The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning™
2020 Volume 10/Issue 2 Article 4

Development of Teacher Efficacy Scale for Language Teachers (T-eSLT) in German Higher Education Context

Ebru Melek Koç, Department of English Language Teaching, İnönü University, Malatya, Turkey, ebrumelekkoc@gmail.com
Stephan Breidbach, Department of English and American Studies, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany, englischdidaktik@hu-berlin.de

Recommended Citations:

APA
Koç, E. M. & Breidbach, S. (2020). Development of Teacher Efficacy Scale for Language Teachers (T-eSLT) in German Higher Education Context. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 10(2), 41-58.

MLA
Ebru Melek Koç and Stephan Breidbach. " Development of Teacher Efficacy Scale for Language Teachers (T-eSLT) in German Higher Education Context." The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning 10.2 (2020): 41-58.

The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2020(*1*), pp.41-58

Development of Teacher Efficacy Scale for Language Teachers (T-eSLT) in German Higher Education Context

Ebru Melek Koç[1] & Stephan Breidbach[2]

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received December, 2019
Revisions completed May, 2020
Published 30 June, 2020

Key Words:
Self-efficacy
English language teachers
Language teaching
Student teachers
Scale

ABSTRACT

Teaching a language requires specific pedagogical knowledge and skills such as teaching grammar; designing appropriate activities and materials to enhance learners' listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills; assessment of language proficiency; etc. However, none of the self-efficacy scales existing in the related literature reflect dimensions unique to language teaching. To fill this gap, the present study aims to construct and develop a teacher efficacy scale for language teachers. .In the first phase of the study, an instrument with 81 items designed using 5-point Likert scales was developed. In the second phase, the instrument (scale) was administered to 119 student teachers who had experience teaching English as a foreign language. Data were collected from three German universities. The seven-component solution explained 65.725% of the total variance and included 36 items. The analysis indicated that the Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was 0.952, which shows that the Teacher Efficacy Scale for Language Teachers (T-eSLT) is a very valid and reliable instrument. The scale can be used as a tool for reflection and/or needs analysis in both pre- and in-service language teacher training contexts. The mentors can use the T-eSLT during student teacher observations to detect the skills that student teachers lack and provide constructive feedback accordingly.

The European Union multilingual policy encourages learning at least two foreign languages in addition to the native tongue. In the scope of the multilingualism framework, new strategies have been developed to ensure quality in language learning and teaching. Ensuring 'Teacher Quality' is one focus of these strategies. A well-qualified teacher should have extensive subject knowledge, a good knowledge of pedagogy, the skills and competences required to guide and support learners, and an understanding of the social and cultural dimensions of education (Council of the European Union, 2007, pg.12). Moreover, teacher self-efficacy is important (Moulding, Stewart & Dunmeyer, 2014), because it influences teachers' motivation for teaching as well as students' learning outcomes (Morris, Usher & Chen, 2017; Torsney,

[1] Department of English Language Teaching, İnönü University, Malatya, Turkey, ebrumelekkoc@gmail.com, Telephone: +90 (422)377- 4244

[2] Department of English and American Studies, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany, email: englischdidaktik@hu-berlin.de, Telephone: +49 -(030) 2093-2743, Fax: (030) 2093-2405

 ISSN: 2146-1732

Lombardi & Ponnock, 2019; Zee & Koomen, 2016). In a broader sense, teachers' sense of efficacy refers to teachers' judgments about their ability to promote student learning.

According to Bandura (1977), efficacy beliefs are powerful predictions of behavior; they are active and learned systems of belief held in context. Therefore, self-efficacy beliefs can be changed and vary depending upon the context and the specificity of tasks (Dellinger *et al*. 2008, p. 752). Efficacy is likely to be most malleable early in learning, which means that student teachers' perceptions of efficacy may be more easily influenced during the first years of teacher education programs (Paulou, 2007; Shelley & Farahnaz, 2018; Yeung & Watkins, 2000). Therefore, investigating student teachers' efficacy in teaching could be crucial to the long-term development of teacher efficacy (Henson, 2001; Tschanan-Moran & Woolfolk, 1990). If the student teacher has negative beliefs about his/her teaching abilities, teacher educators can dissolve these pre-existing negative beliefs, transforming them into positive beliefs by providing constructive feedback (Gordon & Debus, 2002). The preliminary step for a successful transfer from negative to positive change is to detect the skills a teacher believes he/she lacks or, in other words, to assess the needs of teachers. To assess the needs of teachers, it is important to investigate the self-efficacy beliefs of language teachers (Delinger *et al*. 2008).

Currently, for such an assessment, some tools have been developed to assess teachers' beliefs regarding their teaching skills. One is the *Teacher Efficacy Scale,* developed by Gibson and Dembo (1984). Another is the *Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* (TSES) constructed by Tschanan-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (1990, 2001). However, these instruments have been confirmed to have validity problems (Brouwers & Tomic, 2003; Colardci & Fink, 1995; Denzie, Cooney & Mckenzie, 2005; Henson *et al.* 2001; Moulding et al. 2014; Pajares, 1992; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). In addition to having validity issues, these scales are not multidimensional and reflect a limited number of teaching aspects. A recently developed scale, the Norwegian Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (NTSES) (Avanzi *et al*. 2013), is different from those mentioned above in that it is multidimensional, with six dimensions (self-efficacy for instruction; adapting education to individual students' needs; motivating students; maintaining discipline; cooperating with colleagues and parents; and coping with changes and challenges). However, none of these dimensions addresses skills related to language teaching.

