

Language proficiency and pedagogical strategies in the English-language classroom: Determinants of preservice teachers' level of self-efficacy

Donna Bel F. Sy

*Romblon State University, The Philippines; De La Salle University-Manila,
The Philippines*

donna_bel_sy@dlsu.edu.ph

Abstract

Social Cognitive Theory explicates that teachers' efficacy beliefs shape the kind of environment that they create as they instill the culture of learning among their students (Bandura, 1977). Accordingly, every teacher education program offered in various colleges and universities aims to produce self-efficacious preservice teachers with high expectations that they can affect both the kind of context they build and the various pedagogical activities they present in the classroom. It is therefore the purpose of this study to determine the relationships among the perceived levels of preservice English-language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, language proficiency, and pedagogical strategies. Findings revealed that the respondents have a moderate level of self-efficacy beliefs, and this is significantly associated to their speaking proficiency. Results also showed that their classroom management is linked to their writing self-efficacy; whereas, their communicative strategies are correlated to classroom and outcome efficacy. Recommendations to offer language-training programs that will help boost the levels of language proficiency and self-efficacy of preservice English-language teachers are likewise presented.

Keywords: Classroom management, English proficiency, pedagogical strategies, self-efficacy

1. Introduction

Provisions for both elementary and secondary teacher education programs offered in different colleges and universities are systematized to hone the teaching potentials of students within the span of four years. These education students learn the curricular content of professional education subjects such as contemporary teaching approaches, instructional tools development, and assessment strategies prior to their actual practicum in the teaching field. Additional units in preservice teaching are mandatory for these students to do classroom observations and become acquainted with prevailing pedagogical conditions. In the duration of their internship, these preservice teachers develop their familiarity with students and the curriculum, and get valuable tips from seasoned teachers.

According to Borg (2003), teacher education programs significantly influence student-teacher's attitudes, beliefs, and cognition. These attitudes and beliefs also affect the

way they weave their insights, make relevant decisions, and manage educational activities in the classroom (Johnston, 1992). The said program aids them to understand more the impact of their beliefs as they learn to teach and see how these outlooks develop or change overtime through experience and socialization (Richardson, 1996). Hence, Korkut (2017) suggests that before these practicing teachers begin to work in the professional field, it would be beneficial to intensify first their cognition as teachers.

More so, in the area of secondary teacher education, preservice teachers who specialize in English are expected to have higher self-efficacy beliefs because of their edge in having a good command of the target language. Their proficiency in English helps them become more resistant in dealing with various communicative and speech situations that regularly occur in language classrooms. Therefore, their adeptness in using English as medium of instruction makes them more efficacious as they employ methods and approaches that work best in language teaching. This, of course, leads them to a successful result of their preservice teaching experience.

1.1 Theoretical Dimension of Self-Efficacy Concept

In a paper published by Albert Bandura (1977), he pointed out that observation is an important part of learning. If people observe other's behavior and happen to witness the outcome of this behavior, learning occurs. He also stressed that mental or cognitive processing has a significant role in seeing the bond between people and their behaviors (Fraser, 2014). This concept on cognitive processing is termed as 'self-efficacy.' In his Social Cognitive Theory, Bandura defined 'self-efficacy' as a psychological concept about one's own ability to establish and accomplish a specific task (Eggen & Kauchak, 2007). Bandura (1986) expounded his definition and stated that self-efficacy is concerned with what individuals can perform with whatever abilities they have (Ashton & Webb, 1982). It has two important components: efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. The former is related to one's belief in his own capacity to influence behavior, while the latter is the belief that the behavior will end up in a definite outcome (Albion, 1999). According to Bandura (1986), the belief of an individual about his own capability of accomplishing a particular undertaking is predisposed by four central factors: modeling, past performance, psychological state, and verbal persuasion. Eggen and Kauchak (2007) assert that the most important factor among these is the past performance on related tasks, or the so-called 'enactive experience.' Enactive experience is also termed as 'mastery experience.' This experience is considered as the most dominant foundation of efficacy. One's belief that a particular action or performance is successful will increase one's level of efficacy, and this adds to a better expectation for a future competent performance. On the contrary, the idea of a failed performance will contribute to anticipation that the future action will also be incompetent (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Another factor is 'modeling' in which self-efficacy for a behavior is elevated by imitating people who act the behavior effectively. Modeling creates a greater impact if an observer pays close attention to the model. If this model performs very well, the observer's efficacy will be heightened. However, if the model performed poorly, the observer's efficacy anticipation will decline. Meanwhile, 'verbal persuasion' is another factor that inspires others

to do or perform tasks. Social persuasion requires a detailed feedback of the performance or task, which usually comes from an expert, a supervisor, or a more knowledgeable other. Verbal persuasion may have its limitation when it comes to creating a persistent growth in self-efficacy, yet it can still add to a better performance because persuasion lifts the level of self-efficacy and induces an individual to do a task, try out new strategies, or strive more to achieve success (Bandura, 1986). Lastly, diverse psychological conditions such as stress, anxiety, hunger, or fatigue can affect one's self-efficacy beliefs; therefore, an individual can feel incompetent in accomplishing particular tasks (Scholz, Dona, Sud, & Schwarzer, 2002). Attributions likewise have an important role in this situation. If a successful performance is attributed to internal manageable sources such as skill or energy, self-efficacy is improved. If an attribution is linked to fortune or from the intervention of other people, self-efficacy may not be possibly reinforced (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Moreover, self-efficacy brings significance on people's decision-making, determination in accomplishing goals, and the extent of time they would spare for hindrances and difficulties. Therefore, self-efficacy is linked to motivation and personal achievement. Compared to those who have low self-efficacy level, people whose self-efficacy levels are relatively high tend to have greater goals, and they easily execute well-planned actions. They also capitalize on more time, effort, and energy. If they do not succeed, they recover faster and find other ways to realize their goals (Scholz et al., 2002).

