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ABSTRACT

To understand EFL teachers’ actions and pedagogical decisions in the classroom, it is necessary to investigate teachers’ beliefs because teachers’ beliefs and perceptions tend to guide their actions and behaviors. According to Bandura’s social cognitive theory, teachers’ beliefs about their instructional efficacy influence the kind of environment they create to orchestrate learning. Thus, teachers with a high sense of teaching efficacy usually believe that difficult students are teachable if the teacher puts in an extra effort. Conversely, teachers with a low sense of efficacy tend to believe that there is little they can do to teach unmotivated students because students’ success often depends on the external environment.

This study explored the teacher efficacy beliefs of selected Venezuelan EFL middle school teachers. The purpose of the study was twofold. On the one hand, it sought to investigate the EFL teachers’ self-reported proficiency in English and the extent to which they reported that they felt well prepared to teach English. On the other hand, the study also addressed the need for research on teacher efficacy in the field of foreign/second languages, particularly in EFL contexts. Quantitative as well as qualitative methods were used to answer the research questions in regards to EFL teachers’ self-reported sense of efficacy, self-reported English language proficiency, and self-reported strategies used to teach EFL and manage student behavior.
A 78-item questionnaire (adapted from Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2000; Riggs and Enochs, 1990) was used to assess the teacher efficacy of 100 Venezuelan EFL middle school teachers who participated in the study. In addition, selected interviews with 20 respondents were conducted to further explore these EFL teachers' views.

Factor analytic procedures showed that Venezuelan EFL teachers had two dimensions of teacher efficacy as has also been shown in past studies. Findings also suggested that self-reported English language proficiency was a strong predictor of teacher efficacy. Based on the results of the study, implications were presented for preservice and in-service EFL teachers in Venezuela. Additionally, recommendations for further study were included. The study also includes a description of limitations and sample documents used to collect the data. The latter are included in the appendices.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In seeking to understand foreign language teacher behavior, it is crucial to examine the nature of their beliefs about language teaching and learning. Freeman (1996) argued that much of the research in foreign language teacher education has emphasized outcomes in students’ learning under the process-product paradigm, overlooking the fact that in order to understand how teachers deal with the “complexities” of everyday teaching, “we have to place teachers’ perceptions -their reasoning, beliefs, and intentions- at the center of any research account” (p. 95). Similarly, Johnson (1992) pointed out that research in foreign language education has long overlooked the cognitive dimensions of foreign/second language teachers and how their actions affect the nature of their teaching. Thus, researchers must examine teachers’ cognition as a way of understanding what teachers do when teaching and how they think when they teach.

Over the past four decades research (Cochran-Smith & Lyttle, 1999; Freeman, 1996; Johnson, 1992; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Richards, 1996) has shown that teachers’ beliefs are fundamental in guiding the actions they take in the classroom. Nespor (1987) posited that belief systems are important in shaping how an individual
organizes and defines tasks and problems. Although the relationship between cognition, task definition, and performance is complex, Nespor acknowledged, "beliefs perform the function of framing or defining the task at hand" (322). Similarly, Richards suggested that teachers develop rational principles based upon their belief system, and those principles function as rules that guide the teachers' actions. In other words, teachers' actions and behavior are tied closely to their beliefs, perceptions, assumptions, and motivation.

Additionally, Putnam and Borko (2000) contended that "How a person learns a particular set of knowledge and skills, and the situation in which the person learns, become a fundamental part of what is learned" (p.4). From this sociocultural perspective, it can be argued that teacher cognition affects, and is affected by, contextual factors through interaction with others inside and outside the classroom. As Freeman (1996) put it, "Teachers are constantly involved in interpreting their worlds: They interpret their subject matter, their classroom context, and the people in it. These interpretations are central to their thinking and their actions" (Freeman, 1996, p.98). Therefore, in order to understand why English as a Foreign Language teachers do what they do in their classrooms, it is fundamental to understand the beliefs that shape and guide their actions as language teachers.

Over the last three decades, many educational researchers have studied self-efficacy beliefs as a specific type of belief that accounts for the relationship between students' academic achievement and teachers' self-efficacy. In his article *Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioral change*, Bandura (1977) defined the construct of self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of
action required to produce given attainments" (p.3). Bandura (1997) wrote, “Evidence indicates that teachers’ beliefs in their instructional efficacy partly determine how they structure academic activities in their classrooms” (p.240).

Teachers’ sense of efficacy is pivotal in understanding teaching and learning. Therefore, researchers in fields such as mathematics and science have examined the perceived teacher efficacy and its impact on student academic achievement. However, in the field of English as a foreign language few studies of teachers’ sense of efficacy and its relationship to teaching and learning have been published. Thus, to examine how the perceived self-efficacy relates to the actions that guide English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers’ pedagogical practices is a need in the field, as a way to understand the complex process of teaching and learning a foreign language.

In a comprehensive literature review of “Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure,” Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, and Hoy (1998) suggested that in order to raise inservice teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs through intervention strategies, “Probably the most logical place to start is with the assessment of teaching competence” (p.238). From this perspective, this study sought to investigate the self-reported teaching competence of EFL middle school teachers not only with respect to the pedagogical knowledge of how to teach English, but also in terms of the knowledge and command of English of the EFL teachers in the study.

Statement of the Problem

The development of student communicative competence is a primary goal for teaching EFL in Venezuelan middle schools in grades 7 to 9. To meet this mandatory
national requirement, teacher education programs focus on the development of prospective teachers' proficiency in English as well as the development of their pedagogical knowledge and skills. Thus, upon graduation, EFL teachers are expected to have not only the language proficiency needed to teach English but also the required pedagogical knowledge of how to teach English. However, this expectation is not always met. At least based on the researcher's contacts with many EFL teachers in middle schools in Táchira State, some teachers seem to lack the necessary language proficiency to teach English for communicative purposes.

The purpose of this descriptive study was twofold. On the one hand, the study sought to investigate the EFL teachers' self-reported proficiency in English, and the extent to which teachers reported that they felt well prepared to teach the language. On the other hand, the study also addressed the need for research about teachers' sense of efficacy in English as a foreign language teaching in one setting outside of the U.S.

Background and context of the study

In Venezuela, English is taught as a foreign language. It is one of the required academic courses in the national curriculum in order to earn a high school diploma. The Ministry of Education released an official document in 1987 called Program of Study and Teacher's Manual 7th, 8th 9th grade Third Stage Basic Education Subject English, which contains the rationale, objectives, content, and suggested strategies for teaching English in the middle school (7th, 8th, 9th grade). For the two following years, 4th and 5th year, the goal of teaching English is mainly aimed at ESP (English for Specific Purposes, i.e., developing students competence to read and understand different types of reading texts).
Reading and understanding English is a skill that Venezuelan students use first, at the university, and later in their professional careers. In Venezuela, many journals, magazines, and books, especially for science and technology, are not translated into Spanish. Many of these publications are written in English.

In 7th to 9th grade, the teaching of English focuses on developing the students communicative competence to perform functions such as introducing themselves, requesting, complaining, agreeing/disagreeing, following and giving directions, and so forth. Reading and writing are also part of the instruction, but they have less emphasis in middle school.

The national curriculum for English instruction has been developed based on the tenets of the Notional-Functional approach to the teaching of foreign languages (Hymes, 1976). The document states, “the functional approach meets the major goal of English instruction which is to acquire the competence of the language in a natural, dynamic, and interesting way” (Program of Study and Teacher’s Manual, 1987, p.111). The Teacher’s Manual recommends integrating other approaches to language teaching as long as those approaches meet the objectives stated in the national curriculum.

The foreign language teacher education program at the University of Los Andes, Táchira State, Venezuela.

This is a five-year program for preparing teachers who intend to major in English. They obtain the degree of Licenciate in Education, Major: English. The requirements to enter the program are limited to a high school diploma and a GPA of at least 12 points. The grading scale is from zero to twenty. The lowest passing grade is 10. There are no established assessment or testing instruments required to evaluate students’
English proficiency or language aptitude before they enter the program. There does not exist a formal examination that assesses the prospective teachers’ oral proficiency before they obtain their degree in teaching EFL.

In 1996, the English teacher education program at the University of Los Andes Táchira underwent a major curricular reform. The traditional nine-semester program was gradually replaced by a five-year program. The curriculum was, and still is, mostly concentrated on developing pedagogical knowledge (i.e., abilities and skills on how to teach). Approximately 65% of the course curriculum concerns pedagogy and field experiences while approximately 35% deals with the specialist component (i.e., English competence). The Language Department is in charge of developing prospective teachers’ communicative competence in English while the Pedagogy Department is in charge of the pedagogical knowledge and field experiences. The subject matter or content knowledge component addresses the development of prospective teachers’ competence in English. Thus, the Language Department’s goal is to adequately prepare prospective teachers regarding the subject matter knowledge, that is, the acquisition of the communicative competence that enables them to acquire not only the linguistic competence of English (e.g., syntax, lexicon, grammar, phonology, and morphology), but also the pragmatic competence (e.g., what is appropriate behavior in particular situation).

Teaching English as a foreign language

In addressing the pedagogical issues in teaching English in foreign settings, it is important to make a distinction between the teaching of ESL (English as a Second Language) and the teaching of EFL (English as a Foreign Language). Celce-Murcia (1991) defined the terms as follows. ESL is “used in educational situations where
English is the partial or universal medium of instruction for other subjects” while EFL is “used in educational situations where instruction in other subjects is not normally given in English” (p. 21). For instance, immigrant students in mainstream classes in the U.S. would be in ESL classes, while Venezuelan students learning English in middle schools would be in EFL classes.

From this perspective, the context makes a major difference with regard to both ESL and EFL settings. The context requires different goals and purposes in each particular case. Context also requires the use of different materials, resources, syllabi, and strategies. In Venezuela, English is a mandatory subject matter taught in formal classroom situations. Students do not typically need to use the language for communicative purposes outside of the classroom because they use Spanish as the official common language spoken in the country. Thus, Venezuelan students do not have the same exposure to the target culture and language as ESL students in an English-speaking country such as the U.S. On the contrary, the input and contact with native speakers outside the classroom is very limited in Venezuela.

Nonetheless, according to the national curriculum students should learn English for communicative purposes. In the Program of Study and Teacher’s Manual 7th, 8th 9th grade Third Stage Basic Education Subject English (1987), it is stated that the teaching of English in middle school responds to two main needs: “(1) To offer students another language that allows them to communicate with individuals from different cultures. (2) To provide students with English as an instrument to access scientific, technological, and humanistic knowledge” (p. 17). As can be seen, these two needs require the use of the language for spoken as well as written communication, which means that students should acquire the needed communicative competence to enable them to use English for both communicative and instrumental purposes. Thus, the main goal of English teaching in Venezuelan middle schools in grades 7 through 9 is communication.
Needless to say that to meet the goals mandated by the Venezuelan Ministry of Education in regard to English instruction, EFL teachers must acquire the English language proficiency themselves in order to teach the language for communicative purposes. Language teacher programs are in charge of developing prospective teacher proficiency in both oral and written language and also in the pedagogical knowledge of how to teach the language.

Competence in their subject matter knowledge as well as in the pedagogical content knowledge that “goes beyond knowledge of subject matter per se to the dimension of subject matter knowledge for teaching” (Shulman, 1986, 7) [italics in original] is relevant in understanding teachers’ thinking and their instructional actions. Shulman’s argument about the “missing paradigm” (p.7), referring to the lack of focus on subject matter in educational research, raised interesting questions regarding the content knowledge of teacher development in teacher education programs. He argued that educational researchers emphasized pedagogical knowledge understood as classroom management, allocation of time and turns, organization of activities, planning, structuring lessons, and praising while overlooking the questions regarding the “content” of the lesson taught. He asked

Where do teacher explanations come from? How do teachers decide what to teach, how to represent it and how to deal with problems of misunderstanding? . . . What are the sources of teacher knowledge? What does a teacher know and when did he or she come to know it? . . . What pedagogical prices are paid when the teacher’s subject matter competence is itself compromised by deficiencies of prior education or ability? (p.8)
The above concerns raised by Shulman involve some of the issues this study aimed to investigate such as teacher thinking about their self-efficacy beliefs to teach EFL as well as their beliefs about their competence in the subject matter knowledge to effectively teach English.

Significance of the study

A teacher’s belief system seems to have a direct impact on teachers’ thinking and practices (Nespor, 1987). Hence, making those beliefs explicit should generate valuable information regarding how EFL teachers arrive at pedagogical decisions based on their system of beliefs. It is also important to assess teacher self-reported competence to teach English in order to improve teacher education programs in the future and to provide ongoing staff development to assist inservice teachers with their deficiencies and the challenges they face in their English classrooms. In this sense, the study is an important step towards providing data to improve EFL teaching in Venezuelan middle schools for both preservice and inservice teachers.

Additionally, the study aimed at fulfilling the need for research on teacher self-efficacy in the field of foreign/second language in an EFL context. Although research in teachers’ sense of efficacy has been conducted in the U.S., there is a dearth of research on self-efficacy in the area of foreign/second languages, especially in EFL contexts. Thus, the study attempted to explore the relationships between teacher self-efficacy beliefs about their competence to teach English and the extent to which their perceived capabilities seemed to affect the students’ learning of English.
Research questions

The following initial questions guided the researcher’s work.

1. What are the general and personal teacher self-reported efficacy levels among EFL teachers in selected San Cristóbal middle schools?

2. What is the correlation between teacher self-reported efficacy and their self-reported academic and professional experiences?
   a) Teachers’ sense of efficacy and teachers’ participation in staff development?
   b) Teachers’ sense of efficacy and years of experience teaching English?
   c) Teacher experiences studying/traveling in English speaking countries?

3. What do teachers in San Cristóbal middle schools self-report to be their English proficiency level on 16 Likert-type items related to English language proficiency?

4. What is the correlation between EFL teacher self-reported efficacy beliefs and their self-reported level of proficiency in English?

5. What is the correlation between EFL teacher self-reported efficacy beliefs and their self-reported job preparedness to teach English?

6. What are the routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in teaching English in San Cristóbal middle schools in terms of frequency of use?
   d) Grammar-oriented strategies
   e) Communication-oriented strategies
   f) Teacher-centered strategies
   g) Student-centered strategies
7. What is the relationship between the frequency of use of the methods and strategies advocated in the Teacher's Manual disseminated by the Venezuelan Ministry of Education (1987) for the teaching of EFL under the communicative-functional approach and the current routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in their actual practice?

8. What is the correlation between the routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in their actual practice and their self-reported level of proficiency in English?

9. What is the correlation between EFL teacher self-reported efficacy beliefs and their self-reported use of strategies to teach English?

10. What are the pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using to manage student behavior in selected San Cristóbal middle schools?

11. What is the correlation between EFL teacher self-reported efficacy beliefs and their self-reported strategies to manage student behavior?

12. What are the typical characteristics of EFL teachers in San Cristóbal including
   a) Academic and professional experience: Level of education, total years of teaching English, experience studying or traveling abroad, and certification and degrees.
   b) Contextual factors: grade levels, average size of English classes, and time weekly allotted to English classes.
   c) Self-reported teacher staff development experiences:
      Courses/workshops, seminars, conferences, and subscription to English Language Teaching journals.
13. What are the implications of the study of teacher self-reported efficacy beliefs for teacher education programs and staff development in Venezuela?

Definition of terms

The following terms are defined to clarify what they mean in the context of this study.

Beliefs: According to Webster's New Collegiate dictionary (1981) a belief is a “tenet or body of tenets held by a group. A conviction of the truth of some statement or the reality of some being or phenomenon” (p. 100). Richardson (1996) stated “beliefs are thought of as psychologically held understandings, premises, or propositions about the world that are felt to be true” (103). For the purpose of this study, beliefs encompass those self-reported tenets held by selected Venezuelan EFL teachers as true regarding their knowledge and professional practice in teaching English to middle school students.

Communicative competence: Savignon (1983) defined communicative competence as “functional language proficiency: the expression, negotiation of meaning involving interaction between two or more persons belonging to the same or different speech community, or between one person and a written or oral text” (p.303). In this study, communicative competence means the actual use of language (i.e., how speech acts are successfully performed to communicate messages appropriate to specific situations).

English as a Foreign Language (EFL): In Venezuela, English is taught as a foreign language (i.e., English is not routinely used for communication outside the classroom). Spanish is the official language in the country. Therefore, English is mostly used in formal classroom situations by nonnative students and teachers. Others uses of English in Venezuelan society are purely voluntarily.
In-service teachers: In-service teachers are those currently working in middle schools at the time of the study. It includes both novice and experienced teachers.

Methodology: The methodology used in conducting this study involved both quantitative and qualitative methods. In order to analyze and report the data gathered in the study questionnaire, the researcher used descriptive and correlational statistics, and multiple regression. The analysis also included one-time face-to-face interviews conducted with a purposeful sample of the surveyed population to triangulate the data.

Pedagogical content knowledge: According to Shulman (1986), pedagogical content knowledge “goes beyond knowledge of subject matter per se to the dimension of subject matter knowledge for teaching” [italics in original] (p. 9). Thus, for the purpose of this study, pedagogical content knowledge refers to both a knowledge of English as the subject matter and the knowledge of what, why, and how to teach English.

Pedagogical strategies: Shulman (1983) argued “the teacher is not only a master of procedure but also of content and rationale, and capable of explaining why something is done” (p. 13). Operationally, in this study, pedagogical strategies involve teacher judgments in regards with the procedures, instructional resources, and tasks they select to accomplish content and curricular objectives for a particular group of students.

Preparedness: Housego (1990) defined preparedness as “how well prepared the student teacher feels to perform a selection of tasks for which teachers are responsible” (p. 224). In this study, teacher preparedness is operationally represented by Items 16 and 19 in the study questionnaire that were taken from Woolfolk and Hoy (1990). These two items deal with the level of satisfaction with job preparedness.
Proficiency: The ACTFL proficiency guidelines—speaking (1986) scale measures "learners' functional competency; that is, their ability to accomplish linguistic tasks representing a variety of levels" (Breiner-Sanders, Lowe, Miles, and Swender, 2000, p.13). The levels are Superior, Advanced, Intermediate, and Novice. Each level is divided in high, mid, and low to place the learner according to his or her fluency, accuracy, ease of speech, and clarity. For the purposes of this study, proficiency is operationally defined as the participant self-reported command of the English language in terms of fluency, accuracy, pronunciation (intelligibility), and contextual appropriateness of messages (North, 1997).

Prospective teachers: They are also called student teachers, interns, and pre-service teachers. These terms refer to those who are enrolled in teacher education programs in order to become teachers of English. Prospective teachers in this study refer to the students enrolled in the English teacher education program at the University of Los Andes, San Cristóbal, Venezuela.

Routine pedagogical strategies: Nunan (1995) stated, "an important aspect of methodology is the development of teaching routines, materials and tasks for use in the classroom" (p.3). Operationally, routine pedagogical strategies in this study refer to those teaching routines, materials, and tasks EFL teachers regularly use in their English class to facilitate learning. Tasks in this study involve procedures, activities, exercises, and techniques used in the English class to facilitate student learning.

Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy is grounded in Bandura's social cognitive theory. Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to produce given attainments"(p.3). Gibson & Dembo (1984)
stated, "Self-efficacy beliefs would indicate teachers' evaluation of their abilities to bring about positive student change" (p.570). In this study, self-efficacy refers to teacher self-reported beliefs about his or her capabilities to bring about a desired instructional outcome. Three different terminologies are used in this study to refer to the same thing: self-efficacy, perceived efficacy, and teachers' sense of efficacy.

Subject matter knowledge: In this study, subject matter knowledge refers to English as the subject taught in middle schools in San Cristobal, Venezuela.

Teachers' sense of efficacy: Teachers' sense of efficacy has been defined as "teachers' evaluation of their abilities to bring about positive student change" (Gibson and Dembo, 1984, p. 570). Guskey and Passaro (1994) defined it as "teachers' belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be considered difficult or unmotivated" (p.628). Researchers (Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990; Soodak and Podell, 1996) have identified two dimensions of teachers' sense of efficacy: Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) which "has to do with one's own feelings of competence as a teacher" (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, p.19) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) which refers to the individual's belief that his or her teaching, in general, brings about a change in the students' learning. In this study, PTE is operationalized as the individual's score on the nine items representing Personal Teaching Efficacy on the English Teacher Sense of Efficacy Belief Instrument (ETSEBI). GTE is operationalized as the individual's score on the eight items representing General Teacher Efficacy on the English Teacher Sense of Efficacy Belief Instrument (ETSEBI).
Basic Assumptions

For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions have been made to guide the reader in understanding the researcher’s perspective and the orientation of this study.

Knowledge of the subject matter should be a major factor in a teacher preparation. Programs. Therefore, it is expected that English teacher education programs prepare EFL teachers to use English for communicative purposes. In addition, a focus on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in EFL classes would require teachers to have the ability to understand, speak, read, and write English, with functional ability in communicating across the language skills.

Teachers’ beliefs affect their teaching practices. In other words, in this study EFL teachers’ beliefs about their subject matter (i.e., English) and the pedagogy of how to teach English shape the teacher actions and praxis. In addition, for the EFL teacher, subject matter involves linguistic knowledge of the English language, pragmatic knowledge, and cultural awareness about the English-speaking people and communities of the world.

EFL teachers’ self-reported beliefs are an accurate description of their beliefs. The items of the questionnaire measured the accuracy by using a Likert-type scale where the participants chose the answers more closely related to what they perceived as beliefs.

It is expected that EFL teachers will respond honestly to the questionnaire and subsequent interviews conducted by the researcher. Data from the questionnaire will help in guiding the researcher’s questions during interviews as a way to triangulate information.
A baseline descriptive study such as the current one can provide a foundation for further studies of Venezuelan EFL teacher preparation that might inform the programs regulated by the Ministry of education.

Limitations

The present study included EFL teachers who worked within the limits of San Cristóbal, capital city of Táchira State, Venezuela. Therefore, the results may not be generalizable to other EFL settings. A second limitation regards the participants’ perceptions of their English and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Third, self-reported data have certain inherent limitations and these are acknowledged. Finally, the survey and interview methodologies used in the study have certain built-in limitations widely known to researchers in the profession (e.g., survey instrument validity, sampling). Despite these limitations, however, the present study is important because it provides a foundation for further research.

Summary

Chapter I presented a general introduction to the study of self-efficacy beliefs of EFL teachers in a Venezuelan context, their self-reported proficiency of English, and their use of instructional strategies to teach English. It also included the statement of the problem, the background of the context, the research questions, the definitions of terms, and limitations of the study. In addition, it included the relevance of studying teachers’ sense of efficacy and its impact on teacher pedagogical practice. Chapter II provides a review of the professional literature that guided the study. Chapter III includes a
description of the methods and procedures to collect data in the investigation. Chapter IV presents the data, an analysis, and discussion of the data. Chapter V presents the research questions answered, a summary of findings, implications, recommendations for further research, and limitations. The study also includes a bibliography and appendices. Finally, this first chapter presents an overall description of the organization of the dissertation.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presented a review of the relevant literature that serves as the theoretical framework for the problem and research questions addressed in this study. Therefore, it provided a review of (1) nature of teachers' beliefs (2) self-efficacy theory, (3) teachers' sense of efficacy beliefs, and (4) pertinent research on teacher self-efficacy beliefs and its impact on student academic achievement. The chapter has been organized around the following sections: characteristics of effective foreign language teachers, teachers' beliefs, self-efficacy theory, teachers' sense of efficacy, dimensions of teachers' sense of efficacy, factors associated with teachers' perceived efficacy, and measurement of perceived efficacy.

Characteristics of effective foreign language teachers

Over the last four decades, researchers have examined the characteristics of effective teachers as a way to identify what characteristics are present in good models of teaching. Considering that teaching is a constructed (VanPatten, 1997) and situated activity, research on teachers' desirable characteristics in specific subject areas provides a better description of what it means to be an effective teacher in a particular area.
In the field of foreign language teaching, Brosh (1966) conducted a study about the perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher with 200 foreign language teachers of English, French, Arabic, and Hebrew and 406 ninth-grade middle school students. He gathered data through a questionnaire and interviews. The findings included the following desirable characteristics:

1. Knowledge and command of the target language.
2. Ability to organize, explain, and clarify, as well as to arouse and sustain interest and motivation among students.
3. Fairness to students by showing neither favoritism nor prejudice, and
4. Availability to students. (p.133)

In his study, Brosh was interested in considering language teaching effectiveness "from the point of view of communication, given its relevance and importance to the teaching-learning process" (p.125). Brosh found that "the ELT's [English Language Teacher] adequate command of the subject matter, i.e., his or her mastery of the four basic skills - reading, writing, speaking, and understanding" (p.129) was perceived as the first priority in order of importance for both teachers and students.

Lange (1990) integrated the characteristics of effective second language teachers into five areas of knowledge and practice of teaching as a reflective process:

1. Competence in a second language, 2. Understanding of how the target language is taught, 3. Practice in the application of knowledge about the subject and teaching in teaching situation, 4. Opportunities to reach an understanding of both the art and the craft of teaching, and 5. Evaluation of teaching. (p.248-249)
It is important to point out that for Lange, competence in a second language involves the "ability to listen, read, speak, and write in the language to be taught" (p. 248). Accordingly, part of that competence includes the "knowledge about language, language use, and culture, and their interrelationship [and also] knowledge of how second languages are learned and acquired" (p. 248). As can be seen, Lange's outline is consistent with Brosh's findings, which placed language competence as a priority for both teachers and students. In a similar vein, other researchers have stressed the importance of language proficiency. Hancock (1981), for example, proposed to "encourage an emphasis on linguistic and communicative competency" (p. 191) [Italics in original] as an "energizer" in the directions for the training of teachers of foreign languages in the 80s. In an earlier work, Hancock (1978) defined competency in the foreign language in terms of understanding language as spoken by native speakers at a regular tempo, speaking with sufficient command to carry on a conversation, reading materials with immediate comprehension, and writing with correct orthography and structures (p. 4). In a review of the theories that form the bases of foreign/second language instruction, Hancock (1994) argued that in order to attain the learning outcomes set for language students; teaching, testing, and assessment must be integrated into the components of the language program.

Discussing the importance of proficiency in foreign/second language teacher programs, Lafayette (1995) stated, "among the components of content knowledge, none is more important to foreign language teaching than language proficiency" (p. 135). Lafayette pointed out that the general consensus for foreign language teachers'
proficiency as measured by the ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) guidelines is to attain at least an advanced rating on the specialist component. In other words, language teacher proficiency requires teachers to be competent (i.e., functional in performing in the four language skills: speaking, listening, reading, and writing).

Despite the consensus in recognizing the critical role of teachers' language proficiency for effective foreign language teaching, some authors (Crandall, 1999; Lafayette, 1995; Tedick & Walker, 1995) claimed that many teacher education programs tend to view language as an "object," placing a major emphasis on the acquisition of student teachers' theoretical pedagogical knowledge and language skills based on grammar, morphology, lexicon, and syntax of the language. According to these authors, such programs fail to consider the fact that language is a tool for communication and therefore, social interaction cannot be overlooked. Thus, the use of the target language constitutes the major goal in foreign language teaching.

Similarly, Cullen (1994) contended that in most parts of the world, language teaching is often seen as fragmented, decontextualized, teacher-centered, and separated from the community and student needs and interests. He goes on to argue that there is a tendency to take for granted the teacher proficiency in the target language. As a result, a teacher's lack of proficiency in English could become a barrier for using CLT, for teachers may find themselves unable to use English for communicative purposes. Thus, the deficiencies in the oral command of the target language affect the teachers' confidence in the classroom (Li, 1998). Additionally, Horwitz's (1985, 1996) research has
shown that foreign language teachers particularly novices, tend to experience “foreign language anxiety.” In other words, lack of confidence in the English language proficiency not only prevents foreign language teachers from using CLT, but also tends to increase the feelings of anxiety provoked by having to speak English on daily basis in front of the class. From this perspective, it is critical to take into account that how teachers learn English along with their previous experiences will have a significant impact on their professional practice as EFL teachers. In the next section of this chapter, some considerations regarding the relationship between teacher beliefs and pedagogical practices are presented.

Teachers’ beliefs and pedagogical actions

Research on teachers’ beliefs and their impact on teacher cognition has been a relevant topic for educational inquiry over the last four decades. More recently, scholars in the field of foreign/second language teaching have joined the movement towards the study of teacher cognition and its impact on their pedagogical actions. For example, Richards (1996) pointed out that according to research on teachers’ beliefs, teachers develop rational principles based upon their belief systems, and those principles function as rules that guide the teachers’ actions. There seems to be a general agreement that learning to teach is a complex task that involves not only the knowledge on how to teach but also the knowledge of what to teach and why to teach a particular group of students in a particular context (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1999; Darling-Hammond, 1998; Freeman 1996; Richards, 1996). In other words, teachers’ actions and behaviors are tied to their beliefs, perceptions, assumptions, and motivation levels.
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Following this line of research, Sato and Kleinsasser (1999) conducted a study on Japanese LOTE (Languages Other Than English) teachers' beliefs and knowledge about CLT. They used triangulation that included both qualitative and quantitative methods, open-ended interviews, observations, and a survey. Ten state school teachers of Japanese (9 native Australian English speakers and 1 native Japanese speaker) in 10 different state middle schools in a large Australian metropolitan area participated in the study. Sato and Kleinsasser found that "the way that these teachers made sense of their L2 teaching and learning was based on their personal experiences" (p.511). In other words, how these teachers learned their L2 language seemed to influence their beliefs about language teaching and learning. In regards to CLT, the findings showed that the participants held four conceptions about CLT: "They believed that CLT (a) emphasized communication in the L2, (b) relied heavily on speaking activities, (c) involved little grammar teaching, and (d) used time-consuming activities" (p.512).

Similarly, Freeman (1991) conducted a 10-month longitudinal study that examined how foreign language teacher conceptions of their classroom practice developed as they took part in an in-service teacher education program. The study was designed in five phases with four foreign language teachers who were followed-up from spring 1989 to fall 1990. Data consisted of semi open-ended interviews, document analysis of the teachers' writing, and observations at their home schools. The intensive case study of these 4 teachers led to extensive comparison and development of cross-case themes. Freeman's findings suggested that the participants' "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975; quoted in Freeman, 1991) as language learners seemed to
have equipped them with norms of experience, ways of acting as teachers, and a tendency to focus on the FL as content to be presented and practiced in controlled interaction. Freeman found that their approach to teach was “teacher-centered, textbook-based,” and teaching as a “step-by-step process” (p.444). In addition, Freeman’s teachers described negative experiences with the foreign language in schools, and positive experiences outside the classroom, particularly in using the language abroad in a live environment. Freeman concluded that as the participants moved towards the last stages of their training, they developed explanations and understandings in the construction of their teaching practice through shared professional discourse.

In the same vein, Johnson (1992) conducted a study to examine how preservice ESL teachers perceived and processed information during their initial teaching experience. The study followed six ESL preservice teachers during two semesters in a practicum as a part of the Master’s degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). Data included videotaped observations of participants’ actual classroom instruction, participants’ stimulus recall reports, and participants’ written retrospectives of their instructional decisions. Using a modified version of Fogarty’s et al. (1983) schema, the analysis was based on four descriptive categories: student performance cues, instructional actions, instructional goals, and prior knowledge. Johnson found that “preservice ESL teachers’ instructional actions were directed by unexpected students’ responses and the desire to maintain the flow of instructional activities” (507). Those ESL teachers were mainly concerned in ensuring the students’ understanding as L2 learners, increasing their motivation and involvement, and
maintaining management control. Overall, they paid most attention to student responses that were teacher elicited rather than student initiated. Johnson noted that the findings supported the L1 literature regarding unexpected student behavior. She contended that preservice teachers "tend to rely on a limited number of instructional routines, and are primarily concerned with maintaining the flow of instructional activities" (p.527). In conclusion, the author pointed out the need to continue research towards the understanding of cognitive dimensions of L2 teaching and how L2 teachers learn to teach.

In a second study of four preservice ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning and teaching, Johnson (1994) used written journals, observations, interviews and participants' comments on videotaped lessons to gather data to inform teachers' thinking during the practicum in a university ESL course. She found out that the participants' beliefs were rooted in images of their past formal and informal language learning experiences, and that those images were both positive and negative.

