

Language Proficiency

by Dwita Laksmi

Submission date: 04-Feb-2020 02:13AM (UTC-0600)

Submission ID: 1238382627

File name: Article_template_exposure.docx (47.8K)

Word count: 6393

Character count: 36644

14
Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy, English Proficiency, and Teaching Ability in EFL Setting: A Case Study in Tertiary Level

Dwita Laksmita Rachmawati^a, Dian Fadhilawati^b

^{a,b}State University of Surabaya, Surabaya, ^bUniversitas Islam Balitar, Blitar,
Email: ^adwita.19030@mhs.unesa.ac.id ^bdianfadhilawati@unisbablitar.ac.id

ABSTRACT

One important character which should be owned by teacher that influence the outcome of teacher is called as teacher self – efficacy. However, the correlation between teacher' self – efficacy and linguistic proficiency hasn't really investigated yet. Hence, this research aims to examine the connection between language proficiency to their efficacy perceptions. The participants of this research were 11 teachers of private University in Indonesia with various demographic characteristics. They were asked to answer related to the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) and recognize their linguistic proficiency self – rating. The statistical analyzing result which used Pearson – product moment correlation and Regression analysis showed a signification correlation between teacher's self – efficacy and their proficiency level. The regression results also affirmed that the possibility level of proficiency of self – efficacy beliefs of teachers in classroom activity. The findings of this research are elaborated in relation to the previous research.

Keywords: Teacher' Self-Efficacy, Linguistic Proficiency, Tertiary Education, EFL Teachers, and Linguistic Competence

1. Introduction

A significant challenge which is faced by the teachers is to adjust all student-centered strategies, methodologies and teaching learning to grow the competence and uplift the independent learning environment. The fortune of those teaching and learning activity will depend on the increase of teacher's self-perception and confidence to indulge any changes relate to learning-centered models of teaching (Sahin & Yildirim, 2016). The teacher's professionalism had been examined utterly as a main issue in education. It is acknowledgeable that teachers' professionalism had been increasing time to time and in line with education need. That condition had been a challenge for governments and pedagogues to give maximum result. The Indonesian government itself has tried to address this problem by implementing and improving education reform. It can be seen by the release of the issuance of No.14 Act 2005 about Indonesian pedagogues by government. This focuses on improving the training of pedagogues. Furthermore, their expertise is defined by an integrity in accordance with the principles of professional education. Pedagogues will therefore have a certified professional educational background and have some effect as practitioners. Such competencies are

including: 1) intellectual competence, 2) emotional competence, 3) interpersonal competence, 4) technical competence (Richards, 2017).

Significantly, teachers' competence will be identified with how well teachers are able to play their role as pedagogues, including how well the class preparation run, and how the students and teaching evaluation need to be implemented, how teachers succeed to control the class and credits, and how long the teacher needs to assess all of those process properly. The mention criteria above can be defined the teachers' performance when they are being evaluated according to their task's accomplished within the specific time. Meanwhile, the teaching performance is judged based on the individual factors of the teachers (which include willing, interest, motivation, characteristics, and individual perceptions) and institutional factors (which include duties according to functional position, working climate, leadership, career path, rewards, and colleagues) correlate with an innovation reached when pedagogues accomplished their depend on the required quality, quantity and time needed (Richards, 2017).

Pedagogues play a role to enhance and assist learners' effort to reach the goal-setting and expanding the suitable learning strategies to construct their knowledge. As stated by Vygotsky (1987), teachers, as a mediator, shall customize their teaching strategy and apply to their learners' zone to gain maximum knowledge development, for instance to students' growing capabilities. Meanwhile, 'pedagogues are contributors to organize subject-centered knowledge and learning activities of their learners' learning journey by present suitable mediation to help them extend their current competence limit (Richards, 2010).

A factor which relates to pedagogical ability is teacher's self-efficacy (Ayoobiyani & Soleimani, 2015). Self-efficacy can be called as self-perception, it plays a big role to shape how teachers choose tasks and learning activity, shaping their efforts and perseverance to address specific challenges, and balance out their emotional management even to complicated situation. This self-efficacy eventually describe a cognitive construction which mediates between action and knowledge development (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008) Pedagogues who owns high level of confidence, showing immense willingness to apply new teaching methods, design and organize their teaching activity better, including more enthusiastic and satisfying (Siew & Wong, 2005). Briefly, self-efficacy affects to teaching practice and attitude during educational process and the outcome of it.