1.2 Teacher's Self-Efficacy Beliefs

In the academic context, a teacher's belief about his or her own efficiency and effectiveness, also termed as 'teacher efficacy,' is an important element of behavioral transformation. Bandura (1997) affirms that the beliefs of teachers in their instructional efficiency affect the pedagogical setting they build as they instill the culture of learning among their students. Social cognitive theory also asserts that the sense of self-efficacy is always concomitant with optimistic teaching behaviors and successful student-learning outcomes (Henson, 2001).

In the area of language teaching, the beliefs of teachers who are novice in the teaching field need to be assessed in order to find out how their knowledge and personal views about language learning have influenced their pedagogical practices and choices as English-language teachers (Burns, 1992). According to Borg (2003), teachers are in-charge of creating the most conducive atmospheres so that their learners are guaranteed to acquire the needed knowledge and skills. Thus, to build such an affirmative setting for learning, there is a need to constantly examine how teachers' own predispositions and personal views affect their capacity to construct an ideal context for their students to learn the target language. Exploring on the levels of self-efficacy of practicing teachers tends to become noteworthy because their personal efficiencies continue to become stable through the years but may possibly worsen when they start to engage in a full-time teaching career.

In a study conducted by Woolfolk Hoy and Burke Spero (2005), they tracked down the experiences of practice teachers from the start until the end of their apprenticeship. These practicing teachers were found to exhibit low-efficacy level upon experiencing the actual classroom situations. This change in the scores of their personal efficacy was also linked

to the professed support provided by the school setting. Considering that English-language learners commonly came from subordinate institutions and urban environments, the self-efficacy of beginning educators turned to be the significant variable of the study (Durgunoğlu & Hughes, 2010). A similar study was also pursued by Soodak and Poodell (1997). They also tried to see how teaching experience influences the efficacy of both elementary and secondary practice teachers. They found that the personal teaching efficacy of those in the elementary level was primarily high in the duration of their internship. However, in their first year as full-fledged teachers, their self-efficacy belief decreased dramatically. Nevertheless, as they stay for more years in the teaching profession, their self-efficacy again increased, but their perceived sense of effectiveness did not reach similar levels attained by those teachers in the secondary level.

According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007), those teachers who start their careers being less self-efficacious end up discovering effective pedagogical approaches to improve their teaching skill over time, therefore elevating their sense of efficacy. Alternatively, it may be the other way around, shifting their career once they fail to do so. Also, teachers who are less efficacious are expected to use teacher-directed instructional strategies such as reading from books or lecture. However, in Bandura's (1977) argument, less efficacious teachers think that they are ineffective to teach passive and unmotivated learners. This is because learners' success depends on the external environment. Teachers seeing that external factors portray a role better than their personal skills may be more certain that they cannot do anything in a classroom with low-performing students. This reinforces the order of low anticipations and inconsistent academic outcomes that triggers more the drop of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs (Smylie, 1988). Whereas, Berg and Smith (2016) claim that preservice teachers who possess stronger self-efficacy beliefs are found to have higher commitment than those with weaker beliefs. In addition, those with noble dispositions and a higher self-efficacy exert more efforts in employing interventions and behavior management in dealing with the needs of brilliant students. Likewise, very efficacious teachers are more likely to utilize open-ended, inquiry-based, and learner-directed teaching approaches and strategies (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Guskey (1984) discovered that those teachers who love to teach and are certain of their potentials are exceedingly effective in the classroom. They are also the most responsive teachers to introduce innovative pedagogical practices; hence, students learn more from these type of teachers (Gavora, 2010). Contrariwise, those presumed to be ineffective seemed to be less innovative. Furthermore, it is also noted, based on related studies, that students learn more from highly efficacious teachers than those who are less efficacious (Coladarci, 1992).

Subsequently, it is vital to identify the existing beliefs of preservice English-language teachers because their conceptions affect their perceptions in the teacher education program. Indeed, the more efficacious these preservice teachers are in instructing their learners, the more determination they will put into their teaching and their diligence to assist learners who are struggling academically (Kennedy, 1997). Thus, this study wishes to add to the bulk of confirmatory findings based on Bandura's (1977) premise on self-efficacy beliefs.

1.3 Teachers' Efficacy and Other Related Factors

Numerous research have been conducted concerning teachers' perceptions and beliefs about their personal efficacy that intend to provide deeper insights into the field of teacher education. Some of these works paid attention to the factors that substantially contribute to how teachers become efficacious in their profession.

According to Mahboob (2004), there are two main factors that determine language teachers' pedagogical strategies and reason(s) for using or not using the target language in their classes: the teachers' language proficiency, and their attitude toward language learning. Berry (1990) conducted a research on language proficiency and found that this is a factor associated to a language teacher's feeling of self-efficacy. Lange (1990) noted that language proficiency underpins English-language teachers' professional confidence and emphasized that language competence is considered as an indispensable trait of an effective teacher.