In sum, research has shown that teacher beliefs are important in determining the way teachers understand and organize instruction. Beliefs are particularly important in preservice education. Studies (Calderhead, 1991; Johnson, 1992) found that when entering the teacher education programs, student teachers bring with them knowledge about learning and teaching as part of their previous life experience and formal schooling. In other words, teacher education programs need to acknowledge that as a result of the process of "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975), prospective teachers do not enter their programs as blank slates, but with a rich knowledge and experience with
teaching and learning. As Pajares (1992) posited, “beliefs are formed early and tend to self-perpetuate . . . The earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter” (324-325). Thus, teacher education programs can guide prospective teachers in constructing strong efficacy beliefs from the beginning of their teaching career.

The present study focused on teacher self-efficacy beliefs in the context of EFL classrooms taking into account that both teaching tasks and teachers’ assessment of their capabilities -competence and skills- form part of efficacy beliefs (Tschannen-Moran, et al., 1998).

Self-efficacy theory

The construct of teachers’ sense of efficacy originated from two theories: Rotter’s social learning theory (1966) and Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1977, 1986). Rotter’s theory of locus of control was used by the Rand Corporation to conduct the seminal study (1976) on teachers’ self-efficacy. That study included two items that were grounded on Rotter’s article “Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement.”

Rand Item 1 stated, “When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of the student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.” It indicates that those teachers who agree with this statement consider the forces exerted by the environment as more powerful than what teachers can do in their classrooms to provoke students’ learning. No matter what capabilities teachers
possess, the influences of external factors are more powerful. From this perspective, environmental factors such as students’ home, community, and social inequalities exert an impact on students’ motivation and performance.

**Rand Item 2** stated, “If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.” In contrast to Rand item 1, teachers who agree with this statement show confidence in their experiences and teaching abilities to overcome the external factors that may hinder students’ learning.

After the Rand Items, some researchers (Ashton and Webb, 1986) used Bandura’s social cognitive theory as a second strand to ground the construct of teachers’ sense of efficacy. In Bandura’s theory, self-efficacy refers to the individual’s judgment about his or her capabilities to complete a task. In social cognitive theory people sense of agency or exercise of control is a fundamental component that influences what they do. “Beliefs of personal efficacy constitute the key factor of human agency. If people believe they have no power to produce results, they will no attempt to make things happen” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Bandura claimed that individuals who judge themselves as capable to perform certain tasks or activities will attempt and successfully execute them.

Paraphrasing Bandura, how successful people are in obtaining what they want is directly related to their perceived self-influence in terms of how they foresee future outcomes, and how they appraise their abilities to succeed.

Bandura (1997) conceived human agency in a triadic reciprocal causation where behavior, environment, and personal factors (cognitive, affective, and biological) function in interdependence and reciprocal causation. Personal factors and environment
interact "within an interdependent unified causal structure" (p. 6). The following schematic representation shows the interdependence of behavior, environment, and personal factors in a triadic reciprocal causation or reciprocal determinism (Bandura, 1986).

![Diagram of triadic reciprocal causation]

In the above figure, the "triadic reciprocal causation" means that behavior, personal factors, and environment influence each other in a bi-directional way. Social cognitive theory "focuses more on evolvement of agency as central to personal development than on internalization of social functions as private self-regulation (Bandura, 1977, p. 227). Bandura’s theory recognized that environment affects cognitive development. In fact, he said, "cognitive development, of course, is situated in sociocultural practices. These
influences operate interactively through familial, peer, educational, neighborhood, and other cultural systems” (p. 227). However, Bandura’s triadic framework differs from sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) in the way cognition is interpreted. For Vygotsky (1978) cognition is the result of collaboration, engagement, and appropriation as “every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological) and then, inside the child (intrapsychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, logical memory, and to the formation of concepts” (p. 57). For Bandura (1977) on the other hand, there is a dynamic interplay between the external (environment), internal (personal factors) and the individual’s behavior. He stated, “although much learning is socially situated, after people develop self-regulatory capabilities, they can learn a lot on their own” (p. 227). Paraphrasing Bandura, Gist and Mitchell (1992) expressed that in a triadic reciprocal causation, “behavior, cognition, and the environment all influence each other in a dynamic fashion” (p. 184).

Bandura (1977) posed that self-efficacy is a different construct from self-esteem, self-worth, and self-concept. Although they are often used interchangeably, perceived self-efficacy and self-esteem are different. According to Bandura, perceived self-efficacy involves judgments of personal capabilities while the concept of self-esteem is concerned with judgments of self-worth. In other words, self-concept and self-esteem are related to “global self-images” (p. 11). For instance, the judgment of an EFL teacher who perceives himself or herself as inefficacious in teaching English does not involve his or her loss of self-esteem. In Bandura’s conceptualization, self-efficacy is a judgment of capabilities to
perform in task-specific situations (i.e., teaching English grammar). Thus, the teacher’s judgment about his or her capabilities to teach English grammar does not originate from affective evaluation of the self (Gist and Mitchell, 1992).

Moreover, self-efficacy is a dynamic construct that changes over time depending on new information or experiences individuals go through. Research (Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990) found that teachers’ sense of efficacy increased with teaching experience while Soodak and Podell (1996) found that preservice teachers personal efficacy was initially high, but dropped precipitously during their first year of teaching.

A third aspect of self-efficacy involves a “mobilization component” (Gist and Mitchell, 1992, p. 84). In other words, self-efficacy varies according to the individual’s performance. That is, people perform differently in different circumstances depending on the combination or sequencing of skills they use for a particular task (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). For instance, EFL teachers may perform differently depending on the utilization, combination, or sequencing of skills they use in a specific task and circumstances with a particular group of students.

Considering the fact that self-efficacy beliefs impact teachers’ actions (Bandura, 1977; Pajares, 1992; Richards, 1996), this study intended to assess teachers’ sense of efficacy among EFL teachers in middle schools in San Cristóbal, Venezuela, in order to correlate those beliefs with their self-reported assessment of English proficiency and use of classroom instructional and management strategies. From this perspective the study is consistent with the model proposed by Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) that addressed the conceptualization of teachers’ sense of efficacy integrating both Rotter’s and Bandura’s
theories. Tschannen-Moran et al. provided a schematic representation of their model (See Figure 2) in order to represent the cyclical nature of teachers' sense of efficacy.

Figure 2
The cyclical nature of teachers' sense of efficacy
(Tschannen-Moran et al. 1998, p. 228)

In addressing the argument about the conceptualization of teachers' self-efficacy, Tschannen-Moran et al. in their article "Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure," proposed the above integrated model of teachers' sense of efficacy that attempts to solve the controversy by "weaving together both conceptual strands," (p.227). That is, Rotter's locus of control theory and Bandura's theory. The model conceived teachers' sense of efficacy in terms of specific teaching tasks including resources and constraints in
specific contexts along with the teachers’ personal assessment of their competence. One innovative feature of the model is “its cyclical nature” (p. 233). As the model shows, “the proficiency of a performance creates a new mastery experience, which provides new information that will be processed to shape future efficacy beliefs.” (p.233-234). As the process repeats each experience becomes the source of future efficacy beliefs which over time leads to the stabilization of a set of efficacy beliefs.

Sources of efficacy

Bandura (1997) stated that individuals construct their self-efficacy from four sources of information:

(1) **Enactive mastery experiences (performance accomplishment).** Efficacy beliefs are generated from successes and failures when performing a task (Bandura, 1981). Success tends to strengthen beliefs in one’s efficacy while failures tend to weaken them. But getting only successes make people get discouraged if they do not obtain the expected outcomes. Thus some difficulty is desirable to help people persevere and “turn failure into success” by using one’s capabilities and exercising control over the environment (Bandura, 1997, p. 80). Thus, EFL teachers may construct self-efficacy from successful experiences based on performance achievement during their preservice education and field experiences (opportunities to teach in classrooms).

(2) **Vicarious learning experiences (modeling).** Observing others perform a task helps people evaluate in terms of observation their abilities to perform the same task. Bandura (1997) stated that while observing others’ attainments, individuals compare themselves as...
performers in the same situation. Surpassing peers or colleagues increases efficacy beliefs while being outperformed lowers them. In the case of EFL teachers, providing them with good models of teaching (Brosh, 1996; Lange, 1990) particularly during preservice education would build strong efficacy beliefs. Observing effective teachers (Hancock, 1994; Lange, 1990) in middle schools would also provide a source of vicarious learning.

(3) Verbal persuasion. When people receive realistic appraisals based on “evaluative feedback” (Bandura, 1997, p.101) from their significant others regarding their attainments, this verbal persuasion seems to strengthen their beliefs on the capabilities they have to achieve what they want. EFL teachers may benefit not only from the encouragement of faculty and its feedback, but also from peer assessment, self-assessment, and group assessment.

(4) Physiological arousal. Affective states influence people’s beliefs of self-efficacy. Thus, physiological arousal such mood, stress, and subjective threats affects people performance. In this case, EFL teachers’ judgments about their self-efficacy are affected by affective factors that involve anxiety and stress to perform in the foreign language.

Motivation and self-efficacy

In psychology, motivation is a cognitive mechanism. Bandura’s social cognitive theory integrates cognitive, metacognitive (control of one’s own cognition, thoughts), and motivational mechanisms of self-regulation. For instance, in the process of learning a second/foreign language, the individual may self-regulate his or her learning by selecting appropriate strategies, correcting his or her deficiencies, and recognizing cognitive strategies. Metacognition involves factual and procedural knowledge used in problem
solving. Motivation involves affect in terms of personal goals, self-efficacy appraisal, outcome expectancies, and self-monitoring. All these components of social cognitive theory are present in EFL teachers’ performance and judgment of their personal capabilities to teach English. For instance, how much effort and time a teacher invests in helping students’ achievement in English would be tied to his or her motivation and sense of self-efficacy to teach English. In the same way, depending on their sense of efficacy, EFL teachers would be more likely to pursue self-directed learning and self-regulation of mechanisms and strategies that would help them improve their teaching. In this sense, Bandura (1997) argues that self-directed learning, for instance, requires motivation as well as cognitive and metacognitive strategies in a process of self-regulatory mechanisms that “involves comparing what one knows against the level of understanding one seeks and then acquiring the requisite knowledge” (p. 228).

According to Bandura (1977) people form beliefs about what they can do (cognitive mechanism) and in so doing they anticipate positive or negative outcomes of their pursuits, set goals for themselves, and plan courses of action. Thus, efficacy beliefs are central to cognitive regulation of motivation. People who perceive themselves as highly efficacious persevere and insist on their efforts to produce change and exercise control over the environment (Bandura, 1977). They are more likely to choose challenges, and persist when faced with failures or obstacles while those who have low beliefs in their capabilities are more likely to withdraw or debilitate their efforts. Furthermore, self-regulation is understood as the self-capacity of monitoring, appraising, testing, and correcting one’s selection of strategies, deficiencies, knowledge, and so on. In
According to Bandura (1993) "self-beliefs of efficacy play a key role in the self-regulation of motivation" (p.129) that influence the effort an individual make to achieve his or her future goals.

Bandura postulated three theories of motivation in which self-efficacy beliefs operate. The first one is the Attribution Theory, where casual attributions act as cognitive motivators for people who consider themselves as highly efficacious. Thus, high efficacy individuals perceive their failures as lack of effort whereas low efficacy people perceive their failures as low ability. Secondly, for Expectancy-value Theory, motivation is guided by outcome expectancies where people take into account their self-beliefs of capability to pursue outcomes. The third theory is goal oriented and conceived in terms of cognized goals. Through a cognitive comparison process, people match the goals that guide their efforts to self-satisfaction and goal fulfilling (Bandura, 1993). Motivation is then guided by one’s performance, perceived self-efficacy, and readjustment of personal goals based on one’s progress (Bandura, 1993). Thus, self-efficacy beliefs influence motivation as “They determine the goals people set for themselves, how much effort they expend, how long they persevere in the face of difficulties, and their resilience to failures” (Bandura, 1993, 131). For EFL teachers, self-efficacy, i.e., how efficacious teachers judge themselves in teaching English would influence their teaching practice in regards with the goals and challenges they set up for themselves and for their students, and how much effort and time they invest in attaining instructional goals. In other words, if the teacher judges himself or herself as having the capabilities to bring about student learning, he or she would put more effort in orchestrating different teaching strategies and techniques to
reach low achieving students. Conversely, a belief that teachers have little impact on student learning because external forces in the environment (home) determine success or failure would reduce the teacher effort to try different strategies to reach student learning.

Teachers’ sense of efficacy

According to Bandura (1977) teachers’ beliefs in their instructional efficacy influence the kind of learning environment they create to orchestrate learning. Teachers with a high sense of teaching efficacy believe that difficult students can be teachable if the teacher puts extra effort. Conversely, teachers with a low sense of teaching efficacy believe that there is little they can do to teach unmotivated students because students’ success depends on the external environment (Gibson and Dembo, 1984). Bandura (1977) pointed out that “teachers who believe strongly in their ability to promote learning create mastery experiences for their students, but those beset by self-doubts about their instructional efficacy construct classroom environments that are likely to undermine students’ judgments of their abilities and their cognitive development” (p. 241). In a study with practicing teachers, Woolfolk, Rosoff, and Hoy (1990) found that those teachers with a great sense of PTE (beliefs in their abilities to reach students) and GTE (beliefs that all students can be taught) tended to be humanistic rather than custodial. In other words, the more efficacious the teacher, the less custodial to control students, and the more he or she seemed to support students’ autonomy in problem solving and the student’s responsibility as an individual.

The seminal study of the Rand Corporation was framed by Rotter’s (1966) social learning theory of locus of control and constituted the first strand to the construct of
teachers' received efficacy efficacy. In that study two items on a 5-point Likert scale were used to measure teachers' level of efficacy. Rand Item 1: "When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of the student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment," and Rand Item 2: "If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students." As a result of the seminal study of the Rand Corporation, a sequence of studies grew based on the two Rand items (Ashton Webb, 1986; Gibson and Dembo, 1984).

Dimensions of teachers' sense of efficacy

The foundations for research of teacher perceived efficacy originated from Rotter's theory of locus of control (1966) and Bandura's social cognitive theory (1977). In the twenty years of research conducted on teachers' sense of efficacy, the findings support at least two dimensions of teachers' perceived efficacy: Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) and Teacher Efficacy (GTE) that differ from one another (Gibson and Dembo, 1984). In studying teachers' sense of efficacy of EFL teachers in Korea, researchers' (Gorrell and Young, 1995; Shim, 2001) findings were consistent with the two dimensions of self-efficacy (PTE and GTE) found by other researchers (Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990) in the U.S.

In this study, the researcher explored the two dimensions of teachers' sense of efficacy. PTE with the score represented by the items on teachers' perceived efficacy to teach English, and GTE represented by the items measuring the teachers' beliefs that success or failure in students' learning is attributed to the students' background.
Measurement of teachers’ sense of efficacy

In measuring the two identified dimensions of teachers’ perceived efficacy, there has been some agreement as well as disagreement among researchers of this construct. As it was already mentioned, Gibson & Dembo’s (1984) two dimensions of teachers’ perceived efficacy grounded on Bandura’s conceptualization of self-efficacy, have been challenged by other researchers (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). However, despite the debate, studies on teachers’ sense of efficacy have been consistent in identifying two separate dimensions in teachers’ sense of efficacy. The first one, General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) corresponds to teachers’ beliefs that the influences of the environment exert the control over their capabilities to affect students learning. The second one, Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) corresponds to those teachers whose beliefs of efficacy show confidence in their capabilities to overcome external obstacles and bring about students’ learning.

In the seminal study conducted by the Rand Corporation, Rand Item 1 (GTE) and Rand Item 2 (PTE) intended to assess whether a teacher believed that he or she could control student learning and motivation. In fact, the two Rand Items (Armor et al., 1976) gave birth to the subsequent studies and development of instruments to assess self-efficacy during the 70s and 80s. One of the most prominent studies inspired in the two Rand Items was Gibson and Dembo’s (1984) Teacher Efficacy Scale.

Gibson and Dembo’s Teacher Efficacy Scale

Based on the two Rand Items, Gibson and Dembo (1984) developed a “Teacher Efficacy Scale,” (TES) a validated and reliable instrument designed in a Likert format
that became the most used instrument during the past two decades. The original 53-sample items were piloted with 90 teachers and their construction was based on interviews and previous literature on self-efficacy. The revised instrument consisted of 30 items.

In their study, Gibson and Dembo identified two factors under the construct of teachers' self-efficacy. Factor 1, labeled Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) accounts for the teachers' beliefs that they have the skills and abilities to affect students' achievement. According to Gibson and Dembo, PTE corresponds to the previously used Item 2 (Rand Corporation study) “If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.” Gibson and Dembo (1984) stated, “All of the items included in Factor 1 reflect the teacher’s sense of personal responsibility in student learning and/or behavior, and correspond to Bandura’s self-efficacy dimension” (p.573).

Factor 2, labeled General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) accounts for the “teacher's sense of teaching efficacy, or belief that any teacher's ability to bring about change is significantly limited by factors external to the teacher, such as the home environment, family, background, and parental influences” (Gibson & Dembo, 1984, 574). This dimension corresponds to Item 1 used in Rand's previous research: “When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her environment.” According to Gibson and Dembo, these two factors corresponded to Bandura’s two-factor theoretical model of self-efficacy. For them, “outcome expectancy [Bandura’s general outcome expectancy on self-efficacy] would essentially reflect the degree to which teachers believed the
environment could be controlled, that is, the extent to which students can be taught given such factors as family background, IQ, and school conditions” (p. 570). They concluded that sense of self-efficacy, the second factor in Bandura’s theory would correspond to teachers’ belief that they have the required skills to bring about the desired outcome. “Results indicate that teacher efficacy, as measured by the Teacher Efficacy Scale, is multidimensional and comprises at least two clearly distinguishable factors” (Gibson and Dembo, p. 574) that are consistent with Bandura’s conceptualization of self-efficacy.

In Bandura’s conceptualization of self-efficacy, for instance, an EFL teacher may believe that teaching in general may influence students’ achievement. Inversely, he or she may believe that external forces such the students’ environment determine student learning no matter what teachers do in the classroom. Similarly, an EFL teacher may think that he or she has the capabilities to influence students’ learning. Thus, if the teacher perceives himself or herself as highly efficacious, he or she will put more effort and persistence in teaching students as well as in implementing new ways of instruction (Gibson and Dembo, 1984).

Although Gibson and Dembo’s scale has been validated in numerous factor analyses with different samples, there has been some disagreement in regards to their conceptualization of efficacy among efficacy researchers (Soodak and Podell, 1996; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990). Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) questioned Gibson and Dembo’s interpretation of outcome expectation (Factor 2: GTE) because they argue that in Bandura’s theory, outcome expectancy “stems from the person’s assessment of his or her own capabilities and expected level of performance, not from what it would be possible
for others to accomplish under similar circumstances" (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy and Hoy, 1998, p. 223). In addressing the difficulties, Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) revised Gibson and Dembo’s scale to a 22-item instrument to measure both personal efficacy (PE) and teaching efficacy (TE). Each item is designed in a 6-point likert scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” They identified TE as GTE (General Teaching Efficacy) because TE reflects a general attitude towards the impact of education on students’ change. PTE, on the other hand, “is more specific and individual than a belief about what teachers in general can accomplish” (Tschannen-Moran et al., p. 205). A second argument in regards with Gibson and Dembo’s items is that they seem to be too broad to meet Bandura’s definition of self-efficacy as a situation specific construct.

Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument

Other researchers, for instance, Riggs and Enochs (1990) also addressed the measurement of teachers’ sense of efficacy by designing a 25-item situation-specific questionnaire to measure the self-efficacy of elementary school science teachers in the U.S. Consistent with Bandura’s (1977) idea that self-efficacy is not necessarily uniform across tasks and subject matter, but situation specific, Riggs and Enochs modified all items in Gibson’s and Dembo scale to adapt them for elementary science classroom settings. The resulting fifty items were given to a panel of experts to judge the validity, and then field-tested in a preliminary study with seventy-one practicing elementary teachers. In a second major study, the reliability and validity of the instrument were estimated again, and then the instrument given to 331 teachers.
This section provided a review of the seminal studies (Rand Corporation, 1966; Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Riggs and Enochs, 1990) that grounded the study of teachers’ sense of efficacy conducted in education as well as the theories that framed those studies. Some examples and references to English as a Foreign Language contexts were also included.

Teachers’ sense of efficacy and foreign language teaching

Research on teachers’ perceived efficacy and assessment of foreign language proficiency and use of instructional strategies is scant in the field of second/foreign language teaching. However, recently Shim (2001) conducted a study on teachers’ sense of efficacy and selected characteristics of Korean EFL high school teachers. His findings were consistent with the two dimensions of teachers’ self-efficacy (PTE and GTE) already identified in previous research (Gibson and Dembo, 1984). Regarding English proficiency, Shim found that high efficacious teachers had higher listening proficiency than low efficacious teachers while low efficacious teachers had higher speaking skills than high efficacious teachers. Shim argued that the Korean trend to consider listening skills important for preparing for college entrance examinations might explain the fact that teachers with good listening skills had higher efficacy beliefs than those with poor listening skills. The finding regarding speaking skills “was counter to what was expected” (Shim, 2001, p.108).

In addressing the scarce research in EFL teachers’ sense of efficacy, the present study explored teachers’ self-efficacy to teach EFL among a selected group of
Venezuelan middle school teachers and its correlation with the variables English self-reported proficiency and self-reported use of instructional strategies to teach and self-reported strategies to manage student behavior.

Factors associated with teachers' sense of efficacy

Previous research has found several factors associated with teachers' sense of efficacy. The following are factors associated with teachers' perceived efficacy: student achievement and motivation, (Gibson and Dembo, 1984), teachers' adoption of innovation (Ghaith and Yaghi, 1997; Guskey, 1996), commitment to teaching (Coladarci, 1992), teachers' classroom management and control strategies (Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990; Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990), and teachers' personal characteristics such as gender, grade level taught and experience (Ghaith and Shaaban, 1999).

Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement

In Gibson and Dembo's study, the two dimensions of teachers' self-efficacy brought significant differences between teachers with high efficacy and teachers with low efficacy particularly regarding time devoted to academic activities, student grouping, and feedback. For instance, the high-efficacy teachers did not allocate time for intellectual games while those with low-efficacy spent 10.5 minutes in intellectual games. In addition, the high-efficacy teachers allocated twice the amount of time to whole class instruction while the low-efficacy ones spent more time involved in working with individual students or/and small groups. Accordingly, efficacious teachers focused more on students' academic achievement than their less efficacious counterparts. In other words, those who judged themselves as having the abilities to bring about students'
change insisted with low achieving students, made better use of time, criticized less student incorrect answers, and were more effective in guiding students to correct answers through their questioning. Whereas low efficacy teachers spent more time in nonacademic activities, they provided teacher feedback in the form of criticism to incorrect answers, and made use of less effective techniques to guide students to correct responses.

Teachers' sense of efficacy and teachers' commitment to teaching

Research (Coladarci, 1992) found that personal (PTE) and general efficacy (GTE) "were the two strongest predictors of commitment to teaching" (p.334). A random sample of 364 elementary-level teachers in Maine were the subjects for the study. The findings suggested that teachers who were more confident in their abilities to affect student achievement through teaching and who assumed personal responsibility for influencing student achievement tended to have a higher commitment to teaching (Coladarci, 1992).

Teachers' sense of efficacy and adoption of innovation

Research in teachers' perceived efficacy examined TE in regards to teachers' willingness to introduce innovation in their teaching practices. Guskey (1988) studied the relationship between teachers' effectiveness and attitudes towards implementation of instructional practices. A revised version of Guskey's Responsibility for Student Achievement (RSA) scale was used for the questionnaire he designed to measure teachers' self-efficacy. Guskey also used the two efficacy Rand Items, and two other scales to assess affect toward teaching and teaching self-concept. Data were gathered
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from 120 elementary and secondary teachers who were participating in a staff
development program. The findings in Guskey's study indicated that those teachers who
expressed greater personal efficacy had also positive attitudes towards teaching (teaching
affect), and had a fairly high level of confidence in their teaching abilities (teaching
self-concept). Hence, those who liked teaching and felt confident about their abilities
were highly effective in the classroom, and they also seemed to be the most receptive to
implement new practices. Conversely, those assumed to be less effective appeared to be
the least receptive to innovation (p. 67). In Guskey’s explanation, more effective teachers
tend to incorporate mastery learning in their present practices while less effective teacher
probably do not. Besides, “highly effective teachers may simply be more open and more
receptive to new ideas on instructional practice than are their less effective colleagues”
(p. 68). Guskey’s findings seemed to suggest that for teachers to embrace innovation it
would be necessary to provide them with more than a one-time workshop, as it is the
common practice. Innovation seems to be tied to teachers’ perceived self-efficacy as a
strong predictor for success or failure in future performances. In other words, the self-
perception of his or her teaching competence (mastery learning) would impact teachers’
expectations to succeed or fail in future performances (e.g. implementing a new
strategy/technique).

Ghaith & Yaghi (1997) replicated Guskey’s study by investigating teachers’
experience, efficacy, and attitudes towards implementation of STAD, an instructional
practice in cooperative learning, in a 4-day staff development program. Data were
gathered from sixteen middle school teachers and nine high school teachers. The
researchers used Gibson & Dembo (1984) instrument to measure teachers’ efficacy and Guskey’s (1988) scale to measure attitudes towards implementation of innovation. The findings were: first, experience was correlated with teachers’ willingness to implement innovation. Teachers with more years tended to consider STAD as more difficult and less important to implement. This finding was not consistent with Guskey’s study where experience and grade level taught were not significant. Second, teachers with high sense of personal efficacy (PTE) considered STAD as more congruent with their present practices, less difficult to implement, and very important. This attitude was consistent with Guskey’s findings. Additionally, teachers’ sense of general efficacy (GTE) appeared to have little relation with attitudes towards the implementation of STAD which means that there was not significant correlation found with neither the congruence nor the difficulty and cost of implementing STAD. Overall, Ghaith and Yaghi’s findings support the measuring of PTE and GTE as separate dimensions that seem to be “a strong determinant of teachers’ willingness to adopt new practices” (p.457).

**Teachers’ sense of efficacy and experience**

Soodak and Podell (1997) used Gibson and Dembo’s Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) to investigate how preservice teachers and experienced teachers developed the perceptions of their capabilities over time. Their findings were consistent with the two factors previously identified by Gibson & Dembo (TE and GTE). Additionally, Soodak & Podell found that when compared, there were no significant changes in the personal efficacy beliefs among high school teachers while the drop of personal efficacy in elementary teachers was dramatic as they started their first year of teaching.
efficacy (PE) of preservice teachers was initially high during their fieldwork and student
teacher experience, but in their first year of teaching it declined “precipitously” (p.219).
This finding suggests that novice teachers face a huge pressure or “shock” when entering
the profession. Soodak and Podell stated that during the following years of experience,
teachers seemed to recover their confidence, but “their efficacy beliefs appear never to
reach their preservice level” (p.219). The findings also suggested that experienced
teachers beliefs of personal efficacy are more resistant to change.

In a context outside the U.S., Gorrell and Young (1995) examined the differences
in teachers’ sense of efficacy among 90 Korean preservice early childhood and
elementary teachers beginning and completing teacher education programs. Using a
Korean version of Gibson and Dembo’s scale, the authors used multivariate analysis of
variance (MANOVA) of subjects’ responses. The analysis revealed statistically
significant multivariate main effect (p< .05) related to experience in the program on the
teaching and general efficacy of the subjects. In other words, fourth-year preservice
students showed higher levels of efficacy than beginning students. In addition, advanced
students showed higher personal teaching efficacy, but not higher general efficacy.
Teachers’ self-efficacy increased as preservice teachers advanced in their education,
which is a finding consistent with Bandura’s theory as performance influences efficacy
beliefs.

In regards to practicing teachers, researchers (Guskey, 1984, 1988; Pajares, 1992;
Woolfolk Hoy and Murphy, 2001) found that experienced teachers beliefs of efficacy
tend to be “stable” and hard to change even through professional development. Guskey
(as cited in Tchannen-Moran et al. 1998, 237) found that teachers take time and need support, encouragement and feedback in order to change and implement new methodologies after they have been exposed to training. Even more, teachers with confidence may not feel that they want to implement new strategies.

Despite the fact that experienced teachers resist change, research (Korthagen and Kessels, 1999; Kwo, 1996; Putnam and Borko, 2000) suggested that by engaging in-service teachers in a process of self-reflection, they are likely to implement innovative practices in their classrooms and gain new insights about the attitudes, beliefs and past experiences that shape their practice. It is important to provide teachers with mastery experiences that show positive evidence of students’ learning progress (Guskey, 1988). In a similar vein, Tschannen-Moran et al. pointed out that supporting and increasing the efficacy levels of experienced teachers will turn into a future gain in terms of “higher motivation, greater effort, persistence, and resilience across the span of their teacher career” (p.238). But, they also warned that

Verbal persuasion in the form of professional development workshops or inservice programs can provide a provisional boost in teachers’ sense of efficacy; however, if persuasion is not accompanied by the development of new skills that improve performance and increase student learning, then the impact may be fleeting. (p. 238)

From this perspective, it is important to highlight that for change to occur, teachers need support and follow-up on the new strategies to be implemented. In addition to encourage self-reflection as a constant process as suggested earlier, Tschannen-Moran et al.
proposed to engage teachers in role playing and microteaching experiences with the necessary feedback on their performance so that those mastery experiences have a powerful impact on self-perceptions and teaching praxis. According to Bandura (1977), mastery experiences produce "stronger" (p.80) efficacy beliefs. The more successful an individual is in his or her performance, the more he or she will be likely to build beliefs of personal efficacy. However, performance experiences depend not only on individual appraisal but also on factors such the difficulty of the task, the amount of effort expended, and the external circumstances under which the individual perform.

Teachers' sense of efficacy and classroom management

Emmer (1990) conducted a study to determine if a teacher's belief about classroom management and discipline differed from the two already identified factors of teachers' self-efficacy (PTE and GTE). Emmer argued that teachers dedicated considerable attention to classroom behavior, which does not necessarily connect to learning outcomes. Therefore, he claimed that in order to understand teachers' decisions, it is important to assess their efficacy in management and discipline. This dimension of efficacy is beyond the construct of GTE according to Emmer.

A sample of 119 preservice teacher education students and 42 student teachers who were near the end of their field experiences were the participants of the study. Six vignettes describing different teaching problems and strategies were used in order to examine relationships between the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson and Dembo, 1984) and teacher decision-making. Five reductive strategies (teacher behaviors such as time out, warning the student, and desist) and four positive strategies (teacher behaviors such
as talking with the student, praise, giving extra attention) were presented to the subjects. On a 5-point scale ranging from “very likely” to “not at all likely,” the participants chose what they would use according to each problem. In addition, the subjects were administered a questionnaire adapted from Gibson and Dembo’s TES, plus some other items added by Emmer to assess classroom management discipline efficacy. As factor analysis was run, results indicated that the new items made a dimension that was distinct “both conceptually and behaviorally, from the ability to influence learning or achievement outcomes” (Emmer, 1990, p.2). Emmer labeled this third factor as “Classroom management/discipline factor” to establish the difference from PTE and TE. “Classroom management/discipline” is understood as “beliefs about capabilities in managing a classroom and handling behavior problems” (Emmer and Hickman, 1990, p. 2). In addition, Emmer argued that the second factor identified as TE in Gibson and Dembo’s TES “reflects the relative influence on student behavior of events or characteristics beyond the teacher control” (p.3). Therefore, Emmer identified the second factor as “External influences” rather than GTE as Gibson and Dembo’s label. External influences make the teacher less important in regards to environment. For the third factor (PTE), Emmer’s findings supported Gibson and Dembo’s dimension of PTE indicating the teacher’s beliefs about his or her capabilities to affect students’ learning.

In a similar vein, Woolfolk and Hoy’s study (1990) examined prospective teachers’ sense of efficacy about pupil control ideology, motivational orientation, and bureaucratic orientation in regards with school organization. Data were gathered from 182 prospective teachers who were given a revised version of the Gibson and Dembo’s
(1984) TES (Teacher Efficacy Scale). Woolfolk and Hoy found that teachers with high efficacy were more humanistic in their pupil control than teachers with low efficacy who tended to be custodial, i.e., more authoritarian and dogmatic. In other words, teachers with a custodial orientation were more rigid and highly controlled students while teachers with a humanistic orientation tended to stress cooperation, interaction, and experience as well as students' autonomy. Their findings also supported the two dimensions of efficacy (TE and PTE) found in previous studies. Woolfolk and Hoy concluded that teachers' sense of efficacy was a complex construct, and that it was necessary to conduct further research to examine the mixed combinations of high and low efficacy categories of TE and PTE. As being multidimensional, teachers' self-efficacy should be examined and measured in context specific situations.