Whatever that teacher knows, thinks and believes are related to what they would do during teaching process. Specifically, their self-perception of capabilities of teaching method, expressed teachers' self-efficacy which are arranged as powerful instruments of teachers' perception as they need to engage to the task they give and in which they feel more competent

and shun in areas that they do not feel competent on (Khanshan & Yousefi, 2015). Therefore, self-efficacy is the most central psychological mechanism which influence the actions. Universal research on education found out that teachers' self-efficacy will not only impact the teaching practice choices but also will impact the whole teaching environment. For example, high self-efficacy of teachers would bring positive improvements for students' learning activity, in contrary, those who has low self-efficacy would think that external elements would bring more influence rather than the teaching choices of theirs (Ayoobiyan & Soleimani, 2015).

Other than self-efficacy, the other factor of teaching is none other than language proficiency. Teaching process is a very contextual-based process and has the factors to contribute during teaching process, including to teacher's expertise. Hence, there is no specific acceptable criteria to identify the teachers' expertise (Faez & Karas, 2017). Yet, language proficiency level of a teacher has been a major concern for measuring the teacher's teaching proficiency. Awareness of the English competence of the English teacher is teacher's linguistic competence including teachers' ability presenting a good model of English education, maintain English fluency and usage, identify students errors, present suitable feedback and catch in improvisational teaching activity (Faez & Karas, 2017). It is also important aspect to considerate that teachers' language proficiency level brings impact to their confidence in teaching abilities and recognition of their professional validity (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008).

According to the essence of the language instruction, the primary purpose of the study in language teachers' self-perception was to establish a relationship between their confidence in using English as a medium of instruction and their language skills of the instructor. The material and teaching method are taught in the English language classroom. Targeted language proficiency was a major anxiety problem for teachers who are non-native speaker. Meanwhile, opposed to native speakers, non-native English teacher believe that their language skills are insufficient, most of the time. That's because the misperceptions of their linguistic ability (Tsang, 2017). To learn effectively, the pedagogues have to put more trust in their competence to bring out great learning outcome. The native speakers' norm in delivering English Language Teaching (ELT) face challenges to balance out and maintaining their integrity and capability as English teacher (Faez & Karas, 2017). For area of linguistic competence itself, some studies have enhanced that non-native teachers' capability will likely to bring impact to their professional belief of their self-efficacy, their teaching professionalism and their pedagogical processes (e.g. Dellinger, 2008). Regarding to the significance of this issue, the teacher development has been studied in some ways to observe that the teachers' English proficiency

level plays role to shape or obstruct their self-efficacy perceptions. This study attempted to illuminate under-researched scope.

There are three studies that reported the connection between self-efficacy of teachers and their language proficiency. Those have been done by; 1) Eslami & Fatahi, (2008), 2) Khansan and Yousefi, (2015), and 3) Butler, (2004). Those studies showed the varying results of both correlations. Research found by Eslami & Fatahi (2008) showed the self – efficacy of Forty Iranian EFL pedagogues who own one to five years of English teaching experiences at various high schools in Tehran that would establish a remarkable correlation among language proficiency of teachers' including speaking, reading, listening, and writing. The result shown that the more teachers feel efficacious, the more comfortable they are in delivering and using communicative-based teaching strategies. Alike to Eslami's, study examined the connection between teachers' self-confidence and teaching proficiency. Similar result was found by Butler (2004) which showed a remarkable relationship between teachers' self-perception and linguistic competence. Compatible to those studies conducted previously, this research objected to discover if there any statistically remarkable relationship which live between teachers' sense of self-efficacy, language proficiency, and teaching competence in Indonesia. Furthermore, the following research question of this paper was: Is there any significant remarkable connection between tertiary level education of non-native English teachers' self-confidence and their proficiency level?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Self-Efficacy

Akbari & Tavassoli (2014, p.28) Interprets self-efficacy sense as individual's determination to measure their ability to arrange and also implement courses of action to create customized types of individual's execution. They concerned more of teacher's self-efficacy, which runs to what someone would decide to act, and also the attempt level and persistence when combating troubles and consequences. This is an active synergy, some other belief systems which are varied in different circumstances and actions. Self-efficacy is common belief of someone's capabilities to control their crucial action successfully. Furthermore, Ayoobiyan & Soleimani (2015), explains that individual's self-efficacy is an encouragement which set up to influence students to build a self-determining behavior. Regarding to someone's beliefs that he/she own the capabilities to achieve certain level of action and accomplishment, he/she own a self-system which allow them to scale and control over their feelings, encouragements, thought and action choices. Self – efficacy beliefs would turn individual into presenting

someone with the ability to give impact to their cognitive process and actions and to modify their environments. Akbari & Tavassoli (2014, p.29) declares that someone's motivational level, affective states and also action are determined on what they believe rather than what is true objectives. Thus, human functioning could be measured by their beliefs of their capability on what they truly capable of doing, in actual facts those beliefs could help to choose what someone can really do by using their cognition and skills.