Teaching a language requires specific pedagogical knowledge and skills such as teaching grammar; designing appropriate activities and materials to enhance learners' listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills. However, none of the self-efficacy scales existing in the related literature reflect dimensions unique to language teaching. To fill this gap, the present study aims to construct and develop a teacher efficacy scale for language teachers.

2. Methodology

The present study consists of two phases. In the first phase, a pool of items for the scale was prepared, and the draft version of the Teacher Efficacy Scale for Language Teachers (T-eSLT) was finalized. In the second phase, further validity and reliability tests were conducted.

2.1. The First Phase

2.1.1. Constructing the item pool

2.1.1.2. Literature review

The first step in developing the self-efficacy scale is to construct a pool of items. The items in the pool are constructed by conducting a thorough review of the related literature, adapting the existing tools

in the related literature, and generating new items through interviews. The literature provides a variety of self-efficacy scales. The most commonly used are those developed by Gibson and Dembo (1984) and Tschanan-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). Recently, the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL), a reflection tool with 193 items, has also been developed within the framework of the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) project by Newby *et al*. (2007). All of the items of these instruments were adapted to the research context. During the adaptation process, special care was taken to avoid any ambiguity in the wording. For example, items from the EPOSTL formulated as 'I can use and critically assess ICT learning programs and platforms' and 'I can cater to a range of learning styles' were reformulated to 'use and critically assess ICT learning programs and platforms for language teaching purposes' and 'cater to a range of learning styles (for example, verbal, logical, linguistic, social, aural, etc.), respectively.

2.1.1.3. Interviews with student teachers

The goal of the interview was to generate items that were not addressed by existing measures. Two student teachers at Humboldt University from the English and American Studies Department were interviewed. During the interview sessions, they were asked questions such as 'What skills should a language teacher have?' and 'Are there any teaching skills that you would like to improve to teach more efficiently?' The interviews were recorded and transcribed. Then, a qualitative analysis was conducted. First, all student teacher quotations were analyzed and sentences having meaningful content within each quotation were listed as separate items. These newly generated items were then added to the spreadsheet. In total, there were 240 items on the spreadsheet. All items were reviewed, and a spreadsheet that included verbatim items from the instruments was created. Items addressing similar topics were clustered. Then, the items under each cluster were reviewed again to eliminate items with overlapping meanings. At the end of this elimination process, 200 items were left on the list.

2.1.1.4. Content Reliability

The spreadsheet was e-mailed to two experts with PhDs in the field of English language teaching and experience in mentoring student teachers during their school-based practicum. They were asked to comment on each item on the list by selecting the options: 'omit from the list', 'include in the list', or 'needs modification'. They were also asked to provide suggestions for how to modify the item if they selected 'needs modification'. Then, each item on the spreadsheet was analyzed by the researcher and an expert at the Humboldt University Department of English and American Studies to decide whether it was relevant and applicable to the pre-teacher education context in Germany. The expert was an instructor and was responsible for the student teachers' school-based teaching practice. As a university-based mentor who was aware of the teacher training context in Germany, she was very helpful in analyzing each item on the list and deciding which items were relevant to the teacher education context in Germany. After the analysis, some items were omitted or revised. The final list contained 81 items.

2.1.1.5. Face validity

To investigate whether the items were clearly stated and easily understandable, the preliminary version of the scale was piloted by three student teachers from the English and American Studies Department at Humboldt University. Modifications and changes were made to improve the research instrument according to their recommendations to achieve the final version of the scale.

2.1.1.6. Final version of T-eSLT before data collection

After all revisions, the final version of the T-eSLT had two parts. The first part included demographic questions such as their amount of teaching experience, level of education, and gender and the age groups of students they had taught to date. The second part of the questionnaire included 81 items; for each, the student teachers were asked to indicate their level of confidence. The items were designed using a 5-point Likert scale (1: no confidence; 2: low confidence; 3: moderate confidence; 4: high confidence; 5: complete/full competence).

2.2. The Second Phase

2.2.1. Participants

In this phase of the study, the T-eSLT constructed teacher efficacy scale was administered to a total of 119 student teachers. Of these, 21 were student teachers from the Department of English and American Studies at Humboldt University, 66 were student teachers from the Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) department at Justus-Liebig University, Giessen, and 32 studied at the American/English Language Department at the England & American Studies Institute at Goethe University Frankfurt am Main. All of these student teachers had teaching experience ranging from four weeks to 12 months.

2.2.2. Data analysis

To investigate whether the T-eSLT was reliable, two tests were used. First, factor analysis (principal component analysis) was used to reduce the number of items and cluster the remaining items to show common aspects. Items with loadings of 0.40 or higher are considered to be significant (Cooms & Schroeder, 1988; Coughlin&Knight, 2007), and those with loadings of 0.70 or higher indicate a well-defined structure (Hair et al. 2006). Therefore, in the present study, items with loadings of 0.4 and lower were not taken into consideration and were deleted from the scale. Second, to determine the internal consistency of items within the instrument, Cronbach's Alpha (α) – a measure for the reliability of coefficients was applied (Appendix 2).