In another study, Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy (1990) examined practicing teachers' management, control, and motivation of students. Data were gathered from 40 Hebrew schools that voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. Four questionnaires were given to the subjects. The authors chose 16 of the original 30 items in Gibson & Dembo's scale, added 4 items pertaining the adequacy of the teachers' preservice preparation, and also included the two Rand items for a total of 22 items. The other three questionnaires were the PCI (Pupil Control Ideology), Deci's et al. Problem in School Inventory, and an instrument developed by Woolfolk et al. to measure teacher perception of student motivation. The study found that PTE (Personal Teacher Efficacy) and attitudes towards pupil control ideology were negatively correlated, i.e., "the more efficacious the teacher, the less custodial the pupil control ideology" (p.143) which suggests that PTE (teachers'
beliefs in their instructional abilities) lead them to be more humanistic in their attitudes about control in the classroom. Additionally, teachers who held an optimistic belief that students can be taught (Teaching Efficacy) tended to be both more humanistic about control and more supportive of students’ autonomy to problem solving (p.146). The authors concluded that teachers’ classroom management and motivation of students are tasks influenced by teachers’ sense of efficacy.

Summary

In sum, the review of a growing body of research has shown that there is increasing research evidence about the role of teachers’ sense of efficacy as a critical factor that influences teachers’ instructional practices and the ways in which they create opportunities to foster student learning. Drawing upon the studies conducted by many researchers about self-efficacy, some implications of the construct of teachers’ sense of efficacy and its dimensions for teacher education programs as well as for professional development have been presented in Chapter II. Overall, it was found that GTE and PTE are pivotal dimensions of teacher cognitive processes that guide their decisions, strategies, and the fundamental ways in which they teach.

However, research about teachers’ sense of efficacy and EFL teachers in contexts outside the U.S. is scarce. Thus, examining EFL teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs in relation to their English self-reported proficiency and the instructional and management strategies they use to teach English may provide a theoretical framework to improve the teaching of English in Venezuela. First, it may show teacher education programs how to possibly
improve preservice teacher education and provide insights for building strong efficacy beliefs in prospective EFL teachers. Secondly, recommendations are drawn for ongoing professional development for in-service teachers to support them in the implementation of innovations and increase teachers' beliefs about their capabilities to teach EFL. This Chapter has established both the existence of a theoretical and empirical database for teachers' sense of efficacy research and its application to the proposed research in a Venezuelan context.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The methods and procedures described in this chapter were used to collect data to answer the research questions. The data analysis and discussion form the basis for making subsequent recommendations for EFL teacher education in San Cristóbal, Venezuela. The context, research design, variables of interest, instrumentation, population and sample, data collection, and data analysis of the study are described in this chapter.

Research Design

This study included both descriptive research methods and correlational research methods. The study was designed to explore teachers' sense of efficacy of selected Venezuelan EFL teachers and its relationship with self-reported competence to teach English and their professional education and academic background. A descriptive correlational design was used. Document analysis and semi-structured open-ended interviews were also conducted in order to triangulate the data. The one-time interviews lasted between 50 and 60 minutes. Each interview was audio taped and transcribed to identify common patterns in the teachers' responses and later relate them to survey data.
Population and Sampling

The target population for this study consisted of EFL inservice teachers currently working in middle schools located in San Cristóbal capital city of Táchira State in Venezuela. The available population consisted of all the EFL teachers (N=104) who worked at the time of the study, in public and private middle schools within the geographical limits of San Cristóbal. The participating schools have all the same EFL curriculum for grades 7, 8, and 9.

Research setting background

The focus of the present study was on EFL teacher self-reported efficacy in middle schools in San Cristóbal, which is the capital city capital of Táchira state. Táchira state is located in the western part of Venezuela, and its population is approximately 950,000 people. The middle schools where the study took place belong to the School District 1, which has the higher number of private and public schools, and it is represented by San Cristóbal, San Josecito, and Santa Ana. In this section, a description of the research setting in terms of site of the study, educational setting, school year, weekly time allotted to English, student factors, and teacher factors is provided.

Educational setting: The study included a total of 51 schools (34 private middle schools and 17 public middle schools) in School District 1. Public and private middle schools are organized according to the policies of the Venezuelan Ministry of Education. The Venezuelan educational system is divided in three major levels: preschool education, basic education, and professional high school education. Preschool education is for children under 6 years. Elementary education (Educación básica) starts at the age of 7 and lasts for nine years that are divided into three levels. The first level (Primera Etapa)
includes grades 1 to 3, the second one (Segunda Etapa) 4, 5, and 6; and the third one (Tercera Etapa) corresponds to grades 7, 8, and 9. The third level is organized around seven areas of study: language, mathematics, social studies, natural science and health education, physical education and sports, vocational education, and art education. In the language area, students study two subjects: Spanish and literature, and English as a foreign language. The time allotted to EFL in grade 7 is 4 hours per week, and 3 hours for grades 8 and 9.

School year: The school year in Venezuela starts September 16 and ends July 30. The school year is divided in three periods. The table below shows the annual distribution of periods and the time allotted to EFL during each grade. Each period includes 6 hours for written exams. Annually, a total of 122 hours are allotted to the teaching of English for 7th grade, and 89 hours for 8th and 9th grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>7th grade</th>
<th>8th &amp; 9th grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First period (until December)</td>
<td>42-6=36</td>
<td>31-6=25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Period (until April)</td>
<td>56-6=50</td>
<td>44-6=38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Period (until July)</td>
<td>42-6=36</td>
<td>32-6=26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Class-hours</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In a typical day, 7th, 8th, and 9th graders in most middle schools attend classes from 7:00 a.m. to 1:00 pm, from Monday through Friday. In some cases, when schools
cannot meet all the schedule needs in the morning due to space reasons, students may also attend school in the afternoon from 2:30 to 5 p.m.

**English as a foreign language class:** The maximum number of students per class in public middle schools is 38 students. The number of students in private middle schools usually ranges between 30 and 50 students. The age of students is normally between 13 and 15 years during 7th, 8th, and 9th grade. The class time scheduled for EFL classes as well as for the other general classes is 45 minutes per class. In some schools class time is scheduled in blocks of 80 minutes.

**Student factors:** The population that feeds the urban schools in San Cristóbal where the study was conducted is middle to lower-class socioeconomic status for public schools and middle to high-class socioeconomic status for private schools. The households of students attending public schools typically consist of one-income families where the income comes from jobs such as secretaries, factory workers, general laborers, janitors, and clerks, whereas students attending private schools tend to come from higher income households where parents typically hold a college degree. In spite of the differences in socioeconomic status and parents’ education between public schools and private schools, the students represent a homogenous population coming, essentially from the same cultural and language background.

**Teacher factors:** Although public and private schools differ in the socioeconomic status of their students, teachers who work in private or public middle schools share similar demographic characteristics, including socioeconomic status. The population of this study included teachers from both private and public schools who worked either part-time or full time teaching EFL. Whether a teacher holds an administrative position (e.g., chief
of the section, librarian, coordinator) or not, the workload for a full time teacher is 40 hours a week. Depending on the grade taught, a full-time EFL teacher might have between 8 and 10 courses per week. Part-time teachers generally work a number of hours in different schools either public or private to complete the workload for the salary that a full time teacher earns.

Sampling procedure

The researcher requested a list of all public and private middle schools for School District 1 (San Cristóbal, San Josecito, and Santa Ana) from the Ministry of Education. She subsequently requested from each middle school the total number of EFL teachers working in each school at the time of data collection and compared that with the list provided by the state office of the Ministry of Education. The rosters were gathered and analyzed by the researcher in December 2001. A total population of 104 EFL teachers in grades 7, 8, and 9 was verified.

Since the results of the present study cannot be generalized beyond the study population, external validity was not considered to be a concern for the measured outcomes. However, the researcher examined the four threats to external validity that affect survey procedures. These threats are explained below.

Frame error. Refers to the possible discrepancy between the intended target population and the actual population. In this case, frame error was controlled by obtaining an up-to-date listing and using each teacher's name one time.

Sampling error. Occurs when a nonrepresentative and nonprobalistic sample is drawn from the population. For the present study, sampling error was not a threat since a census was conducted and all individuals were included.
Selection error. Happens when some sampling units have a greater change of being selected than other sampling units. Again, in this study the use of the total census meant that a selection error was avoided. Teachers on the lists were double checked to avoid duplication of names.

Nonresponse error. Usually occurs when subjects selected for the study cannot be located, fail to respond, or will not return the questionnaire. In this study, the researchers and her two assistants administered the questionnaire to the teachers in their work sites, thereby reducing the probability of a nonresponse error. However, from the 104 questionnaires, 4 were not returned.

A 78-item questionnaire designed by the researcher, semi-structured interviews and document analysis were all used in this study. Each of these research strategies is described in the following sections of the chapter.

Instrumentation

Four instruments provided information on the content and format for the development of the 78-item questionnaire English Teacher Sense of Efficacy Belief Instrument (hereafter referred to as ETSEBI) used in the study to assess self-reported efficacy beliefs of EFL teachers in a Venezuelan context. The ETSEBI has been partially adapted from four previously validated instruments that have been used over the last two decades to study teachers' self-efficacy. The four instruments were: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2000); the Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument (STEBI), developed by Riggs and Enochs (1990); the two Rand Items (Armor, Conroy-Oseguera, Cox, King, McDonell, Pascal, & Zellman, 1976), and the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) developed by Gibson and Dembo.
(1984). In addition, the researcher added several items related to teacher self-reported English proficiency and use of strategies to teach and manage student behavior.

The questionnaire contained five sections (See Appendix A), the first section (Short form of The TSES containing 12 items) having to do with teacher self-efficacy beliefs on how to deal with some of the most common difficulties regarding student discipline and interest in learning English. The second section (N=19) addressed teacher self-reported efficacy beliefs about teaching English. Thirteen items from the STEBI, the two Rand Items, two items on job preparedness from Woolfolk and Hoy’s (1990) modified version of TES (Teacher Efficacy Scale), and two new items were included in section two. The third section (N=16) contained statements developed by the researcher about teacher self-reported proficiency in English. The fourth section (N=19) included items developed by the researcher about strategies used in teaching English and strategies used to manage student behavior. Section five (N=12) contained questions regarding teachers’ individual professional education and academic background. A total of 78 items constituted the survey questionnaire based on an adaptation of previously developed instruments and several researcher-developed items. Each part is described in greater detail in the following section.

Part I. In the first section, teachers were given the short version of Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES, 2000). The TSES contained 12 items that required teachers to rate the twelve statements on a scale of 1 to 9 from “Nothing” to “A great deal.” Three factors were identified in the TSES (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2000): 1. Efficacy for student engagement, 2. Efficacy for instructional strategies, and 3. Efficacy for classroom management. The short version of the TSES was judged appropriate to address English
classroom context in San Cristóbal, Venezuela. In items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12 the word “English” or “learning English” was either added or substituted for “school work” to make the items apply to EFL classrooms. Table 3.1 shows the 12 items with the different factors as identified by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Efficacy for Student Engagement      | 2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in *learning English*?  
  3. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in *English*?  
  4. How much can you do to help your students value learning *English*?  
  11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school? |
| Efficacy for classroom management    | 1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?  
  6. How much can you do to get *students* to follow classroom rules *in your English classroom*?  
  7. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy *in your English class*?  
  8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students? |
| Efficacy for instructional strategies | 9. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies *in your English class*?  
  10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when *your English* students are confused?  
  5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?  
  12. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your *English* classroom? |

Table 3.1: Short version of the TSES
Part two. This part of the instrument included 13 items adapted from the 25-item STEBI (Riggs and Enochs, 1990), the two Rand Items (Armor et al., 1976), 2 items designed to address the level of satisfaction with job preparedness to teach English (Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990), and two new items developed by the researcher. The researcher-developed items measured the teachers' sense of efficacy to teach speaking and grammar as a specific task in EFL teaching: I am not confident about my English fluency and pronunciation to teach speaking effectively; and, I know grammar well enough to be effective in teaching English.

Table 2 shows the 19 items and their corresponding sources. From these 19 items, 9 items assessed the Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) beliefs about teaching English. Eight items assessed the teacher's beliefs about General Teacher Efficacy (GTE), and 2 assessed the level of teacher satisfaction with job preparedness to teach English.
### Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am continually finding better ways to teach <em>English</em>.</td>
<td>STEBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I try hard, I am effective at teaching oral skills.</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the necessary strategies to teach the four language skills <em>(listening, speaking, reading, and writing)</em> effectively.</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not very effective in monitoring students' oral interaction in <em>English</em>.</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am typically able to answer students’ <em>English</em> questions.</td>
<td>Item 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know what to do to turn students on to <em>English</em>.</td>
<td>Item 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not confident about my <em>English</em> fluency and pronunciation to teach speaking effectively.</td>
<td>Item 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.</td>
<td>Item Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know <em>grammar</em> well enough to be effective in teaching <em>English</em>.</td>
<td>Rand Item 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem.</td>
<td>Item added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher training program has given me the necessary skills to be an effective teacher.</td>
<td>Items 5 &amp; 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Efficacy (TE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When a student does better than usual <em>in English</em>, it is often because I have exerted a little extra effort.</td>
<td>STEBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the <em>English</em> grades of students improve, it is often due to their teacher having found a more effective teaching approach.</td>
<td>Item 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lack of a student’s interest in learning <em>English</em> can be overcome by good teaching.</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a low achieving student progresses in <em>English</em>, it is usually due to extra attention given by the teacher.</td>
<td>Item 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ achievement in <em>English</em> is directly related to their teacher’s effectiveness in <em>English</em> teaching.</td>
<td>Item 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in <em>English</em> teaching has little influence on the achievement of students with low motivation.</td>
<td>Item 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even teachers with good <em>English</em> competence and good teaching abilities may not reach many students in learning <em>English</em>.</td>
<td>Item 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her environment.</td>
<td>Item 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2: Teachers’ sense of efficacy about teaching English

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part three: Self-reported level of proficiency in English (16 items)

This section contained 16 items developed by the researcher based on the professional literature, theories, and the researcher's twenty years of experience as an EFL teacher and as a teacher educator. The items asked teachers to self-report the level of proficiency in English on a 6-point Likert-type scale from "Strongly disagree to "Strongly agree" to indicate how teachers self-evaluated themselves in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and sociolinguistic knowledge.

The 16 items as shown in Table 3 were distributed as follows: three for reading, three for writing, three for listening, three for speaking, and four for sociolinguistic knowledge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1. I can read and understand magazines, newspapers, and popular novels when I read them in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I can draw inferences/conclusions from what I read in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I can figure out the meaning of unknown words in English from the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>4. I can write business and personal letters in English without errors that interfere the meaning I want to convey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. I can write a short essay in English on a topic of my knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. I can fill in different kinds of applications in English (e.g., credit card applications).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>7. I understand English films without subtitles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. I can understand when two native English-speakers talk at a normal speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. I can understand a message in English on an answering machine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>10. In face-to-face interaction with an English-speaker, I can participate in a conversation at normal speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. I can express and support my opinions in English when speaking about general topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. I can understand the meaning of common idiomatic expressions used by English-speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistic</td>
<td>13. I know the necessary strategies to help maintain a conversation with an English-speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence</td>
<td>14. I can talk in English about cultural themes and norms in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. I know how to act in social English-speaking situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. I know the English terms to use in regular classroom interaction with students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Teacher self-reported proficiency in English
Part IV: Teaching practice (19 items)

In addition, 19 items were developed by the researcher to assess the use of strategies to teach English and the use of strategies to control student discipline. As with the items to assess self-reported English proficiency, the researcher reviewed the literature on self-efficacy and classroom management (Emmer & Hickman, 1991; Ho, 2000; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) and approaches for teaching foreign languages (Ellis, 1994; Freeman, 1989; Hancock, 1994; Hymes, 1976; Nunan, 1995; Tedick & Walker, 1995). In Part four, teachers were asked to report the frequency of the types of strategies they used to teach and to control student behavior with a 6-point Likert scale ranging from “Almost always” to “Almost never.” The first category consisted of strategies (11 items) related to the major approaches currently identified in the professional literature for teaching foreign languages: Grammar-translation and Audio-lingual method; Notional-functional and Communicative Language Teaching approach. The second category of strategies (8 items) focused on teacher-centered and student-centered approaches. Table 4 shows the items addressing instructional strategies and the items for management behavior.
### Instructional strategies items

1. Students translate English words/sentences into Spanish and vice versa.
2. Students share information through interviews and polls to express their opinions on different topics.
3. Students memorize and practice dialogues to role-play them in class.
4. Students memorize lists of words/phrases for later dictation.
5. Students pair off to discuss answers to problem-solving situations/activities.
6. Students in groups/pairs make up dialogues to role play in class.
7. Students are called to the blackboard to write their responses to in-class drill exercises.
8. Students copy grammar exercises from the blackboard after the teacher’s explanation.
9. Students in groups/pairs simulate social situations from everyday life as a class activity.
10. Students write in their notebooks while the teacher translates dialogues/readsings.
11. Students engage in interactive games to practice communicating the English.

### Management Strategies

12. When a student misbehaves in English class, I either give him or her a low grade or write a negative note in his/her records.
13. When a student is disruptive and noisy in class, I refer him or her to the section chief (Jefe de Seccional).
14. If a student repeats his or her bad behavior several times, I discuss the problem with him or her privately after class.
15. I try to involve misbehaving students more in class activities.
16. I ignore disruptive students in my English classes.
17. I reward students’ appropriate behavior in my English class.
18. I reprimand/discard a student’s misbehavior in front of the class.
19. If a student misbehaves several times in English class, I expel him or her from class.

---

Table 3.4: Teaching and management strategies

**Part V: Teacher Professional Education and Academic Background Scale** (12 items)

Part V contained 12 researcher-developed items to gather data about the teachers’ academic background and individual professional education relevant for the study.

---
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Demographic information included professional education and academic background, gender, average class size, level of teaching, number of years of English teaching, college degrees obtained, travel experience or study in an English-speaking country, participation in professional development, and subscription to journals in the field of TESOL.

**Instruments**

The next section describes the four instruments used to develop the ETSEBI in the following order: (1) The seminal Rand scale consisting of two items, (2) the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) by Gibson and Dembo (1984), (3) The Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument (STEBI) by Riggs and Enochs (1990), and (4) The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2000).

**Rand Scale**

A two-item Likert scale developed by the Rand researchers (Armor, et al., 1976) was the first instrument used to measure teacher efficacy. The study of teachers’ sense of efficacy was determined by computing a total score for the responses to the two five-point scale items:

**Rand Item 1:** When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of the student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.

**Rand Item 2:** If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.

The Rand items were based on Rotter’s (1966) locus of control theory and intended to measure the teachers’ beliefs that student learning and motivation were under
teacher control (Henson, 2001). For the present study, these two items were included as part of the ETSEBI because they represent a seminal study in teachers' self-efficacy and they have been widely used in teachers' sense of efficacy research over the past three decades. Including these items will allow the researcher to compare her findings with previous studies related to these items.

**Gibson and Dembo's Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES)**

Using the Rand scale and Bandura's theory of self-efficacy, Gibson and Dembo (1984) developed a 30-item Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) to measure teacher efficacy. Factor analysis of responses from elementary teachers to the 30-item instrument yielded two factors that according to Gibson and Dembo corresponded to Bandura's model of self-efficacy. Factor 1 representing Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) yielded an alpha = .75, and factor 2 General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) yielded alpha = .79. Gibson and Dembo's scale presented some inconsistencies when factorial analysis was applied because several items loaded on both factors. Therefore, the sixteen items that loaded on either factor (alpha = .79) were subsequently used by other researchers (Soodak and Podell, 1993; Wolfolk and Hoy, 1990).

In their study, Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) examined Gibson and Dembo's Teacher Efficacy Scale on the grounds of Bandura's theory, proposing a revised version containing 22 items. They took the 16 items that showed adequate reliability according to Gibson and Dembo's study, developed four additional items about teacher preparation, and added the two Rand items for a total of 22 items on their scale. Then, the scale was subjected to a two-factor analytic procedure. In their last revision, Woolfolk and Hoy (1993) developed a new, short version of ten items from the 22-item scale.
The English Teacher Sense of Efficacy Belief Instrument (ETSEBI) included two items about teacher job preparedness from the 22-item questionnaire (Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990): Item 16, *I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem*, and item 19, *My teacher training program has given me the necessary skills to be an effective teacher*.

**Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument (STEBI)**

Riggs and Enochs (1990) developed a 25-item questionnaire based on Gibson and Dembo's (1984) Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES). They used a 5-point Likert scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Consistent with Bandura’s (1981) conceptualization of self-efficacy as situation specific rather than as a global construct, Riggs and Enochs’ instrument was designed to specifically address self-efficacy of science teachers at the elementary school level. The STEBI was composed by two scales: "Personal Science Teaching Efficacy Belief" (PSTEB) and "Science Teaching Outcome Expectancy" (STOE).

The STEBI scale also used a Likert format. The five response categories were "strongly agree," "agree," "uncertain," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." A score of 5 was assigned to positive items with a "strongly agree" response, and other scores reflected the same type of ratings with 4 meaning agree, and so forth. The STEBI was field-tested in a preliminary study with 71 elementary teachers in order to refine the item pool (Riggs and Enochs, 1990, 628). While there was no problem with the PSTEB, the STOE showed some major flaws that were more evident when a factor analysis was conducted. The complexity of the STOE showed that teachers interpreted some items as referring to them in particular, rather than to teaching in general. Therefore, items were
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selected on the basis of their factor loading. Reliability for the Science Teaching
Outcome Expectancy (STOE) resulted in an alpha of 0.74 while the Personal Science
Teaching Efficacy Belief (PSTEB) produced a 0.92 alpha.

In a second major study with 331 teachers, the two dimensions of the STEBI
reliability were again determined. This time the PSTEB scale produced an alpha of 0.91
while the STOE scale achieved an alpha of 0.76 (Riggs and Enochs, 1990, p.630-631).
Riggs & Enochs concluded that the somewhat low reliability of the STOE was consistent
with Gibson and Dembo’s findings regarding the complexity of the second factor (TE).
Nonetheless, the factor analysis showed that the scales resulted in two distinct and
measurable dimensions consistent with the Gibson and Dembo labels for PTE and TE.
The final version of STEBI resulted in 25 items.

For the purposes of the present study, the researcher selected 14 out of the 25
items of the STEBI. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 24, and 25 seemed more
appropriate to adapt to the Venezuelan context of EFL teaching. The items omitted are
presented below.

Items 8 & 19

8. I generally teach science ineffectively.

19. I wonder if I have the necessary skills to teach science.

These items seemed too general to make them specific to the teaching of English
in its four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Items 7, 10, 13, & 14

7. If students are underachieving in science, it is most likely due to ineffective
science teaching.
10. The low science achievement of some students cannot generally be blamed on their teachers.

13. Increased effort in science teaching produces little change in some students’ science

14. The teacher is generally responsible for the achievement of students in science.

The ETSEBI contained Item 15, “Students’ achievement in English is directly related to their teacher’s effectiveness in English teaching” which seemed suitable to substitute items 7, 10, 13, and 14.

Items 16, 17, 21, 22, and 23.

16. If parents comment that their child is showing more interest in science at school, it is probably due to the performance of the child’s teacher.

17. I find it difficult to explain to students why science experiments work.

21. Given a choice, I would not invite the principal to evaluate my science teaching.

22. When a student has difficulty understanding science concepts, I am usually at a loss as to how to help the students understand better.

23. When teaching science, I usually welcome student questions.

The above items seemed not relevant to make them specific to the context of EFL classrooms in Venezuela. Furthermore, the short version of TSES contained statements dealing with efficacy for student engagement and instructional strategies.

Short Version of The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) developed an instrument based on their theoretical model of teachers’ perceived efficacy (See Figure 2 in Chapter 2) that
addresses efficacy in terms of the tasks teachers encounter in school and their assessment of PTE. Following Bandura’s scale, the TSES used a 9-point Likert scale format ranging “A great deal” to “Nothing.” The TSES was validated by using three different studies, all of which are described below.

In the first study, the authors enlisted eight students in a graduate seminar on teachers’ self-efficacy to design a new instrument inspired in Bandura’s 30-item scale. One hundred items were produced, pooled, and revised first to 52, and later reduced to 32 items. The instrument was administered to a sample of 224 subjects (146 preservice teachers and 78 inservice teachers). Principal-axis factor analysis was conducted resulting in 32 of the original 52 items. In the second study, the authors used a different group of teachers to field test the 32-item scale that yielded 18 items with three factors. This time the participants were 217 subjects (70 preservice teachers and 147 inservice teachers). As a result of factorial analysis, items with the lowest loadings within each factor, redundant items, and those loaded in more than one factor were removed (Tschannen-Moran and Wooffolk Hoy, 2001). The authors identified three factors that they labeled “Efficacy for Student Engagement,” “Efficacy for Instructional Strategies,” and “Efficacy for Classroom Management.” The findings of Tschannen-Moran and Wooffolk Hoy are consistent with Bandura’s conceptualization of self-efficacy as a task-specific construct that goes beyond the idea of general PTE and TE. In the same way, the study support other researchers’ (Emmer & Hickman, 1991; Riggs and Enochs, 1990) efforts in making self-efficacy specific to particular activities and tasks within the complexities and multiplicity of classroom life.
The 78-item English Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument (ETSEBI) for assessing EFL Venezuelan middle school teachers’ efficacy beliefs is the researcher-adaptation based on the four major instruments described above.

Interviewing Phase

As an additional source of data, semi-structured open-ended interviews were conducted to add qualitative data to the present study.

In discussing the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, Creswell (1994) pointed out that although the “mixing” of both methodologies has brought an epistemological controversy among followers of each paradigm, scholars have contributed by advancing some models that use combined designs. For instance, Creswell (1994) stated that in the “dominant-less dominant design . . . the researcher presents the study within a single dominant paradigm with one small component of the overall study drawn from the alternative paradigm” (p.177). In the same vein, Glesne and Peshkin (1992) argued that despite the philosophical differences between quantitative and qualitative paradigms, “This does not mean, however, that the positivist never uses interviews nor that the interpretivist never uses a survey. Different approaches allow us to know and understand different things about the world” (p.9). In addition, Nunan (1992) stated that the interview has been widely used as a research tool in applied linguistics in combination not only with surveys but as an important source of data on SLA.

Interview sampling procedure

This study used interviews as a complementary data source. Semi-structured open-ended interviews were conducted with a “purposive sampling” (Ary, Jacobs, and
Razavieh, 1996, p. 573) where subjects were selected as representatives of the population. By “using the maximum variation approach, the researcher . . . analyzed the potential population to assess the maximum range of sites and people that constitute [d] the population” (Seidman, 1998, p.45). Procedurally, the researcher's goal was to interview 20 participants. Therefore, she invited the participants to volunteer to be interviewed after the surveys. From the population (N=104) the researcher obtained 65 volunteers who handed in their personal data (name and phone number) in an additional consent form when they were administered the survey. Next, the researcher selected 20 participants among the 65 who volunteered. The interview participants were selected taking into consideration those that met the criteria set up for the purposeful sampling. These criteria included those scoring high and low in Part I and Part II of the ETSEBI. To meet this criterion, descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) was run to select the 20 teachers for the interview phase. In addition, the researcher took into account that the sample represented the population including subjects who worked in public and/or private middle schools, taught in 7, 8, and/or 9 grades, had a major in English, represented males and females, and had from 0 to more than 20 years of English teaching experience.

**Interview procedures**

After the first contact with the participants, the researcher visited them in their schools or talked to them on the phone to make a second contact to agree on the interview date and place. A third meeting was arranged to conduct a one-time formal interview that lasted between 50 and 60 minutes. Each interview was audio taped and transcribed.
verbatim by the researcher for later analysis. A consent form was signed prior to the interview and the permission to be recorded granted by the interviewees.

**Interview Questions**

Semi-structured open-ended interviews were conducted with the sample of 20 teachers in order to support, refine, and add a source of data to triangulate information. According to Nunan, (1992) “In a semi-structured interview, the interviewer has a general idea of where he or she wants the interview to go, and what should come out of it, but does not enter the interview with a list of predetermined questions” (p.149). The researcher followed Spradley (1979) conceptualization of the ethnographic interview “as a series of friendly conversations into which the researcher slowly introduces new elements to assist informants to respond as informants” (p.58). To guide the researcher’s purposes, four major themes related to the questionnaire ETSEBI were chosen as the topics for the interview. The researcher used open-ended descriptive and structural questions (Spradley, 1979) to ask questions about the following themes:

1. Teachers’ academic background and teaching practice.
2. Teaching instructional practice, teacher’s language skills, and goals in teaching EFL.
3. External factors that affect teaching and learning.
4. College training program.

The interview was divided in three segments. The researcher used an interview protocol (Appendix C) to keep track of the information she was interested in getting from the respondents. No predetermined order was followed.
The first segment included questions regarding teachers' academic background and work experience. In the second segment, the questions were about teaching practice, teacher language skills and teaching goals: strengths and weaknesses as an EFL teacher, goals in teaching English in 7th, 8th, and 9th grades, EFL teacher's role in facilitating, managing, and assessing students' learning. In this segment, four short cases describing four different classrooms were used to indirectly have the teachers talk about the teaching strategies being used by the teachers in classrooms 1, 2, 3, or 4. In addition, in this segment teachers were asked their opinion concerning external factors and their influence on teaching and learning EFL: factors that constrained students' achievement and factors that constrained teachers' work (e.g., In your experience, what factors if any, constrain your daily work as an EFL teacher?) The third segment requested the teachers' opinion about the training they received from their college teacher preparation program (e.g., Do you believe that your college teaching training program has effectively trained you to teach EFL? Why do say yes/Why do you say no).

During the interview process, the researcher was aware of the relevant importance of establishing the necessary rapport with the participants in order to gain trust and make them feel at ease while talking. The researcher also acknowledged the participants' right to remain anonymous. Therefore, all the participants were assured that their anonymity as well as their place of work would be protected by omitting real names and using a code in place of their names and school name.

Data gathered from the interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed by the researcher in order to look for common themes or patterns among the respondents. As a result of the analysis, common patterns from the teachers' responses
were grouped under each question asked during the interview to triangulate those data with data in the ETSEBI (English Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument). These data are presented in chapter four.

The purpose of the interviewing phase was to obtain the "emic" perspective of the participants' experiences in their daily English teaching praxis. Schwandt (1997) defined "emic" as "the local language, concepts, or ways of expression used by members in a particular group or setting to name their experience" (p.35). This process allowed the researcher to get a deeper perspective from the teachers' insights about their English proficiency, use of teaching and management strategies, and teacher self-efficacy beliefs to teach English.

By comparing data from the interviews, the researcher sought to ensure the emic perspective of the participants. However, the researcher acknowledged that her "reflexivity," was involved in the establishment of rapport and trust during the interview phase. In other words, as a Venezuelan EFL teacher and educator the researcher was part of the setting and context and social phenomenon she sought to understand; therefore, her bias were involved in the interviewing process.

In summary, the researcher relied on a variety of data sources to analyze data and identify the emergent themes from the interview phase. In addition, a correlational design was applied in the instrumentation of the research in order to study the relationships between teacher self-efficacy beliefs to teach English, teachers' reported level of proficiency and teaching strategies, and professional and academic background.
Document analysis

Document analysis “refers broadly to various procedures involved in analyzing and interpreting data generated from the examination of documents and records relevant to a particular study” (Schwandt, 1997, p.32). For the purposes of the present study, the researcher examined two public official documents: Programa de Estudio y Manual del Docente Tercera Etapa de Educación Básica 7, 8, 9 Grado Asignatura Inglés (1987) regarding curricula of EFL teaching in Venezuela and the Curriculum for the English Teacher Education Program (1996) at the University of Los Andes Táchira. The data gathered from document analysis were used as a source to triangulate information. The researcher compared the instructional strategies and teaching goals suggested in the official document of the Ministry of Education with the data self-reported by the participants in the study. The goal was to determine the alignment between the official document and the teachers’ self-reported strategies.