To measure self-efficacy effectively, Bandura (1997) composed an indicator which consists on seven sub-scales, which include *decision making, the efficacy in influencing acquiring, school resources efficacy, teaching efficacy, disciplinary efficacy, obtaining parental assistance efficacy, joining into community efficacy, and efficacy of leading into an open school environment.*

2.2. English Proficiency

The capability in English language teaching produces a content or subject which relates to knowledge, pedagogical skills and capability to deliver material in English, a skill which is commonly viewed to influence teacher's pedagogical language proficiency (Richards, 2017). Based on conventional wisdom, the more someone knows a language, the better they are to teach it. For this reason, it is regularly assumed that they are usually the native teacher ones (English, French, Chinese etc.) and is at more advantage compared to the ones who aren't, that assumption is seen as the legacy in teaching target language and also valuing the "nativeness" as criteria to be a "good" language teacher, also being another point which has been mentioned as "native-speakerism" (Renandya et al, 2018). Describing that proficiency is not as easy or direct task, it is a contextual based and different levels and also proficiency types which are required for various contexts and aims. Blending this complexity will be the different varieties of English which exists. Hence, the teacher's language proficiency issue and proficiency level are needed for teachers to be effective (Richards, 2017).

Richards (2010) Stated that teachers shall achieve a specific level of proficiency to teach effectively. Stressing the threshold level conception, Tsang, (2017) stated pedagogue's universal proficiency becomes a considerable role in classroom activity, however, it only applicable in certain extend. When a certain proficiency threshold is reached, the other factors including teachers' pedagogical skills and also the personality characteristics play a more important role. But minding the varied tasks, contexts, contents and also cultures that teachers are meant to perform in, this threshold carries on a shifty idea.

Meanwhile, there are many who have declared that native-like English language mastery individual is not mandatorily to teach well. Akbari & Tavassoli, (2014) Stated that

mostly English teachers in the world are non-natives and are not necessary to be native-like English language mastery individuals to teach well. Freeman *et al* (2017) also presented an idea that common language proficiency is needed for teaching English. According to a “Language for specific purposes” has compiled the general words and phrases which are used by English language teachers in the classroom. The English language for teaching is still developing and be an approach that researchers proclaim could help the ELT field to prepare English teachers for specific tasks in the classroom activity (Freeman et al, 2015).

In conclusion, the language proficiency level is a key component which compose a language teacher’s knowledge. Insufficiently, a professional language teacher is supposed to have adequate professional knowledge of English language, pedagogical content knowledge which relate to teacher’s English pedagogical skills, and enough language proficiency level to teach effectively. The relationship between language proficiency and teaching effectiveness is not a perfect one, indeed. It is not a case which relate to individual with a high proficiency level who could automatically teach effectively. If that were the case, then all natives could be the suitable ones to teach English in classroom effectively. However, research has shown that eve for high proficient natives of their English, they would still need to learn “classroom language” and utilize properly to teaching language effectively during teaching activities. The proficient users are acknowledged to have a clear and great command in using the targeted language, they would easily understand the language, express various ideas and explain them clearly either in speech or writing and could interact with other speakers effortlessly (Richards, 2017). Five performance indicators are commonly used to assess language proficiency which include; accuracy, fluency, complexity, appropriacy and capacity (Richards, 2017). It is key to point out that having a great proficiency level is needed for effective teaching experience. Owning an adequate proficiency will make teachers to steer their lesson planning more smoothly and efficiently. Research has shown that teachers with a higher language proficiency level would likely be more adaptable to utilize it in the classroom and provide proper language support for their learners’ (Richards, 2017).

3. Research Method

3.1. Research Design

This research is quantitative research. Muijs (2004, p.1) explained the quantitative research as elaborating phenomena by obtaining numerical data which have been analyzed mathematically based on the methods that have been chosen (in particular statistics). It was an appropriate approach as the researcher obtained the data from questionnaires which are filled

out by teachers in D3 English Program of Universitas Merdeka, Malang. This research conducted in order to observe the correlation between pedagogues' self- efficacy and their linguistic competence.

3.2. Sampling

The data were obtained from 11 EFL teachers of Private University in Malang. Respondents of this research are all permanent teachers in D3 English program, Universitas Merdeka, Malang. There were 8 females and 2 males. Their age was ranged 25 to 32 years old. All of them taught English at University. They lead classes according to current curriculum which consist of mandatory and elective courses. The classes are consisted of around 30 students. Almost all teachers have earned master degrees, but there are two who were registered in Doctorate level classes. The teaching experiences are varied from 4 to 15 years, with the mean number of 9 years.