Ethical Considerations

An informed consent form was prepared according to the European Commission Ethical Research Guidelines for the volunteer participants before administering the scale and conducting interviews. The participants were informed about the research and data collection procedures in detail.

3. Results

3.1. Testing the Reliability of the T-eSLT

Before applying factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha tests to the data, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was used to measure the adequacy of sampling. The KMO was .907, which is well above the acceptable threshold of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1974), indicating that the sampling was sufficient for factor analysis.

Then, the 81 items of the T-eSLT were examined using principal component analysis, according to which the number of items was reduced to 36 and grouped under seven factors (Appendix 2). These explained 14.625%, 12.634%, 8.796%, 8.456%, 7.946% and 6.129% of the total variance (Table 1). The seven-

component solution explained 65.725% of the total variance. Total explained variance values of 60% and higher are acceptable in the social sciences (Hair et al. 2006).

Further analysis indicated that the Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was 0.952. The Cronbach's alpha values of the seven factors ranged from 0.74 to 0.91. The Cronbach's value ranges from 0 to 1; the higher the value is, the more reliable the scale. Nunally (1978) indicates 0.7 to be an acceptable value for the scale to be reliable. Thus, the results indicated that not only were all items of the scale internally consistent but also the items clustered under each factor were inter-related and measured the same construct/concept. All of these statistical findings indicate that the T-eSLT is a very reliable and valid instrument.

3.2. Reporting Factor Analysis Results

Subscale 1, with ten items, accounts for the most of the total variance (14.625%) (Table 1). Items 3, 5, 6, and 8 reflect the assessment process, including planning assessment, evaluating performance, and making decisions on the results of the assessment (Davison & Leung, 2009).

The other three items, 'identifying the areas for improvement' (Item 7), 'addressing errors' (Item 10) and 'providing constructive feedback' (Item 4), address the process of 'error correction' (Sheorey, 1986). Error correction during assessment results in the acquisition of instructions (Waugh, 2010), which makes error correction a vital internal part of assessment.

Item 2, 'cater to a range of learning styles (ex. verbal, logical, linguistic, social, aural, etc.)' reflects teachers' use of different learning styles. Students learn differently; they have a range of strengths and preferences for how they receive and interpret information. Thus, they have different learning styles. Gardner (1993, 1999) identifies eight 'multiple intelligences': linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal and naturalistic. For effective learning, teachers should organize instruction and activities that appeal to the needs and learning preferences of their students (Adams & Hamm,1994, pg. 6). These distinct intelligences should be used to assess students' strengths and weaknesses, and teachers should develop assessments that allow students to demonstrate these intelligences.

Table 1. Variance loadings and Cronbach Alpha Values of Seven Factors of T-eSLT

Factor number	**Factor name**	**Variance**	**Cronbach alpha**
1	Assessment of Learners' Language Performance	14.625	0.910
2	Using Preventive Classroom Management Strategies	12.634	0.894
3	Teaching through ICT	8.796	0.804
4	Using Reactive Classroom Management Strategies	8.456	0.783
5	Organising Materials and Activities for Language Teaching'	7.946	0.784
6	Teaching Grammar	7.138	0.767
7	Dealing with Learners' Language Errors	6.129	0.743
Overall		**65.725**	0.953

Item 1 'activate learners' previous language knowledge and use it for the task at hand', focuses on the 'activation of previous knowledge', which is a prerequisite for the assessment of students' pre-existing knowledge. Learning involves transfer that is based on previous experiences and prior knowledge. This is also true for language learning. If students cannot relate the new knowledge to their existing knowledge, it may result in 'surface learning' (Halikari, Nevgi & Lindblom-Ylanne, 2008) rather than deep learning. Therefore, a teacher should try to understand the previous experiences and prior knowledge of his/her

students and should assess their prior knowledge to obtain a baseline of what they know and to determine their skill levels. Such information, in turn, allows the teachers to craft appropriate instructional activities for his/her students. To identify the missing knowledge and skills, a teacher first needs to access prior knowledge by bringing the pre-existing knowledge to the forefront of the students' memory. Teachers, taking into consideration the different learning styles of students, may use a variety of activities to activate their students' previous knowledge. For example, for visual learners, teachers may prefer showing video clips, pictures, images, and charts to effectively activate prior knowledge; for auditory learners, they may use discussion questions and listening; and for kinesthetic learners, they could use movement activities. Because all of the items clustered under Factor 1 explicitly or implicitly refer to issues related to 'student assessment', this factor is labeled 'Assessment of Learners' Performance'.

The second and the fourth subscales are interrelated because they both involve items related to classroom management. In general, there are two types of classroom management strategy. The classroom management strategies used to prevent problems before they occur are called preventive strategies, whereas those used to respond to problem behaviors are reactive strategies (Korpershoek et al. 2014). Preventive strategies support academic achievement, and reactive strategies reduce disruptive or undesired student behaviors. The second subscale comprises seven items and explains 12.63% of the total variance (Table 1). The seven items address different aspects of classroom management (Appendix 1). Brophy (2006) defines classroom management as "the actions taken to create and maintain a learning environment conducive to successful instruction (arranging the physical environment, establishing rules and procedures, maintaining students' attention to lessons and engagement in activities)" (p. 17). In line with this definition, Items 11, 14, and 15 explicitly address teacher actions for getting, keeping, and maximizing attention. Item 16 reflects teacher actions for 'learner participation' and 'following classroom rules'; and Items 13 and 17 refer to teacher actions that lead learners to obey instructions and classroom rules, respectively. Finally, Item 12 addresses controlling large classes. Teachers of large classes experience problems such as difficulty promoting student interaction and engaging students in activities (Hayes, 2007); motivating them (Capel, Leask & Turner, 1995); and regaining students' attention when they are distracted (Osim, Chika, Uchendu & Isaac, 2012). In T-eSLT, the second subscale involves items related to classroom management strategies that promote appropriate environments for academic instruction. Therefore, this subscale is labeled 'Using Preventive Classroom Management Strategies'.