Validity

Validity has been commonly defined as “the extent to which and instrument measures what is supposed to measure” (Ary, et al. 1996, p.262). Construct validity was partially established by the instruments that gave birth to the ETSEBI. However, as some of those items were modified and some were added, there was a need to reestablish the validity of the instrument. Therefore, validity was established by a panel of experts and field-testing.

Panel of experts: Face validity was established by a panel of experts composed of three faculty members at The Ohio State University who tested the suitability and clarity of the
instrument. Revisions were made and the instrument was field-tested in Columbus, and pilot tested in Táchira State Venezuela, before administering it to the population of the study.

**Field-testing:** A field test was conducted in Columbus with three graduate students in the Foreign/Second Language Education Program at The Ohio State University. In addition, the instrument was sent via email to four teacher educators in the English Teacher Education Program at the University of Los Andes Táchira who had experience in middle schools in Venezuela. They were asked to comment on the instrument's wording, ambiguities, and appropriateness. Based on the input of the graduate students at The OSU and Venezuelan educators, new revisions regarding vocabulary and directions were made and attention was given to the comments incorporating them in the revision. Finally, the instrument was administered to 10 EFL teachers who worked in “Francisco Tamayo” middle school located in El Piñal, a small city out of the perimeter of San Cristobal. The ten teachers (five females and five males) graduated from the University of Los Andes with a diploma of Licenciate in Education major English and taught in 7, 8, and 9 grades with a class size of 38 students. Items and directions did not present any problem to those teachers. One item was added to part V (In which university did you obtain your degree?) and time was changed on the cover because four teachers spent between 30 and 40 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Time was changed from 20 minutes to 40 minutes after field-testing the instrument.

**Reliability**

According to Ary et al. (1996) reliability refers to “the degree of consistency with which [an instrument] measures whatever it is measuring” (p.273). After field-testing the
instrument, reliability was assessed using coefficient alpha (Cronbach alpha), which resulted in .75 for Part I, .59 for Part II, .92 for Part III, and .80 for Part IV.

Data collection

The method of data collection used in this study was primarily a survey conducted from December 1, 2001 through January 18, 2002. The researcher conducted the interviews between January 20 and February 24. Data were gathered by using the 78-item ETSEBI that was administered directly to the participants with the assistance of two professors of the University of Los Andes, in San Cristobal. According to Ary et al. (1996) directly administered questionnaires have the advantage of providing “the high response rate which typically reaches 100 percent” (p.437).

Data analysis

Data were analyzed by using the SPSS 10.1 version for Windows in order to describe the characteristics of the participants. Correlational statistics were used to describe the relationships of self-reported teachers’ sense of efficacy beliefs to teach English, self-reported proficiency in English, and self-reported use of teaching and management strategies to teach English.

Statistical procedures

The following paragraphs describe the statistical procedures used for the analysis of quantitative data.

Research questions 1, 3, 6, 7, and 10

In order to capture the teachers’ sense of efficacy level among middle school teachers (Part I & II of the ETSEBI) measures of central tendency (the mean) and measures of variability (the standard deviation) were used. The total score was computed
by adding the item in each part in order obtain the scores for PTE and GTE to teach English and the scores for efficacy for engagement, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for classroom management. Similarly, the mean and the standard deviation were used to compute the total scores of the items measuring self-reported English proficiency, self-reported instructional strategies, and self-reported strategies to manage student behavior.

**Factor analysis:** Part II included 19 items from which 9 items assess the Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) beliefs about teaching English. Eight items assess the teacher's beliefs about General Teacher Efficacy (GTE), and 2 items assess the level of teachers' satisfaction with job preparedness to teach English. Table 5 below shows the factor analysis for identifying PTE, GTE, and teacher level of satisfaction with job preparedness.
Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE)

1. I am continually finding better ways to teach English.
2. When I try hard, I am effective at teaching oral skills.
3. I know the necessary strategies to teach the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) effectively.
4. I am not very effective in monitoring students' oral interaction in English.
5. I am typically able to answer students' English questions.
6. I don't know what to do to turn students on to English.
7. I am not confident about my English fluency and pronunciation to teach speaking effectively.
8. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.
9. I know grammar well enough to be effective in teaching English.

General Teaching Efficacy (GTE)

1. When a student does better than usual in English, it is often because I have exerted a little extra effort.
2. When the English grades of students improve, it is often due to their teacher having found a more effective teaching approach.
3. The lack of a student's interest in learning English can be overcome by good teaching.
4. When a low achieving student progresses in English, it is usually due to extra attention given by the teacher.
5. Students' achievement in English is directly related to their teacher's effectiveness in English teaching.
6. Effectiveness in English teaching has little influence on the achievement of students with low motivation.
7. Even teachers with good English competence and good teaching abilities may not reach many students in learning English.
8. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her environment.

Teacher satisfaction

1. I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem.
2. My teacher training program has given me the necessary skills to be an effective teacher.

Table 4.5: Items representing PTE, GTE and satisfaction with job's preparedness.
Research question 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 11.

Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients were computed between the dependent variable (teacher efficacy) and the independent variables. The independent variables included self-reported English proficiency, self-reported use of strategies to teach, self-reported strategies to manage student behavior, and teachers’ characteristics such as years of teaching English, experience studying/living abroad, staff development, type of school, gender, and subscription to professional journals. For the description of the magnitude of the relationship, Davis’ (1971) criteria below were used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.70 - 0.99</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50- 0.69</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30- 0.49</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10- 0.29</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01 - 0.09</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Point-biserial correlation coefficient was computed between the dependent variable (teacher efficacy) and the nominal dichotomous variables experience abroad and gender. The independent variable teaching practice had two levels: 1) Strategies used to teach, and, 2) Strategies used to manage behavior. For strategies used to teach, teachers were placed in two categories: grammar-oriented teachers and communication-oriented teachers. Their self-reported use of strategies was compared with the strategies suggested
in the Program of Study and Teacher Manual 7th, 8th, and 9th grade Subject English, mandatory document released by the Venezuelan Ministry of Education in 1987.

a) Grammar-oriented teachers: score on items 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 10.

b) Communication-oriented teachers: score on items 2, 5, 6, 9, and 11.

For strategies used to manage behavior, two categories were used according to the scores

c) Teacher centered: scores on items 13, 16, 18, and 19.

d) Student-centered: score on items 14, 15, and 17.

Qualitative data: Qualitative data drawn from the semi-structured interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim after each interview. Recurrent themes were identified and coded under categories drawn from the questions asked. Semi-structured open-ended interviews were conducted to get the emic perspective of the participants in regards to the research questions of the study, and to serve as a source of comparison with the survey results.

Both quantitative and qualitative data are discussed in detail in chapter 4 and 5 to support the findings of the study. In addition, the findings provided the basis for chapter 5 where a coherent set of recommendations are made to the University of Los Andes Táchira for training and development of prospective EFL teachers as well as for the need of offering continuous on-going professional development to in-service EFL teachers to increase their levels of self-efficacy.

Conclusion

This chapter described the research methodology used in the study. The methodology included both quantitative and qualitative methods. A questionnaire
(ETSEBI) was used to obtain information about teacher self-efficacy, self-reported English proficiency, self-reported use of instructional and management strategies, and personal and academic background. This chapter has explained how the ETSEBI was developed, the instruments that inspired it, and the procedures to administer it. Procedures for the interviews with a sample of the participants in the study, and document analysis were also described as part of the research methodology.
CHAPTER 4
DATA AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter presents the statistical analysis of data collected through the questionnaire and the interview data. The results of the statistical analysis are reported for each research question. The analysis of the interview data is presented in categories based on a comparison of data from the teacher interviews. This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section describes the Venezuelan EFL teachers who participated in the study as well as the data and discussion of the research questions from a quantitative perspective. It addresses the participants’ perceived level of efficacy, the analyzed relationships between self-reported data in terms of self-efficacy, reported English proficiency, and reported use of certain teaching and management strategies. The second section presents the qualitative data gathered in the teacher interviews. Data are presented according to an interview protocol that included themes related to the research questions of the study. Answers to questions are presented and then discussed by using cross-comparisons among the respondents’ views. Section one and section two begin with the data followed by the analysis and discussion. Section three describes the data for each question from both quantitative and qualitative perspectives. Section four provides a summary of the chapter.
Characteristics of the Venezuelan EFL teachers who participated in the study

The following section presents demographic data of study participants in terms of gender, academic and professional experience, English language experience, participation in staff development, subscription to professional journals, and contextual factors (e.g., school type, grade(s) taught, class size, weekly time allotted to English).

Gender: Female teachers were double the number of male teachers in the study. As presented in Table 4.1, there were 66 female teachers and 30 male teachers. Four teachers failed to provide gender information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows the gender distribution of study participants.

Academic and professional development experience

Highest degree earned: Table 4.2 reveals that 84% of the respondents held a Bachelor’s degree while, only 8% held a Master’s degree, and 3% held a certificate as specialist in elementary school teaching. Five participants did not provide the required information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest degree Earned</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. A</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows the degrees earned by participants.

**English language teaching experience:** Years of teaching experience of Venezuelan high school EFL teachers are reported in Table 4.3. The results showed that 40% of the respondents have been teaching for 6 to 12 years. Findings also indicated that 26% of the teachers have less than 5 years of experience, while other 26% reported teaching between 13 to 20 years. Eight percent reported more than 20 years of teaching experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of English Teaching</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5 years</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 years</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 20 years</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 indicates the percent of years of teaching English for different time frames.
Experience studying/traveling to English-speaking countries: As presented in Table 4.4, the majority of the participants (77%) did not report having experiences traveling or visiting English-speaking countries. Among the surveyed teachers, only 22% had ever studied or visited an English-speaking country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/travel abroad</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows the percentage of reported experience traveling and/or studying in English-speaking countries.

Participation in staff development: Table 4.5 shows that 54% of the participants reported that they never attended staff development training such as seminars and workshops offered or sponsored by the Venezuelan Ministry of Education, while 30% reported that they attended staff development once a year. Eight percent said twice a year and 4% more than three times a year. One person did not provide the requested information.
Table 4.5 presents the percent of self-reported staff development participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in staff development</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than three times a year</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscription to professional journals: Table 4.6 reveals that 88% of the respondents reported not subscribing to any professional journal for EFL teachers. Only 12% reported subscribing to a professional journal in the field. Four respondents did not provide the requested information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscription to EFL Journals</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 indicates the reported percentage of subscriptions to professional journals.
Contextual factors

School type: School type was divided into two categories: public high schools and private high schools in the School District 1 of Tachira state. From the 51 high schools that compose School District 1, seventeen were public and 34 were private. Among the 100 participants 43 worked in private schools, 41 in public schools while 16 reported working in both the private and the public educational system (Table 4.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 indicates the reported percentage of subjects teaching in private and public high schools.

Grade(s) taught: The study was conducted for teachers who work in Venezuelan middle schools (grades 7th to 9th). The participants reported teaching at different levels, with 40% of them reported teaching at the three levels. One participant did not provide the requested information. Table 4.8 showed the teaching experience distribution by grade level.
Gradef(s) taught | Percent  
---|---
Seventh grade | 16.0
Eighth grade | 10.0
Ninth grade | 9.0
Seventh and eighth | 13.0
Eighth and ninth | 8.0
Seventh and ninth | 3.0
Seventh, eighth, and ninth | 40.0
Missing | 1.0
Total | 100.0

Table 4.8 shows the teaching experience distribution by grades.

Class size: Class size differs from public to private school. In the public schools teachers reported having a maximum of 38 students per class, while in the private schools class size may reach 50 students or more per class. Eighty-six percent of the participants reported having between 30 and 50 students per class. One participant did not provide the requested information.

Number of students per class | Percent  
---|---
More than 50 students | 2.0
40-49 | 16.0
30-39 | 68.0
20-29 | 11.0
Less than 19 | 2.0
Missing | 1.0
Total | 100.0

Table 4.9 indicates the class size of the participants.
Weekly time allotted to English classes: English is a mandatory subject in the curriculum for middle school, junior, and senior high schools in Venezuela. Starting in the 7th grade, the time allotted to English is four hours weekly, whereas time is cut to three hours a week for the 8th and 9th grades. Participants were asked if they judged the time allotted to English classes to be sufficient for them to accomplish the instructional objectives stated in the curriculum. Sixty-eight percent of the surveyed teachers said “No,” while 30% said, “Yes.”

Data related to Research Questions 1 through 7

Research Question 1: What are the general and personal teacher self-reported efficacy levels among EFL teachers in selected San Cristóbal middle schools?

In order to identify the level of self-reported efficacy among the EFL teachers in selected San Cristóbal high schools, participants were asked to rate their efficacy in management, instructional strategies, and engagement, using a 9-point Likert scale format ranging from “A great deal” (9) to “Nothing” (0) (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). The Mean and SD for the 12 items of Part I of the ETSEBI are shown below in Tables 4.10, 4.11, and 4.12.
Table 4.10 shows the means and standard deviations of Efficacy for Engagement.

The lowest Mean (5.72) was related to “How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school,” indicated a relatively low sense of teacher efficacy for engaging families in their children’s progress and achievement in English. It is noteworthy to report that many Venezuelan parents do not seem to be as involved with their children’s schooling as parents in the U.S. Parents in Venezuela tend to limit their attendance to school to cases when they are formally invited as parents to come. Otherwise, parents tend to expect teachers and the school system to take care of their children’s education.
Table 4.11 indicates the means and standard deviations of Efficacy for Management.

Comparing efficacy for engagement (Mean=6.59) and efficacy for management (Mean=7.00), it can be said that participants were more efficacious in controlling student behavior than engaging them in learning English. The third dimension measured in Part I of the ETSEBI was efficacy of instructional strategies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy for instructional strategies</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies in your English class?</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>1.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when your English students are confused?</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>1.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well can you implement alternative strategies in your English classroom?</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 shows the means and standard deviations of efficacy for instructional strategies.

Comparing efficacy for engagement, management, and instructional strategies, a slight difference in means seemed to indicate that teachers were more efficacious in the implementation of instructional strategies (Mean=7.13) than in dealing with engagement and management.

Part II of the questionnaire asked teachers to rate their Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) and their General Teacher Efficacy (GTE) to teach EFL on a 6-point Likert scale format ranging from “Strongly agree” to “Strongly disagree.” On the adapted instrument Items 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 15 measured personal efficacy (PTE). Items 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 14, 17, and 18 measured general teaching efficacy (GTE). Items 6, 7, and 13 on PTE and 14, 17, and 18 on GTE were scored in reverse so that a low score reflected a high
sense of efficacy and a high score reflected a low sense of efficacy. Means and standard deviations for both PTE and GTE are shown in Tables 4.13 and 4.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal teacher efficacy items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am continually finding better ways to teach English.</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I try hard, I am effective at teaching oral skills.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the necessary strategies to teach the four language skills</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(listening, speaking, reading, writing).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not very effective in monitoring students’ oral communication.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not confident about my English fluency and pronunciation to teach speaking effectively.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am typically able to answer students’ English questions.</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know what to do to turn students on to English.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know grammar well enough to be effective in teaching English.</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher training program has given me the necessary skills to be an effective teacher of English.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 presents the means and standard deviations of PTE items.
Overall, Items 2 (Mean=5.05) and 12 (Mean=4.88) in the questionnaire had the highest scores while item 6 (Mean=3.80) had the lowest, and a total Mean= 4.54 for PTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General teacher efficacy items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When a student does better than usual in English, it is often because I have exerted a little extra effort.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the English grades of students improve, it is often due to their teacher having found a more effective approach.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lack of student’s interest in learning English can be overcome by good teaching.</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a low achieving student progresses in English, it is usually due to extra attention given by the teacher.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ achievement in English is directly related to their teacher’s effectiveness in English teaching.</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in English teaching has little influence on the achievement of students with low motivation.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even a teacher with good English competence and good teaching abilities may not reach many students in learning English.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes write down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on the environment.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14: Means and standard deviations of GTE items
With regards to GTE, the lowest (Mean=3.15) was for Item 17 in the questionnaire, "Even a teacher with good English competence and good teaching abilities may not reach many students in learning English." The highest Mean=4.86 was for Item 8, "The lack of students' interest in learning English can be overcome by good teaching."

In this study, the mean for GTE was slightly lower (Mean=4.11) than the mean for PTE (Mean=4.54), indicating that PTE tended to be higher than GTE for the Venezuelan EFL teachers who participated in the study. That is, PTE as beliefs on their capabilities to reach students and GTE as beliefs that external factors such as students' background determine student achievement. GTE has also been defined as reflecting a general attitude towards the impact of education on students' change (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, and Hoy, 1998).

Teachers' sense of efficacy

Factor Analyses

Part I and Part II of the ETSEBI were subjected to factor analyses. Principal Component Analysis and the rotation method varimax with Kaiser normalization was separately conducted for Part I and Part II of the questionnaire. The structure correlation matrix for Part I (The TSES) indicated that three factors were extracted. Tables 4.15 and 4.16 show the structure correlation matrix and factor analysis for Part I.
Table 4.15 indicates the correlation between teachers' self-efficacy items for instructional strategies, management, and engagement.

Low correlations were generally found. Items 2 and 7 ($r = .277$), 4 and 7 ($r = .254$), and 3 and 7 ($r = .260$) showed low correlations. Some other items showed stronger association such as Items 3 and 4 ($r = .615$), 1 and 8 ($r = .655$), 4 and 5 ($r = .633$), 11 and 12 ($r = .631$) and 9 and 12 ($r = .597$). Low correlations suggested that when all the items go into factor analysis, uncorrelated items would be part of the same component that are
independent from each other. Three factors yielded from the factor analysis accounting for 68% variance in the respondents’ scores. Ten out of 12 items fell into three groups: 1. Efficacy for student engagement, 2. Efficacy for classroom management, and 3. Efficacy for instructional strategies. Item 5 and Item 11 did not load in the category that it was expected according to the previous studies conducted by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2000). The first component explained 50% of variance with an eigen value of 6.0, the second component explained 10% of the variance with an eigen value of 1.2, and the third component explained 7% of variance with an eigen value of .88. Cumulative percent of variance explained was 68% (Table 4.16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigen values</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.033</td>
<td>50.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>10.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>6.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>5.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>4.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>3.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>3.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>3.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>2.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>2.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>1.446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 shows that about 68% of total variance was explained by extracting three components with the application of Principal Component Analysis.
Despite Items 5 and 11, the results (Table 4.17) supported the three-factor solution previously found by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, and other researchers (Emmer and Hickman, 1991) that identified efficacy for classroom management as a distinct dimension of teacher efficacy. The loadings for each item are shown in Table 4.17. Factor loading greater than .30 and loading on the same factor are boldface; factor loadings less than .30 were omitted, as they are usually considered no significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>1 Efficacy for Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>2 Efficacy for Classroom Management</th>
<th>3 Efficacy for Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much can you...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. do to control disruptive behavior?</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. do to motivate students?</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td></td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. do to get students to believe they can do well?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. do to help your students value learning?</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td></td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td></td>
<td>583*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. do to get students to follow classroom rules?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. do to calm a student who is disruptive?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How well can you establish a classroom management system?</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td></td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td></td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation when students are confused?</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td></td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. do to assist families in helping their children do well in school?</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How well can you implement alternative strategies</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: factor loadings < .30 are omitted
* Item did not load in Factor 1; ** Item did not load in Factor 3.

Table 4.17 indicates the results of Principal Component Analysis and rotation method using varimax with Kaiser normalization.
Table 4.18 indicates the correlation matrix for teacher efficacy items for PTE and GTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Part II (19 items) two factors were extracted by the application of Principal Component Analysis and rotation method using varimax with Kaiser normalization. Low correlations among some items were found. Items 2 and 14 (r = .002), 2 and 18 (r = -.006), 12 and 17 (r = .005), and 16 and 18 (r = .026) showed low correlations that suggested that they were more likely to belong to different dimensions independent from each other. Items 2 and 12 (r = .486), 4 and 11 (r = .454), and 9 and 16 (r = .420) were moderately (Davis, 1971) correlated which suggested that they were more likely to load under the same dimension when subjected to factor analysis. The scree plot was checked for deciding the number of components to extract. (Appendix F). The two factors yielded named PTE and GTE are consistent with previous research (Table 4.19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigen values</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.801</td>
<td>22.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.652</td>
<td>9.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td>9.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>8.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>7.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>6.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>5.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>4.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>4.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>4.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>3.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>3.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>2.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>2.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>2.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>2.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>1.660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19 shows that about 32% of the total variance was explained by extracting two components with the application of Principal Component Analysis.
As Table 4.19 above indicates, the first component explained 22% of variance with an eigen value of 3.8, and the second component explained 9.7% of the variance with an eigen value of 1.6. Cumulative percent of variance explained was 32%. Table 4.19 shows the total variance. The loadings for each item are shown in Table 4.20 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(PTE)</th>
<th>(GTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When a student does better than usual, it is because I have</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exerted extra effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am continually finding better ways to teach.</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.475*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I try hard, I am effective at teaching oral skills.</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When the English grades improve, it is often due to the teacher</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having found a more effective approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I know the necessary strategies to teach the 4 language skills.</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The lack of students’ interest in learning can be overcome.</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When a low achieving student progresses, it is usually due to extra</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention given by the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult or unmotivated students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students’ achievement is related to the teacher’s effectiveness.</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am typically able to answer students’ English questions.</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I don’t know what to do to turn students on to English.</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Effectiveness in English teaching has little influence on students</td>
<td></td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with low motivation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I know grammar well enough to be effective in teaching.</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I have enough training to deal with any learning problem.</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Even a teacher with good English competence and good teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abilities may not reach students in learning English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much</td>
<td></td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because a student’s motivation depends on the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My teacher training program has given me the skills to be an</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective teacher of English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item did not load in PTE; ** Item did not load in GTE

Table 4.20 shows the Principal Component Analysis and rotation method using varimax with Kaiser normalization.
Factor loadings greater than .30 and loading on the same factor are in boldface; factor loadings less than .30 were omitted, as they are usually considered no significant. Items 6 and 7 were deleted. Table 4.20 shows the result of the extraction method (Principal Component Analysis) and the rotation method varimax with Kaiser normalization that yielded two factors: the first one accounted for Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE), and the second one for General Teaching Efficacy (GTE). Previous research within the U.S (Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990; Soodak and Podell, 1996), and in some places outside the U. S (Gorrell and Hwang, 1995; Shim, 2000) has identified two dimensions of teacher efficacy: PTE and GTE. Despite the controversy (See Chapter two for discussion) in regards to GTE, the influence of external factors has been corroborated by previous research as a distinct dimension of teacher efficacy. Soodak and Podell (1996) posited that the constant emergence of TE as a separate factor indicates that beliefs about one's efficacy and the efficacy of the profession exists simultaneously and independently (p.440).

The results of the factorial analysis for the Venezuelan EFL teachers were consistent with the two separate dimensions of teachers' perceived efficacy identified in previous studies (Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990; Soodak and Podell, 1996). However, contrary to what was expected Items 8, 9, and 11 loaded on Factor 1 (PTE) while Item 2 loaded on factor 2 (GTE). One explanation might be that the respondents in the study interpreted Items 8, 9, and 11 as referring to themselves rather than to teachers in general (GTE). In that case, the items would load well on PTE. Moreover, Item 2 seemed to be more conceptually linked to GTE because it expressed the teacher's assessment of his or her capabilities to produce desirable outcomes.
(Bandura, 1977; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990). In this sense, Item 2 may be more related to outcome expectation defined by Bandura as the individual’s judgment of likely consequences his or her behavior will produce. Items 6 and Item 7 were excluded because they loaded in GTE, but they were not deemed to be conceptually related to GTE. Item 6, *I am not very effective in monitoring students’ oral communication*, and Item 7, *I am not confident about my English fluency and pronunciation to teach speaking effectively*, were found to be problematic, probably due to specificity problems. Although researchers (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 1998) recommend writing items that measure specific tasks and contexts, Items 6 and 7 may have been too specific in terms of task, rather than relating to personal teaching efficacy.

**Research Question 2:** What do teachers in San Cristóbal middle schools self-report to be their English proficiency level on 16 Likert-type items related to English language proficiency?

In Part III of the ETSEBI, EFL teachers were asked to rate their current English skills and cultural knowledge on a 6-point Likert scale that ranged from “Strongly agree” (6) to “Strongly disagree” (1); the higher the score, the more proficient teachers self-reported themselves in reading, writing, listening, speaking, culture and strategic competence in using the English language. Table 4.21 presented the means and standard deviations for each of the 16 items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Skills</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can understand magazines, newspapers, and popular novels when I read them in English.</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can draw inferences/conclusions from what I read in English.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can figure out the meaning of unknown words in English from the context.</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can write business and personal letters in English without errors that interfere the meaning I want to convey.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can write a short essay in English on a topic of my knowledge.</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can fill in different kinds of applications in English (e.g., credit card applications).</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand when two English-speakers talk at a normal speed.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand English films without subtitles.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand a message in English on an answering machine.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In face-to-face interaction with an English-speaker, I can participate in a conversation at a normal speed.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can express and support my opinions in English when speaking about general topics.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the meaning of common idiomatic expressions used by English-speakers.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the necessary strategies to help maintain a conversation with an English-speaker.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can talk in English about cultural themes and norms in the U.S.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to act in social English-speaking situations.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the English terms to use in regular classroom interaction with students.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21 shows the means and standard deviations of self-reported English proficiency.
For reading proficiency, most teachers reported that figuring out the meaning of unknown words in English from the context was the easiest item (Mean= 4.90). For writing, filling out different applications in English (e.g., a credit card application) had a high Mean= 4.87. As for listening skills, teachers self-reported less proficient in understanding English films without subtitles with a Mean=3.88. For speaking skills, they rated themselves less proficient in understanding the meaning of common idiomatic expressions used by native speakers (Mean=4.04). Their cultural knowledge (Mean=3.71) and strategic competence (Mean=3.87) were also self-reported as low. However, they rated their knowledge of the English terms used in regular classroom interactions with students to be high (Mean=5.00). Overall, teachers expressed more difficulty in listening to and maintaining a conversation in English as well as in using appropriate strategic competence while they were more confident about their skills in reading and writing English.

**Research Question 3:** What are the correlations among EFL teacher self-reported efficacy beliefs and selected other variables: job preparedness to teach English, use of strategies to teach English, class management, engagement, and English language skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking, culture) and demographic and academic characteristics.

The next section presents the data and discussion of the relationships among Venezuelan EFL teachers self-reported Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) beliefs and selected variables of the study namely, job
preparedness, strategies to teach, engage, and manage students, teachers' self-reported English proficiency in reading, writing, listening, speaking and culture, and demographic and academic background such as gender, years of English teaching experience, teachers' travel/study experience in English speaking countries, and frequency of in-service professional development.

The relationship among variables was investigated using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient for interval/ratio variables, and Point-Biserial correlation for dichotomous nominal and interval/ratio variables. The correlation between teachers' sense of efficacy and the variables selected is presented after each question in the next section. For the description of the magnitude of the relationship, Davis' (1971) criteria described on page 85 in Chapter 3 were used. Accordingly, the following was observed:

3.1. Is there a correlation between Venezuelan EFL teachers' sense of efficacy and job preparedness?

Venezuelan EFL teachers' reported beliefs about their job preparedness to teach English was shown to have a moderate positive relationship with PTE (r = .40). Teachers who were more positive about the preparation to teach English they received at their teaching training programs were found to be more efficacious than those that thought they were not well prepared. Likewise, it was found that the correlation between GTE and job preparedness was a moderate positive relationship (r = .36) which indicated that teachers' beliefs that teaching in general may influence student achievement tended to be higher, as the teachers' felt well prepared to teach English.
3.2. Is there a relationship between the use of strategies to teach, engage, and manage students and the teachers’ sense of efficacy of Venezuelan EFL teachers?

Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) of Venezuelan EFL teachers was shown to have a significant positive correlation with efficacy for strategies, engagement, and management. The correlation was moderate between PTE and efficacy for engagement ($r = .36$) and moderate between PTE and efficacy for management ($r = .34$) while the relationship was substantial between PTE and strategies to teach ($r = .57$). These results indicated that the higher the PTE, the higher the efficacy for engaging, managing students, and orchestrating instructional strategies. In the same way, moderate positive correlations were found between GTE and instructional strategies ($r = .39$), GTE and management ($r = .36$), GTE and engagement ($r = .30$).

It is worth mentioning the positive statistically significant but low relationships between PTE and student-centered strategies ($r = .29; p < .01$), and communication-oriented strategies ($r = .23; p < .05$). Thus, as PTE increases, the more likely that teachers will use communication-oriented strategies to teach English and student-centered strategies to manage classroom discipline. However, no association was found between PTE and grammar-oriented strategies and PTE and teacher-centered strategies. In addition, these results support previous research suggesting that high efficacious teachers tended to be less custodial and more open to students’ autonomy and responsibility (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990).

The correlation between GTE and communication-oriented strategies was found to be a positive low correlation ($r = .28; p < .01$). Similarly, GTE and student-centered strategies was a positive low correlation ($r = .29; p < .01$). Grammar-oriented strategies
and GTE were positive, but low associated ($r = .24$) while teacher-centered strategies and GTE were negative, but low correlated ($r = .20$). PTE and GTE showed substantial to low correlations with efficacy for strategies to teach, engage, and manage students as well as with communication-oriented and teacher-centered strategies.

3.3. Is there a relationship between Venezuelan EFL teachers self-reported efficacy beliefs and their self-reported English proficiency?

Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) had substantial positive correlations with self-reported proficiency in reading ($r = .51$), writing ($r = .55$), listening ($r = .56$), speaking ($r = .60$) and culture ($r = .56$). The correlations indicate that teachers who showed stronger personal teaching efficacy (PTE) also showed stronger language skills in reading, writing, listening, speaking and knowledge about culture. In other words, PTE seems to increase as language proficiency increases. This might mean that high efficacious teachers should be more proficient in their English language skills than low efficacious teachers who might tend to be less proficient in their English skills to read, write, listen, and speak.

In regards to GTE and self-reported proficiency in language skills, with an exception of reading, the correlations were positive and low: GTE and speaking ($r = .28$), GTE and listening ($r = .27$), GTE and writing ($r = .28$), GTE and culture ($r = .25$). GTE and reading was found to be a moderate positive ($r = .39$) correlation. According to the results, teachers’ sense of efficacy is positively correlated with self-reported language proficiency which seems to indicate that the stronger the language skills, the higher the teacher efficacy.
3.4. Is there a relationship between Venezuelan EFL teachers' self-reported efficacy beliefs and selected demographic and academic characteristics?

Years of teaching English: The data showed that there was no correlation between PTE and years of English teaching experience ($r = 0.06$). This finding may be explained by the fact that researchers (Guskey, 1984, 1986; Pajares, 1992; Ross, 1994) have found that the efficacy beliefs of practicing teachers tend to be “stable” as they grow in years of experience. On the other hand, the correlation between years of English teaching experience and GTE was found to be a negative low statistically significant association ($r = -0.21; p < 0.05$). In other words, less years of experience may indicate higher levels of GTE while more years of experience tend to lower GTE. For instance, the teacher’s beliefs that students can be taught seem to be higher for a novice teacher, while GTE seems to be lower as the teachers grows in years of experience.

Gender: There was no correlation between gender coded with 0 and 1 and PTE ($r = 0.16$). GTE and gender were not correlated either ($r = 0.13$). The results suggested that gender did not seem to have an impact on Venezuelan EFL teachers’ PTE/GTE.

Traveling or studying abroad: Teachers’ traveling or studying experiences in English-speaking countries was shown to have a low positive significant relationship ($r = 0.25$) with PTE. The more traveling experiences the teachers reported having, or the experience of studying in an English-speaking country, the more there was an increase in their PTE. GTE was no associated with traveling/studying in English-speaking countries.

Staff development: The relationship between in-service staff development and self-reported PTE was found to be positive and significant, but low ($r = 0.22$). That is, the
more in-service training the teachers reported having, the higher their Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE). No association was found between self-reported GTE and staff development.

Research Question 4: What are the routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in teaching English in San Cristóbal middle schools in terms of mean frequency of use? Is there any difference between the mean frequencies of use of these routine pedagogical strategies?