The study of Eslami and Fatah (2008) also argued that there is a positive correlation between language teachers' perceived efficacy and their self-reported proficiency in English. The findings confirmed that the higher the teachers' professed language proficiency, the more effectual they felt.

Meanwhile, an added line of research by İnceçay and Keşli (2012) endeavored to determine preservice teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, their viewpoints concerning classroom management, and their teaching readiness using observational data and scales. They found that while self-efficacy of student-teachers and their readiness levels were interrelated, these were not linked to what they actually performed in their demonstration-teaching lessons. Moreover, in Cabaroğlu's (2012) study, student-teachers' confidence, self-efficacy, and levels of readiness transformed in different ways after their practice teaching. Some became affected by the experience affirmatively, while some had lesser self-efficacy and self-confidence afterward. Smylie (1988) recounted that preservice teachers' self-confidence related to their instructional practices and skills was the primary aspect connected to their self-efficacy, yet again emphasizing the implication of their professed readiness.

In the area of English-language teaching and learning, the study of Richards, Gallo, & Renandya (2001) revealed that most of the respondents firmly adhere to the notion that grammar is fundamental to learning a language and that their EFL or ESL students need direct grammar teaching, although several admitted that they utilize the communicative approach. In the study of Eslami and Fatah (2008), they found that the more possibilities that preservice teachers employ communicative-based strategies giving importance to meaning than accuracy, the more that they gain a sense of self-efficacy. This is incongruous to the findings of other related research such as Chacón's (2005), which discovered that most EFL teachers' instructional activities are centered on grammar.

As directed by this literature review, teacher-efficacy beliefs and concerns have substantial empirical importance. Correspondingly, the first-year teaching experience could be very crucial to the development of a teacher's sense of efficacy (Woolfolk Hoy & Burke Spero, 2005). Thus, the present study purposely explores on the self-efficacy beliefs among secondary preservice English-language teachers by focusing on their vital role as student-teachers. At the same time, this study examines the perceived appraisal of their capabilities that constitute their efficacy beliefs. The teacher efficacy model established by Tschannen

Moran et al. (1998) supports the framework of this study, which provides a suitable lens to scrutinize a relatable issue and to fully understand the nature of teacher education. Likewise, the study aims to ascertain the possible impact of preservice English-language teachers' beliefs about themselves as emerging professionals.

Similarly, this study bears significance in the present curriculum of the College of Education at Romblon State University because the findings may serve as basis for the conceptualization of effective teacher-training programs for English majors prior to their internship. It is assumed that the sensitivity of language teachers about their professional accountability should be deeply reflected in order to heighten their awareness that self-efficacy affects teaching performance, and also to determine how prepared and confident they are in handling language subjects. Therefore, this construct is pondered on as a research gap that still calls for supplementary attention. In finding answers to this inquiry, the researcher objectively trailed the statements of the problem initially worked out by Chacon (2005), which were also adapted by Eslami and Fatah (2008).

1.4 Research Questions

Generally, this research was conducted to determine the relationships among self-efficacy, language proficiency, and pedagogical strategies as employed by preservice English-language teacher-respondents during their internship. Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

- a. What are the respondents' perceived levels of efficacy in terms of classroom-management, personal, outcome, and teaching?
- b. What is the self-reported proficiency level of the respondents in terms of their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills?
- c. What self-reported pedagogical strategies do these respondents employ in teaching English?
- d. What are the correlations among the respondents' sense of efficacy for students' interactive engagement, classroom management, and pedagogical strategies, and their self-reported English proficiency?
- e. What are the correlations among the respondents' sense of efficacy for classroom management, personal, outcome, and teaching, and their self-reported use of pedagogical strategies?

2. Method

2.1 Respondents

The population of this study involved fourth-year students enrolled in preservice teaching at Romblon State University. Through a nonprobability sampling technique, particularly accidental or convenience sampling, the members of the population who were accessible during the present study were asked to willingly participate. Out of 108, 100 were readily

available. These 100 respondents were composed of three groups: 79 Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English student-teachers; 52 of which were enrolled at the main campus, while 13 and 14 were enrolled at Romblon and Sibuyan campuses, respectively. The remaining 21 respondents were Bachelor of Arts in English interns who were also enrolled at the main campus. These respondents shared two homogenous characteristics: (1) those who have completed the required number of hours for internship, and (2) those who have finished the final demonstration teaching in March 2018. Considering that the groups of respondents came from two different degree programs, the findings of the present study were generalized and particularly referred to all student-teachers involved in the data gathering.

2.2 Research Instruments

The present study is descriptive-quantitative in nature. To answer the research questions under investigation, three survey questionnaires were used to collect the needed data. The first instrument is an adapted short version of the Teacher Efficacy Scale designed by Gibson and Dembo (1984). This scale consists of five subcomponents, namely classroom-management efficacy, personal efficacy, outcome efficacy, and teaching efficacy. These subcomponents were measured using the six-item Likert scale: 1-strongly agree, 2-moderately agree, 3-agree slightly more than disagree, 4-disagree slightly more than agree, 5-moderately disagree, and 6-strongly disagree.

Another measured construct in this study is the self-report English proficiency, which is four-macro-skills-oriented (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, and writing). In gauging the responses, the researcher adapted the instrument developed by Chacon (2005), which has 12 items as descriptors of the said four macro skills. As explained by Eslami and Fatah (2008) in their study, language proficiency is a self-report inventory, which is considered as the most convenient type of self-assessment because it is easy to administer and shows practical associations with other variables.

