

Journal of English Language
Teaching and Learning
No. 13, 2014

The Role of Educational Context in Influencing EFL Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Beliefs

Manoochehr Jafarigohar

Associate Professor, Payam-e-Noor University, Tehran

Amir Valadi

Ph.D student, Payam-e-Noor University, Tehran

Abstract

Teachers’ sense of efficacy belief has been introduced as a context-specific construct, but the related literature is not clear on this specificity. This study was an attempt to show how contextual factors influence efficacy beliefs among English language teachers. To this end, thirty Iranian EFL teachers working in both school and private institute contexts were chosen as the participants to respond to Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Beliefs questionnaire (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) twice: once based on school context and once based on private institute context. Afterwards, the participants were invited to a brief interview designed to investigate further the reasons for which they had scored higher in either context. The interview findings and the results of a t-test revealed that context really made a difference. It is argued that the proper or improper functioning of efficacy building sources is the cause of the difference.

Key words: teachers’ sense of efficacy belief, contextual factors, efficacy building sources

تاریخ وصول: ۱۳۹۳/۳/۶ تأیید نهایی: ۱۳۹۳/۶/۸

E-mail: Jafarigohar2007@yahoo.com

E-mail: a_valadi@yahoo.com

Introduction

The history of English language teaching (ELT) in Iranian schools dates back to the time when the ministry of education was formally established in 1964. During its lifetime in Iran, ELT has been in relative progress reflected in changes made to the schoolbooks, attention to research findings, modifications in teacher training programs, etc. However, Iranian students' average score in English as a school subject is not indicative of the progress (Abasi, Ahmadi, & Lotfi, 2009; Amini & Heidari, 2013; Kalantari & Gholami, 2012). Things get worse when communicative functions of English are addressed to the extent that students graduating from Iranian state schools, after about seven years of instruction in English, are not able to cope with situations where rudimentary communicative language competence is necessary (Abasi, et al., 2009; Amini & Heidari, 2013). This has been realized by the parents, and caused them to rush towards private language institutes to compensate for the shortage. The rush is so great that only one of these private institutes (the ILI) has about a million language learners (visit [http:// www.ili.ir](http://www.ili.ir)) most of whom are the students having courses in general English in state school at the same time.

Whatever the reasons, the parents' rush towards private language institutes indicates that the private language institutes have been more successful in bringing about satisfaction among students and their families in terms of language learning. It appears that a big share of this success, like any other pedagogical achievement, possibly has to do with the English language teachers working in such institutes. But the point is that many of the teachers who teach in these institutes are simultaneously teaching in state schools indicating that, probably, the mentioned teachers function differently and more fruitfully when teaching in these institutes, something that this study tries to shed more light on with reference to Bandura's sense of efficacy belief theory (Bandura, 1997).

Bandura (1997) argues that beliefs tend to be translated into actions and, as a result, are capable of human agency, or intentional pursuit of courses of action. Human agency functions in a process called triadic reciprocal causation. Reciprocal causation is a multi-

directional model that suggests that our agency results in future behavior as a function of three interrelated forces: environmental influences, our behavior, and internal personal factors such as cognitive, affective, and biological processes. This trinity (a) mutually influences its members, (b) determines what we come to believe about ourselves, and (c) affects our choices and actions (Bandura, 1997).

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (1998) tried to bring Bandura's ideas into educational settings and proposed teachers' sense of efficacy defined as teachers' judgment of their capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of students' engagement and learning, even among those students who may be hard to understand or unmotivated. Teachers' beliefs determine their actions, as Pajares (1996) believes that the beliefs that individuals hold about their abilities and about the outcome of their efforts powerfully influence the ways in which they will behave.

Therefore, it seems logical that more attention should be paid to teachers' beliefs about themselves, teaching, and learning. These beliefs enormously influence their job performance, their choice of methodology, their way of class management, and their dealing and coping with the students. Successful teachers have been reported to have higher degrees of self efficacy beliefs and it has been shown that such beliefs are positively correlated with students' achievement (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006; Ross, 1992).