This section summarizes the results of Part IV of the questionnaire: Teaching practice: (A) Strategies used to teach English (items 1-11). Teachers were asked to rate the frequency of their teaching strategies in classroom instruction on a 6-point scale ranging from “Almost always” to “Almost never.” Part IV contained 11 items related to teaching strategies used to teach EFL, according to the two major approaches currently identified in the professional literature for teaching foreign languages: grammar-oriented approach (6 items), and communication-oriented approach (5 items). The means and standard deviations for communication-oriented strategies are presented in Table 4.22.
Teaching Practice: Communication-oriented strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students share information through interviews and polls to</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express their opinions on different topics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students pair off to discuss answers to problem-solving situations.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in groups/pairs make up dialogues to role-play in class.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in groups/pairs simulate social situations from everyday</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life as class activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students engage in games to practice communicating the English.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 shows the means and standard deviations for communication-oriented strategies.

According to Table 4.22 the item "Students in groups/pairs make up dialogues to role-play in class" had the highest score (Mean=4.26) while the item "Students share information through interviews and polls to express their opinions on different topics" had the lowest score (Mean=3.00). The fact that role plays, simulations, and games had the highest means whereas problem-solving and expressing opinions had the lowest means might suggest that problem solving and expressing opinions require higher level thinking (Bloom’s taxonomy) such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation in order for students to be able to create new solutions or provide their opinions based on valuing a situation. The fact that these tasks are supposed to be conducted in English requires EFL teachers to be proficient in speaking English so as to be able to facilitate a discussion and improvise in English. However, despite the participants’ disposition to use communication-oriented strategies to develop students’ communicative competence, they...
self-reported English deficiencies in speaking. This fact might prevent them from using strategies such as problem solving and polls/debates to develop students' communicative competence. For this reason, they may favor the use of dialogues that are generally taken from the textbook and role-played in order to have students interact in English.

Additionally, simulations based on the dialogues and games seemed to better suit the teacher's level of confidence with the language. It seemed to lessen the levels of anxiety and stress with regards to spoken English. The next section, presents the data related to the use of traditional grammar-oriented strategies with means and standard deviations (Table 4.23) for the questionnaire items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Practice: Grammar-oriented strategies</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students translate English words and sentences into Spanish and viceversa.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students memorize and practice dialogues to role-play in class.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students memorize lists of words/phrases for later dictation.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are called to the blackboard to write their responses for in-class drill exercises.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students copy grammar exercises from the blackboard after the teacher's explanation.</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students write in their notebooks while the teacher translates dialogues/readings.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>.84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 shows the means and standard deviations of grammar-oriented strategies.
Regarding grammar-oriented strategies to teach, the item with the highest score was, “Students copy grammar exercises from the blackboard after the teacher’s explanation” (Mean=5.12) while the remaining 5 items had Mean scores between 3.49 and 4.86. The above strategies tended to focus on the grammar-translation approach to teach foreign languages with emphasis on memorization, drilling, and written exercises. Under the principles of the grammar-translation approach, learning a language is mostly a rule-governed process reinforced by oral and written practice.

In order to examine if there was any difference in the mean frequencies of use between the instructional strategies participants self-reported for the study, a Paired Sample t-test (See figure 3) was used to compare the means between communication-oriented strategies and traditional grammar-oriented strategies.

![Figure 3: Comparison of means for Communication-oriented and Grammar-oriented strategies.](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.5940</td>
<td>.98163</td>
<td>-.6593</td>
<td>-7.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>4.2533</td>
<td>.84003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note p< .001

Table 4.24 shows the means difference between Communication-oriented and Grammar-oriented strategies.

The difference was statistically significant ($t = -7.364; p < .001$). Data indicated that among the population (N=100) although teachers self-reported both kinds of strategies, teachers seemed to be more oriented towards the use of strategies that are consistent with the grammar-translation approach to teaching foreign languages (e.g., translation, deductive grammar method, lectures with demonstrations on the board) than to using strategies that promote real life communication and interaction such as problem solving and sharing information about different topics. Overall, grammar-oriented strategies had a higher mean (Mean= 4.25) than the mean of communication-oriented strategies (Mean= 3.59).

**Research Question 5:** What is the relationship between the frequency of use of the methods and strategies advocated in the Teacher's Manual disseminated by the Venezuelan Ministry of Education (1987) for the teaching of EFL under the communicative-functional approach and the current routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in their actual practice?
Programa de Estudio y Manual del Docente Tercera Etapa de Educación Básica
Asignatura Inglés” (1987) – Teacher’s Manual for teaching English in middle high school
7th 8th and 9th grades.

The above document was issued in 1987 by the Venezuelan Ministry of Education to set up the new curriculum based on CLT for teaching English at the middle high school. The Manual included the rationale, contents to be taught in each grade, assessment, and instructional strategies recommended to teach each objective. The document states the importance of developing students’ linguistic competence (e.g., grammar competence), but it also emphasizes communicative language teaching (CLT). Although the teaching of grammar is necessary for students to acquire communicative competence in English, the Manual clearly states that grammar teaching should be done in context, through real life situations (p.282). “Grammar explanations contained in each objective are by not means to be required as theory from students but to apply them in the use of the language for communication” (p.66). Group work and pair work are recommended and encouraged in order to accomplish language learning goals. Activities that promote student interaction should be the core of the strategies used to teach the language.

The Manual advocates six major strategies to be used to achieve the instructional objectives of the curriculum for 7th to 9th grade: dialogues, songs, simulations, games, debates, and problem solving. The same strategies are suggested for each grade, and content is organized around functions in a cyclical sequence for reinforcement purposes.
The use of materials and resources such as calendars, clocks, flashcards, bulletin boards, posters, pictures, bingos, and puzzles is encouraged, particularly for use in student-centered activities.

To study the current routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers reported using in their classrooms, teachers were asked to rate their response from 6 to 1 on a Likert-type scale ranging from "Almost always" to "Almost never," on 11 statements based on the literature of the two major approaches for teaching foreign languages: traditional grammar-oriented approach and communicative-functional approach (Part IV of the questionnaire). Figure 4 presents differences in means regarding the strategies reported by the respondents.

![Bar chart showing routine pedagogical strategies self-reported by the participants](image)

Figure 4 presents the routine pedagogical strategies self-reported by the participants.
Figure 4 shows that lectures about formal aspects of grammar prevailed as the most commonly used strategy among the participants (Mean=5.12). Although the Teacher’s Manual emphasizes the need to teach grammar in context rather than through formal explanations, teachers’ concern in teaching formal aspects of the language permeates their teaching practice. Grammar was generally reported to be taught deductively, that is, theory and rules are stated, and then practiced by having students copy them from the board.

This result was corroborated during the interviews where teachers were asked to comment on four short situations (See samples in Appendix B) depicting the instructional strategies being used by four different teachers. The interviewees’ perceptions about each situation reflected the individual’s thinking about the current routine strategies they used. Those views are presented and discussed later in the second part of this chapter as part of the analysis of the qualitative phase of the study. As can be noted in the data reported, teachers complied with the use of dialogues, simulations, games, and to a less extent problem solving as suggested in the Teacher’s Manual. Nevertheless, interviews/debates and problem solving were not reported to be popular strategies among the interviewed teachers.

The above findings were consistent with Sato and Kleinsasser’s (1999) findings of Japanese LOTE (Languages Other Than English) teachers in Australia who reported using role-plays, games, and simulations for CLT; however, when they were observed teaching Japanese, the researchers found that most teachers tended to use “traditional practices.” That is, they focused on grammar teaching; grammar was not contextualized; they used teacher-fronted classes, and few student interactions.
Research Question 6: What are the pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using to manage student behavior in selected San Cristóbal middle schools?

This section summarizes the results of the questionnaire Part IV: Teaching practice: (B) Strategies used to manage students behavior (items 12-19). Teachers were asked to rate the frequency of their classroom management strategies teaching on a 6-point scale: 1 = Almost never, 2 = Only occasionally, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Quite often, 5 = Very often, and 6 = Almost always.

Eight items in the questionnaire Part IV were related to classroom management. According to previous research (Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990), high efficacy teachers tended to use more humanistic strategies while low efficacy teachers used more authoritarian strategies to control student behavior. In section IV of the questionnaire, five items were more likely to identify teacher-centered classrooms while three items were more likely to identify student-centered classrooms. Table 4.25 presents the means and standard deviations of items in this category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When a student misbehaves in the English class, I either give him or her a low grade or write a negative note in his/her records.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a student is disruptive and noisy in class, I refer him or her to the Section Chief (Jefe de Seccional).</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ignore disruptive students in my English class.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I reprimand/discredit a student’s misbehavior in front of the class.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a student misbehaves several times in English class, I expel him or her from class.</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25 indicates means and standard deviations of teacher-centered strategies to manage students.

With regards to teacher-centered strategies to manage student behavior, Means were relatively low on the scale from 1 to 6 indicating that overall (Mean=2.21). This range suggests that the participants were not likely to use punishment management strategies to control student behavior. The lowest mean was for the item relating to ignoring a student’s disruptive behavior.

Table 4.26 presents the means and standard deviations for the items measuring student-centered strategies self-reported by the participants to manage their students’ behavior.
If a student repeats his or her bad behavior several times, I discuss the problem with him or her privately after class.

I try to involve misbehaving students more in class activities.

I reward students’ appropriate behavior in my English class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a student repeats his or her bad behavior several times, I discuss the problem with him or her privately after class.</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to involve misbehaving students more in class activities.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I reward students’ appropriate behavior in my English class.</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.26 Means and standard deviations of student-centered strategies.

The overall mean (4.65) indicated that participants were more likely to use student-centered strategies to control student discipline than teacher-centered strategies. (See figure 5). Overall, teachers reported trying to involve disruptive student more in class, reward good behavior, and encourage student responsibility by talking to them in private.

In order to test if there was any difference in the mean frequencies of use of both types of strategies, a Paired Sample t-test (Table 4.27) was used to compare the means between teacher-centered and student-centered strategies. The difference was statistically significant ($t = -16.98, p< .001$).
Figure 5: Comparison of means for teacher-centered and student-centered strategies.

Paired Samples T-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
<th>t*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>-16.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-centered</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note p< .001

Table 4.27 indicates the mean difference between teacher-centered and student-centered strategies reported to manage student behavior.
Results indicated that although teachers reported using both types of strategies, student-centered strategies were predominantly used which indicates the teacher’s intention to encourage student responsibility, class engagement, and reward students rather than punish them.

**Research Question 7:** What is the correlation between the routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in their actual practice and their self-reported level of proficiency in English?

To answer this question, Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient was used in order to examine the association between teachers’ self-reported proficiency in English and their self-reported use of routine strategies grouped under two categories: Communication-oriented strategies and Grammar-oriented strategies (Table 4.28).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-reported Level of English Proficiency</th>
<th>Communication-oriented Strategies</th>
<th>Grammar-oriented Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>.247**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>.364**</td>
<td>.374**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note ** Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.28 Pearson correlations between self-reported English proficiency and the use of self-reported routine pedagogical strategies.
The correlations between teachers' routine pedagogical strategies and their self-reported level of proficiency showed several important findings. First, there was a statistically significant positive correlation between the level of proficiency in English and the use of communication-oriented strategies which suggested that the higher the proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and culture, the more teachers were likely to use strategies that promoted student interaction and communication in the English language. The positive significant correlation between communication-oriented strategies and speaking ($r=0.29$) suggested that despite the fact that although some teachers self-reported deficiencies in speaking, they are presumed to teach CLT as mandated by the Ministry of Education. Furthermore, no significant correlation was found between speaking, listening and culture and grammar-oriented strategies. However, there was a positive statistically significant correlation between grammar-oriented strategies and reading and writing. These different findings need to be corroborated with further research. At this point, the researcher is cautiously interested in this result.

The predictors of Teacher Efficacy

This section presents the multiple regression analysis that was conducted to investigate to what extent the independent variables language proficiency (listen, speak, read, write, culture), job preparedness, management, and selected demographic characteristics could account for Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE). The study sought to explore whether the selected independent variables might predict teacher efficacy. Multiple regression results for PTE are shown in Table 4.29. Multiple regression results for GTE are shown in Table 4.30.
Table 4.29: Regression of PTE and selected independent variables.

Table 4.29 shows that the independent variables might predict the dependent variable Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) with an R Square of .527. This result indicates that the independent variables account for 52.7% variance of the dependent variable Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE).

Table 4.30 below shows the model of regression for GTE indicating that the independent variables might predict the dependent variable GTE with an R Square of .268 which means that the independent variables account for 26.8% of the dependent variable GTE.

Table 4.30: Regression of GTE and selected independent variables.

Additionally, partial regression coefficients were also examined to explore the relative importance of the independent variables on the dependent variables PTE and GTE. The results are shown in Table 4.31 and 4.32 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.904</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Prep</td>
<td>2.264E-02</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>2.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>6.247E-02</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>1.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>-2.595E-02</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1.334E-02</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>7.603E-02</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>1.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>6.871E-02</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4.194E-02</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Dev</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>1.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>2.840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: PTE

Table 4.31 shows the relative importance of the selected independent variables on PTE.

The above results indicate that the independent variables speaking and management may be significant predictors of PTE with a Beta of .335 for speaking and a Beta of .233 for management. In other words, speaking explained 33.5% of the variance.
in the scores of the ETSEBI for PTE. Speaking was the strongest individual predictor of teachers' self-reported PTE. Management accounted for 22.3% of the variance in predicting PTE. The data suggested that the better the speaking and management skills, the higher PTE. Partial regression coefficients for GTE are shown in Table 4.32.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.794</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>6.222</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Prep</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>1.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>7.198E-02</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>-2.619E-02</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>2.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>-1.917E-02</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-9.303E-02</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>-1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>-2.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>1.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>5.711E-02</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Dev</td>
<td>4.1171E02</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.1614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: GTE

Table 4.32 shows the relative importance of the selected independent variables on GTE.

The above results indicate that the independent variables reading and experience teaching English may be significant predictors of GTE with a Beta of .377 for reading,
and a Beta of .316 for years of teaching experience. That is, reading explained 37.7% of the variance in the scores of the ETSEBI for GTE. Years of teaching experience accounted for 31.6% of the variance in predicting GTE.

To examine the relationships between TSES, PTE and GTE and other variables of the study, Pearson Product-moment correlations were run for the TSES, PTE and GTE and the following variables: communication-oriented strategies, grammar-oriented strategies, student centered strategies, teacher centered strategies, job preparedness, years of English teaching experience, experience studying/traveling into English-speaking countries, staff development and self-reported language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing, and culture). The correlation matrix presented in Table 4.33 shows substantial positive correlations between PTE and self-reported language skills; low to moderate positive correlations between GTE and reported language skills, and low to moderate positive correlations between efficacy for instructional strategies and efficacy for engagement and perceived language skills. It was found that efficacy for management was positively but low correlated (r = .23) with self-reported writing proficiency. No correlation was found with the other language skills. Additionally, positive correlations were found between PTE and staff development and PTE and experience studying/traveling abroad. PTE, GTE, and efficacy for instructional strategies were positively correlated with job preparedness.
Table 4.33 shows the comparison between for The TSES subscales, PTE, GTE, and other variables of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comm-oriented strategies</th>
<th>Grammar oriented strategies</th>
<th>Student-centered strategies</th>
<th>Teacher-centered strategies</th>
<th>Job Prepared -ness</th>
<th>Speak</th>
<th>Lispe</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>Writ</th>
<th>Cultu</th>
<th>Years of English Experien</th>
<th>Experien study/ travel abroad</th>
<th>Staff Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engag</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruc.</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTE</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTE</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
Qualitative data from interviews

This section reports the data of the individual interviews conducted with the purposeful sampling of the 20 teachers in this aspect of the study. The transcript of a sample interview is shown in Appendix G.

Summated scores from Part I and II of the questionnaire were used to identify the high and low efficacious teachers. Twenty teachers were selected for a one-time interview that lasted an hour. Teachers were asked questions in terms of efficacy and instructional approaches related to the following themes:

1. Types of strategies they used to teach, assess, and manage EFL classes.
2. Factors that they believe constrain teacher work and student achievement, and
3. Teacher preparation they received from their formal teaching training programs.

The interview was first piloted with three different EFL teachers. After piloting the interview process, the researcher opted to use an interview protocol (Appendix C). However, additional questions were included periodically based on issues raised by the participants during the interviews. Questions were divided in three segments. The interviews were conducted in Spanish, except in one case where the interviewee requested to use English. Interviews were generally recorded except in three cases that the participants preferred not to be taped; the researcher took extensive handwritten notes in the interview protocol prepared ahead of time. Locations for the interviews varied from the teacher's classroom to the teacher's house where privacy of the meeting could be
guaranteed. All the participants were assured that their anonymity as well as their place of work would be protected by omitting real names and using a code in place of their names.

Subjects

There were a total of 20 interview subjects, all of whom were selected from the 65 who volunteered after answering the questionnaire. Ten teachers from private high schools and 10 teachers from public high schools, 10 males, and 10 females were interviewed.

The researcher conducted a purposeful sampling choosing among the teachers who had the highest and lowest scores in Part I and II of the questionnaire that measured teachers' perceived efficacy. Part I measured teachers' sense of efficacy for instructional strategies engagement, and management, and Part II measured PTE and GTE to teach EFL. The purposeful sampling of 20 interviewees included 10 teachers with high efficacy scores and 10 teachers with low scores based on the questionnaire. A "maximum variation approach" (Seidman, 1998, 45) was also used to select among teachers who worked in public and private schools, represented males and females, had different ranges of teaching experience and experience in studying or traveling in English speaking countries. Detailed information about the subjects' background is given in Table 4.33.
### Subject background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Subjects (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>17 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern languages</td>
<td>02 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/Literature</td>
<td>01 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>03 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Years Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>08 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>08 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>03 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-</td>
<td>01 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Staff development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>07 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>02 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study/travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>07 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English speaking country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Type of school</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.34: Subjects background information.

### Procedures

Semi-structured interviews were carried out as another source of collecting data to substantiate findings (Patton, 1990). The first segment contained questions about
teachers’ academic background. In the second segment, the teachers were given a handout containing four short case studies where four different EFL teachers used four different strategies to teach EFL (See Appendix B). The researcher had them comment on those situations to indirectly find out the participants’ perceptions and thinking about their current use of strategies to teach. They were asked to hypothetically place their students in that kind of situation and express how the students would have reacted to the type of strategy being used in classroom 1, 2, 3, or 4. The case studies written in Spanish were a contextualized way to have teachers talk about their current use of instructional strategies to teach. Teachers were also asked about factors that constrained their teaching as well as factors that constrained their students’ achievement. The third segment included questions about the interviewees’ teaching training programs and recommendations they thought would improve English teacher education programs.

Data analysis and discussion

Through cross comparison among the respondents’ answers, the researcher identified common patterns to answer the research questions. Interviews were transcribed verbatim.

In order to examine the differences and similarities of high efficacy and low efficacy teachers, the researcher initially sought to select 10 high efficacy teachers and 10 low efficacy teachers according to highest and lowest means of Part I and Part II of the questionnaire. However, in the selection process, subjects’ scores were heterogeneous. That is, they differ in their perceived efficacy for engagement, management, and strategies as well as in PTE and GTE. Thus, to choose the 20 subjects, the researcher
selected them based on their summated scores of the items measuring teachers' sense of efficacy for engagement, instructional strategies, and management (Part I), and the items measuring PTE and GTE to teach EFL (Part II). Four groups of teachers (See Table 4.35 below) resulted from this purposeful sampling: four teachers received a high score in both Part I and II (high efficacious teachers); five teachers scored low in Part I and II (low efficacious teachers); and, eleven teachers had a mixed combination score. That is, seven teachers scored high in Part I but low in Part II (high-low efficacious teachers), and, four teachers scored high in Part II, but low in Part I (low-high efficacious teachers).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Teacher Efficacy</th>
<th>Number of subjects in each group</th>
<th>Part I (Efficacy for instructional strategies, management, and engagement)</th>
<th>Part II (PTE and GTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High efficacious teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low efficacious teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-low efficacious teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-high efficacious teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.35 indicates the four groups of teachers' perceived efficacy selected for the interviews.

The next section presents the data and discussion for each group of teachers with regards to the three major themes addressed in the interview protocol: instructional and management strategies to teach EFL, factors that limited teachers' work and student achievement, and teachers' formal training programs.
Teachers' sense of efficacy and instructional strategies

The interviews began by having the participants read and comment on four short situations where different EFL teachers used four different strategies (a dialogue, a song, a simulation, and problem solving) to teach English. The participants expressed their perceptions and beliefs agreeing or disagreeing with what each teacher in classroom 1, 2, 3, and 4 was doing with his or her students. They also expressed the why or why not they would use that specific type of strategy in their classrooms. The next section of this chapter presents the data from the interviews and the demographic and academic information for the four groups of efficacy teachers.

**Group I: High efficacious teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Experience teaching English (years)</th>
<th>Staff development</th>
<th>Experience traveling/studying abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. A</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>B. A</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. B</td>
<td>Pub/Priv</td>
<td>M.A Management Ed.</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. C</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. D</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.36 High efficacious teachers: Background information.

The four high efficacious teachers reacted to the four situations as follows.

Mr. D expressed his agreement with Situation 1, where the teacher used a textbook to have students read, repeat, and translate a dialogue on page 18. Mr. D said:

I identify myself with this kind of teacher, no? I read the dialogue two o three times. Then, I have students repeat right after me. I have one row read one part...
and another row read the other, and so on. After they had repeated it and talked it a lot, I ask two students to role-play it. Generally, I work it that way, and I translate what the students don’t know.

In contrast to Situation 1, Ms. C said:

The mechanics I use in the classroom, it’s you know, I try to motivate students to lose their fear of speaking a foreign language.

“Do you think the teacher in Classroom 1 is motivating his students,” Ms C responded:

In some ways, but they are not creating. They are not creating. I think is a good point to use music too, you know. I do it with 9th graders and that … come to class and dance… Yeah, my classes are like a circus. I use puppets with this one. I speak. I . . . It’s just like an experiment I am doing now. When a kid has a puppet in his hands he has to get involved with it, and they lose the fear talking and they don’t feel afraid of. That puppet helps a lot to make them get loose, you know.

“How would your students react to this activity?

I say some dialogue (later she said she took it from textbook) first of all. We read together and practice some difficult words they can find . . . We practice a lot, many times, and then, I give the puppets to them . . . to the couples, and at the beginning they start reading using the book, and then they try to memorize the dialogue and then do it again… I write a lot on the blackboard, you know, make them repeat and then read on their own. I like working with grammar worksheets.

Ms. A in contrast to Mr. D and Ms. C, expressed that she likes to have students give grammar lectures to classmates. She argued that, “students have to participate in class
and produce rather than being there passive waiting for their teacher to give them everything.” She added:

Today they were explaining the use of “used to” and “would” to express an idea of a customary or habitual action in a past.

What is your objective in having students do this?

I want them to read in the textbook and express in their own words what they understood.

Do they do give the explanations in English?

Of course, not. At the beginning, they think they have to speak in English and they get scared. I tell them, ‘I am not demanding that you explain in English, how am I going to expect that?’ What I expect is that they explain in their own words, like, ‘This structure here has the same meaning than this one, with the difference that this takes the particle to.’ For instance, the structures that we are studying now (used to and would) you have to tell me that “used to” uses the particle “to” and that the verb that follows it, is in infinitive while “would” although is followed by a verb in infinitive does not use “to.”

Ms. B who works both in public and private schools commented on Situation 2. Songs are wonderful but my students at the private school love working with dialogues. They want dialogues about communicative situations where they could for example, talk in a cafeteria. The students in San Josecito (the public school) on the other hand, prefer to translate songs, but . . . ah, there are so many expressions in songs so difficult to translate . . . But, I think we can find topics for both groups of students.
Could you explain more about how you work out strategies for both schools?

With students in San Josecito, I really use short dialogues. They want to use the target language to express what they go through in real life . . . they have a lot of problems, and generally poor communication with their parents . . .

I also work with short paragraphs and students seem to like that. I choose situations at the disco, at the beach, at the swimming pool, and they get really interested in learning the words and phrases for they find connections with their daily lives.

The next group (Group II) was labeled low efficacious teachers because they scored low in both Part I and II of the ETSEBI. The background information of Group II is presented in Table 4.36.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Degree earned</th>
<th>Experience teaching English (years)</th>
<th>Staff development (in years)</th>
<th>Experience traveling/studying abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. E</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. F</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. G</td>
<td>Private/Pub</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. H</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. I</td>
<td>Private/Pub</td>
<td>M.A Adult Ed.</td>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.37: Low efficacious teachers: Background information.
In the group of low efficacious teachers, two teachers mentioned that they made use of dialogues from the textbook and had their students listen, read, and repeat as the teacher in situation 1 did. One of those teachers, Ms. H, said:

In my case, I also use dialogues as an important strategy to teach English. Well, in translation ... I also make emphasis ... students repeat chorally and individually, and know the meaning of the words.

Ms. H also chose Situation 3 where the teacher used simulations and pair work. After explaining that she did not use a textbook, but different sources such as flashcards to teach grammar, and games to teach vocabulary, Ms. H expressed:

I also use pair work. Sometimes students have to fill in the missing words in a dialogue; other times they have to create a dialogue. They pair up to work on the dialogue and, then they role-play it. Not only do they write it but they also speak up.

Do they have the script when they role-play?

No, they learn the dialogue by heart. Once, I ask them to improvise, but I gave them the guidelines and told them what structures to use and they did it.

Can you tell me how you work with flash cards?

Let’s see. If it’s a present progressive, I tell to the kids: first, we put the “what,” followed by the verb, next the pronoun; and, then comes the verb with the –ing, like in “What are you doing?” They break up in two groups, one with the questions, and one with the answers. They exchange questions and answers. In this way, first I am promoting teambuilding and second, teaching grammar.
Likewise, Ms. E also agreed that using dialogues is an important strategy to teach EFL.

Referring to Situation 1, she stated:

This sounds quite well, doesn’t it? If the group you have is too big, this is almost the only thing you can do with a dialogue. I would rather do it with the books closed. That’s something I like to do. Before starting, I brainstorm the situation. Let’s say, if it’s about “going to the doctor,” I ask: “How do you feel today? I might do this in Spanish; here I am not so strict.

In Ms. E’s classroom, interaction is promoted through dialogues as a way to communicate in English. She tells the students:

Now, let’s try to interact. First, you, and me. Then, you and (points at as if she were referring to a student). You understand? (She looked at the researcher and continued) I promote interaction between some students, rather than having everybody talking at the same time because to be honest one just listens to about 20% of the class in such a situation!

She continued explaining how dialogues may be used in class:

With the dialogues there’s something else that I don’t see here (points at situation 1 in the handout). After, for instance, (students) practiced the dialogue they have to create a dialogue with the same pattern, but they have to... let’s say, alter the options, right?

Ms E also used speeches and songs with her students. She said:

I have introduced speeches particularly with juniors and seniors...

Songs, once in a while. I bring a song that I like about a topic that does not be
“baby, I love you,” all the time, you know. . . A song that has a structure that interest me, but I can’t do it all the time because (students) tend to be totally relaxed and the policy of the school is very strict, you know, discipline is a big deal here . . .

Table 4.38 shows the background of Group III: High-low efficacious teachers. They scored high in efficacy for engagement, management, and instructional strategies, but low in PTE and GTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Experience teaching English (years)</th>
<th>Staff development</th>
<th>Experience traveling/studying abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. J</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>B. A</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. K</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>B. A</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. L</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>B. A</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. M</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>B. A</td>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. N</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>B. A</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. O</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>B. A</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. P</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>B. A</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.38 Teacher interviews: High efficacy in engagement, management, and instructional strategies.

This group scored high in efficacy in engagement, instructional strategies, and management, but low in PTE and GTE to teach EFL. The seven teachers in the group
approached strategies in somewhat similar ways to low and high efficacious teachers. They also mentioned the use of dialogues as an important strategy to teach English. They reported that generally dialogues were taken from the textbook. Similarly, they reported having students read, repeat, and role play dialogues. Noteworthy here, is the fact that two teachers mentioned interaction and creation of new dialogues as important steps in using dialogues as a strategy to teach EFL. Songs and games were also mentioned as additional strategies used in the EFL classroom. Here are some of the responses to Situation 1 where a dialogue is being used. For instance, Ms. J said:

I read the dialogue as the teacher in situation 1 does, so that they (students) listen to the pronunciation. Next, in pairs, kids dramatize the dialogue. They practice 5-10 minutes and present it to the class trying not to read or translate. That’s how I work. In case 1, something is missing; the teacher is missing the interaction among classmates; students’ practice is not only with me, the teacher . . .

Discussing the use of songs, Ms J said:

When we work with songs, I give kids the song written. Many kids already know the song because they have heard it on the radio or TV, though they don’t generally understand what is being said. Therefore, I have them guess the meaning of the words they don’t know.

Another teacher, Mr. K compared himself with the teacher in Situation 1, and explained:

The only thing I do differently is that before practicing a dialogue, I first explain everything that has to do with grammar structures and rules, that sort of things, and then once it is clear, we apply it in the dialogue.

Ms. M identified herself with teacher in Situation 3. She said:

147
I do something similar. I tell kids to make up a dialogue. I give them information questions with “what,” “where,” and so on. I tell them to write a conversation about any topic. After they make it up, we practice it, and simulate it. I help them with intonation . . . First, I work pronunciation; after they pronounce, I write the dialogue or whatever sentences we are practicing on the board so they see . . . I also use dictation a lot. After dictation, I call on students to the board to check how they did it. The corrections are done as a whole class.

Ms. L and Ms. N pointed out that the approach in Situation 1 was “traditional and behaviorist.” They expressed that they preferred having kids to make up dialogues individually or in groups about topics of their interest. Pronunciation and error correction were major goals for these teachers. Ms. L said:

I read the dialogues so that kids see how to pronounce the words. Then, I call out volunteers for role-playing. I kind of have them memorize it first.

Mr. O on the other hand, makes use of games to teach vocabulary and grammar. He said:

Kids complained about the textbook we were using. So I decided to have them create games that they use in class for grammar and vocabulary building. We use unscrambled sentences and puzzles for question/answer practice.

When asked why the students and not the teacher created the games, he responded:

I have students create the games because in that way they have to do some research to decide the level and skill to be developed with a specific game. Then, it comes the result of the game, did it motivate the group? Did they learn?

In regards to strategies such as the dialogue, he said:
I bring examples of dialogues and have kids fill in the missing words. In groups of five, I have them fill in the words. I also have them do role-plays. They may produce the dialogue or use one I give them.

Mr. O also uses songs. He selects them according to the structure(s) he going to teach. Let’s say, if I going to work with present tense, kids look at the structures and identify the subject verb or a noun in the letter of the song. I later give them the song with blank spaces to fill in. They listen to it, fill in, and sing.

Table 4.39 presents the background information of Group IV: Low-high efficacious teachers. They scored low in efficacy for engagement, instructional strategies, and management, but high in PTE and GTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Degree earned</th>
<th>Experience teaching English (years)</th>
<th>Staff development (in years)</th>
<th>Experience traveling/studying Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Q</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. R</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>M.A College Instruction</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. S</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. T</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.39: Teacher interviews: High efficacy in PTE and GTE.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Referring to Situation 1, Mr. Q explained that he was comfortable using a textbook. He said:

Sometimes it is practical for us. I think working with a textbook is good, but . . . however, textbooks are incomplete; they do not meet all the requirements of the language in regards to grammar and conversation.

In his complaint about the textbooks, Mr. Q said:

Now we are studying nationalities, but the examples provided in the textbook do not explain students how to perform the exercises (he meant in terms of grammar). Then, what does the teacher do? I have to provide the explanation the textbook misses. Because before a kid can perform the example, he needs to know the grammar (i.e.) simple present of verb “to be.” Then, from there, one begins . . . One helps kids remember that when working with the verb “be,” bla, bla, bla.

Mr. Q added:

Now, in regards to giving students real life situation to simulate (situation 3), I frequently do that. I make up my dialogues, readapt them from different books. Today I was telling to the class that when arriving at the airport, one has to answer questions at customs office, and that we need to know those questions. You know, kind of questions like name, identification number, address, and then, we did the simulation. (Referring to his class) Let’s say: He is the officer. He is looking to your passport, and asks you questions. What do you answer? This is what I work in my class. Kids love that kind of activity because they find it very practical.
In contrast to Mr. Q, Ms. S stated that she “rarely requires a textbook” for her classes. She prefers using the blackboard to write exercises, dialogues, and so on. Talking about situation 1, she said, “This is perfect. I use dialogues for everything: reading, writing, pronunciation, everything.” When asked about oral skills, Ms. S made a confession:

Now, I am not working much on oral skills because I am having trouble with my vocal cords. When I started teaching 18 years ago, I worked on oral skills a lot. Though it was hard for students, they loved it. I had a language lab that we used a lot. In fact that is how a language should be learned.