The third instrument identifying the commonly used instructional strategies of the respondents was likewise adapted from the one developed by Eslami-Rasekh and Valizadeh (2004). This instrument has 10 items, which are ranked based on the Likert Scale ranging from 5-always, 4-most of the time, 3-sometimes, 2-rarely, and 1-never. The variable related to pedagogical strategies is focused on grammatically or communicatively oriented stratagems employed by the respondents during their preservice teaching.

2.3 Procedure

Because the present study is a replication of the papers authored by Chacon (2005), and Eslami and Fatah (2008), the researcher initially sought the consent of the said authors by sending them e-mail requesting their approval to allow the researcher to replicate the study and to adapt the data-gathering instruments. A few days after, the researcher received a favorable response from one of the authors. The researcher proceeded to the next step by seeking the permission of college deans and directors for the administration of the questionnaires. Upon the approval of the request, the researcher set the schedule for the distribution of the research instruments. After the survey forms had been accomplished by the respondents, the

collected data were then checked for completeness and accuracy. Afterward, the coding of the responses and the statistical analysis of data were conducted.

2.4 Method of Analysis

The present study applied both descriptive and inferential statistics in analyzing the quantitative data. For the descriptive analysis, the subcomponents for perceived self-efficacy, self-reported English proficiency, and instructional strategies employed in the classroom were measured using weighted mean (WM) through the use of the SPSS 24.0 software. The highest weighted mean identified in each subcomponent was cited for the level of emphasis. As to the inferential statistics, the overall WM of the three variables was used to determine their relationships (i.e., self-efficacy and English proficiency, and self-efficacy and instructional strategies) through Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient r .

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1

Perceived levels of classroom-management efficacy, personal efficacy, outcome efficacy, and teaching efficacy

	WM	DI
A. Classroom-management Efficacy		
1. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.	1.79	MA
2. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him quickly.	1.94	MA
Overall Weighted Mean	1.87	MA
B. Personal Efficacy		
3. When a student is having difficulty with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it to his or her level.	1.72	MA
4. If one of my students could not do a class assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at a correct level of difficulty.	2.05	MA
5. If a student did not remember the information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his or her retention in the next lesson.	1.79	MA
Overall Weighted Mean	1.85	MA
C. Outcome Efficacy		
6. When a student gets a better grade than he or she usually gets, it is because I found better ways of teaching that student.	1.66	MA

Table 1 continued...

	WM	DI
7. When the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I exert a little extra effort.	1.71	MA
8. When a student does better than usually, many times it is because I exert a little extra effort.	1.84	MA
9. If a student masters a new concept quickly, this might be because I knew necessary steps in teaching that concept.	1.89	MA
Overall Weighted Mean	1.78	MA
D. Teaching Efficacy		
10. A teacher is very limited in what he or she can achieve because a student's home environment is a large influence on his or her achievement.	2.17	MA
11. The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background.	2.24	MA
12. If parents would do more for their children, I could do more.	1.87	MA
13. The hours in my class have little influence of their home environment.	2.23	MA
14. If students are not disciplined at home, they are not likely to accept any discipline.	2.32	MA
15. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.	2.23	MA
16. The influence of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.	1.68	MA
Overall Weighted Mean	2.11	MA

Weighted Mean (WM)

5.50-6.00

4.50-5.49

3.50-4.49

2.50-3.49

1.50-2.49

1.00-1.49

Descriptive Interpretation (DI)

Strongly Disagree (SD)

Moderately Disagree (MD)

Disagree Slightly more than Agree (DSA)

Agree Slightly more than Disagree (ASD)

Moderately Agree (MA)

Strongly Agree (SA)

As seen in Table 1, the respondents have moderately agreed on their levels of classroom-management (M=1.87), personal (M=1.85), outcome (M=1.78), and teaching (M= 2.11) efficacies based on the overall weighted means. Among the four indicators of efficacy, most of the respondents considered outcome efficacy as the number one indicator of their self-efficacy. In classroom management, most respondents moderately agreed on the item (M=1.79) "When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students." This only means that the respondents know how to deal with students' difficulties if problems arise.

This supports the assertion of Berg and Smith (2016) that preservice teachers with noble dispositions and a higher self-efficacy exert more efforts in employing interventions and behavior management in dealing with the needs of brilliant students.

With respect to personal efficacy, the respondents moderately agreed on the item indicating that they can adjust when a student is having difficulty with an assignment ($M=1.72$). This only implies that the respondents can execute scaffolding techniques in dealing with students' problems. In outcome efficacy, on the other hand, a majority of the respondents moderately agreed on the item indicating that when their students get a better grade than they usually get, the respondents believe that they found better ways of teaching them ($M=1.66$). In this case, the respondents have professed their confidence that they can exercise good instructional techniques in the presentation of their subject matter, thus leading to a successful learning outcome. Meanwhile, in terms of teaching efficacy, most respondents moderately agreed on the item indicating that the influence of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching ($M=1.68$). This shows that the respondents believe that effective teaching can influence their students' overall well-being, regardless of their home upbringing and background.