The fourth subscale includes three items, 'motivate learners who show low interest in school work', 'get through to challenging learners', and 'effectively deal with disruptive behavior in the classroom', accounting for a total variance of 8.45%. The items clustered under this subscale address disciplinary interventions to reduce undesired student behavior; that is, they address reactive classroom management strategies. Therefore, this subscale is named 'Using Reactive Classroom Management Strategies'.

The third subscale includes four items and can explain 8.796% of the total variance (Appendix 1). Items 18, 19, and 21 are 'manage and use instructional media efficiently (OHP, ICT, video, etc.) for language teaching', 'select and use information communication technology (ICT) materials and activities in the classroom that are appropriate for learners', and 'use and critically assess ICT learning programs and platforms for language teaching purposes', respectively. These clearly address issues related to integrating ICT in language teaching. Item 7, 'critically assess teaching in relation to theoretical principles', is also clustered under this subscale. Technical skills are not enough to enable teachers to integrate ICT into teaching. Teachers should also be trained in the pedagogical application of ICT, which requires them to understand the conceptual framework and thus link theory and its application (Carlson & Gadio, 2002; Keengwe & Onchwari, 2009). In sum, because all of these items under the third factor address integrating ICT into instruction, it is named 'Teaching through ICT'.

The fifth subscale is 'design appropriate activities to develop the language skills (listening, speaking, writing, reading) of learners' (Item 25); 'Adapt teaching according to the age, interests, and language level of learners'; 'Evaluate and select a variety of texts and activities to make learners aware of the interrelationship between culture and language'; and 'Evaluate and select listening and reading materials appropriate for the needs of learners'; it explains 7.94% of the total variance. One of the most fundamental dimensions of teaching is adaptation (Richards, 2011). Shulman (1987) identifies the adaptation process as 'transformation'. During the transformation process, the teacher should have the ability to analyze, to adapt and, in turn, to make the content pedagogically powerful. Such an adaptation requires adapting content from different sources such as course books and internet-based materials to design materials and classroom activities; adapting the subject matter according to the level and ability of the students; and making appropriate decisions about timing, sequencing, and grouping arrangements (Richards, 2011). Because the items clustered under this subscale reflect planning involving materials and activities for language teaching, it is named 'Organizing Materials and Activities for Language Teaching'

'Teaching Grammar', the sixth subscale of the T-ESLT with three items, explains a total variance of 7.13%. According to Tomlinson (2011), one of the basic principles of language learning is exposing learners to meaningful and comprehensible input from the target language, which is a prerequisite for language learning. Item 31, 'Introduce a grammatical item and help learners to practice it through meaningful contexts', reflects this principle. Similarly, another language learning principle is that learners should be provided with opportunities to use the target language for communication purposes (Tomlinson, 2011), which is also addressed in Item 32, 'Evaluate and select grammatical exercises and activities that support learning and encourage oral and written communication'.

Grammar can be viewed as both knowledge and ability. Grammar as knowledge is a specific subset of metalinguistic knowledge (Myhill, Johns & Watson, 2013). Grammar as ability is the ability to use grammar for communication purposes (Richards & Reppen, 2014). Therefore, to enable their learners to communicate effectively, language teachers should plan their instruction carefully. That is, they should select accurate and appropriate examples and design activities to practice grammatical structure in meaningful ways; this is addressed in Item 30, 'Design materials, texts, and activities appropriate to the needs, interests, age and language levels'.

The last subscale accounts for the least variance (6.12%) and contains four items: 'Provide constructive feedback to learners concerning their errors/interlanguage to support their learning process' (Item 33); 'Draw on appropriate theories of language, learning, culture, etc. to guide teaching' (Item 34); 'Address learners' spoken errors in ways that support their learning processes' (Item 35); and 'Analyze learners' errors and identify the processes that may cause them' (Item 36) (Appendix 1). These four items are inter-related and reflect the threefold process of error correction: identification, evaluation, and correction (Hyland & Anan, 2006; Sheorey, 1986). Identification of an error is a prerequisite to successful error analysis (Chiang, 1981). For successful analysis, it is important to locate error correction in a framework such as Contrastive Analysis (CA) or Error Analysis (EA) (Tomkova, 2013). Such location enables teachers to make and test hypotheses and to develop an understanding of error identification as a pedagogical practice (Alroe, 2011). They can thereby readdress their methodology to fix and fill the students' gaps (Londono Vasquez, 2007). Evaluation of an error involves classifying errors according to their nature and cause and determining the extent of their seriousness. In this stage, the teacher should also decide whether he/she should correct the error and what methodology to use for the correction (Hendrickson, 1978).