She also admitted that her students asked her to bring songs into the classroom, but she said, “If I choose a song then I have to bring a tape recorder,” meaning that she does not have the resource in the classroom.

Another teacher, Mr. T said that he would not use a textbook for the class because “it’s tedious.” He rather develops his own materials, and in his own words the goal in teaching EFL is “communication.” He said,

I establish communication with the group. I start a story and have them ask questions in English. If they ask in Spanish, I answer in English.

When asked how he would have worked the dialogue, he explained:

Students choose a topic they like. In groups of 3 or 4, they write the dialogue with the structures I suggest. They practice it and read it in class.

Referring to Situation 2 (songs) Mr. T explained that he used songs differently:

I give kids the song unscrambled. I play the CD and have kids listen to it and rearrange the song as it were a puzzle. I ask comprehension questions allowing them the use of the dictionary for that part.
In commenting on Situation 3, Ms. R stated that she has given her students several topics related to their personal lives such as autobiographies, narration, and description to be developed in groups in what she calls “classroom projects.” She explained:

The group discusses the project and gets ready for an oral presentation in front of the class. Though the project is written in English, the discussion is conducted in Spanish because in English is difficult. They say some terms in English, but discussing in English is not done.

When asked “Why not making it in English?” Ms. R was prompt to reply with a negative answer because according to her, the students did not have the appropriate English language level to discuss in English. In her own words:

Students do not have the appropriate language level for that. It’s hard even for juniors and seniors . . . they don’t develop that competency, you know. They can do small dialogues, but a discussion in English is impossible.

Referring to dialogues, Ms. R acknowledged that in fact her students “really like dialogues because they prefer speaking than writing in English.” In her words:

I talk to them, “How are you,” and they answer. Simple conversations. We repeat the dialogues in class and then they break up in pairs and role-play the dialogue.

Ms. R also referred to the use of songs (Situation 2):

I use songs, but I do it in the opposite way. First, I give them the written version and have them underline unknown words. Next, I play the song in chunks, and have kids sing until they can sing alone and understand what is being sung. They love songs so I let them make their selections and bring them to the class.
Discussion

Patterns of comparison of teachers’ responses and comments on the four different case studies and open-ended questions throughout the interview seemed to indicate that there were no obvious differences between the groups in regards to teachers’ sense of efficacy and the use of communicative-oriented strategies and grammar-oriented strategies to teach English. The strategies reported by the teachers were not mutually exclusive. In other words, most teachers reported using both types of strategies differing only in the emphasis given to one type over the other. Some were more grammar-oriented while others tended to be more communication-oriented. For instance, Ms. A, a highly efficacious teacher, said that she expected her students to learn the grammar by explaining it to the classmates in oral presentations they were assigned in class. In contrast with Ms. A, a low efficacious teacher, Ms. E, used dialogues “to foster students’ communicative competence.”

In addition, most teachers used a combination of both cognitive and behaviorist theories as well as interaction through pair work and group work. While there seemed to be a tendency to focus on the development of habit formation by breaking the target language into small chunks and having students do choral and individual repetition and memorization drills, some high efficacious teachers as well as some low efficacious teachers showed concern about having students “create” new dialogues in English. In other words, for some teacher, learning a language requires the construction of knowledge on the part of the student. Most of them insisted that interaction through dramatization and simulation were important components of the language class.
Overall, it can be said that both high and low efficacious teachers used different types of strategies. However, the interviewed teachers reported a tendency to focus on accuracy (i.e., formal aspects of the language) rather than on meaning (i.e., communication). Teaching students grammar rules and translation was a common pattern self-reported among the interviewees. They reported more attention to ensure students' understanding of grammar rules taught either deductively or inductively. Although the interviewees had students practice English through role plays, simulations, songs, and games, their comments suggested more attention to grammar and accuracy than to communication. In summary, it can be said that communication-oriented strategies and grammar-oriented strategies were not mutually exclusive, but grammar-oriented strategies were predominantly used among the interviewees.

Contrasting views in the four teacher self-efficacy groups.

In contrasting teachers' views about lesson planning and use of materials, data suggested that Group I (high efficacious) teachers were more likely to use group work activities and choose more challenging tasks and mastery experiences for their students. Ms. C, for instance, used puppets to help student lose their fear to speak English. She showed satisfaction when saying:

I like to . . . I mean, the main part of it is how they pronounce, and one of the other things is to make them be free. I mean to lose the fear in class; that fear that is related to the teacher; I don't like that.

Mr. T, another high efficacious teacher expressed that he had developed his own materials according to his students' interests rather than being dependent on a “tedious”
textbook. Likewise Mr. T, Mr. Q also criticized the English textbooks used in high
schools for being “incomplete.”

Furthermore, it was found that high efficacy teachers were more likely to pursue
self-directed learning (Bandura, 1977) through planning courses of action to improve his
English proficiency. For instance, Mr. Q, a high PTE teacher, said:

In my case, I buy English courses to study. I sit and listen to my courses to
improve my pronunciation, to improve everything. At the same time, I share with
my kids what I learn from those courses. I like what I do and I like what I learn.
That’s why I want to learn... I learn and they (students) learn. One major feature
in English, is pronunciation, you know, phonetics. I love phonetics...

As it can be noted, Mr. Q’s motivation is consistent with Bandura’s (1977) idea
that high efficacy teachers are more persistent and put extra effort to improve. The next
section presents the data in regards to responses of the interviewees to teachers’
perceived efficacy and strategies to manage student behavior

Teachers’ sense of efficacy and management strategies

As with instructional strategies used to teach EFL, the interviewees were asked
about classroom management. The four groups of teachers responded to the questions
“Tell me about what management means to you? How important is class
management in your classroom? and, What strategies do you find effective to deal
with class management? The teachers’ responses are presented below.
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Group I: High efficacious teachers

Among the four high efficacious teachers (Group I), only one manifested discipline problems, particularly in group work activities. However, she expressed that she handled students’ behavior well by mixing disruptive students within different groups to control discipline. She also said that usually she had two or three students who were “problematic,” but they were usually absent from class. When asked which strategy worked best in her case, she said that talking to disruptive students in private worked best for her.

Group II: Low efficacious teachers

As it was already noted, Group II scored low in Part I and Part II of the instrument that measured efficacy in management, engagement, strategies, PTE, and GTE. These teachers reported more than one strategy they used to handle classroom management. Those strategies are presented below in the teachers’ words:

Give kids a verbal warning (two teachers)
Take off points from the final grade (one teacher)
Dismiss them or send them to the Principal’s office (two teachers)
Call parents (two teachers)
Evaluate each activity done in class and take off points if students misbehave (one teacher).
Talk to them in private (two teachers).
Group III: High-low efficacious teachers

From this group of seven teachers, four of them said that they did no have discipline problems in their classrooms. Thus, discipline was not a problem for them. Their responses were:

Mr. P: “I have 48 or 49 students, but I manage discipline well. I don’t have discipline problems in my class. What happens is that I am not that kind of “preacher, grumpy” teacher. I am demanding yes, but kids and I are friends. I respect them and they respect me. If a kid is disruptive, I call him or her, and we talk. I insist on cooperation and collaboration in class.”

Ms. N: “I can manage students’ behavior well. Sometimes they get noisy, particularly, when we do activities with posters, pictures. Then, I tell them ‘or, you behave or I cancel this activity.’ They immediately calm down. They really respect me.”

Ms. M: “I don’t have management problems in class. In general, discipline is good. When a student gets disruptive, I usually focus my attention on him or her, and try to involve him or her more in class. I also switch them from their seats. Another strategy I use is talking to them (disruptive students) in private.

Ms. J: “discipline is not a problem for me. I usually keep kids on task, and monitor them when doing group work. I also minimize grammar explanations on board because kids get bored with too much grammar explanations on the board. I check answers to exercise in groups. I keep track of time for each activity.

Mr. K: “Well, I had that problem before. Now, what I do is that I get more concerned about the kids’ family. So I keep reminding kids, you know, as a preacher, about the sacrifice their parents do, and the time and money they are investing in their
education. I try to touch their feelings, and make them aware of that, you know. I avoid reprimanding them . . .

Two teachers in the group reported that they handled students’ discipline by using “authority” when there was no other choice. Mr. O, for instance, said that he had about 8 students who disturbed him and wanted to become the leaders to promote indiscipline, and because he could not control them he decided to punish them with their grades. “I take off .05 of their grade each time they misbehave.” Likewise, Ms. L stated that she sometimes is more authoritarian depending on the group, because some groups are difficult to control. For instance, she explained:

Last year, I had a group of students that was out of control in most classes. I had to be more authoritarian than creative to control them. I kept them busy doing exercises in the textbook all the time. I called on to the board the most disruptive ones, and did not leave them off-task. I start using praising stickers on their notebooks and they loved it. At first, it was hard; I remember that I cried after class. I believe we have to mix strategies because not all groups are alike.

Group IV: Low-high efficacious teachers

Group IV was labeled low-high efficacious because they scored low in Part I, but high in Part II. Four teachers in this group, scored low for teachers’ self-efficacy in management, engagement, and strategies (Part I), but high for PTE and GTE (Part II). Accordingly, these teachers judged themselves capable to overcome external factors, but their efficacy to manage student behavior, engage them, and develop instructional strategies was low. Interestingly enough, two of them expressed that they liked group
work, but they avoided it because students tended to be noisy and got out of control. In one teacher’s words:

When I do group work, the class goes crazy . . . it’s a mess because in a 38-student class it’s very hard . . . If I break them up in groups what I am going to have is a whole mess because from those 38 only 12 have the textbook. Some chat, some work, some daydream; then the class ends up being a failure. That’s why I rather have them copy from the board . . . the ones that have the text do not copy as much as the ones who don’t have it, but in that way I explain the class and everybody works . . .

Another teacher in this group defined her students’ discipline as “horrible.” When asked to explain why she thought that, Ms. S said that over the past two years student discipline had gotten worse than ever before because of the many interruptions in school regular schedules particularly due to strikes and the whole sociopolitical situation the country was going through. In her own words, “the general unhappiness of Venezuelans with the polices of the current government, and the political situation of the country has had a negative impact on kids’ behavior at school . . .”

Discussion

Overall, low efficacy teachers (Group II) tended to handle classroom discipline by using “authority.” They explained that being “very strict” and “spelling out the rules” from the beginning was something they as teachers did in order to manage the students. When kids were constantly disruptive, some of these teachers assumed teacher-centered strategies such as punishing kids with their grades, threatening them, and dismissing them from class.
Group IV (low teachers' sense of efficacy in Part I only) was less authoritarian than Group II that scored low in Parts I and II. As Group I, they tended to avoid group work because of lack of confidence in their efficacy for management. In contrast to Groups II and IV, the majority of high efficacious teachers (Group I) and the high-low efficacious (Group III) seemed to handle students' discipline well, and they tended to use more humanistic or custodial strategies (e.g., getting disruptive students more involved in class, giving them more attention, talking to them in private, and keeping them on-task). These findings were consistent with previous studies (Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990; Woolfolk, Rosoff, and Hoy, 1990) that found that teachers with high efficacy tended to be more humanistic in their control of discipline than teachers with low efficacy who tended to be more authoritarian. During the interviews, teachers also reported what they thought were factors that affected their teaching and their students' achievement in English. These data are presented in the section that follows.

Factors that affected EFL teacher efficacy

This section is divided in two parts. First, the EFL teachers' perspectives about the factors they reported as affecting their teaching effectiveness is presented. Secondly, the factors that teachers reported as possible causes of poor student achievement in English are described by using comments from the interviewees.

Through constant pattern comparison among the teachers' responses, six factors were commonly reported by the group of high efficacious teachers. The low efficacy and the mixed group also mentioned the same factors, but they added motivation as an
influence on students and teachers as well. Some factors were contextual (class size, weekly time allotted to English, environment, and lack of resources) while others had to do with teachers (motivation and English proficiency) and students (motivation). The factors the teachers reported were:

1. Class size (12 teachers – high, low, and mixed teacher efficacy).
2. Weekly time allotted to English and interruptions (10 teachers - high, low, and mixed teacher efficacy).
3. Students’ social environment (9 teachers - high, low, and mixed teacher efficacy).
4. Classroom environment (6 teachers - high, low, and mixed teacher efficacy).
5. Lack of instructional resources (5 teachers - high, low, and mixed teacher efficacy).
6. Teacher proficiency of English (3 teachers - high, low, and mixed teacher efficacy).
7. Student motivation (5 teachers - low and mixed teacher efficacy).
8. Teacher motivation (4 teachers - low and mixed teacher efficacy).

It is noteworthy to mention that high efficacious teachers did not mention motivation as a constraint in their teaching, but later they reported that motivation was a cause of poor student achievement.

1. Class size

Class size was judged as the major constraint to achieve instructional goals in teaching EFL. Teachers agreed that the large number of students (38-50) per class was an
impediment for them to do enough oral practice and individualized instruction with students in order for them to acquire the communicative competence in English as mandated by the Ministry of Education. Class size and schedule were two major complaints in the interviewees’ comments. Ms. B (a high efficacious teacher who usually used group work) said:

We have 38 students per class. The number of students is very important and it’s one of the issues we bring up all the time in the seminars and workshops we attend . . . Everything that is suggested there . . . the strategies they introduce to us are in fact for group work in small classes like 15 to 20 students. Breaking up big classes in seven, eight groups of five kids each is, it’s very difficult, and then even worse to monitor and keep them on task . . . there’re always many distracters . . .

Another high efficacious teacher echoed Ms. B’s concern, “It would be wonderful if we could have 4, 5, 6, 7 hours of English every week with the kids so that they can acquire the ability to use English for communication, but we only have 3 hours weekly, and 38 students and we are asked to teach them how to speak English! Big problem!

Ms. E (a low efficacious teacher) expressed:

The number of students for me is crucial! I can’t complain about the rest. I have a very comfortable and spectacular classroom and resources; I can use a TV, films, and videos any time I want, but the large classes I have . . . That’s a problem for me to do what I want to do, teach kids to speak English.

2. Weekly time allotted to English and continuous time interruptions

Time was the second most important factor mentioned by teachers in the four groups. For some, the continuous interruptions due to strikes, holidays, particularly in the
public system, affected them, as it limited them to accomplish their objectives. In Mr. E's words:

I want, you know, [to] have a group of kids whom I can teach at least one hour every day. At the end of the month, I will have given them many hours! But in one and a half hour today and half an hour at the end of the week, because let's face it, that's what we end up really teaching in a 45-minute period. You know we have three 45-minute periods weekly. Let's take into account the missing days you know we always have . . . Perhaps next week we have a holiday, now is the fair, then carnival, then Holy week . . . Then, we don't have a sequence . . .

Ms. J also commented that time limited her from accomplishing the activities she planned.

When we have one hour of class [45 minutes], time flies . . . taking roll and giving announcements, you know . . . in one hour we can't actually work the 45 minutes. We end up teaching around 20 minutes of the 45-minute period.

According to data reported by the interviewees, time seemed to be a barrier for their EFL teaching effectiveness. Here, it is interesting to point out that in the questionnaire 68% of the respondents expressed that time was not sufficient for them to accomplish the instructional objectives in the curriculum. They alleged that continuous time interruptions aggravated the fact that weekly time allotted to English in the curriculum was not enough to accomplish the tasks conducive to develop students' communicative competence. They reported that forty-five minutes three to four times a week was not enough to provide students with individualized instruction and promote
student interaction through pair work and group work. Lack of time has also been
reported as a difficulty to implement CLT in studies conducted among Korean EFL
teachers (Li, 1998) and Japanese LOTE (Languages Other Than English) in Australia
(Sato and Kleinsasser, 1999).

3. Students’ social environment

About 50% of the interviewees reported that students’ home environment such as
socioeconomic status, family background, and parents’ education had an important
impact in what they could achieve with their students. The interviewees cited many social
and economic problems that affect student achievement in English. Here are some of
their comments:

Ms B who worked in both public and private high school stated:
Kids who attend private school have a better ability for the language than kids in
the public schools who usually come from poor neighborhoods. In fact, one can
find kids in private school that speak English because they have had the
opportunity to travel with their parents, and they also afford attending private
English courses.

Other teachers made similar comments. For instance, Mr. D said:
Environment influences student achievement absolutely. We can do much in the
class, but if kids’ home environment doesn’t support their learning, what can we
do, other than helping them while they’re in the classroom? Parents’ education
also plays a critical role in student achievement. Parents who are more educated
care and nurture their kids . . .
Mr. I commented on the fact that poor kids do not eat well.

Environment influences what we as teachers do in our classrooms. I have kids who often times come to class without breakfast because they are poor and can’t afford eating well. They generally bring with them to class empty stomach and a lot of home troubles. Some don’t live with their parents, but with a grandma, aunt, or uncle. They lack the affect and necessary support they require to succeed in school; they’re low achievers . . .

Ms. R was also concerned about low achievers who generally come from poor neighborhoods, both in the rural and the urban area. She commented:

I have students who come from poor homes where only one parent supports the family. Others live with relatives because their natural parents are gone. Some don’t even have breakfast before coming to school because of their poor economic conditions. How are they going to succeed in school?

Two teachers, Ms. N and Ms. B, mentioned child abuse as another critical problem that may affect student achievement. Ms. N narrated the case of a child who was beaten by his dad after a teacher conference where he was informed about his son academic problems.

“We have really sad cases, particularly with the poor . . .”.

Ms. B explained that her kids are also victims of child abuse. “In the school, kids have many problems. There are cases where the kids want us to report to the authorities that their stepfathers and stepmothers are abusing them . . .”

4. Classroom environment and lack of instructional resources

Most teachers reported that they needed a classroom adequately decorated and including resources that supported the teaching and learning of EFL. Considering that the
classroom is the place where students interact in English, the teachers said that they wanted a classroom for English classes where they could have the necessary resources to make the environment conducive to learning. The fact that in most public and private schools English classes are scheduled in different classrooms where teachers and students rotate is a limitation for having variety of stimulus such as bulletin boards, posters, and pictures in English. Not having their own classroom was reported as a difficulty for teachers to use a tape recorder or TV set if they want to use films, tapes, or CDs.

5. Teacher proficiency of English

Interestingly enough, at least one teacher in Group I, II, III, and IV reported their concern with their English language deficiencies, particularly in speaking. Ms. H (a low efficacious teacher) reflected about her English by saying:

Even though I’m new [novice] I like what I do; I like to teach. One thing I can’t deny though is that, I can’t speak English perfectly. I feel sorry. Sometimes I feel a little uncomfortable, yes because I try to speak . . . sometimes they [students] don’t understand me. I say to myself, ‘I may not be pronouncing well, and I may be confusing them.’ But when I teach the class normally in Spanish they understand me.

When asked what did she mean by “normally in Spanish?” She replied:

I mean speak in Spanish everything, the whole class. I translate everything so that they understand. I don’t need to necessarily speak in English for them to understand English.

Mr. D also shared Ms. H concern, but he expressed more confidence about his efforts to improve his speaking proficiency.
Well, in my case, particularly in the pedagogy, would be that I don’t have the English proficiency in speaking. Though I try to learn by myself through English courses and try to improve my pronunciation, still that deficiency limits my fluency. It’s no a limitation to teach because I prepared myself ahead of time before coming to class I try to do my best although I have that limitation. I try to give the best of my capabilities . . .

Furthermore, Mr. P reflected on the scarce professional development opportunities offered to EFL teachers in the area. He mentioned that for EFL teachers’ proficiency in the oral language was crucial. As he put it, “After I went abroad for a summer course, I feel a little more confident about my speaking abilities. I feel much better now about my capabilities”

6. Student motivation and teacher motivation

The low and mixed teacher efficacious groups (Groups II, III, and IV) reported that motivation affected both teachers and students. When commenting on motivation, one teacher in Group III said:

I think that love for the subject matter and love for teaching are crucial ingredients in the profession . . . the will to work and make an effort to improve, that’s important . . . If teachers don’t get continuous professional development and if they don’t get enthused about it by themselves forget it there won’t be motivation for students like the teacher who graduated and never took PD, What can he offer to his students?

Another teacher, commented:

If a student really wants to learn the language, he’s always using it.
Some even go to the Cyber Café to investigate and learn [On the Internet].

But there are students that... from 100% in a class, I would say that 60% don’t care about learning English.

One of the low efficacious teachers in Group II said:

I have to make a clear difference here. Because motivating students in high school it’s quite difficult! It’s not the same if you have one of those private courses where students go because they want to learn because they’re motivated. In the high school the motivation is just to pass the class... To be... yes, it’s hard for me to motivate a kid in high school... not a child, no, because children are always more open to any experience.

Discussion

More than 50% of the interviewees found external factors such as class size, weekly time allotted to English classes, students’ environment, classroom environment, and lack of resources as relevant factors that influenced student achievement no matter what they did in their classrooms. Some similarities and some differences were found among the four groups of teacher efficacy. For instance, all four groups agreed that external factors affected their teaching. Furthermore, at least one teacher in each group reported that the lack of proficiency in speaking English is a limitation. Previous research (Li, 1998; Sato and Kleinsasser, 1999) has also found that teachers’ deficiencies in the oral command of the target language were reported as preventing them from using CLT to develop the student’s communicative competence.
Additionally, the results in this study were consistent with previous studies (Ashton and Webb, 1987) where teachers' perceived efficacy was found to be influenced by external forces such as students' family, community, and sociocultural environment. Because teachers' actions are mediated by interrelated influences (Bandura, 1986, 1977; Vygotsky, 1978) that interact in and out the school setting, not surprisingly, teacher's sense of efficacy is affected by external factors. In this study, about 50% of the interviewees reported external factors have an influence on their teaching. Their actions and decisions seemed to be affected by external factors such as class size, time, students' home and so on. Their sense of personal efficacy did not seem to overcome external factors. However, further research need to be conducted on this finding.

Moreover, all groups except Group I, reported that motivation on the part of the teacher and on the part of the students played a role in the effectiveness of their teaching as well as in the student achievement in English. Therefore, besides the impact of external forces on the interviewees' efficacy perceptions, internal factors such as motivation also played a role in their sense of efficacy. The next theme addressed in the interviews was related to the factors that the EFL teachers reported as a cause of poor student achievement in English.

Factors that caused poor student achievement

This section summarized the interviewees' responses to the question, what do you think are the factors that cause poor student achievement in English? As in the
previous section regarding factors that limited teachers’ performance in the EFL classroom, the four groups of teachers reported similar views about the causes of poor student achievement.

**Group 1: High efficacious teachers**

In the group of high efficacy teachers, the teachers reported factors affecting student achievement that involved students and teachers. Two teachers reported that students had low expectations about using English in their future; therefore, they lacked interest in learning the language. In addition, two teachers stated that the lack of good models to teach English (teachers) was a cause of poor student achievement. Furthermore, a few teachers mentioned that some EFL teachers lacked the motivation to teach. Here are some of the teachers’ comments:

Ms. B: “Many of the kids wonder what the English is going to be use for when they finish high school. They don’t believe they can get solutions to their future problems through English. I think they don’t see the need of the language; they see it far from their close expectations; it’s just another subject to pass.

Ms. C said that one reason for poor English achievement is that “because they [teachers] don’t like to be teachers you know; they don’t even realize they don’t like it; teachers are not creative you know; they keep repeating, I mean . . .”

Mr. D also reported that teachers were responsible for poor student achievement in English. He said, “I think that we as teachers are the spinal cord of student motivation because if I myself as a teacher come into my class, and I am not motivated to teach what I am going to teach, how am I going to expect students to learn? I think we are a
fundamental piece in the school system. If in the 7th grade kids don’t have a good model that fills their expectations, things start going wrong from the very beginning."

**Group II: Low efficacious teachers**

Two teachers in the group of low efficacy said that the obsolete curriculum and insufficient time allotted to English were causes of poor student achievement. As in the group of high efficacious teachers, two teachers reported that students did not have any interest in learning English. Another teacher, Ms H, considered that teachers’ oral deficiencies cause poor student achievement because as she put it, “If I have deficiencies what can I expect from my students? They are copying what I am saying. I am the model they follow.”

**Group III and IV: Mixed combination of high-low or low-high efficacy**

Furthermore, the respondents in the mixed groups reported that poor student achievement in English was due to factors such as lack of teacher motivation, lack of teachers’ professional development, and lack of student’s interest. Here are some of the comments among the teachers in Groups II and IV.

**Ms J:** “I think that teachers don’t love teaching and don’t like what they teach. That’s why there is no motivation to work; that’s important. The teacher who doesn’t attend professional development . . . if the teacher doesn’t implement innovation there won’t be motivated students, forget it!

**Ms. M:** “Teachers don’t use the appropriate strategies that really motivate students. They’re not interested in learning new strategies; it’s like a circle; it’s always the same; the same routines through the years . . .”
Ms. N: “Sometimes it’s teacher motivation, but also student motivation. In my case, I see that my kids get enthusiastic to learn English; they feel motivated. Perhaps it’s because the techniques I use.”

Mr. P: “Professional development is a must. Training in-service teachers is. . . teachers graduate with good command of grammar; I can’t complain about that, but when it comes to speak the language there is no much experience. So teachers overwhelm kids with formal grammar; teaching becomes mechanical [repetitive].”

Mr. T agreed with Mr. P, “It’s our fault. We give kids too much grammar and don’t tell them what it is for. Teachers feel more comfortable teaching grammar than speaking in English. There is less probability to make mistakes in teaching grammar than in speaking in English. . . rules and formulas never change.”

Discussion

Teachers in the four groups seemed to have similar views about the causes of poor student achievement in EFL. In sum, the causes mentioned by the interviewees were: lack of students’ interest/motivation, lack of good English models (teachers), teachers’ lack of in-service training (professional development), teachers’ lack of motivation, curriculum, and weekly time allotted to English.

Students’ motivation/interest: According to a number of interviewees, the lack of students’ interest or motivation in the English class becomes an “intrinsic” barrier for successful learning of the language. Research has shown that motivation is a complex cognitive construct that guides how much effort and investment an individual makes in order to pursue outcomes and goals (Bandura, 1977). If students’ expectations are not
fulfilled, and if they do not have relevant personal goals for learning English, they are less likely to be interested and motivated to learn English. Some teachers reported that students did not see the point of learning English; therefore, their expectations were low.

In light of the social constructivist theory, learning is constructed and socially situated; therefore, EFL language teaching should be contextualized and meaningful to students. In other words, lecturing students on grammar and having them memorize rules and formulas without a meaningful context related to their interests and experiences may cause them to lose motivation in learning English. Additionally, as already noted, in Bandura's social cognitive theory, motivation is connected to personal goals, outcome expectations, self-monitoring and self-directed learning. If students' expectations for learning English are not fulfilled by the instruction they receive in the EFL class, and if they do not see English as useful for their personal lives, they are likely to lose motivation or not having the necessary motivation to learn English. However, more research on this topic is needed.

Factors within teachers: Teachers orchestrate learning according to their efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1977); thus, actions and tasks mirrored teachers' beliefs about their capabilities to bring about students' change. Internal factors within teachers reported by the interviewees as provoking poor student achievement included lack of good models (teachers), teachers' lack of in-service training (professional development), and teachers' lack of motivation.

External factors: Regarding external factors affecting student English learning, a few teachers mentioned that the curriculum was obsolete. Furthermore, some teachers reported the fact that they lacked opportunities to retrain in CLT. Insufficient time...
allotted to English and continuous interruptions during the school year were external factors the teachers reported as a limitation for English learning. Additionally, some teachers reported that a majority of EFL teachers lacked the English speaking proficiency, which they believed affected student English learning.

Teacher preparation

Teacher preparation was the last theme of the interview. Teachers were asked, “Do you believe that your teaching education program has effectively trained you to teach EFL? Why you say yes? Why you say no? The second question asked was, If you could make changes to your teacher education program, what would they be?

Seventeen out of twenty teachers reported that they did not feel they were well prepared to teach English by their training programs. The most critical area they mentioned was deficiencies in oral proficiency (subject matter knowledge). Reflecting on their deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, some teachers said:

In regards with grammar, yes, but in conversation, no. At the university we had a cassette and a textbook; we couldn’t see what was going on. It’s not the same when we talk with somebody in real life situations.

Well, I think I got the tools, but how could I say this? The university gives you the tools, but it’s not all we need when we go to the real world, like the English competence, the listening, speaking. These skills are not being given by the university.

As Bandura (1986) stated, vicarious experiences and successful mastery experiences build stronger self-efficacy beliefs. According to a majority of the
participants they lacked mastery experiences to help them build strong efficacy beliefs about their capabilities as EFL teachers, particularly in oral proficiency. Some of them reported their personal efforts to improve the English communicative competence since they did not feel confident about their language abilities. As one teacher put it, “I have had to study English courses by myself to improve because the university just taught me grammar. I mean teachers did not encourage conversation.”

Comparison between quantitative and qualitative data

For the purposes of answering the research questions in the study, two major methods were used to triangulate information. Through a 78-item questionnaire quantitative descriptive data were gathered and analyzed by using both descriptive and inferential statistics. A second method, individual interviewing was also used with a purposeful sampling in order to obtain the participants’ emic perspectives about the topics addressed in the study. The next section presents the research questions and the quantitative and qualitative data discussion for each question.

1. What are the general and personal teacher self-reported efficacy levels among EFL teachers in selected San Cristóbal middle schools?

Descriptive statistics were used for means and standard deviations of the items in Part I and Part II of the questionnaire addressing teacher efficacy. Efficacy for strategies was slightly higher than efficacy for engagement and management. In addition, the overall mean for PTE was slightly higher than the overall mean of GTE. Factor analysis
was used to reduce the teachers’ sense of efficacy items (Part I & II) into factors previously identified in the literature. The results for Part I were consistent with the 3-factor model used by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2000), while the results for Part II were consistent with the PTE and GTE dimensions of teachers’ self-efficacy identified by other research studies.

Data gathered from the interviews, however, corroborated what researchers have pointed out about teachers’ self-efficacy as being multidimensional and task specific. The participants’ sense of efficacy seemed to vary across tasks and contexts. Findings showed that it could be misleading to classify teachers in two extremes, (e.g., being low efficacious or being high efficacious).

2. What do teachers in San Cristóbal middle schools self-report to be their English proficiency level on 16 Likert-type items related to English language proficiency?

On a scale from 1 to 6, teachers were asked to self-evaluate and report their proficiency in English. Means and standard deviations were used to examine the levels of proficiency selected by the participants. The results showed that reading and writing had higher means than listening, speaking, and culture. The findings indicated that teachers self-reported themselves to be less proficient in speaking, listening, and sociolinguistic skills.

During the interviews, some participants reported a concern about their oral English deficiencies. Some of the teachers expressed a lack of confidence in using their oral skills to model the language for their students. Reflecting on her deficiencies, a
teacher commented about her frustration for not having adequate oral proficiency in the language. Consistent with research conducted in other EFL contexts (Li, 1998), the Venezuelan EFL teachers self-reported that deficiencies in spoken English influenced their confidence in the capabilities to speak and model language input for the learners.

3. What are the correlations among EFL teacher self-reported efficacy beliefs and other selected variables: job preparedness to teach English, use of strategies to teach English, class management, engagement, and English language skills (e.g., reading, writing, listening, speaking, culture), teacher demographic and academic characteristics.

Pearson Product Moment correlations were calculated to investigate the relationship between selected variables. The findings showed that PTE was positively correlated with job preparedness (r = .40). That is, the more confident the teacher was about her or his teacher preparation, the higher her or his PTE. PTE was also positively correlated with reading (r = .51), writing (r = .55), listening (r = .56), speaking (r = .60), and culture (r = .56). As can be noted, the highest correlations were found between PTE and listening, speaking, and culture. These results were consistent with the teachers' self-reported levels of proficiency in Part II. In other words, teachers who rated themselves more proficient in speaking and listening and culture tended to have a higher PTE.

Finally, PTE was correlated with selected demographic variables showing no significant correlation between gender and years of experience teaching English. The
correlation was positive, however, between staff development attendance and experiences studying or visiting English-speaking countries.

4. What are the routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in teaching English in San Cristóbal middle schools in terms of mean frequency of use? Is there any difference between the mean frequencies of use of these routine pedagogical strategies?