Table 2

Levels of self-reported English proficiency of preservice teachers in listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills

	WM	DI
A. Speaking		
1. In face-to-face interaction with an English speaker, I can participate in a conversation at a normal speed.	2.04	MA
2. I know the necessary strategies to help maintain a conversation with an English speaker.	2.22	MA
3. I feel comfortable using English as the language of instruction in my English class.	1.84	MA
Overall Weighted Mean	2.03	MA
B. Listening		
4. I can watch English news (for example, CNN) and/or English films without subtitles.	1.54	MA
5. I understand the meaning of common idiomatic expressions used by English speakers.	2.06	MA
6. I can understand when two native English speakers talk at a normal speed.	1.73	MA
Overall Weighted Mean	1.78	MA

Table 2 continued ...

	WM	DI
C. Reading		
7. I can understand English magazines, newspapers, and popular novels.	1.38	SA
8. I can draw inferences or conclusions from what I read in English.	1.79	MA
9. I can figure out the meaning of unknown words in English from context.	2.13	MA
Overall Weighted Mean	1.77	MA
D. Writing		
10. I can easily write business and personal letters in English and can always find the right words to convey what I want to say.	2.16	MA
11. I can fill in different kinds of application forms in English such as a bank-account application.	2.41	MA
12. I can write a short essay in English on a topic of my knowledge.	1.39	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	1.99	MA

Weighted Mean (WM)

5.50 - 6.00

4.50 - 5.49

3.50 - 4.49

2.50 - 3.49

1.50 - 2.49

1.00 - 1.49

Descriptive Interpretation (DI)

Strongly Disagree (SD)

Moderately Disagree (MD)

Disagree Slightly more than Agree (DSA)

Agree Slightly more than Disagree (ASD)

Moderately Agree (MA)

Strongly Agree (SA)

As shown in Table 2, the respondents moderately agreed on their level of language proficiency. Among the four indicators of language proficiency, a majority of the respondents declared 'reading' to be their top macro skill, with the mean score of 1.77. In speaking proficiency, most respondents 'moderately agreed' that they feel comfortable using English as the language of instruction in their English class, with a total mean score of 1.84. When it comes to their listening proficiency, the respondents believed that their listening proficiency is 'average' and admitted that they can watch English news (for example, CNN) and/or English films without subtitles, with the total weighted mean score of 1.54. Also, a majority 'moderately agreed' on their writing proficiency; however, they 'strongly agreed' on the item indicating that they can write a short essay in English on a topic of their knowledge. Meanwhile, the overall weighted mean scores revealed that they have 'moderate' level of writing proficiency (M=1.99). Nevertheless, they 'strongly agreed' on the idea that they can understand English magazines, newspapers, and popular novels. Generally, as evident from the data, it can be inferred and interpreted that these preservice English-language teachers perceived that they are more efficacious in the productive macro skills rather than the receptive ones.

Table 3 shows that ‘most of the time,’ the respondents employed communicative pedagogical strategies based on the total mean score (M= 3.89). These communicative strategies are employed through providing students the opportunity to get into groups and discuss answers to problem-solving activities (M=4.14), and play English films and videos in class and ask students to engage in discussions about the films or videos (M=3.29). Most of the time, they also ask students to converse with one another in English and encourage them to find opportunities to speak English outside the classroom, and present these students with real-life situations (M=3.89). They, too, ask their students to come up with responses or answers in English appropriate to these situations ‘most of the time’ (M=4.38). The respondents, however, admitted that they merely ‘sometimes’ play audiotapes that feature native English speaker’ conversation exchanges and ask their students to answer questions related to the conversations (M=3.29).

Table 3
Self-reported pedagogical strategies of preservice teachers in teaching English

	WM	DI
A. Communicative		
4. I give students the opportunity to get into groups and discuss answers to problem-solving activities.	4.14	MT
5. I play audio tapes that feature native English speakers’ conversation exchanges and ask students to answer questions related to the conversations.	3.29	S
7. I play English films and videos in class and ask students to engage in discussions about the films or videos.	3.74	MT
9. I ask students to converse with one another in English and encourage them to find opportunities to speak English outside the classroom.	3.89	MT
10. I present students with real-life situations and ask them to come up with responses or answers in English appropriate to these situations.	4.38	MT
Overall Weighted Mean	3.89	MT
B. Grammatical		
1. I use students’ native language rather than English to explain terms or concepts that are difficult to understand.	3.53	MT
2. I ask students to memorize new vocabulary or phrases without showing them how to use the words in context.	2.67	S
3. As a classroom exercise, I ask students to translate single sentences in the English text into their native language.	3.05	S
6. I use grammatical rules to explain complex English sentences to students.	3.86	MT
8. I pay more attention to whether students can produce grammatically correct sentences than whether they can speak English with fluency.	3.82	MT
Overall Weighted Mean	3.39	S

Weighted Mean (WM)	Descriptive Interpretation (DI)
4.50 - 5.00	Always (A)
3.50 - 4.49	Most of the Time (MT)
2.50 - 3.49	Sometimes (S)
1.50 - 2.49	Rarely (R)
1.00 - 1.49	Never (N)

In terms of grammatical strategies, ‘most of the time,’ the respondents use students’ native language rather than English to explain terms or concepts that are difficult to understand ($M=3.53$); use grammatical rules to explain complex English sentences to students ($M=3.86$); and pay more attention to whether students can produce grammatically correct sentences than whether they can speak English with fluency ($M=3.82$). Meanwhile, it is only ‘sometimes’ that they ask students to memorize new vocabulary or phrases without showing them how to use the words in context and as a classroom exercise. They ask students to translate single sentences in the English text into their native language. The overall weighted mean scores ($M=3.89$) of Communicative against Grammatical ($M=3.39$) provide an impression that the respondents preferred to apply communicative strategies most of the time in their teaching, while grammatical strategies become optional.