Research on teachers' beliefs and their impact on students' achievements has been a relevant topic for educational inquiry in recent years. Teachers' actions and behaviors are related to their beliefs, perceptions, assumptions, and motivation levels. Thus, research on teachers' beliefs is necessary in determining the way teachers understand and organize instruction. In fact, in recent years, more and more researchers (Caprara et al., 2006; Shaukat & Iqbal, 2012; Swan, Wolf, & Cano, 2011) came to the same conclusion as Pajares (1992) that beliefs are much more powerful than knowledge in determining how individuals organize and define tasks and problems, so they are stronger predictors of behavior. The following quotation is more telling:

People who have a low sense of efficacy in a given domain shy away from difficult tasks...have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goal they choose...maintain a self-diagnostic focus rather than concentrate on how to perform successfully...dwell on their deficiencies and obstacles they encounter...slacken their efforts and give up quickly...fall easy victim to stress and depression. A strong sense of efficacy enhances personal accomplishments. People with high efficacy beliefs approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an outlook fosters interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them...maintain a task-diagnostic focus that guides effective performance...heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure...attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills that are acquirable. Such an outlook produces personal accomplishments, reduces stress, and lowers vulnerability to depression (Bandura, 1993, p. 144).

With such importance and power, it would be promising if sense of efficacy beliefs were stable across different contexts. However, unfortunately, efficacy beliefs are not viewed stable and fixed traits of an individual, but rather, they are dynamic and learned systems of beliefs held in context to perform a task at a certain level of quality. According to Kumaravadivelu (2012), teachers' beliefs do not remain stable within teachers if the context of teaching differs, as a result such beliefs can change and vary due to the specificity of teaching task. That is why sense of efficacy belief has been introduced as a situation-specific construct (Bandura, 1997).

Many scholars have emphasized the role of this context-specificity in raising or lowering efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997; Kumaravadivelu, 2012; Moran & Hoy, 1998; Pajares, 1996). However, this context-specificity and its functioning have not been

practically addressed. To address this specificity we first refer to efficacy building sources.

Efficacy Building Sources

According to Hall (2011), teachers' beliefs are derived from and influenced by a range of sources including the perspectives of others (e.g., colleagues, teacher-trainers and educators, and academic research and researchers) and their own practical experience of what is and is not successful. This suggests that a two-way relationship exists between beliefs and practice, with beliefs informing practice and practice informing what an individual may believe. Likewise, Bandura (1986) argued that perceived self-efficacy beliefs originating from different sources of information are transferred vicariously, through social feedback, and as a result of direct experience. According to Bandura (1977), individuals construct their self-efficacy beliefs from four sources of information:

First, enactive mastery experiences (performance accomplishment). Mastery experience is the most important factor determining a person's self-efficacy. Efficacy beliefs are generated from successes and failures when performing a task. Success tends to strengthen beliefs in one's efficacy whereas failures tend to weaken them. If one is successful in a performance and knows himself/herself as the reason of success, efficacy is enhanced, but a failure or a success thought to be the result of an external element causes a negative prediction about future and decreases the sense of efficacy.

Second, vicarious learning experiences (modeling). This is related to a model observed by the teacher. A successful model helps the teacher reach a higher level of efficacy but a poor performance with which the observer can identify has a bad effect. Bandura (1997) posited that while observing others' attainments, individuals compare themselves as performers in the same situation. This process is more effectual when a person sees himself as similar to his own model.

Third, social persuasion. Social persuasion relates to encouragements/discouragements. These can have a strong influence as most people remember times where something said to them significantly altered their confidence. While positive persuasions increase self-efficacy, negative persuasions decrease it. When people

receive realistic appraisals from their significant others, i.e., “evaluative feedback” in the form of verbal persuasion, regarding their attainments, they seem to strengthen their beliefs on the capabilities they have to achieve what they want.

Finally, fourth, psycho-physiological arousal. Affective states influence people’s beliefs of self-efficacy. Physiological arousal in the form of mood, stress, and subjective threats affects people’s performance. Teachers’ feelings during their performance in teaching, influences their sense of efficacy. If there is a state of anxiety and stress, the teacher will deem it as a drawback and therefore works as a detriment to the teachers’ efficacy.

On the one hand, a sound conclusion based on what went on above is that proper or improper functioning of these sources will drastically influence teachers’ sense of efficacy beliefs. On the other hand, the negative or positive presence of these sources can bring about different instructional contexts that can further feed into the sources themselves. This study is to demonstrate that in the broad Iranian context, the functioning of these sources has caused two separate micro contexts to emerge, each of which with its own characteristics and idiosyncrasies.

Two Micro Contexts of English Teaching/Learning in Iran

The common idea is that classroom is a place where a teacher and a number of students, gather for pedagogical purposes. However, in addition to their physical or virtual location and pedagogic function, classrooms are also social environments; that is, language lessons can be understood as social events based upon social relationships and social interaction (Hall, 2011). The beliefs and expectations of parents, institutional managers and governmental agencies beyond the classroom and the relationships between the participants in the classroom affect classroom practices and behavior. Therefore, diversity and complexity are fundamental elements of language teaching and learning, making each classroom unique and context-specific (Hall, 2011).

