to determine the self-efficacy of prospective EFL teachers: Raising awareness in English language teacher education. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(1), 399-411.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(6), 473-490.
- Çankaya, P. (2018). The exploration of the self-efficacy beliefs of English language teachers and student teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(3), 12-23.
- Çelik, H., & Zehir Topkaya, E. (2017). Pre-service English teachers' teaching-efficacy perceptions and their potential sources in the field experience. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 4(1), 12-24.

- Deemer, S. A. (2004). "Classroom goal orientation in high school classrooms: revealing links between teacher beliefs and classroom environments". *Educational Research*, 46(1), 73-90.
- Demirel, E. E. (2017). Investigating Pre-Service EFL Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 38, 221-232.
- Dweck, C. S. & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95 (2), 256-273.
- Egel, İlknur Pekkanlı. (2009). The prospective English language teacher's reflections of self-efficacy. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 1 (2009) 1561-1567.
- Elliot, A. J. & Murayama, K. (2008). On the measurement of achievement goals: Critique, illustration, and application. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(3), 613-628.
- Faez, F., & Valeo, A. (2012). TESOL teacher education: Novice teachers' perceptions of their preparedness and efficacy in the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 450-471.
- Friedman, I. A., & Kass, E. (2002). Teacher self-efficacy: A classroom-organization conceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 675-686.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.
- Heiman, G.W. (2001). *Understanding research methods and statistics: An integrated introduction for psychology*. 2nd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kırmızı, Ö. (2015). The Interplay Among Academic Self-Concept, Self-Efficacy, Self-Regulation and Academic Achievement of Higher Education L2 Learners. *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, 5(1), 32-40.
- Lee, B., S. Cawthon, and K. Dawson. 2013. Elementary and Secondary Teacher Self-efficacy for Teaching and Pedagogical Conceptual Change in a Drama-based Professional Development Program. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30, 84-98.
- Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task-related beliefs in mathematics during transition to junior high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(2), 247-258.
- Munoz, A.P, Palacio, M. & Escobar, L. (2012). Teachers' Beliefs About Assessment in an EFL Context in Colombia. *Profile*, 14(1), 143-158.
- Oğuz, E. & Kalkan, M. (2011). Examining teacher candidates' attitudes towards teaching profession and pupil control ideology. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(3), 903-917.
- Retelsdorf, J.; Butler, R.; Streblov, L. & Schiefele, U. (2010). Teachers' goal orientations for teaching: Associations with instructional practices, interests in teaching, and burnout. *Learning and Instruction*, 20, 30-46.
- Ross, J. & Bruce, C. (2007). Professional development effects on teacher efficacy; Results of randomized field trial. *The Journal of Educational Research*. 101(1), 50-66.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business: A skill-building approach*. 4th edition. Singapore: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sevimel, A. & Subaşı, G. (2018). The Factors Affecting Teacher Efficacy Perceptions of Turkish PreService English Language Teachers. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 8(1), 1-17.
- Shaughnessy, M. F. (2004). An interview with Anita Woolfolk: The educational psychology of teacher efficacy. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(2), 153-176.
- Tilfarlioglu, F.Y. & Ciftci, F.S. (2011). Supporting Self-efficacy and Learner Autonomy in Relation to Academic Success in EFL Classrooms (A Case Study). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1,10, 1284-1294.
- Tournaki, N., & Podell, D. M. (2005). The impact of student characteristics and teacher efficacy on teachers' predictions of student success. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 299-314.
- Tschannen-Moran, M.; Hoy, A. W. & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measurement. *Review of Educational Research*, 68 (2), 202-248.

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

Tschannen Moran & Hoy, A. W. (2002). 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.

Ucar, H & Bozkaya, M.Y. (2016). Pre-service EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, goal orientations and participations in an online learning environment. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, 17(2), 15-29.

Ülkümen, H.A. (2013). The predictors of English language preparatory school instructors' self-efficacy beliefs. Unpublished M.A Thesis. Ankara: The Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Yost, R. (2002). "I think I can": Mentoring as a means of enhancing teacher efficacy. *The Clearing House*, 75(4), 195-197.

Wallick, J. S. (2002). The relationship between teacher efficacy and student academic outcomes on curriculum-based measures. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, Stockton.

Ware, H., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Teacher and collective efficacy beliefs as predictors of professional commitment. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100(5), 303-310.

Wertheim, C., & Leyser, Y. (2002). Efficacy beliefs, background variables, and differentiated instruction of Israeli prospective teacher. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(1), 54-63.