As reflected in Table 4, the sig-2 tailed value 0.031 for classroom management against writing proficiency is less than 0.05; thus, there is a significant relationship between the classroom-management efficacy and the English proficiency in writing of the practice teachers at 5% level of significance. On the other hand, the sig-2 tailed value 0.005 for personal efficacy against speaking proficiency is less than 0.01; hence, there is a significant relationship between the personal efficacy and the speaking proficiency of the student-teachers at 1% level of significance.

Table 4

Correlations among English-language preservice teachers’ sense of self-efficacy and their self-reported English proficiency

Self- Efficacy	English Proficiency				
		Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing
Classroom-management	Pearson Correlation	0.046	0.101	-0.042	0.215*
	N	100	100	100	100
	Sig-2 tailed	0.229	0.186	0.515	0.031
Personal	Pearson Correlation	0.278**	0.023	0.132	0.093
	Sig-2 tailed	0.005	0.817	0.191	0.356
Outcome	Pearson Correlation	0.189	0.214*	0.067	0.112
	Sig-2 tailed	0.060	0.032	0.507	0.269
Teaching	Pearson Correlation	0.091	-0.053	0.046	0.160
	Sig-2 tailed	0.366	0.601	0.649	0.112

The sig-2 tailed value 0.032 for outcome efficacy against listening proficiency is less than 0.05; therefore, there is a significant relationship between the outcome self-efficacy and the English proficiency in listening of the practice teachers at 5% level of significance.

The rest of the variables in self-efficacy and English proficiency have no significant relationship.

Table 5

Correlations among English-language preservice teachers' sense of efficacy and their self-reported use of pedagogical strategies

Instructional Strategies	Efficacy				
		Classroom-management	Personal	Outcome	Teaching
Communicative	Pearson Correlation	-0.213*	-0.157	-0.261**	-0.084
	Sig-2 tailed	0.034	0.119	0.009	0.406
	N	100	100	100	100
Grammatical	Pearson Correlation	-0.050	-0.181	-0.164	-0.029
	Sig-2 tailed	0.622	0.071	0.103	0.773

Table 5 shows the correlations among English-language preservice teachers' sense of efficacy and their self-reported use of pedagogical strategies. In communicative against classroom-management, the sig-2 tailed value 0.034 is less than 0.05; hence, there is a significant relationship between instructional communicative strategies and classroom-management efficacy at 5% level of significance. Further, the sig-2 tailed value 0.009 for communicative instructional strategies against outcome is less than 0.01. This shows that there is a significant relationship between communicative instructional strategies and outcome efficacy at 1% level of significance. The rest of the variables under instructional strategies and efficacy have no significant relationships.

The findings presented here are relatively pertinent to the theory of Bandura on self-efficacy. Bandura (1997) upholds the notion that teachers' beliefs about their instructional effectiveness affect the kind of context they create to cultivate the culture of effective learning. This concept shows evidence on the number of findings in the present study. Based on the results, seven major significant findings were accounted. First, it was revealed that among the different components of self-efficacy belief, the preservice English-language teachers acknowledged that they are moderately efficacious constituted by their moderate level of outcome efficacy. This supports the claim of Bandura (1997) that the beliefs of teachers in their instructional efficiency affect the educational setting that they create as they instill the culture of learning among their students. Here, the respondents are found to have a 'moderate' efficacy belief that their teaching behavior ends up in a particular outcome. Second, the respondents were also found to have 'moderate' level of language proficiency accompanied by their reading skill. This confirms the study of Eslami and Fatah (2008) that there is a positive correlation between teachers' perceived efficacy and their self-reported

proficiency in English. Their findings established that the higher the teachers' professed language proficiency, the more effective they felt. Although the results of the present study revealed the moderate level of the respondents' language proficiency, it can still be reflected as satisfactory level. Third, positive correlations were determined in terms of the significant relationship between classroom-management efficacy and English proficiency in writing. This attests the finding of Chacon (2005), which claimed that a teacher's higher writing proficiency can be linked to higher efficacy in classroom management. She affirmed in her study that classroom management has no close association with listening, speaking, and reading. Fourth, the preservice teachers' personal efficacy and speaking proficiency were found to be significantly correlated. This means that the preservice teachers projected themselves to be speaking proficiently; hence, they become personally efficacious, especially in giving instructions to their students. Their speaking proficiency also aids them to become confident in articulating their lessons, thus becoming more efficacious in their beliefs about their capability in meeting their learners' intellectual needs. Fifth, another positive correlation was found between outcome self-efficacy and listening proficiency. This result supports the conjecture that these preservice teachers are more inclined to listening to student concerns at times that they need to introduce activities that attain pedagogical outcomes. This is supported by Guskey's (1984) study, which found that teachers who loved teaching and felt assured about their potentials were highly efficacious in the classroom and seemed to be the most amenable to apply innovative practices. Sixth, communicative instructional strategies were linked to classroom efficacy. It only shows that most of the student-teachers use communication strategies in managing their classrooms, specifically in dealing with the behavior of their students. Lastly, outcome efficacy was significantly associated with communicative instructional strategies. Students' outcomes are found to be largely related to how teachers apply communicative strategies among their learners for them to easily acquire and learn the target language. This result holds true to the statement of Eslami and Fatah (2008) that communicative-based pedagogical strategies were mostly favored by preservice teachers who have higher self-efficacy beliefs, although in the present study, the respondents were found to be 'moderately' efficacious only. This result, however, contradicts the finding of Chacon (2005), which revealed that most English teachers choose to focus on grammar rather than adhering to the communicative teaching approach.