In Iran, English is taught and learnt in two broad contexts: state schools and language institutes, each of which with its own educational system. State schools cannot charge tuition fee and are

funded by the government and admit all students regardless of their economical, social and personal background. By law, state schools must educate all students, including students with special needs. To enroll in a state school, parents register their children by filling out the necessary paperwork. State schools' classes are usually more populated than those of institutes. Teachers employed in such schools have related university degrees and are supposed to teach for a period of thirty years during which they may not be observed at all. English as a subject is taught once a week for 90 minutes, usually in classrooms without any visual or audio facilities. The books taught in state schools are the same across the country.

On the other hand, institutes are financially independent; their budget comes from students' tuition fee. The ministry of education, of course, puts some constraints on them like the safety of their building, and the amount of tuition fee they can charge. These institutes, however, have their own educational and pedagogical programs, and their classes are less populated than those of state schools. These institutes have their own teaching material, system of employing teachers, teacher training courses and evaluation. English language teachers are employed after taking the required employment test, regardless of their university degree, observed each semester by supervisors and will be given promotion if they fulfill the institute expectations. English is taught three times a week, 90 minutes per session.

It seems that private language institutes, compared with state schools, have been more successful in helping students achieve more knowledge of English, especially in communicative modes of the language (Abasi et al., 2009; Kalantari & Gholami, 2011). This is reflected in the establishment of hundreds of English language institutes all over the country and the parents' rush on registering their children's names in such institutes.

Certainly, for a language learning program to be successful many factors must work in harmony such as policy makers, syllabus designers, materials developers, teachers, students, and parents. Among the factors mentioned, teachers' role is of great importance, as Harmer (2007, pp. 108-110) sees the roles of the L2 teacher as controller, prompter, participant, resource and tutor. This has been

realized by many people including parents within the country causing them to ascribe the institutes' success to enjoying more qualified teachers which is not really the case because many of the English teachers who work in these institutes are working in state schools simultaneously.

It appears that the same teachers are functioning differently in two different settings. This is the issue that this study wants to investigate with reference to Albert Bandura's sense of efficacy theory. We believe that the overall context of such institutes might differ because efficacy-building sources function differently. This can be investigated in terms of the sources of efficacy that each context provide its teachers with. To this end, this study was an attempt to find out if context influences teachers' sense of efficacy beliefs and, if so, how.

Methodology

Participants

Thirty EFL teachers were chosen as participants of the study with either B.A or M.A degrees in TEFL. All of them were working in both language institutes and state high schools simultaneously. Their teaching experience ranged from seven to twelve years, which assured us that their efficacy beliefs were no longer malleable (According to Moran and Hoy (1998), after about five years sense of efficacy beliefs come to a stable point).

Procedure

The long form of Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale or Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale, developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) (see appendix 1) was used as the instrument to measure the construct among the teachers. According to Klassen et al., (2009), the reliability and validity of the instrument have been explored and established in different educational contexts with an average α of 86.15. This measure has twenty-four Likert-type 9-point scale items all in the form of questions. The participants were asked to answer the questionnaire items twice with no time interval: once based on state school context and once based on that of private language institute. Afterwards, they were invited to a brief interview designed to

investigate further the reasons for which they had scored higher in either context. Specifically, they were required to answer the following question: “*Why did you give yourself a better score in either the institute or the school context?*”

Both contexts were observed and analyzed by the researcher in terms of different factors influential in raising or lowering efficacy beliefs among the teachers. The observation and analysis aimed at finding out whether the sources of efficacy beliefs, put forward in Bandura’s theory, functioned differently in the two contexts.

Data Analysis

The participants’ answers to the items of the questionnaire were tallied and two scores (out of nine) were assigned to each of the participants because they answered the items twice according to the contexts. Later a paired sample t-test was run for any possible significant difference between the participants’ dual answers. The results were discussed with the participants for further insight. The researcher’s observation and analysis aimed at the way sources of efficacy were functioning in the two contexts.