Theories of learning and teaching explain how language is learned and how this understanding can be used for teaching purposes. Language teachers use this information to develop their pedagogical practices (Mahboob & Tilakaratna, 2012). Being aware of these theories and cultural facts enables the teacher to address learner errors in an appropriate way, and a teacher's constructive feedback supports language learning and encourages learners to continue.

Because all items under this subscale reflect the 'multiple stages of the error correction process', the seventh subscale is named '*Dealing with Learners' Language Errors'*.

4. Discussion

The present study aimed to develop a scale to assess language teachers' efficacy regarding their teaching skills. The statistical analysis applied to the scale supported the internal consistency of the seven-factor structure of the scale and the seven subscales (see also section 3.1) showed the newly developed T-eSLT to be a reliable and valid tool.

The T-eSLT is significant in many ways. First, it is multidimensional. As Avanzie et al. (2013) mention, teacher self-efficacy measures should be multidimensional and assess teachers' competency in a variety of tasks. Teacher efficacy scales developed to date in the related literature do not represent the multifaceted nature of a teachers' work. For example, Gibson and Dembo's scale has two main dimensions: general and personal teaching efficacy. Similarly, the long version of the TSES measures three dimensions: efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. The newly developed T-eSLT, however, is multidimensional with seven subscales: Assessment of Learners' Language Performance; Using Preventive Classroom Management Strategies; Teaching through ICT; Using Reactive Classroom Management Strategies; Organizing Materials and Activities for Language Teaching; Teaching Grammar; and Addressing Learners' Language Errors. These determine one significant aspect of the T-eSLT.

None of the self-efficacy scales existing in the related literature reflect dimensions unique to language teaching. Therefore, another, and perhaps the most important, significant aspect of the T-eSLT is that four of its subscales (Assessment of Learners' Language Performance; Organizing Materials and Activities for Language Teaching; Teaching Grammar; and Addressing Learners' Language Errors) address aspects related to language teaching, which makes the T-eSLT specific to language teachers.

The analysis revealed that the student teachers perceive 'Teaching Grammar' as a unique dimension of language teaching, which indicates that student teachers regard 'grammar' as skill rather than as knowledge (Richards & Reppen, 2014). The student teachers may believe that grammatical ability refers to the ability to use grammar as a communication resource and thus requires a different teaching approach in relation to the skills of writing and speaking (Jones, 2012; Richards & Reppen, 2014).

It is also interesting that 'Teaching through ICT' is perceived by the student teachers to be a unique competency that language teachers should possess. This may be because although trainees believe that ICT integration, which refers to the integration of ICT in the language teaching and learning process, is important in language teaching, they may lack the necessary skills for its application. With the recent developments in technology and, in turn, technology's integration into educational settings, teachers have increasingly been using ICT in classrooms (OECD, 2009). However, ICT-related practical pedagogical skills are rarely addressed in initial teacher education, and trainees cannot gain the necessary ICT competences (Caena, 2011; Lim, Chai & Churchill, 2011), which in turn may lead to challenging experiences.

Another noteworthy finding of the study is that in T-eSLT, as opposed to other teacher efficacy scales, two unique dimensions related to classroom management strategies have emerged: Using Preventive Classroom Management Strategies and Using Reactive Classroom Management Strategies. Student teachers may have identified these two as different cases because they are experiencing severe difficulty in managing the classroom efficiently during their practicum. Although classroom management is the most significant source of concern for pre-service teachers (Bromfield, 2006; van Tartwijk, Veldman,

& Verloop, 2011), particularly during the practicum (Mastrilli & Sardo-Brown, 2002), handling disruptive student behavior is a more serious concern for new teachers (Browes & Tomic, 2000).

Teachers who establish enhanced interactions with students can manage behavior problems easily, which leads to improved student academic performance (Decker, Dona & Christenson, 2007; Furrer & Skinner, 2003). Another reason for student teachers' identification of the two separate classroom management strategies may be due to their belief that establishment of good relationships with students is a prerequisite for increasing student achievement.

5. Conclusion

The present study aimed to develop a scale to assess language teachers' self-efficacy regarding their teaching skills. The present study is significant in many ways. First and foremost, a multidimensional teacher efficacy scale, uniquely addressing language teachers (T-eSLT) by reflecting general teaching skills as well as skills specific to language teaching, has been developed. The statistical tests used in data analysis have also confirmed that the scale is valid and reliable. Development of such a scale has significant practical implications in both pre-service and in-service teacher training.

In pre-teacher education, teaching practice is a very critical period in terms of shaping the self-efficacy beliefs of pre-service teachers. One of the basic responsibilities of cooperating teachers and university-based mentors is to provide constructive feedback to the student teachers regarding their teaching performance (Koç, 2012, 2011). The mentors can use the T-eSLT during student teacher observations to detect the skills that student teachers lack and provide constructive feedback accordingly. Such identification of student teachers' needs may also offer stakeholders such as program coordinators some ideas for improvements to the current language teacher education programs to address possible challenges. Because the T-eSLT is subject specific, it will act as a true reflection tool for student teachers and help them to be aware of their teaching skills and areas of low efficiency.

The T-eSLT makes an important contribution to in-service language teacher training as well. A vital step to the success of a program is the identification the areas for improvement (Ruba, 1985; O'Sullivan, 2001). Therefore, needs analysis, which is a basic part of developing a program, is very significant in that the results of the analysis can provide INSET program developers with the necessary information to design an INSET program specific to English language teachers' needs.