4. Conclusion

The major conclusions drawn from this research are the following: First, a majority of the preservice teachers possess moderate, but still acceptable, level of language proficiency, particularly in writing. This implies that the 'moderate' proficiency level in the three macro skills suggests that these preservice teachers still need to undergo a rigid language-training program that can enhance both their macro-receptive and macro-productive skills prior to their actual exposure to the teaching field. A well-planned training will raise their English language proficiency level and will help boost their sense of self-efficacy. Therefore, the higher self-efficacy belief they will have among themselves, the more effective they will become in the area of ESL instruction. It is deemed appropriate that preservice teachers be

encouraged to participate in this training and to be open for improvements, so they can reflect on how their cognition may affect their future actions related to teaching. As to the limitation of this finding, the present study recommends to future researchers to utilize standardized instruments or tools that can assess the actual language-proficiency levels of preservice teachers. The self-reported data provided by the respondents delimit the reliability of the results because such data were merely based on their perceived personal appraisal.

Next, this study confirms the types of efficacious novice teachers that represent the educational domain in language instruction: the personal efficacious and the outcome efficacious. The personal-efficacious teachers are those respondents who find themselves effective in verbal inducements through giving instructions and directions to students. The outcome efficacious teachers, on the other hand, are those who try their best to become successful in achieving their personal and pedagogical goals. It is settled here that a majority of the respondents are efficacious in dealing more with the outcomes of their actions and behaviors as preservice teachers, rather than focusing more attention on their personal worth. Another conclusion drawn from the findings is that the preservice English teachers paid extra attention on the development of fluency than accuracy because they preferred communicative to grammatical teaching strategies. This also means that these novice teachers chose to adapt to the changing demands of the teaching profession, for they hardly stick to the old, conventional teaching methods. This is evident in the positive correlations of their communicative instructional strategies with classroom-management and outcome efficacies.

Furthermore, this study concludes that the preservice English-language teachers have not yet reached the optimum level of self-efficacy as revealed by their moderate agreement on the various classroom conditions presented to them. This implies that they have not completely acquired the maximum level of development expected of them as ESL teachers. Their language proficiency and their skills in the appropriate use of instructional strategies are two important factors that affect their cognition. Therefore, it is high time that the teacher education program and professional development program in the University should be revisited for probable modification. Taking the suggestion of Özder (2011), the internship durations may also be adjusted in order for teacher education students to benefit from more experienced cooperating teachers.

The results of this study hope to bring more opportunities for further research in the field of English-language teaching and learning. More studies can take advantage of these results, for these will provide accompanying information on teacher cognition and efficacy beliefs. For a qualitative sort, future research endeavors may concentrate on conducting focus group discussions or structured interviews among panel evaluators, supervising instructors, and cooperating teachers as regards the performance of preservice teachers during their internship and demonstration teaching. Performance feedback from them will serve as guide in the conceptualization of an effective language-training program. Other research enthusiasts may also validate the results of the present study by involving preservice teachers from other areas of specialization such as Mathematics and Science, and may consider other significant variables to be correlated to preservice teachers' sense of self-efficacy. Lastly, because this study was administered after the demonstration teaching of the respondents, it is likewise recommended to future researchers to execute two shot surveys to be conducted before and after the preservice practicum, and subsequently do a comparison of the student-

teachers' self-efficacy levels. This aspect can verify the claim of Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007), which argue that those teachers who begin their careers being less self-efficacious end up discovering operative didactic methods to progress on their teaching skills over time, therefore increasing their level of efficacy beliefs.

References

- Albion, P. (1999). Self-efficacy beliefs as indication of teachers preparedness of teaching with technology. *Association for Advancement of Computing in Education*.
- Ashton, P., & Webb, R.B. (1982). Teachers' sense of efficacy: Toward an ecological model. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research*.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY, US: WH Freeman/ Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.
- Berg, D.A., & Smith, L.F. (2016). Preservice teacher self-efficacy beliefs: An opportunity to generate good research in the Asia-Pacific region. In S. Garvis, & D. Pendergast (Eds.), *Asia-Pacific perspectives on teacher Self-efficacy* (pp. 1-17). Rotterdam/ Boston/Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Berry, R. (1990). The role of language improvement in in-service teacher training programmes: Killing two birds with one stone. *System*, 18(1), 97-105.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36, 81-109.
- Burns, A. (1992). Teacher beliefs and their influence on classroom practice. *Prospect*, 7(3), 56-65.
- Cabaroğlu, N. (2012). Prospective EFL teachers' perceptions of classroom management and misbehavior. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 41(1), 117-132.
- Chacon, C. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 257-272.
- Coladarci, T. (1992). Teachers' sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 60, 323-337.