Results and Discussions

Teachers’ Responses to the Questionnaire

As pointed out earlier, the items of teachers’ sense of efficacy questionnaire were answered by the participants twice with regard to the school and the institute contexts, respectively. Since the questionnaire was a 9-scale Likert type, the participants’ answers were added up and averaged out of nine. Each participant was assigned two scores: school score and institute score. Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the Participants’ Dual Scores

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 school	6.0867	30	1.25112	.22842
institute	6.9887	30	1.16580	.21285

As the table shows, the participants’ mean score in the institute context (6.98) was higher than their mean score in the school context

(6.08). To make sure that the difference in means was a significant one, a paired sample t-test was run, the results of which are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Paired Sample t-test for the Teachers' Dual Scores

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 school - institute	-.90200	1.04110	.19008	-1.29075	-.51325	-4.745	29	.000

It can be inferred from Table 2 that there was a significant difference in the scores for school context ($M=6.08$, $SD=1.25$) and institute context ($M=6.98$, $SD=1.16$); $t(29) = -4.74$, $p = 0.00$." Since the participants of the study were the same for the two contexts, this difference can be accounted for by referring to the settings in which they were teaching. A plausible deduction can be made that the participants (English language teachers) felt more sense of efficacy beliefs in the institute context than in the school context. This, of course, was further explored by conducting a brief interview with the teachers themselves.

The Interview with the Participants

After the answers to the items of the questionnaire were added up, the participants were invited to a brief interview lasting about five minutes on the possible reasons for which they had given a better/worse score to themselves regarding their sense of efficacy in either context. Specifically the interview was around this question: "Why did you give yourself a better score in either the institute or the school context?" Table 3 summarizes the interview findings. The frequency of each response is in the parentheses.

Table 3

The Interview Findings

Why did you give yourself a better score in either the institute or the school context? Because....	
- The reasons of the participants for having higher scores in institute context	- The reasons of the participants for having higher scores in school context
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think I learn as I teach (20). - I like challenges raised in the classroom (17). - I think an English teacher should speak English in the class (23). - Since I know my teaching is observed, I try my best (21). - Students here are motivated and talented (27). - Working here is more prestigious than working in school (22). - I am better paid here (10). - The process through which I have become a teacher here is more reliable and academic (24). - My colleagues are really helpful and knowledgeable; we discuss teaching issues during breaks (14). - I see myself more an English teacher here (19). - I must prepare before the class; this makes me learn more (12). - I see more correspondence between what I learnt and what I teach here (18). - The material here is various (23). - The number of student here is fewer than that of school; this makes it easier for me to deal with students(25). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The students are not good enough to challenge me (3). - No observers, colleagues or principal interfere with my teaching (2). - I am not under time pressure to cover the material; I have one book to cover during nine month (3). - I am not obliged to speak English in the class something that is really challenging to me (3). - Managing school classes are really easier (1). - I am not restricted to regulations (3). - I have been teaching same books for years, I don't need any more preparation (2).

Three participants of the study (ten percent) had a higher score in favor of school context and twenty seven (ninety percent) had higher scores in favor of the institute context. Although there are a variety of reasons for which the majority of participants had tendency to teach in the institute context, we can cluster their responses around the idea that teaching in institute is more challenging which leads to more preparation, motivation, hard work, responsibility and joy, hence higher efficacy beliefs for teachers.

It can be inferred from the interview results that the teachers have ascribed their sense of efficacy beliefs to factors which are present in their context of teaching such as books, number of students, colleagues, syllabus, employment process, students' motivation, being observed, money, and sense of achievement, etc, all of which functioning in an overall instructional setting.

The Researcher's Observation and Analysis of the Two Contexts Based on Efficacy Building Sources

According to Bandura (1977), individuals construct their sense of efficacy beliefs from four main sources of information: enactive mastery experience (performance accomplishment), vicarious learning experiences (modeling), social persuasion from significant others, and psycho-physiological arousal. Now let's see how these sources might be functioning in the two contexts of this study based on the researchers' observation and analysis of the two contexts; school and institute.

The first source concerns the teachers' sense of achievement in their profession. Mastery experience is the most important factor deciding a person's self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Put simply, success raises self-efficacy, failure lowers it. This sense of success seems to be more present in the context of institute which can be corroborated in the teachers' responses to the related questionnaire, in the results of the interview and finally in the students' achievement.

However, the question worth asking is, "How does the institute context bring about this performance accomplishment on the part of the teachers?". It seems that the answer to this question lies in the fact that there are factors, in the institute context, such as the number of students in each class, the teachers' preparation, the parents'

expectation, the system's requirements, the rigorous syllabus, the teacher training program and many others which cause a teacher to see himself/herself in progress and, as a result, feel more sense of efficacy belief, which is positively correlated with students' achievement (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone. 2006; Ross, 1992). It seems that the above mentioned factors are less present in the context of school, which can lead to a teacher feeling failure in his/her profession, and subsequently, resulting in lower efficacy beliefs.