In sum, the present study suggests that the T-eSLT is a valid and reliable instrument for assessing language teachers' efficacy. However, scale validation is an ongoing process (Lafreniere, Verner-Fillion & Vallerand, 2012; Spector, 1992). Therefore, further validation studies of the T-eSLT should be conducted across different contexts. In the present study, the T-eSLT was developed using data from English language trainee teachers in primary and secondary education settings. Therefore, follow-up research replicating the study with language teachers who teach foreign languages other than English, and who teach in different contexts (higher education, distance education) could provide a cross check of the validity of the T-eSLT.

Acknowledgements This research is supported by German Academic Exchange Service ((DAAD) research scholarship.

References

Adams, D., & Hamm, M. (1994). *New designs for teaching and learning: Promoting active learning in tomorrow's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Alroe, M. J. (2011). Error correction of L2 students' texts: Theory, evidence, and pedagogy. *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles,* 50, 35-71.

Ayres, D. B. (2002). *The effectiveness of a lesson planning strategy to aid pre- service elementary teachers in developing reflective practice on lesson design*. Unpublished PhD thesis., George Mason University, Virginia.

Avanzi, L., Miglioretti, M., Velasco, V., Balducci, C., Vecchio, L., Fraccaroli, F., & Skaalvik, E.M. (2013). Cross-validation of the Norwegian teacher's self-efficacy scale (NTSES). *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 31, 69-78.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: W. H.

Bromfield, C. (2006). PGCE secondary trainee teachers and effective behavior management: an evaluation and commentary. *Support for Learning,* 21(4), 188-193

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2003). A test of the factorial validity of the Teacher efficacy scale. *Research in Education,* 69, 67–80.

Brouwers, A. & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16,* 239–253.

Brouwers, A & Tomic, W. (2003). A test of the factorial validity of the teacher efficacy scale. *Research in Education*, 69, 67-80.

Brophy, J. (2006). *History of research on classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein* (Eds.), Handbook of classroom management. Research, practice, and contemporary issues (pp.17-43). Malwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Caena, F. (2011). *Literature review: Teachers' core competences requirement and development.* Education and Training 2020 Thematic Working Group 'Professional Development of Teachers', European Commisison. Retrived from http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/policy/strategic-framework/doc/teacher-development_en.pdf

Capel, S., Leask, M., & Turner, T. (1995). *Learning to teach in the secondary school*. London: Routledge.

Carlson, S. & C.T. Gadio. (2002). *Teacher professional development in the use of technology*. In W.D. Haddad and A. Draxler (Eds), Technologies for education: Potentials, parameters, and prospects. Paris and Washington, DC: UNESCO and the Academy for Educational Development.

Chiang, T. H. (1981). *Error analysis: A study of errors made in written English by Chinese learners*. Taipei: Crane

Colardci, T. & Fink, D. R. (1995). *Correlations among measures of teacher efficacy: Are they measuring the same thing*? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Coombs, W. N.& Schroeder, H. E. (1988). Generalized locus of control: An analysis of factor analytic data. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 9, 79-85

Coughlin, M. A.,& Knight, W. (2007). *Exploratory factor analysis* (EFA). Retrieved from AIR/SPSS Professional Development Series http://www.spss.com/airseries/part_one.pdf

Council of the European Union. (2007). Conclusions of the council and of the representatives of the governments of the member states, meeting within the council, on improving the quality of teacher education (Official Journal C 300, 12.12.2007). Retrieved from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:282:0016:0019:EN:PDF

Davison, C., & Leung, C. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43, 393-415.

Decker, D. M., Dona, D. P., & Christenson, S. L. (2007). Behaviorally at-risk African-American students: The importance of student-teacher relationships for student outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology, 45*(1),83–109.

Dellinger, A.B.; Bobbett, J. J.; Oliver, D. F. & Ellett, C. D. (2008). Measuring teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Development and use of the TEBS-Self. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 24,751-766

Denzie,G.M., Cooney J.B., Mckenzie,R. (2005). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Teacher Efficacy. Scale for prospective teachers. *British journal of Educational Psychology,* 75,689-708.

Furrer, C. & Skinner, E. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 148–162.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed. Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*, New York: Basic Books.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: Construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 76,569-582.

Gordon, C. & Debus, R. (2002). Developing deep learning approaches and personal teaching efficacy within a preservice teacher education context. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 72,483–511

Hailikari T, Nevgi A, & Lindblom-Yla¨nne S. (2007). Exploring alternative ways of assessing prior knowledge, its components and their relation to student achievement: a mathematics-based case study. *Studies in Educational Evaluation,* 33, 320-37.

Hair, J. S., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. &Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Hayes, D. (2007). Helping teachers to cope with large classes. *ELT Journal,* 51(2),106-116.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research and practice. *Modern Language Journal,* 62, 387-398.

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

Henson, R. K., Kogan, L. R., & Haase, T. V. (2001). A reliability generalization study of the teacher efficacy scale and related instruments. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 61(3),404-420.

Hyland,K. & Anan, E. (2006). Teachers' perceptions of error: The effects of first language and experience. *System*,34, 509–519

Jones, W. (2012). *Assessing students' grammatical ability*. In: Coombe C, Davidson P, O'Sullivan B, and Stoynoff S (eds) The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Assessment. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 247–56.