According to the teachers’ self-reported data in Part IV of the questionnaire, it was found that communication-oriented strategies and grammar-oriented strategies were not mutually exclusive. However, the mean of grammar-oriented strategies was higher, and when the mean frequencies of use were compared, a t-test showed a statistically significant difference between both types of strategies. Overall, it can be said that interviewees reported that grammar-oriented strategies dominate in their teaching practice.

When commenting on the four situations about instructional strategies, teachers’ thinking reflected their tendency to rely on formal grammar teaching. Along with dialogues, teachers reported using lectures about grammar rules and drills and exercises from the textbook and blackboard. Regardless of the role CLT suggested in the National Curriculum for EFL teaching, the teachers in the study favored the use of grammar-oriented strategies to teach English. From this perspective, form becomes more important than meaning, and students are more likely to achieve grammatical accuracy than oral fluency. This might be due to the fact that preservice EFL teachers are generally trained
under the grammar-translation approach (Cullen, 1994; Tedick and Walker, 1995); thus, when it comes to real classrooms they face the burden of teaching under the CLT approach as the National Curriculum mandates. But, unfortunately, EFL teachers might not feel well prepared to teach English for communication; therefore, they focus on grammar teaching (linguistic competence) because they tend to feel more confident about their grammar competence.

Studies have found a teacher's tendency to focus on the developing of linguistic competence based on formal grammar. In their study of Japanese LOTE teachers in Australia, Sato and Kleinsasser (1999) concluded, “Grammar was more central in their language teaching than these LOTE teachers admitted . . . Whether or not, they were teaching communicatively, grammar was a central focus in the observed classes” (p.505). In this sense, it can be argued that the context makes a difference when teaching foreign languages. In Venezuela, for example, learners and teachers only experience English in the formal setting of the classroom. Here it is noteworthy to point out the difference between EFL contexts and ESL contexts. In EFL contexts, such as Venezuela, there is no basic need to use English for communication outside the classroom. Additionally, the pragmatics of English is a challenge for those teachers with no experience abroad, and they are probably not familiar with appropriate patterns behavior of English-speaking cultures. Thus, context, social interaction, and availability of input are a barrier to the acquisition of strategic and pragmatic knowledge in the Venezuelan context. However, as Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) contended, “While we sort out conceptual and pragmatic issues, ELT [English Language Professionals] should, first, continue to sharpen their expertise (linguistic, pedagogical knowledge, and skills) and second, seek
or create opportunities to discuss issues related to professionals from diverse, multilingual contexts to raise their consciousness and awareness.” (p. 143).

5. What is the relationship between the frequency of reported use of the methods and strategies advocated in the Teacher’s Manual disseminated by the Venezuelan Ministry of Education (1987) for the teaching of EFL under the communicative-functional approach and the current routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers reported using in their actual practice?

Descriptive data analysis and interviews about the use of instructional strategies revealed the teachers’ tendency to stick to more traditional strategies (e.g., lectures on formal grammar, translation, written drills and exercises on the board, filling in the textbook) than on promoting student interaction and communication to master the language functions proposed in the curriculum contained in the Teacher’s Manual disseminated by the Venezuelan Ministry of Education (1987). In their reaction to the situations presented by the researcher, most teachers reported that dialogues and role plays were the strategies they used to develop students’ communicative competence.

Generally, teachers reported that dialogues were read and translated. In the procedures, they reported that generally grammar structures were presented first, and then students read, repeat chorally and individually, translate, and memorize new words and phrases contained in the dialogues. Although the Teacher’s Manual recommends, “to avoid translation” (1987, p. 144), most teachers reported that they used translation as a way to ensure students’ comprehension. The interviewees also reported the use of songs as a source of motivation that helped students to practice listening and reading.
comprehension and grammar structures contained in the curriculum. Some teachers reported that when using games, they were aimed at developing vocabulary and practicing grammar structures. Simulations were not a very common routine strategy reported by the interviewees. Problem-solving was not reported as a current pedagogical routine by the interviewees.

A major concern reported by the interviewees was having students master grammar structures before they would be able to do communicative activities such as dialogues. Even when using songs as a motivating activity, some teachers reported that songs were useful to have students master grammar structures.

6. What are the pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using to manage student behavior in selected San Cristóbal middle schools?

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the pedagogical strategies related to management (Items 12 through 19, Part IV). Means and standard deviations showed that student-centered strategies were predominantly used among the group of surveyed teachers. This result is consistent with previous findings about the relationship between teachers’ sense of efficacy and management strategies. Management has often been found to be a distinctive dimension of teachers’ perceived efficacy (Emmer, 1990; Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2000), which was supported in this study.

Teachers expressed similar perspectives when they were interviewed about classroom management. In some cases, teachers reported that management differed
across groups; thus, they said they used more teacher-centered strategies depending on the particular group of students they were teaching.

7. What is the correlation between the routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in their actual practice and their self-reported level of proficiency in English?

The use of descriptive statistics and Pearson Correlation resulted in a positive significant association between participants’ self-reported level of English proficiency and the use of communication-oriented strategies to teach English. In other words, the more proficient teachers were in speaking, listening, reading, and writing, the more likely they were to orchestrate student learning around activities that promoted communication. Not surprisingly, grammar-oriented strategies were not correlated with speaking and listening, but correlated positively with reading and writing.

Summary

This chapter has presented the data and discussion in regards to the research questions of the study about teachers’ sense of efficacy and selected characteristics of EFL teachers in San Cristóbal, Venezuela.

Data were gathered through both a 78-item questionnaire and individual interviews. The questionnaire was used to collect the quantitative data to address the research questions. Thus, descriptive statistics, correlations, factor analysis, and linear regression were used to measure teachers’ perceived efficacy and selected variables such
as English proficiency, use of certain instructional and management strategies, and demographic characteristics of the participants.

Interviews were conducted in order to triangulate data in the questionnaire and to gain a deeper understanding of the participants' emic perspectives related to the research questions addressed in the study. Data were first presented and analyzed using quantitative methods, and subsequently using individual teacher interviews with selected respondents as a method to compare and identify common patterns found in the participants' self-reported teaching practices.

The last chapter presents the findings based on the data reported here in Chapter 4. The next chapter also describes the conclusions, the implications, recommendations for further study, and limitations of the present study.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH, AND LIMITATIONS

This study explored the teachers' sense of efficacy beliefs of selected EFL teachers in San Cristóbal, Táchira, Venezuela. Teachers' sense of efficacy is a construct derived from Bandura's social cognitive theory, defined as the teachers' beliefs about their capabilities to bring about student learning. Thus, the study sought to explore Venezuelan EFL teachers' self-reported self-efficacy in task specific situations (e.g., efficacy for instructional strategies, classroom management, and engagement), and their perceived Personal Teacher efficacy (PTE) and General Teacher Efficacy (GTE) to teach English. The study also addressed the need for EFL teachers' self-efficacy research in contexts outside the U.S.

Methodology

**Design:** The present study included both descriptive and correlational analyses as well as interviews conducted with a purposeful sample selected among the 100 teachers who participated in the study.

**Instrumentation:** Four instruments were used in the development of a 78-item questionnaire designed to measure teachers' sense of efficacy. The first one was The
Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2000), the second one was the Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Inventory (STEBI) developed by Riggs and Enochs (1990), the two-item Rand scale (1976), and two items from Woolfolk and Hoy’s (1993) revised version of Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson and Dembo, 1984).

Construct validity was partially established by the instruments that are the base of the ETSEBI (English Teacher Sense of Efficacy Belief Inventory). Face validity was established by a panel of experts composed of three faculty members at The Ohio State University who tested the suitability and clarity of the instrument. Data on validity were presented in Chapter 4.

A pilot study was conducted with ten EFL teachers who worked in a high school outside the limits of San Cristóbal, and who shared similar characteristics with the EFL teacher population of the study. Cronbach’s alpha was used to establish the reliability of the instrument after the pilot subjects returned their survey responses. The following reliability was established Part I (.75), Part II (.59), Part III (.92), and Part IV (.80). Cronbach alpha coefficients for the 100 participants in the actual study were: Part I (.90), Part II (.73), Part III (.95), and Part IV (.79). Standard statistical procedures suggest that these reliability levels are acceptable.

Data collection: Data were primarily gathered via the study survey conducted by the researcher between December 2001 and February 2002. Interviews were subsequently conducted after using descriptive statistics to purposefully select the interviewees. Data were presented in Chapter 4 and samples are included in the appendices.
Analysis of data: The questionnaire data were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 10.1). Descriptive statistics of means, frequencies, standard deviations, and percentages were used to describe the demographic characteristics of the participants and their responses to the questionnaire. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was also used to describe the relationships being investigated. Linear multiple regression was used to identify the variables that would predict teachers’ sense of efficacy. Factor analysis was used to examine the teachers’ sense of efficacy dimensions of Venezuelan EFL teachers in the study.

Qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews were analyzed and coded by the researcher and used to triangulate data from the survey. First, interviews were tape-recorded and then transcribed verbatim to investigate recurrent themes across the teachers’ responses. The next section of this chapter presents the participants’ demographic characteristics, research questions, and findings.

Demographic characteristics of EFL middle school teachers

Data revealed that 66% of the teachers were female and 30% were male. Of the participants, 43% worked in private high schools, 41% worked in public high schools, and 16% worked in both types of schools. The majority of teachers (84%) held a Bachelor’s degree in Education major English whereas 8% held a Master’s degree that was not related to the field of applied linguistics or foreign language education. A low percentage (3%) held a Certificate (Specialization) in elementary school teaching.
Among the surveyed teachers 22% had experience studying or traveling to English-speaking countries while 77% had not traveled or studied abroad. Forty percent of the participants had from 6 to 12 years teaching, 26% had between 0 and 5 years, another 26% had between 13 and 20 years, and 8% had more than 20 years. Of the participants, 54% never attended staff development while 30% attended once a year and 12% between two to three times a year. The majority of teachers (88%) reported that they did not subscribe to EFL journals while 12% answered affirmatively. The next session presents answers to the research questions. Each question is answered based on data presented in Chapter 4. This Chapter also includes interpretative comments based on the Venezuelan context.

**Question 1: What are the general and personal teacher self-reported efficacy levels among EFL teachers in selected San Cristóbal middle schools?**

Part II of the ETSEBI was subjected to factor analysis to examine the PTE and GTE of Venezuelan EFL teachers who participated in this study. PTE and GTE were two dimensions of teachers' perceived efficacy that supported previous studies. PTE was specific to tasks in the teaching English and GTE was also specific to the teaching of English. There were no problems with the PTE loadings; however, items 8, 9, and 11 (GTE) unexpectedly loaded in PTE. Although PTE and GTE have been consistently identified across previous studies as two uncorrelated factors, PTE and GTE have shown both conceptual as well as statistical inconsistencies when subjected to factor analyses. The fact that Items 8, 9 and 11 loaded in PTE rather than on GTE seems to support
Woolfolk and Hoy’s argument that GTE is not a measure of outcome expectation as Gibson and Dembo (1984) initially asserted. In Riggs and Enochs’ (1990) study, “Factor analysis [also] revealed even more complexity within the Science Efficacy Outcome Expectancy scale” (p.628).

An important finding of the study was that teachers’ self-efficacy differed between Part I (The TSES) and Part II (PTE and GTE) according to the participants’ scores. When the levels of efficacy were compared among the subjects by using the means to select the sample for the interviews, it was found that teachers’ sense of efficacy was not homogeneous along the items in Part I and II. Some teachers scored high or low in both Part I and II while others scored low in Part I but high in Part II and vice versa. In other words, their level of efficacy varied across tasks as the statistical means indicated, which made it difficult to place teachers in the extremes, (i.e., being high or low, in all the tasks being measured in Part I and II). This finding indicated that although PTE and GTE were found to be two dimensions of teachers’ perceived efficacy among the surveyed teachers, there was a group for whom perceived efficacy was a mixed combination (high-low or low-high) of efficacy for engagement, management, and instructional strategies as well as for PTE and GTE. Thus, classifying teachers in the extremes as low or high can be misleading in terms of measuring their sense of efficacy because as Bandura (1997) posited, teachers’ sense of efficacy is not a global construct. The mixed combinations found in this study supported previous research (Ashton and Webb, 1986) about teachers’ perceived efficacy as a context-specific construct that varies according to particular characteristics and moment of the teaching situation.
With regards to the results of Part I, statistical analysis revealed that the participants judged their capabilities for instructional strategies as higher than their capabilities to engage and manage student behavior. Likewise, PTE was slightly higher than GTE. PTE refers to the teachers' beliefs about their capabilities to teach whereas GTE as interpreted by Gibson and Dembo (1984) in the light of Bandura' framework of self-efficacy refers to the teachers’ beliefs that the environment (e.g., family background) could be controlled, so that all students can be taught. During the interviews, more than 50% of the teachers reported that students’ home, socioeconomic status and parents’ education were factors that influenced their teaching, and therefore, possibly student achievement. Additionally, they also reported that external factors such as class sizes, amount of weekly time allotted to English classes, and lack of resources were barriers that they believe affect their effectiveness to teach EFL. This finding may be interpreted in light of Bandura’s (1986a) “triadic reciprocal causation,” where behavior, environment, and personal factors function interrelated in reciprocal causation. From a sociocultural constructivist perspective (Rogoff, 1998; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985) learning and teaching are socially constructed practices developed in specific historical, social, and cultural settings; therefore, they are context-bound. Further research is needed to validate the EFL teachers’ perspectives about the influences of external factors on their perceived teacher efficacy.

The Venezuelan middle EFL teachers who participated in the study self-reported the same type of variety that is probably characteristic of EFL teachers in other countries (e.g., Li, 1998; Shim, 2000). While the questionnaire and interview data provided
context-specific findings, it also included relatively few surprises for the researcher who is also a Venezuelan English as a Foreign Language instructor.

**Question 2:** What do teachers in San Cristóbal middle schools self-report to be their English proficiency level on 16 Likert-type items related to English language proficiency?

Language deficiencies particularly in listening, speaking, culture, and sociolinguistic knowledge were self-reported with low means. Furthermore, findings showed a positive significant correlation between speaking, listening, and sociolinguistic competence and PTE. This suggested that the more proficient in English language skills the teachers were, the higher their sense of efficacy tended to be, as they were more confident about their capabilities to model the target language and discuss cultural themes in English class. English language deficiencies in speaking were mentioned as a factor that affected teachers' confidence in their capabilities to teach oral English. Interview results revealed that at least one teacher in Group I, II, III, and IV reported their concern about their own English speaking proficiency. Those teachers reported that language deficiencies in English speaking were a barrier, particularly when it came to speaking English in class and conducting tasks that required oral proficiency, sociolinguistic, and cultural competence.

The fact that some EFL teachers reported lacking confidence in their speaking and listening abilities may have caused them to focus on teaching grammar rather than on activities that promote communication in English. As one high PTE teacher reported in the interview, teaching grammar reduced the chances of making oral mistakes and give
teachers confidence about their grammar knowledge. In this sense, teachers reported
being more confident and prepared to teach grammar than communication skills.

Some teachers also reported that a teacher's language deficiencies particularly in
listening and speaking, possibly, cause poor student performance in English. In fact, one
teacher in Group I and one in Group II echoed the concern by reporting that oral
deficiencies may affect good modeling of input for learners because the teacher is
typically the only model students imitate. Hence, oral English deficiencies seem to affect
teachers' confidence to speak English and orchestrate communicative activities. In sum,
it can be argued that students require EFL teachers who are proficient not only in
grammar, reading, and writing, but also in speaking and listening so that students can
learn English from models that facilitate them with mastery experiences conducive to
acquiring communicative competence of English.

In light of the findings this point is relevant to the Venezuelan context because it
was found that English speaking proficiency as reported by the participants might be a
significant predictor of PTE explaining 33.5% of the variance in the scores of the
ETSEBI for PTE. Speaking proficiency was also a concern expressed by the intervieweed
teachers. The interview results showed that at least one teacher in each group of
perceived efficacy reported that deficiencies in spoken English influenced their
confidence on their capability to speak English and model language input for learners. In
this sense, it is important to note that the national curriculum for EFL in the middle and
high schools recommends the teaching and learning of English for communicative
purposes. But, if the EFL teachers do not have the English communicative competence
themselves, then they cannot orchestrate the learning of English conducive to interact in English and develop communicative competence. Nor can they model language input for their learners.

**Question 3:** What are the correlations among EFL teacher self-reported efficacy beliefs and other selected variables: job preparedness to teach English, use of strategies to teach English, class management, engagement, and English language skills (e.g., reading, writing, listening, speaking, culture) and demographic and academic characteristics.

A positive correlation between job preparedness and teachers' sense of efficacy showed that the extent to which teachers reported feeling prepared to teach English affected their sense of teacher efficacy. The statistics showed that the better prepared they considered themselves, the higher their sense of efficacy was reported to be.

Additionally, a positive correlation between PTE and GTE and efficacy for engagement, management, and instructional strategies was found. This means that as the efficacy for management, engagement, and instructional strategies increased so did the PTE and GTE. This explains that teachers who self-reported confident in their capabilities to manage students, engage them, and orchestrate instructional strategies were more likely to be high efficacious than those who self-reported less confidence in their capabilities.

With regards to strategies to manage student behavior, a low negative correlation was found between PTE and teacher-centered strategies \((r = -0.10)\) which indicated that the higher the PTE, the lower the tendency to use teacher-centered strategies to control
student behavior. Similarly, a low positive correlation, was found between PTE and student-centered strategies. As PTE increased, more student-centered strategies were used. These results are consistent with previous studies that showed that high efficacious teachers tend to be less authoritarian and punitive than low efficacious teachers.

The correlations between PTE and teaching strategies (grammar-oriented and communication-oriented) were positive but low. In this sense, it can be said that no matter which strategies the teachers reported using, the choice did not seem to affect their self-reported teachers’ perception of efficacy.

Findings with regards to the relationship between teachers’ sense of efficacy and English proficiency found language proficiency, as a major predictor of teachers’ perceived efficacy according to the Pearson correlations and linear regression analysis. Correlations were statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Positive correlations were found between speaking and PTE (r=. 60), listening and PTE (r=. 56), culture and PTE (r=. 56), writing and PTE (r=. .55), and reading and PTE (r=. 51). In the same way, positive correlations were found between GTE and speaking (r=. 28), GTE and listening (r=. 27), GTE and reading (r=. 39), GTE and writing (r=. 28) and GTE and culture (r=. 25).

These results were consistent with the teachers’ perspectives about their English speaking proficiency during the interviews. The interview results revealed that speaking proficiency was very important for all the efficacy groups. In some cases, teachers reported their personal efforts to improve their speaking proficiency. Some said that they took additional courses while those that could afford it traveled to English speaking
countries for a summer course. Some complained about the fact that there were no opportunities for them to engage in professional development in order to improve not only their communicative competence but also techniques and methods to teach EFL.

Relationships between demographic characteristics such as gender, years of experience teaching English, experience traveling/studying abroad, staff development and PTE were also examined. The findings showed no correlation between PTE and gender, nor were years of experience correlated with PTE. This finding is supported by previous research (Guskey, 1984, 1986; Ross, 1994) that suggested that in-service teachers’ sense of efficacy tended to be stable throughout their years of experience. Nonetheless, years of experience teaching English and GTE had a low negative correlation (r = -.21).

Positive correlations were found between PTE and staff development, and between PTE and experience traveling/studying into English-speaking countries. Thus, the more staff development teachers reported attending, the higher their PTE. Similarly, those who had experience traveling or studying abroad tended to report a higher sense of teacher efficacy. Unfortunately, among the surveyed teachers, 54% reported that they had never attended any kind of staff development, while 77% said they did not have experiences traveling or studying in English-speaking countries. GTE was not correlated with staff development nor was traveling/studying abroad.

In the Venezuelan context, the answer to this research question is important because it indicates that English language proficiency is a major predictor of teachers’ sense of efficacy. Given the fact that experiences abroad also correlated with PTE, it is relevant to point out that EFL teachers in Venezuela generally are not likely to pursue
studies in English-speaking countries that allow them to improve their proficiency of English. In addition, being an EFL context, the possibilities of encounters with native speakers and exposure to the target language and culture are scarce. Therefore, this situation raises concerns related to the adequacy of training in the subject matter knowledge (e.g., oral English) that EFL teachers receive in their teacher education programs.

**Question 4: What are the routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in teaching English in San Cristóbal middle schools in terms of mean frequency of use? Is there any difference between the mean frequencies of use of these routine pedagogical strategies?**

When means for grammar-oriented and communication-oriented strategies were compared with a Pair Sample t-test, it was found that the difference between both types of strategies was statistically significant. In other words, grammar-oriented strategies were reported to be predominantly used by the participants to help students learn the instructional objectives in English.

Moreover, information gathered during the interviews was consistent with the statistical analysis showing that teachers put more emphasis on grammar-oriented strategies than on communication-oriented strategies. Although they reported using dialogues and role plays, for example, they mentioned that grammar was explained as a means to understand dialogues. The four efficacy groups reported using mimicry practice with dialogues and role-plays in class. They also reported using grammar explanations and exercises on the board to ensure learners’ understanding of the function being
studied. As it was already noted, the participants reported deficiencies in oral English which may explain why they seemed to rely more on grammar teaching than on CLT. Earlier findings (Li, 1998) among EFL Korean teachers indicated that deficiencies in spoken English prevented Korean teachers from using CLT.

In Venezuela English is a mandatory subject during the 5 years of high school. In light of the answer to the above question, it may be argued that one reason why students graduate from high school and do not seem to acquire the communicative competence mandated by the national curriculum stems from the fact that they are mostly taught under the grammar-translation approach. The traditional use of grammar explanations followed by drilling is consistent with the deductive method of teaching grammar where rules are explained first, and then drilled through structure exercises for reinforcement and memorization. Consequently, students tend to memorize language structures for later evaluation through paper-and-pencil tests.

**Question 5:** What is the relationship between the frequency of use of the methods and strategies advocated in the Teacher's Manual disseminated by the Venezuelan Ministry of Education (1987) for the teaching of EFL under the communicative-functional approach and the current routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in their actual practice?

Means of the self-reported items about the instructional strategies the participants used in their EFL classroom, showed that the item, "Students copy grammar exercises from the blackboard after the teacher's explanation," had the highest mean (M = 5.12)
among the 11 items measuring communication-oriented and grammar-oriented strategies. The next item with a high mean also depicted traditional strategies, "Students are called to the blackboard to write their response to in-class drill exercises" (M=4.87). The third highest item was related to the use of dialogues to promote communication in English, with a mean of 4.26. The statistical results as well as the data reported in the interviews suggested more emphasis on form than on meaning.

Some of the participants reported that insufficient class time and large class sizes were obstacles that impeded the use of communication-oriented strategies. They reported that monitoring interactive activities and providing individualized instruction were time-consuming activities that they could not accomplish in a 45-minute class. Although research (Li, 1998; Sato and Kleinsasser, 1999) has shown that time is a difficulty in implementing CLT, it is noteworthy to point out that according to Gibson and Dembo’s study high and low efficacy teachers handled class time differently. High efficacy teachers made a better use of time. They spent more time in teaching the whole class and did not spend time in nonacademic activities or intellectual games while low efficacy teachers spent 10.5 minutes in intellectual games and work more with small groups.

In sum, although teachers complied with the strategies suggested in the Teacher’s Manual, they reported a reliance on grammar for the most part. Large classes (38-50 students) and not enough weekly time allotted to English classes were factors reported as constraints to use communicative activities in class. Some teachers in the group of low efficacy reported that they refrained from using communicative activities such as group work because they felt they would lose control of class discipline.
In the Venezuelan context, the answer to this question is important due to the fact that the goals of the national curriculum for English in middle high school (7th, 8th, 9th grades) are based on two major purposes: 1. Students should be able to speak English as a means of communicating with native speakers. 2. Students should be able to read and understand English so that they can access journals, magazines, and books written in English (Program of Study and Teacher Manual, 1987, p.17).

As it can be seen, Purpose 1 requires teaching EFL under the Communicative Language (CLT) Approach to language teaching, but as the study findings revealed, English is mainly being taught under the grammar-translation approach according to the data reported by the participants in the study. This finding raises several questions worthwhile to pursue for further research. For instance, do Venezuelan EFL students need to speak English to communicate with native speakers? As findings revealed, Purpose 1 does not seem to be met in the teaching practice reported by the participants of the study. As the participants reported, a complex array of external and internal factors interrelate and influence teachers’ actions and thinking in regards with the instructional goals of the national curriculum. Some of those factors are related to teachers themselves such as English oral proficiency and motivation while others are contextual factors that do not directly depend on the teachers’ decisions or efficacy. For instance, the lack of appropriate resources and instructional materials, classroom environments not conducive to learning, lack of professional development opportunities to retrain in CLT, and students’ social environment and lack of interest in learning English are among the external factors reported by the participants as affecting their effectiveness to teach.
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Question 6: What are the pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using to manage student behavior in selected San Cristóbal middle schools?

Findings in the study were consistent with previous research revealing that efficacy for management is a distinct dimension of teachers’ perceived efficacy. It also showed that high efficacious teachers tended to use more student-centered strategies to control student behavior while less efficacious teachers were more likely to use teacher-centered strategies to manage student discipline. However, two high efficacious teachers in management (Group III) reported that the management and discipline strategies they used depended on the particular class they taught. When asked why they thought so, they said that some classes were more difficult to control than others; therefore, sometimes they were compelled to use teacher-centered strategies and punitive management as a way to control classes with a tendency to be disruptive.

Overall, as a recurrent pattern from the interviewees’ responses it was found that Group I and III did not have any complaints about their student behavior. On the contrary, they seemed satisfied and managed discipline well. This finding seems to suggest that high efficacious teachers tended to involve disruptive students in class rather than punishing them. Among the strategies they reported to manage their classes are engaging disruptive students in class, paying more attention to them, and keeping them on-task. Low efficacy teachers, on the other hand, reported a tendency to reprimand students, send them out of class, or punish them with grades taking points of their final grade if students misbehaved.

In Venezuela, both public and private schools tend to have large class sizes,
which explain to a certain extent why it is critical for teachers to be highly efficacious for classroom management, particularly if they use group work in class.

**Question 7:** What is the correlation between the routine pedagogical strategies EFL teachers report using in their actual practice and their self-reported level of proficiency in English?

Pearson Product-moment correlation coefficients showed significant relationship between language proficiency and the use communication-oriented strategies to teach English. In other words, teachers who reported that they were more confident about their language skills were more likely to use strategies that encourage the use of English for communicative purposes. No correlations were found between culture, speaking, and listening and grammar-oriented strategies while positive significant correlations were found between reading and writing and grammar-oriented strategies. Routine pedagogical strategies currently used by the participants were predominantly consistent with the principles of the grammar-translation approach, although they reported using dialogues, role plays, and songs.

Data analyzed across the high, low, and mixed groups of teachers' sense of efficacy revealed that overall the use of communication-oriented and grammar-oriented strategies were not mutually exclusive. Teachers in all four groups used both types of strategies; however, as it was already noted grammar-oriented strategies were predominantly used among the four groups of teachers' perceived efficacy. Another significant finding in the interview results was the fact that some teachers reported being stressful to speak English in class because they were aware of their oral language.
deficiencies. In this sense, it is worthwhile to mention that lack of confidence provokes feelings of anxiety (Horwitz, 1985, 1989) that undermine the teacher’s competence in the classroom and affects his or her self-esteem and professional identity (Cullen, 1994). In sum, how teachers learned formal English along with their previous school experiences had a significant impact on their professional practice as EFL teachers. The findings suggested that teachers’ sense of efficacy for grammar over conversation was stronger; therefore, the participants were more likely to teach grammar than conversation in English. Grounded on Bandura’s framework about the sources of teachers’ self-efficacy, these findings suggest that teachers lacked successful mastery experiences in conversing in English during their preservice education. For this reason, they may not feel confident in their capabilities to teach students to speak in English. Needless to say, their teacher self-efficacy for grammar was strongly built during their preservice training. As most interviewees reported, they felt well prepared to teach grammar, but they did not have the same confidence in regards to speaking, listening, and sociopragmatic knowledge. They did not report having successful mastery experiences in using English for conversation. Neither were they exposed to the pragmatic aspects of English culture during their training programs. This tendency of teacher education programs to focus on theoretical pedagogical knowledge (methodology), and on English language skills based on grammar, phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon of the language (linguistic competence) has been acknowledged by researchers (Freeman, 1989; Tedick and Walker, 1995) who argued that language teaching has often been fragmented, teacher-centered, unrelated to the community and to the students’ needs and interests.
The fact that a majority of EFL teachers cannot afford studying or traveling to English-speaking countries to develop their speaking proficiency and be aware about the pragmatics of the language compromise teacher education programs to fulfill these needs. With the advent of CLT, EFL teachers require the language proficiency to model input for learners and teach them to use English for communication. Those teachers who are aware about their spoken deficiencies in English feel pressure on them when it comes to speak English.

In the Venezuelan context the answer to this research question is important because it shows the need for EFL teachers to receive an adequate preparation not only in the formal linguistic aspects of the language (i.e., syntax, morphology, phonology, lexicon) but also in the productive skills of the language (listening and speaking) which would allow them to use English as a tool for oral communication. In fact, both pedagogical and subject matter knowledge are crucial in building a stronger sense of teacher efficacy of EFL teachers. As this study suggested, speaking might be a significant predictor of PTE, and not surprisingly, was reported as influencing teacher effectiveness to teach English.

Implications for the Teacher Education Program at the University of Los Andes San Cristóbal -Táchira

Important implications emerged from the findings of this study in regards to the training and developing of Licentiates in English Education at The University of Los Andes-Táchira since 85% of the participants hold their degree from that university.
Licentiate in English Education

As was already mentioned in Chapter 1, this is a five-year program for preparing teachers who major in English. Unfortunately, after a reform in 1966, the curriculum remained mostly concentrated on developing prospective teachers' pedagogical knowledge while subject matter knowledge only entails 35% of the career in terms of courses. The subject matter content knowledge addresses the development of prospective teachers' communicative competence in the four skills as well as the sociolinguistic competence of English. As this study showed, teachers reported major deficiencies in speaking and listening as well as in sociolinguistic and strategic competence, which indicated that the teacher program is not accomplishing the goals demanded by the National Curriculum. Among the study participants, 85% graduated from the University of Los Andes - Táchira.

The implications that follow address ways to improve the language proficiency of prospective EFL teachers. They are particularly relevant for the authorities at the Language Department and Curriculum Reform at the University of Los Andes- Táchira, from which a majority of the participants in this study graduated. Theoretical and practical implications can be drawn from the study to improve the teacher education curriculum in three areas: subject matter knowledge, integration of language and culture, and integration of theory and practice.

Subject matter knowledge: Language improvement in speaking and listening are required to build a stronger sense of efficacy in EFL teachers. Not only it is necessary for EFL teachers to acquire linguistic competence (i.e., grammar command of English) but
also they require mastery experiences conducive to the acquisition of the communicative competence that enables them to use English not as an object, but as tool of communication. In this sense, it is worthwhile to mention that fluency and intelligibility in English rather than native-like pronunciation should be the main goal of EFL teacher education programs. Therefore, the recent debate of the dichotomy of native-speaker versus non-native speaker for ELT professionals should be incorporated into the education of prospective EFL teachers through critical praxis (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999) to help them reflect upon the sociopolitical aspects of teaching EFL. As Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) suggested, “The TESOL [EFL] classroom can serve a site for change in breaking down the dichotomous discourses of nativeness” (417-418) as a way to empower EFL teachers to become agents of change of their own realities and replace the label of “native” by language expertise (Rampton, 1990).

Thus, the language component in the English teacher education program at the University of Los Andes Táchira, must be reviewed and reformed so that prospective teachers majoring in English attain appropriate levels of English speaking proficiency. In this sense, it is desirable that all classes in the program be conducted in English rather than in Spanish, particularly those courses that deal with the pedagogical component. Also, teacher educators are expected to be excellent models of the target language so that vicarious experiences as well as successful mastery experiences help prospective EFL teachers build a strong sense of efficacy in all four skills, particularly in speaking. As Bandura (1977) posed, vicarious and mastery experiences act as a source of building a strong efficacy. Furthermore, the program must ensure that prospective teachers acquire a
high level of communicative competence before they graduate. In order to do so, reliable instruments must be developed to assess prospective teachers' oral proficiency in English. Instruments such as holistic interviews need to be developed including a minimum of language competencies in the four skills that guarantee the quality of graduates from the program. As this study revealed, language deficiencies particularly in speaking were judged by the participants as a factor that affected their efficacy to teach English. Some of them reported not being confident about their English oral skills so as to serve as a good model of input for learners.