The second source of efficacy beliefs is vicarious learning experiences (modeling). A successful model helps the teacher reach a higher level of efficacy but a poor performance with which he/she can identify has a bad effect. This source has its roots in the comparison a person makes between himself and the person who is performing. In the context of the English language institute, there are many language teachers working, meeting, and being in touch with one another during the semesters. This provides them with opportunities to observe each others' classes, discuss related teaching issues and see each others' accomplishments. This leads to a constructive vicarious learning process, which raises efficacy beliefs among the teachers. Such an opportunity is not available in the school context.

The third source regards social persuasion which is encouragements/discouragements (social constructive feedbacks) received by the teachers from people who are significant to them. Unfortunately, such feedbacks are not provided at schools, and, in fact, a teacher's class may not be observed for years while in the institute context, the teachers' classes are observed periodically and the necessary feedbacks will be given to the teachers to build upon them. This constructive feedback, which is a social persuasion, causes teachers' efficacy beliefs to rise.

Finally, the fourth source is psycho-physiological arousal. Affective states influence people's beliefs of self-efficacy. Physiological arousal in the form of mood, stress, and subjective threats affects people's performance. Teachers' feelings during their performance in teaching, influences their sense of efficacy beliefs. It seems that the mastery experiences that a teacher obtains can feed into psycho-physiological states and as a result raise efficacy beliefs among teachers. From the teachers' responses and the results of the

interview it can be deduced that, as a result of mastery experiences, for the majority of the teachers psycho-physiological sources might be better functioning in the institute context.

Conclusion

Beliefs are viewed as driving forces behind decisions made and actions taken by individuals throughout their lives and teachers are no exception in this regard. According to Kumaravadivelu (2012), there is a close connection between teachers' beliefs and their teaching behavior and there is overwhelming evidence that such beliefs play a crucial role in shaping teaching performance. However, teachers' beliefs do not remain stable within teachers if the context of teaching differs.

The literature shows that context greatly influences teachers' sense of efficacy beliefs and, in fact, such beliefs have been introduced as situation-specific. Hence, this specificity has not been dealt with operationally or systematically; that is, few scholars have done practical or tangible works on how context might influence sense of efficacy beliefs. The present study tried to account for this influence by referring to sense of efficacy beliefs sources propounded by Bandura(1997), namely enactive mastery experiences, vicarious learning experiences, social persuasion, and psycho-physiological arousal.

Exploring the sense of efficacy beliefs among the same English language teachers teaching in two different contexts namely, schools and private institutes, we found out that efficacy-building sources were functioning differently in the two contexts and, as a result, had brought about higher or lower sense of efficacy beliefs among the teachers. Since the positive influence of sense of efficacy beliefs on teachers' performance is now an agreed upon finding, it is suggested that educational systems should try to raise such beliefs among their teachers through building upon sources from which efficacy beliefs can be obtained. Therefore, the question arises as to how teacher education programs can help their teachers develop higher efficacy beliefs.

References

- Abasi, M., Ahmadi, & Lotfi, (2009). English language teaching and learning problems in high schools. *Knowledge and Research in Humanities*, 22,141-156.
- Amini, A. & Heidari, L. (2013). The effect of focus-on-form instruction on learning simple past tense and definite articles among Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 4(4), 45 – 59.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- (1993). Percieved self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 473–490.
- Chacon, C.T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 257 -272.
- Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English language teaching*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*, 4th edition. Pearson, Longman.
- Henson, R.K. (2001). Teacher self-efficacy: substantive implications and measurement dilemmas. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Educational Research Exchange (College Station, TX, January 26).
- Kalantari, R. & Gholami, J. (2012). Identifying and prioritizing influential factors in English language teaching and learning in schools. *The Quarterly of Educational Crativity*,46.
- Klassen, R.M. et al. (2009). Exploring the validity of teachers' sense of efficacy scale in five countries. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 34, 67-76.
- Kumaravivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society*. Taylor and Francis.

- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 543-578.
- Ross, J.A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effect of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 17(1).
- Sakhuat, S. & Iqbal, H.M. (2012). Teacher self-efficacy as a function of student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9(3), 82-85.
- Swan, B.G. et al. (2011). Changes in teacher self-efficacy from the student teaching experience through the third year of teaching. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 52(2), 128-139.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Wolfolk Hoy A. (1998). Teacher efficacy: its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202 – 248.

Appendix

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy 2001)

Teacher Beliefs	How much can you do?								
Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.	Nothing	Very Little	Some	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal				
1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in English learning?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in English class?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
9. How much can you do to help your students value English learning?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()
13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	(1) ()	2 ()	(3) ()	4 ()	5 ()	6 ()	7 ()	8 ()	9 ()

14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
21. How well can you respond to defiant students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in English class?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)