Lafreniere, M.,Verner-Filion,J. & Vallerand,R.J .(2012). Development and validation of the gaming motivation scale (GAMS). *Personally and Individual Differences* 53,827-831.

Kaiser, H.F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39,31-36

Keengwe, J. & Onchwari, G. (2009). Technology and early childhood education: A technology integration professional development model for practicing teachers. *Early Childhood Education Journal,* 37,209-218.

Koç, E. M. (2011). Development of mentor teacher role inventory. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(*2*), 193-208

Koç, E. M. (2012). Idiographic roles of cooperating teachers as mentors at initial distance teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 28(*6*), 818-826.

Korpershoek, H., Harms, T., De Boer, H., Van Kuijk, M.& Doolaard, S. (2014). *Effective classroom management strategies and classroom management programs for educational practice.* Groningen: GION Onderwijs.

Lim, C. P., Chai, C. S., & Churchill, D. (2011). A framework for developing pre-service teachers' competencies in using technologies to enhance teaching and learning. *Education Media International,* 48(2) ,69-83.

Londono Vasquez, D. A. (2007). *Error analysis*. Retrieved from http:/davilondono.blogspot.com

Mahboob, A. & Tilakaratna, N. (2012). *Towards a principles-based approach for ELT policies and practices*. Alexandria: TESOL International.

Mastrilli, T. & Sardo-Brown, D. (2002). Novice teachers' cases: a vehicle for reflective practice education. *Chula Vista*, 123, 56-62

Morris, D. B., Usher, E. L., & Chen, J. A. (2017). Reconceptualizing the sources of teaching self-efficacy: A critical review of emerging literature. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(*4*), 795-833.

Moulding, L.R., Stewart, P., W. & Dunmeyer, M., L.(2014). Pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy: Relationship to academic ability, student teaching placement characteristics, and mentor support. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 41, 60-66.

Myhill, D., Jones, S. & Watson, A. (2013). Grammar matters: How teachers' grammatical knowledge impacts on the teaching of writing. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 36, 77-91.

Newby, D., Allan, R., Fenner, A.-B., Jones, B., Komorowska, H. & Soghikyan, K. (2007). *European portfolio for student teachers of languages* : European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe Retrieved from http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/fte/pdf/C3_Epostl_E.pdf on 02, July 2012.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

OECD. (2009). Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments. First Results from TALIS. Paris: OECD Publications, Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/17/51/43023606.pdf

Osim R. O., Chika. C. Uchendu, & Isaac. O. Ubi. (2012). Class size pressure: An impediment to teachers' work quality. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Educational Research and Review,* 1(*5*), 95-99.

O'Sullivan, R.G. (2004). *Practicing evaluation: A collaborative approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Poulou, M., & Spinthourakis, J. A. (2002). *Student teachers' perceptions of their teaching efficacy*. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Lisbon. Retrieved from https://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00002355.htm,

Richards, J .C. & Reppen, R. (2014). Towards a pedagogy of grammar instruction, *RELC Journal,* 45(*1*), 5-25.

Richards, J. (2011). *Competence and performance*. New York: CUP

Richards, J. C. (2010). Competence and performance in language teaching. *RELC Journal,* 41(2), 101-122.

Ruba, P. A. (1985). Chemistry teachers' in-service needs: Are they unique?. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 58(5), 430-431.

Shelley, C. & Farahnaz, C. (2018). Self-efficacy beliefs of novice French as a second language teachers: a case study of Ontario teachers. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 21(2), 1-18.

Sheorey, R. (1986). Error perceptions of native speaking and non-native speaking teachers of ESL'. *ELT Journal,* 40(4), 306-313

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(2), 4-14.

Spector, P.E. (1992) . *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction*. Sage University Papers Series. Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Tomková, G. (2013). *Teaching English language and literature for secondary schools*. Unpublished Masters' thesis, Masaryk University, Czech Republic

Tomlinson, B. (2010). *Principles and procedures of materials development*. In N. Harwood (ed.), 81–108.

Torsney,B., M., Lombardi, D., & Ponnock,A. (2019). The role of values in pre-service teachers' intentions for professional engagement. *Educational Psychology*,*39*(*1*),19–37.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*,202–248.

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

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 23: 944-956.

Van Tartwijk, J., Veldman, I., & Verloop, N. (2011). Classroom management in a Dutch teacher education program: a realistic approach. *Teaching Education,* 22, 169 –184.

Yeung, K., & Watkins, D. (2000). Hong Kong student teachers' personal construction of teaching efficacy. *Educational Psychology, 20*(2), 213–235.

Waugh, R.E. (2010). *Effects of error correction during assessment probes on the acquisition of sight. Words for students with moderate intellectual disabilities*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Georgia State University

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 81-91.

Zee, M..& & Koomen,H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student achievement adjustment, and teachers' well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 981–1015

APPENDIX 1
Self- efficacy Scale for Language Teachers (T-eSLT)

I. Demographic Information

1. Gender: □ Female □ Male

2. What is your country of residence: □ UK □ Germany □ Turkey □ Other .....

3. What is the amount of teaching experience you have :

□ ..... weeks □ ……. months □ 3 - 5 years □ 5-10 years

□ 10-20 years □ more than 20 years

4. What is your level of education: □ bachelor student □ holding a bachelor degree

□ master/PhD student □ holding a master /PhD degree □ Other .....

5. Which languages have you experienced teaching so far ?

□ English □ German □ German and English □ Other :.....