Integration of language and culture: Integrating language and culture in foreign language education promotes cross-cultural learning and raises students' awareness about the multiculturalism that characterizes English-speaking cultures. Although socio-pragmatic competence (i.e., appropriateness of language messages in specific situations) is part of communicative competence, in foreign language contexts such as Venezuela, the availability of input and chances of interaction in the L2 culture are scarce. Thus, speaking English with non-native speakers of English is more likely than speaking with native speakers. From this perspective, being linguistically proficient in English, or as Rampton (1995) posited, having the "language expertise," and being aware of cultural differences seem to be more relevant to the needs of Venezuelans than acquiring sociopragmatic competence. It is important to note, however, that research (Bardovi-Harlig and Dornyei, 1998) has shown that fluent nonnative speakers tend to lag behind in sociopragmatics although they may be proficient English speakers.

Integration of theory and practice: University administrators need to form partnerships
with local and state government in order to establish partnerships and mentoring programs with schools that allow student teachers to enter the field during their initial years. It builds, in this way, the gap between theory and practice. Both the schools and the university can benefit from these types of partnerships.

Additionally, novice EFL teachers should be mentored at least during their first year of teaching. Mentoring can provide them with the necessary guide and support they need to overcome frustration when dealing with unexpected dilemmas and challenges common to the complexities of the classroom. At the same time, mentoring novice teachers can help prevent them from unexpectedly dropping their level of perceived teacher efficacy during the first year of teaching. However, this topic needs further research.

Finally, collaborative action research (See Wong, Yen, Bangou & Chacón, 2000) projects in teacher education programs can help prospective teachers develop reflective thinking from the initial years of their training programs.

Implications for in-service EFL teachers

On-going professional development: Teaching is a complex task; therefore, teacher education programs cannot possibly cover everything a teacher will encounter in his or her real-life classroom. For this reason, it is crucial to engage in-service EFL teachers in on-going and continued professional development as one way to support them and fulfill their needs. Professional development can also encourage teachers' collaboration with colleagues in action research projects involving not only the students but also the
community in these projects. On-going professional development that identifies teachers' needs and deficiencies (e.g., subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, action research) should involve the university faculty and school administrators. There is a need to link university research with the schools' goals. In this way, the instruction becomes meaningful to the students.

However, effective professional development has to be accompanied by follow-up, support, and feedback in order for EFL teachers to implement innovation and change their classroom practice based on frequent reflection. Partnerships between the university and schools are an option for collaboration, including common action research projects that encourage in-service teachers to generate theory from their practice.

Recommendations for further research

The purpose of this study was to explore teachers' sense of efficacy and selected characteristics of a group of EFL teachers in San Cristóbal, Táchira, Venezuela. The study sought to describe the relationship between teachers' sense of efficacy, self-reported English language proficiency, and factors such as the use of particular instructional strategies, management strategies, and job preparedness as self-reported by the participant teachers. This section describes recommendations for further research that are needed as follow-up to the present study.

1. As noted in the literature, teachers' perceived efficacy is a multifaceted construct that varies across tasks and contexts where teachers do their teaching. Additional research needs to be conducted to assess teachers' capabilities to teach English as
a situated activity immersed in a sociocultural milieu. It would be useful to explore teachers’ emic perspectives through additional studies that provide a deeper understanding of how teachers’ sense of efficacy influences teachers’ actions and decision-making in planning and conducting lessons. Observations of teaching performance, teaching techniques as well as multiple interviews should be used as another source of data to explore teachers’ sense of efficacy and the teaching of foreign languages, English, and others.

2. Given the fact that the present study was based exclusively on self-reported data, additional research is needed that could include quantitative data on teachers’ perceived efficacy in teaching English as a foreign language using independent measures to investigate the relationship on this variable and student outcomes (e.g., ability to speak English as measured by purposeful sampling interviews). This type of study is needed to determine if teachers’ sense of efficacy correlates in statistically significant ways with student learning of English as a foreign language in certain contexts (e.g., middle and high school classes in Venezuela).

3. It is recommended to repeat this study with Venezuelan EFL teachers from different parts of the country and examine whether there is a difference between the perceived efficacy of the EFL teachers in San Cristobal middle schools and the perceived efficacy of EFL teachers from different high schools in other states.

4. More research studies are needed to assess the teachers’ sense of efficacy of teachers of English as a foreign language. The instrument used in this study was designed to measure PTE and GTE in EFL teaching as well as efficacy for
engagement, management, and instructional studies. However, new studies using additional independent variables are recommended to determine predictors of teachers’ sense of efficacy of English as foreign language teachers in Venezuela and elsewhere.

5. Longitudinal studies with in-service teachers are also recommended to investigate whether teachers’ perceived efficacy to teach EFL varies across years. Although this study found no correlation between personal teaching efficacy and years of English teaching experience, it is recommended to follow-up teachers to investigate whether or not and how their efficacy changes over the years. This type of study should also include an investigation of student achievement as a variable.

Conclusion

Communicative competence has been reported previously as the main goal for teaching English in Venezuelan middle and high schools. However, as the present study suggested, teachers tend to rely more on the grammar-translation approach than on CLT. One probable reason is that a majority of EFL teachers graduate from their programs with English language deficiencies, particularly in the speaking skill. Unfortunately, as Cullen (1994) posited language teacher education programs tend to take for granted teachers’ proficiency of the target language. Thus, if EFL teachers are not users of the language themselves, how can they provide language input for their learners? Even more, how can they use CLT if they were not trained for it or, if they do not feel competent to speak English? This deficiency seems to be the reason why teachers tend to compensate their
lack of spoken proficiency by focusing on teaching grammar. In other words, as Tedick & Walker (1995) concluded, expertise is then substituted by using the language as an “object” rather than as a tool that means that language teaching focuses on grammar (i.e., theory) rather than on teaching students how to use the language for communication.

Reform and innovation are critical for both curriculum planners at the University of Los Andes as well as for local and state government. There is a need to redefine the goals of foreign language teaching and learning by focusing on language as a tool for communication. Along with this focus, the predominant process-product paradigm that seems to characterize teacher education in Venezuela needs to be shifted to a social constructivist perspective where student teachers generate knowledge and reflect upon prior experiences and current theories in the teaching and learning of foreign languages. Focusing on the development of systematic critical reflective thinking helps prospective teachers to become agents of transformation of their own contexts.

Another major outcome that can be concluded from the present study is a lack of integration between culture, language, and socio-pragmatics in EFL teachers’ perspectives. This situation was evident for the participants when they explained that they were not confident about their sociolinguistic and strategic competences in English. In this sense, it is important to recognize the complexity of teaching and learning the pragmatics of English in foreign language contexts such as Venezuela as the availability of input and exposure to the FL culture are scarce. However, several approaches have been proposed for teaching culture and sociolinguistic competence in the EFL classroom. Scholars (e.g., Rose, 1998) have advocated exposing language learners to the pragmatic
aspects of the language in order to develop consciousness raising. In addition, other scholars (e.g., Scollon, 1998) posited that by using contrastive analysis between the L1 culture of learners and the FL culture of these learners, they can develop cultural awareness. Obviously, the ideal approach would be to place EFL student teachers in the target culture as part of their L2 learning but, unfortunately, this may not be feasible in many cases. Hence, through consciousness raising, prospective teachers can link the language and the culture, and at the same time they can become more aware of cross-cultural differences and variations within the cultures of English-speaking countries. Once they themselves have this knowledge base, they can be taught to teach it to their own students. However, it is critical for teachers of EFL to first acquire the knowledge themselves.

Finally, the EFL teachers in the present study echoed the perspectives teachers in general report about their jobs. They explained that external classroom factors were a constraint for them and consequently affected their efficacy. Among those factors were the amount of weekly time allotted to English, large class sizes, and students' social environment; these were the most common factors mentioned. Despite the fact that external factors were perceived to influence perceived efficacy, teacher education programs should strive to build a stronger sense of teacher efficacy in preservice teachers and support efficacy development for in-service teachers through continuous and context-based professional development that helps Venezuelan EFL teachers embrace life long learning as a goal to be better and more effective language learners and teachers.
Limitations

This section explains the main limitations of the present study.

1. Generalization of the findings of this study is not intended for population other than the teachers in the School District 1 in Táchira state, Venezuela. This limitation is based both on the small sample size and the process by which EFL teachers were selected for the study.

2. This study was conducted based exclusively on self-reported data; therefore, the researcher acknowledges that there are certain inherent limitations in this study because of this type of data. For example, it was not possible to verify the self-reported data by comparison with other non-self report data such as observations of participating teachers in their classrooms and student achievement measures (e.g., English test scores).

3. The survey and interview methodologies have certain built limitations widely known to researchers in the profession (e.g., survey instrument validity, sampling). The present study is not different from all other similar studies that utilize surveys and interviews. Therefore, the results apply to the setting in which the study was conducted.
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This study explores the nature of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teacher self-efficacy beliefs in the middle schools in San Cristóbal, Venezuela. Teacher self-efficacy beliefs as well as teachers’ self-reported level of proficiency in English and self-reported teaching strategies will be assessed.

This questionnaire consists of five parts:

Part I refers to your personal beliefs on how to deal with some of the difficulties teachers may encounter in classrooms.

Part II contains questions dealing with your self-efficacy beliefs about teaching English.

Part III contains questions related to your self-reported proficiency in English.

Part IV refers to questions related to your teaching practice and the strategies you use to teach.

Part V contains questions regarding your personal information and academic background.

Please spend about 40 minutes in completing this questionnaire. Please, answer ALL the questions. Each item should be answered according to your point of view. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested only in your frank opinions.

As part of this research, one-time interviews will be conducted with 40 volunteer teachers. The researcher is interested in listening to your opinions about the topics on this questionnaire. Please, fill out last page and hand in separately to the researcher if you would like to volunteer for the interview.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated as it means a lot in the completion of this study.

All information you provide will remain confidential. You DO NOT have to provide your name on this survey.

The code number is used in order to keep track of each questionnaire in the data analysis process. Numbers protect the participants’ confidentiality.
**Part I**

**Teacher Beliefs**

Instructions: Part I contains statements about the kind of difficulties teachers may face in their classrooms. Please use the answer key below and circle the number that best expresses your opinion about each of the following statements. For example, if your opinion for the question being asked is less likely, then you may choose between 1, 2, or 3. If your opinion is moderate, you may choose between 4, 5, or 6. If your opinion is more likely, you may choose 7, 8, or 9. The words “less likely,” “moderate,” and “more likely” help you initially to categorize your answers.

**Answer key:** For each statement below, select the one number that best represents your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher beliefs</th>
<th>How much can you do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in your English classroom?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in learning English?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in English?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How much can you do to help your students value learning English?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much can you do to get students to follow classroom rules in your English classroom?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy in your English classroom?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies in your English class?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when English students are confused?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your English classroom?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part II

**Self-efficacy Beliefs**

*Instructions:* This part includes questions regarding your self-efficacy about teaching English. Please use the key below and circle the number that best describes the level of your agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Key:</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(SLD)</th>
<th>(SLA)</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= Strongly disagree (SD)</td>
<td>2= Disagree (D)</td>
<td>3= Slightly Disagree (SLD)</td>
<td>4= Slightly agree (SLA)</td>
<td>5= Agree (A)</td>
<td>6= Strongly agree (SA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When a student does better than usual in English, it is often because I have exerted a little extra effort.
   - Answer: 1

2. I am continually finding better ways to teach English.
   - Answer: 1

3. When I try hard, I am effective at teaching oral skills.
   - Answer: 1

4. When the English grades of students improve it is often due to their teacher having found a more effective approach.
   - Answer: 1

5. I know the necessary strategies to teach the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) effectively.
   - Answer: 1

6. I am not very effective in monitoring students' oral communication.
   - Answer: 1

7. I am not confident about my English fluency and pronunciation to teach speaking effectively.
   - Answer: 1

8. The lack of student’s interest in learning English can be overcome by good teaching.
   - Answer: 1

9. When a low achieving student progresses in English, it is usually due to extra attention given by the teacher.
   - Answer: 1

10. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.
    - Answer: 1
11. Students’ achievement in English is directly related to their teacher’s effectiveness in English teaching.

12. I am typically able to answer students’ English questions.

13. I don’t know what to do to turn students on to English.

14. Effectiveness in English teaching has little influence on the achievement of students with low motivation.

15. I know grammar well enough to be effective in teaching English.

16. I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem.

17. Even a teacher with good English competence and good teaching abilities may not reach many students in learning English.

18. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on the environment.

19. My teacher training program has given me the necessary skills to be an effective teacher of English.

Please continue on next page
**Part III**

**Self-reported proficiency**

*Instructions:* In this part you are asked to assess your own proficiency in English (listening, speaking, reading, writing, communication strategies, and cultural knowledge). Please circle the number that best describes your best judgment about your level of proficiency in the following English skills.

**Answer Key:**
1 = Strongly disagree (SD)  2 = Disagree (D)  3 = Slightly Disagree (SLD)
4 = Slightly agree (SLA)  5 = Agree (A)  6 = Strongly agree (SA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(SLD)</th>
<th>(SLA)</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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13. I know the necessary strategies to help maintain a conversation with an English-speaker.

14. I can talk in English about cultural themes and norms in the U.S.

15. I know how to act in social English-speaking situations.

16. I know the English terms to use in regular classroom interaction with students.

### Part IV

**Teaching practice:**

A) Strategies used to teach English (items 1-11), and

B) Strategies used to control students' discipline (items 12-19).

**Instructions:** Part four includes questions related to your teaching practice. Please select the number that best describes how frequently your students use the following strategies in your current teaching (items # 1 through 11). For items # 12 to 19, select the number that best describes what you do to control your students' discipline.

**Answer Key**

1 = Almost never (AN)  
2 = Only occasionally (OO)  
3 = Sometimes (S)  
4 = Quite often (QO)  
5 = Very often (VO)  
6 = Almost always (AA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(AN)</th>
<th>(OO)</th>
<th>(S)</th>
<th>(QO)</th>
<th>(VO)</th>
<th>(AA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Students in groups/pairs make up dialogues to role-play in class.

7. Students are called to the blackboard to write their responses to in-class drill exercises.

8. Students copy grammar exercises from the blackboard after the teacher's explanation.

9. Students in groups/pairs simulate social situations from everyday life as class activity.

10. Students write in their notebooks while the teacher translates dialogues/readings.

11. Students engage in interactive games to practice communicating the English.

12. When a student misbehaves in the English class, I either give him or her a low grade or write a negative note in his/her records.

13. When a student is disruptive and noisy in class, I refer him or her to the Section Chief (Jefe de Seccional).

14. If a student repeats his or her bad behavior several times, I discuss the problem with him or her privately after class.

15. I try to involve misbehaving students more in class activities.

16. I ignore disruptive students in my English class.

17. I reward students' appropriate behavior in my English class.

18. I reprimand/discredit a student's misbehavior in front of the class.

19. If a student misbehaves several times in English class, I expel him or her from class.

Please continue on next page
Part V

Professional Information and Academic Background

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by writing a CHECK next to the most close answer. Choose ONLY one response.

1. How long have you been teaching English?
   
   ______ Less than 5 years
   ______ 6-12 years
   ______ 13-20 years
   ______ More than 20 years.

2. Which grade(s) are you currently teaching?
   
   ______ 7th grade ________ 8th grade ________ 9th grade

3. What is the average size of your English class?
   
   ______ Over 50 students
   ______ 40-49
   ______ 30-39
   ______ 20-29
   ______ Below 19

4. Are you a member of an academic organization for English teachers?
   
   ______ YES ________ NO

5. Are you subscribed to any Journal for English teachers?
   
   ______ YES ________ NO

6. How often do you attend staff development sponsored/offered by the Ministry of Education?
   
   ______ Never ______ Once a year ______ Twice a year ______ More than three times a year.

7. How often do you attend staff development sponsored/offered by other institutions?
   
   ______ Never ______ Once a year ______ Twice a year ______ More than three times a year.

8. What is the time-scheduled for your English class weekly?
   
   ______ 3 hours weekly ________ 4 hours weekly

9. Is this time enough for you to accomplish your objectives?
   
   229
10. What is the highest degree you have obtained?

_____ Licenciate/Bachelor with a major in _________________________

_____ Master's Degree with a major in _____________________________

_____ Other (specify) ___________________________________________

College/University where you obtained your degree ______________________

11. Have you ever studied or traveled in an English-speaking country?

_____ YES  _____ NO

(If yes, please SPECIFY) _________________________________________________

12. Gender: _____ Female  _____ Male

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

NOTE: Your cooperation is valuable for this project. Please, volunteer for the interview.
Name _____________________________________________

Name of the school(s) where you currently work _________________________

Grade(s) you currently teach ___________________________________________

Years teaching English ________________________________________________

Address ___________________________________________________________

Phone _____________________________

Email address (if you have one) __________________________________________

Would you like to be contacted at school?

YES _________ NO _______________

What is the best time to call you home?

Morning _____________ Noon ________________ Evening ________________

Signature ____________________

*The code number is used in order to keep track of each questionnaire in the data analysis process. Numbers protect the participants' confidentiality.
APPENDIX B

Four sample cases that participants were asked to talk about

Read the following situations in three different EFL classrooms.

**Situation 1**
**Using dialogues in the English class.**

The eighth grade English teacher asked students to open their books on page 18 to practice a dialogue. Next, the teacher read each sentence twice and had students repeat. Then, the teacher asked students to translate the expressions in the dialogue helping them when students did not know the meanings. Next, students were paired up to read the dialogue while the teacher circulated around the classroom correcting students’ pronunciation. Then, volunteer pairs read the dialogue in front of the class.

**Situation 2**
**Using songs in the English class**

The seventh grade teacher had students listen to a song while she played the tape. Students listened to and followed the song written on a handout. Next, the teacher asked questions to check students’ comprehension. She translated the unknown words and had students listen again. Thirdly, the teacher asked students to sing the song.

**Situation 3**
**Using group work in the English class**

The seventh grade teacher breaks up the class in pairs to simulate a conversation on the phone. Students practice first and then role-play the conversation in class.

**Situation 4**
**Using problem-solving in the EFL class**

The ninth grade teacher gives the students a problem from everyday life where students in small groups to discuss find possible solutions. After discussing the problem, the captain in each group presents to the rest of the class the consensus they reached.
APPENDIX C

Interview Protocol

General Information
Date: ______________________ Time: __________________
Place:______________________________________________

Teacher background
Name: _____________________ Code Number ___________
Grade(s) taught:_____________________________________
Place (s) of work:_____________________________________
Degree earned:
B. A. _____ Major: ________ M.A. _______Major: ________

Do you have the Teachers’ Manual disseminated by the Ministry of Education in 1987?
Yes_________No______________

Do you use it for lesson planning? Why yes/Why no?

Strategies to teach, manage, and engage students to learn English

Please read through the following situation(s) and tell me what do you think about the
strategy being used by this teacher.
Hypothetically, let’s say that you use this strategy with your students. Please tell me:

- What obstacles/difficulties would you have faced with your students?
- What challenges/assets could you have predicted with your students?
- How would your students have reacted?
- How would you have assessed that activity?

- In your experience, what factors constrain your daily work as an EFL teacher?
- What do you think are the factors that cause poor student achievement in English?
- What would you do to enhance students’ motivation to learn English?
- Tell me about what management means to you?
- How important is class management in your classroom?
- What strategies do you find effective to deal with class management?

**Teacher preparation**

- Do you believe that your teaching education program has effectively trained you to teach EFL? Why do you say yes/Why do you say no
- If you could make changes to your teacher education program, what would they be?
Sample of Teacher Interview

Interviewer: There are four different EFL teachers in four different classrooms using four different strategies. Please read # 1 and tell me what do you think your students would have reacted to this activity.

Ms. C: Ok. The mechanics I use in the classroom, you know, I try to motivate the students to lose the fear of speak a foreign language.

Interviewer: Do you think teacher # 1 is motivating students?

Ms. C: In a way he’s motivating, but students are not creating. They are not creating. I think is a good point to use music you know. I do it with 9th graders and that . . . come to class and dance . . .

Interviewer: What do you mean?

Ms. C: Yeah, my classes are like a circus. Yeah, I use puppets with, with this group.

Interviewer: Can you tell me more about that?

Ms C: Well, I speak. It’s just like an experiment I ‘m doing now because this friend who has a puppet group here, and we’re always talking about the use of puppets in the
educational system. How can puppets help teachers to get close to the students and I told him that I was gonna try it with my little kids. . . and I’m doing it like alone, you know . . . Anything, when a kid gets a puppet in his hand, he has to get involve with it and they lose the fear. . . and they don’t feel afraid of talking and that puppet helps a lot to make them get loose, you know . . . I say some dialogue, first of all we read together, practice some difficult words they can find and then (pause) we practice many times and then I give the puppets to them to the couples and the [no audible]. . . at the beginning they start reading using the textbook, and then they try to memorize the dialogue and then do it again.

Interviewer: How would you assess them?

Ms. C: I like to, I mean, I, the main part of it is they pronounce and one of the other things is to make them be free. I mean to lose that fear that is related to the teacher; they have, I, I don’t like that. . . Maybe because they have a very low self-esteem, but with the puppets they enjoy; they really do it. It’s messy. Classes become really messy. I have 38 students.

Interviewer: What do you mean by “messy”?

Ms. C: Messy, noisy very noisy (laughs).

Interviewer: Can you tell me more about assessing that activity?

Ms. C: I don’t like that (pause) the evaluation system we have to use, you know, because the numbers doesn’t tell you, numbers don’t tell you how much the kid has learned, you know has learned . . .

Interviewer: Do you think your students learn by playing with the puppets?
Ms. C: Yeah (answered quickly). The main part for me it's that they love coming to class. They start loving coming. I have had many students who hated English, who hated anything the teacher do. They have a trauma something . . .

Interviewer: What about your English coordinator? Does he/she agree with you?
Ms. C: No, we don’t have a coordinator. We’re only two English teachers in my school. We share sometimes some things. We don’t even speak in English when we are together. I have tried to do it, but she doesn’t like too much, you know . . .

Interviewer: Now, tell me. In your experience, what factors constrain your daily work as an EFL teacher?

Ms. C: First, the lack of time. I need more time. I want more time. I like to have my own classroom decorated, as I want it. The groups, I mean, there are too many students per each group. I mean, I think the appropriate number would be 20 students per class, you know. Wonderful if you could have for instance, 4, 5, 6, 7 hours of English a week so that kids can acquire the ability, but what they have is only 3 hours a week and 38 students! Big problem!

Interviewer: Anything else you can think about?

Ms. C: Well, we don’t have resources. I mean money to buy . . . We don’t even have sometimes a board to write, you know.

Interviewer: What about your students’ motivation to learn English?

Ms. C: I think, I think I make a lot of speaking with them. I mean I think I’m reaching to the point that I am getting. What I really want because they enjoy my class; they really enjoy my class!

Interviewer: Do they enjoy participating in class?
Ms. C: Yeah, because they say that the teacher is crazy and they love coming to my class (laughs) you know what I always say? My [ ] for about three years now I have been enjoying a lot more my class.

Interviewer: Can you tell me more about that?

Ms. C: I always say that I have to enjoy what I was doing, and I don’t like boring classes. I hate boring classes. I hate to be bored in class. I put myself to be 90 minutes hearing and repeating like parrots, you know.

Interviewer: What made you realize about that?

Ms. C: The response I had from them. They complained about when I don’t go to school. They complained about when I get late. They go to pick me up in the other classroom and come to their classroom ( a large pause) I get involved with them, with their personal matters, problems, because they have many, many problems...

Interviewer: What do you think are the factors that cause poor student achievement in English?

Ms. C: The bad relationship between students and teachers because many teachers say that [ ] have like a punishment, you know. They, they want to . . . that it’s not a good way to control students. The only thing to get from them is they start hating the language. They start hating the teacher; they hate the school. The only role you are playing . . . is to be a policeman. You know, kids are noisy and I love them.

Interviewer: Why do you think that happens with teacher-student relationships?

Ms. C: Because they don’t like to be teachers, you know. They don’t even realize they don’t like it. Teachers are not creative, you know. They keep repeating, I mean.
Interviewer: You said your class is messy, right? You are happy; you don’t have any complain about it, right? What about the other teachers who also have 38 students?

Ms. C: They go nuts. They go crazy... start putting bad grades. They punish I do it sometimes, but is not usual in my class. Sometimes I behave like another student, you know. I play a lot with them.

Interviewer: Tell me about plays and games in your class.

Ms. C: I joke a lot. I have a . . . (puzzled) I don’t remember that word “retar”

Interviewer: Challenge, you mean?

Ms. C: Yes. We speak about a lot of things. I mean about many things out of my class, and I challenge them.

Interviewer: Do you do that in English?

Ms. C: No, not too much. Not really.

Interviewer: Do you use the Teacher’s Manual for planning?

Ms. C: No, no. I make up my own techniques. I ‘m using this (point to a grammar book) for 9th graders. I think it has the grammar kit. I give kids examples. I like working with grammar, you know. I work with (shows a small packet) this is like a worksheet. I write for them. I took it out from Robert Dixon’s. They develop it in class. Anything they don’t understand. I always tell them that that guide is going to be helpful, very simple things, you know.

Interviewer: What else is that packet?

Ms. C: Well, something to practice. Gives examples. Make sentences, stories. I ask them to write about their lives or sentences, you know.

Interviewer: What about reading?
Ms. C: Reading? Well, I write a lot on the blackboard, you know, and make them repeat, and read on their own. Sometimes I use magazines. I make photocopies of whole pages and I give it to them. In the last assignment, we were using a page from Newsweek. I took the whole page and led students. You’re gonna read together. We’re gonna read together. We’re going to correct pronunciation, and then, you’re going to make the translation, and then start talking about. We start talking about the whole stuff.

Interviewer: What about using role-plays?

Ms. C: I have used it, sometimes. Sometimes, they’re very afraid of coming up to the front. They have to make fun; they get involved, and if I get involved too, because I have to be with them.

Interviewer: Tell me about your teacher preparation. Do you believe that your teaching education program has effectively trained you to teach EFL?

Ms. C: No, no, they don’t it. When I got into the program I had the illusion, I imagined I was gonna be a translator; I love simultaneous translation. Ok. When I got there I thought I graduate and get into the university as a faculty, but they train you is with theories to work in the high school.

Interviewer: What would you recommend to the program in order to improve the training/development of EFL teachers?

Ms. C: Ok. First of all, we need more ah, How would you say that? (Pause) More English.

Interviewer: what do you mean by “more English”?

Ms. C: More practice. Even things about culture, you know. We have, we need a lab. We have a lack of lab work. We didn’t have lab work when I was studying. And, to let
students to be more creative, you know. The university don’t let students be creative.
You’re always waiting just for the heck of good grades, not for enjoying and creating.
Music, singing are very important and playing. I believe a lot on playing, people learn a lot from when they start playing.

Interviewer: When you say, “more practice” do you refer to speaking?

Ms. C: Yes. And more subjects in English, you know. Many subjects in English. For instance, what about psychology in English?

I love English literature, but not that huge base of pedagogical subjects full of boring theories that in the long run you can’t apply . . . Of course, you adapt it to what you get, but one thing is the University and a different reality is what you get.

Practice is different when you can keep a conversation with someone who speaks English, and not only what is in the textbook, the formula. I myself get tired of being stick to what is the Program in my job, though I like grammar. I think that despite many people say no to grammar; grammar is very important to understand any language.
APPENDIX E

Recruitment Letter

Columbus, December 2001.

Dear Principal:

My name is Carmen Chacón. Currently, I am pursuing my doctoral studies in the Department of Foreign/Second Language Education at the Ohio State University, in Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A. My dissertation is on "Teachers' Sense of efficacy and selected characteristics of selected English as a Foreign Language Venezuelan middle school teachers."

I will require the collaboration of the EFL teachers who work at your school to gather the data for the research. Also I will conduct some individual interviews after the survey.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated to conduct this project.

Sincerely,

Carmen Chacón

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this project, please contact me at chacon.5@osu.edu or Dr. Charles R. Hancock at hancock.2@osu.edu. You can also use my address or phone number below.

Urbanización Altos de Paramillo
M10 P4 Palo Gordo Táchira
Phone: 276-3572726 Venezuela
APPENDIX F

Scree Plot

The following graph shows a scree plot that was used for as a criterion for extracting the number of components for PTE and GTE

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX G

Human Subjects Informed Consent Form

Protocol # _________________

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I __________________________________consent to participating in the research entitled: Teacher Efficacy and Selected Characteristics of Some English as a Foreign Language Teachers in a Venezuelan Context which is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation in Foreign & Second Language Education at the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Dr. Charles R. Hancock or his authorized representative Ph.D. Candidate Carmen T. Chacon (Principal Investigator) (Student Investigator) has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available. I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Signature of participant: ____________________________________________________________ (Participant) (Date)

Signature of Principal Investigator:

Dr. Charles R. Hancock, The Ohio State University

Signature of Authorized Student Investigator:

Ph.D. Candidate: Carmen T. Chacón, The Ohio State University

Participant Contact Information
Name: ____________________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________
Phone: ____________________________________________
Preferred method of contact: ____________________________________________

Researcher Contact Information
Name: Carmen T. Chacon
Address (in Venezuela): Manzana 10 P4
Urb. Altos de Paraimillo Palo Gordo San Cristobal
Address (in the U.S.): 5306 Shiloh Dr. Columbus, Oh 43220
APPENDIX H

Consent Form

I agree to participate in the study entitled, "Teacher Efficacy and Selected Characteristics of Selected English as a Foreign Language Venezuelan Middle School Teachers" which is being conducted by Carmen T. Chacon, Ph. D. candidate in Foreign and Second Language Education at The Ohio State University (School of Teaching and Learning, Foreign and Second Language Education) Arps Hall, 1945 North High Street, Columbus Ohio, 43210-1172. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty.

The following points have been explained to me:

1. The reason for the research is to improve the English Teacher Education Program at the University of Los Andes, San Cristóbal, Venezuela. The study also aims at improving the teaching of English as a foreign language in San Cristóbal middle schools. The benefits that I may expect from this research are: (1) the opportunity to reflect on my experience and knowledge as an EFL teacher in the middle school. (2) To share my knowledge, experience, and needs with the investigators to assist them in proposing changes and improvement in the teaching of English in the middle school, and designing professional development programs aimed at helping in-service teachers to improve the teaching of English.

2. The procedures are as follows:
   The researcher and I will agree on a time and a place and when to meet that is convenient for both of us to conduct an interview of approximately 30 minutes. The interview questions will be like the following:

   **Open-ended questions (Examples)**
   - In your experience, what factors if any, constrain your work as an EFL teacher?
   - What do you think are the factors that cause poor student achievement in English?
   - Tell me about what classroom management means to you?
   - Do you believe that your teacher education program has effectively trained you to teach English?
     Why do you say yes/ Why do you say no
   - If you could make changes to your teacher education program, what would they be?

   **Probing questions**
   - Can you provide an example of this?
   - Can you say more about that?

   The researcher may also telephone or visit me during the course of the study in order to clarify certain issues or to request a follow-up interview.

3. If I experience discomfort or stress while talking about sensitive issues as a result of the study, I may stop the interview and I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty and have the results of the participation returned to me, or destroyed.

4. No risks are foreseen due to my having final authority over any data which I have provided to the researcher.
5. The results of this participation will be confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior consent, unless otherwise required by law. My name and any details that might identify me will be changed in any written reports in order to protect my confidentiality.

6. The researcher will answer further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project.

____________________________________  __________________________
Signature of the researcher                      Date

____________________________________  __________________________
Signature of the participant                      Date

Participant Contact Information
Name: __________________________
Address: __________________________
Phone: __________________________
Preferred method of contact: ______

Researcher Contact Information
Name: Carmen T. Chacon
Address (in Venezuela): Manzana 10 P4
Urb. Altos de Paramillo Palo Gordo San Cristobal.
Address (in the U.S.): 5306 Shiloh Dr. Columbus, Oh 43220
Phone: (614) 459-2660 - U. S.
      572726 (Venezuela)
Email: chacon.5@osu.edu