- Durgunoğlu, A.Y., & Hughes, T. (2010). How prepared are the U.S. preservice teachers to teach English language learners? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(1), 32-41.
- Eggen, P., & Kauchak, D. . (2007). *Educational psychology* (7th ed.) New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Eslami, Z., & Fatah, A. (2008). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies: A study of nonnative EFL teachers in Iran. *TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 11(4), 1-19.
- Eslami-Razek, Z., & Valizadeh, K. (2004). Classroom activities viewed from different perspectives: Learners' voice vs. teachers' voice. *TESL-EJ*, 8, 1-13. Retrieved from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej31/a2.html>
- Fraser, L.E. (2014). Teacher efficacy beliefs: How general teachers feel towards English language learners. *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Retrieved from <https://mds.marshall.edu/etd/828>
- Gavora, P. (2010). Slovak preservice teacher self-efficacy: Theoretical and research considerations. *The New Educational Review*, 21(2), 17-30.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M.H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 569-582.
- Guskey, T. (1984). The influence of change in instructional effectiveness upon the affective characteristics of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 245-259.
- Henson, R.K. (2001). Teacher self-efficacy: Substantive implications and measurement dilemmas. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Educational Research Exchange. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED452208.pdf>
- İnceçay, G., & Keşli, D.Y. (2012). Classroom management, self-efficacy and readiness of Turkish preservice English teachers. *ELT Research Journal*, 1(3), 189-198.
- Johnston, S. (1992). Images: A way of understanding the practical knowledge of student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 8, 123- 136.
- Kennedy, M. (1997). Defining an ideal teacher education program (Mimeo). *National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education*.
- Korkut, P. (2017). Classroom management in preservice teachers' teaching practice demo lessons: A comparison to actual lessons by in-service English teachers. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(4), 1-17.

-
- Lange, D. (1990). A blueprint for a teacher development program. In J.C. Richards, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 245-268). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or nonnative: What do students enrolled in an Intensive English program think? In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience* (pp. 121-149). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Özder, H. (2011). Self-efficacy beliefs of novice teachers and their performance in the classroom. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(5), 1-15.
- Richards, J.C., Gallo, P.B., & Renandya, W.A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *PAC Journal*, 1, 41-58.
- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.
- Scholz, U., Dona, B.G., Sud, S., & Schwarzer, R. (2002). Cross-cultural assessment of coping resources: The general perceived self-efficacy scale. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 18(3), 242-251.
- 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.
- Soodak, L.C., & Podell, D.M. (1997). Efficacy and experience: Perceptions of efficacy among preservice and practicing teachers. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 30, 214-221.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A.W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944-956.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202-248 .
- Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Burke Spero, R. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 343-356.

Appendix A

Woolfolk Hoy's (2001) short form of teacher efficacy scale

A number of statements about organizations, people, and teaching are presented below. The purpose is to gather information regarding the actual attitudes of educators concerning these statements. There are no correct or incorrect answers. We are interested only in your frank opinions. Your responses will remain confidential.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of each statement.

KEY: **1** = *strongly agree*, **2** = *moderately agree*, **3** = *agree slightly more than disagree*, **4** = *disagree slightly more than agree*, **5** = *moderately disagree*, **6** = *strongly disagree*

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. If students are not disciplined at home, they are not likely to accept any discipline. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. A teacher is very limited in what he or she can achieve because a student's home environment is a large influence on his or her achievement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. If parents would do more for their children, I could do more. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his or her retention in the next lesson. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. If one of my students could not do a class assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really cannot do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depend on his or her home environment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Appendix B

Chacon (2005) English proficiency scale

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of each statement.

KEY: **1** = *strongly agree*, **2** = *moderately agree*, **3** = *agree slightly more than disagree*, **4** = *disagree slightly more than agree*, **5** = *moderately disagree*, **6** = *strongly disagree*

English Proficiency Subscales

1. In face-to-face interaction with an English speaker, I can participate in a conversation at a normal speed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I know the necessary strategies to help maintain a conversation with an English speaker.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I feel comfortable using English as the language of instruction in my English class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I can watch English news (for example, CNN) and/or English films without subtitles.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I understand the meaning of common idiomatic expressions used by English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I can understand when two native English speakers talk at a normal speed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I can understand English magazines, newspapers, and popular novels.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I can draw inferences or conclusions from what I read in English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I can figure out the meaning of unknown words in English from context.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I can easily write business and personal letters in English and can always find the right words to convey what I want to say.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I can fill in different kinds of application forms in English such as a bank-account application.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. I can write a short essay in English on a topic of my knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C

Eslami-Rasekh and Valizadeh (2004) instructional strategies

Directions: Kindly indicate the degree to which you manifest each of the behaviors. Encircle the number code that corresponds to your choice. The number codes and their descriptions are as follows:

5	91% to 100% of the time	ALWAYS
4	66% to 90% of the time	MOST OF THE TIME
3	36% to 65% of the time	SOMETIMES
2	11% to 35% of the time	RARELY
1	below 11% of the time	NEVER

Pedagogical Strategies Subscales

1. I use students' native language rather than English to explain terms or concepts that are difficult to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I ask students to memorize new vocabulary or phrases without showing them how to use the words in context.	1	2	3	4	5
3. As a classroom exercise, I ask students to translate single sentences in the English text into their native language.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I give students the opportunity to get into groups and discuss answers to problem-solving activities.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I play audio tapes that feature native English speakers' conversation exchanges and ask students to answer questions related to the conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I use grammatical rules to explain complex English sentences to students.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I play English films and videos in class and ask students to engage in discussions about the films or videos.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I pay more attention to whether students can produce grammatically correct sentences than whether they can speak English with fluency.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I ask students to converse with one another in English and encourage them to find opportunities to speak English outside the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I present students with real-life situations and ask them to come up with responses or answers in English appropriate to these situations.	1	2	3	4	5