6. Which age groups of learners have you taught so far? (you can choose more than one option)

□ elementary (6-10 years) □ secondary (11-14 years) □ high school (15-18 years)

□ elementary and secondary □ secondary and high school □ adults (30+)

□ university students □ Other: .....

	Please read each statement in Column A and mark (×) under the column (1,2,3,4 or 5) which indicates <u>your level of confidence</u> best . There are no right or wrong answers, just the ones that are right for you. Your sincere responses will guarentee the success of this study. Thank you. 1: no confidence 2: low confidence 3: moderate confidence 4: high confidence 5: complete (full) confidence
How much confidence do you have to …… ?	

		1	2	3	4	5
	Assessment of Learners' Language Performance					
1	activate learners' previous language knowledge and use it for the task at hand					
2	cater for a range of learning styles (ex. Verbal, logical, linguistic, social, aural.etc)					
3	assess a learner's ability to produce a spoken text					
4	supervise and give constructive feedback on learners' performance (homework, portfolio, project work, in-classroom activities)					
5	evaluate and assess learners' performance in relation to valid and transparent criteria					
6	evaluate and select valid assessment procedures (tests, portfolios, self-assessment etc.) appropriate to learning objectives					
7	identify strengths and areas for improvement in a learner's performance					
8	assess a learner's ability to understand and interpret a written text					
9	design a valid grading system in assessment of a learners' performance					
10	Deal with learners' errors that occur in written language in ways which support learning processes.					
	Using Preventive Classroom Management Strategies					
11	take the attention of learners during a lesson					
12	control large classes					
13	get learners to listen to your instructions.					
14	keep and maximize the attention of learners during a lesson					
15	settle a group of learners into a room and gain their attention at the beginning of a lesson					
16	encourage learner participation whenever possible					
17	get learners to follow classroom rules					
	Teaching through ICT					
18	use and critically assess ICT learning programmes and platforms for language teaching purposes					
19	select and use Information Communication Technology (ICT) materials and activities in the classroom which are appropriate for learners					

20	critically assess teaching in relation to theoretical principles					
21	manage and use instructional media efficiently (OHP, ICT, video etc.) (for language teaching)					
	Using Reactive Classroom Management Strategies					
22	motivate learners who show low interest in school work					
23	get through to challenging learners					
24	effectively deal with disruptive behavior in the classroom					
	Organising Materials and Activities for Language Teaching					
25	Design appropriate activities to develop the language skills (listening, speaking,writing,reading) of learners					
26	identify time needed for specific topics and activities and plan accordingly					
27	evaluate and select a variety of texts and activities to make learners aware of the interrelationship between culture and language					
28	adapt teaching according to the age, interests, and the language level of learners					
29	locate and select listening and reading materials appropriate for the needs of learners					
	Teaching grammar					
30	design materials, texts, activities appropriate to the needs, interests, age and language levels					
31	introduce a grammatical item and help learners to practise it through meaningful contexts					
32	evaluate and select grammatical exercises and activities which support learning and encourage oral and written communication					
	Dealing with learners'language errors					
33	provide constructive feedback to learners concerning their errors/interlanguage to support their learning process					
34	draw on appropriate theories of language, learning, culture etc. to guide teaching					
35	deal with learners' errors that occur in spoken in ways which support their learning processes					
36	analyse learners' errors and identify the processes that may cause them					

Appendix 2
Total Variance Explained, Factor Matrix

Factors	Item	Factor loading	Explained variance	Cronbach's Alpha
Factor1 (Eingen value =14.239)	32	0,725	14,476	0,910
	27	0,711		
	31	0,670		
	23	0,626		
	29	0,611		
	30	0,588		
	70	0,586		
	81	0,543		
	34	0,461		
	19	0,429		
Factor2 (Eigen value=2.800)	21	0,824	12,578	0,894
	41	0,703		
	43	0,655		
	22	0,632		
	59	0,623		
	71	0,619		
	53	0,529		
(Eigen value=1.949)	65	0,824	8,331	0,804
	69	0,751		

	25	0,703		
	64	0,570		
Factor4m (Eigen value=1.495)	37	0,734	8,286	0,783
	47	0,633		
	56	0,558		
Factor5 (Eigen value=1.379)	10	0,691	7,948	0,784
	11	0,674		
	6	0,607		
	15	0,525		
	1	0,505		
Factor6 (Eigen value=1.242)	9	0,807	7,371	0,767
	51	0,768		
	t18	0,497		
Factor 7 (Eigen value=1.048)	63	0,654	6,285	0,743
	2	0,646		
	76	0,570		
	48	0,426		
Total variance %65.275				

Rotated Component Matrix[a]							
	Component						
Item number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56	**,760**						
41	**,754**						
53	**,741**						
59	**,727**						
71	**,719**						
43	**,710**						
21	**,640**						**,429**
47	**,620**						
37	**,573**						
22	**,489**	**,409**					
32		,717					
31		,704					
27		,703					
29		,629					
70		,626					
81		,622					
23		,585					
30		,573					
63		,523				,469	
34		,506					
48		,482					
76		,457				,444	
57		,438					
9			,785				
51			,613				
15			,572				
1			,567				
T18			,565			,407	
19		,427	,443				
11			,420				
65				,802			
69				,768			
64				,663			
25				,583			
36	,403			,421			