3.3 Instrument

Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

This research is using and modifying the questionnaires of Bandura's Instrument Teacher "Self-Efficacy Scale". This "Teacher Efficacy Scale" (TES) used in order to obtain qualitative data of teachers' self-efficacy level. This questionnaire would judge the teachers' perceptions on both personal and genera; self-efficacies. The personal efficacy could assess teachers' conceptions and perspective of their teaching capacities to challenge learners from less encouraging environment to attain high and acceptable academic outcomes. The common efficacy, concerns to teachers' perception about their teaching ability to face the negative and undesirable impacts on students' background. This is a 30-items form which compiled into "Bandura's Teacher Efficacy Scale" which has been divided into 7 indicators which include: "Efficacy that influences Decision Making", "Efficacy that Influence School Resources", "Self-Efficacy Instructional", "Disciplinary Self-Efficacy", "Efficacy to Obtain Parental Involvement", "Efficacy to obtain Community Involvement", and "Efficacy to create a Positive School Climate". Teachers have to choose a 5 – point scale to rank from 1 (Nothing), 2 (Very Little), 3 (Some Influence), 4 (Quite a Bit), 5 (A Great Deal). Those questionnaires were able to react proper reliability index of 0.79 employing those 30-items form.

It shall be noted that in current study, to investigate if there is any changes were needed in the survey, and all of items in the questionnaire were clear enough for participants to understand, the questionnaire was shared to ten participants similar to the actual research and the Cronbach's alpha results guaranteed a satisfying reliability index ($\alpha = .86$).

Table 3.1 The Distribution of Items of Bandura's Instrument Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale

Item Number	Type of Statement	Total Item
1-2	"Efficacy to Influence Decision making"	2
3	"Efficacy to Influence School Resources"	1
4-12	"Instructional Self-Efficacy"	9
13-16	"Disciplinary Self-Efficacy"	3
17-19	"Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement"	3
20-23	"Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement"	4
24-30	"Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate"	8
7 categories of teacher self-efficacy		30 items

Table 3.2 Guidelines of Correlation Coefficient Interpretation (Sarjono, H & Julianita, W, 201, p.90, as cited in Nuril, 2011, p.33)

Coefficient Interval	Correlation Level
0.80 - 1.000	Very High
0.60 - 0.799	High
0.40 - 0.599	Sufficient
0.20 - 0.399	Low
0.00 - 0.199	Very Low

Language Proficiency Measurement

According to Butler (2004) the teacher respondents were required to rate their English Proficiency Level combined with the least English proficiency level that are considered as essential for tertiary level of education. The gap between present and least levels could reflect the relative nature of self-perceptions and norms deciding a qualified teacher could also bring impact of language competence (Butler, 2004). The proficiency level in this research was examined in seven language subskills which include; Speaking, Listening, Reading, Writing, Vocabulary, Grammar and Pronunciation. This scale was based on 6-point's scale which are level 1 mirrored as the lowest proficiency level, and level 6 as the highest levels and considered as native-like competence. According to obtained scores from participants of this research, those who got score below mean ($M = 0.16$) were regarded as low-proficiency teacher and those with above mean were regarded as high proficiency teacher. This scale was exposed to reliability analysis and the alpha pin pointed level a high level (0.90).

3.4 Research Procedure

The data were obtained from 11 EFL University teachers. The questionnaires were registered to the teachers by shared via Google form because the data could be gathered from many respondents in short period of time. The demographic information about teachers regarding their ages, genders, years of teaching experiences, teaching places and education levels were included in to the last page of questionnaires. Hence, it can make the respondent's focus on the provided statement in the questionnaires. The questionnaires completion took for less than 30 minutes and were sent back within few days.

3.5 Data analysis

The data obtained for this research were analyzed by using (SPSS) version 21. A significance level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) was set up. The mean and standard deviation score in descriptive statistics analysis and a Pearson product moment relation were used to answer the research question.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Perceived Levels of Self-Efficacy for Each Categorical of Instructional Strategies

Bandura (1997) assembled self-efficacy into seven indicators which include “efficacy that influence decision making”, “efficacy that influence school resources”, “instructional self-efficacy”, “Disciplinary self-efficacy”, and “Efficacy to create a Positive School Climate”. Based on the shared questionnaires, here are the results:

Table 4.1. Teachers’ Self-Efficacy Beliefs

No.	Item of Efficacy Subscales	Mean	SD
“Efficacy to Influence Decision making”			
1.	How much your effort to affect an outcome produced by the department?	4.55	0.522
2.	How much can you openly speak your opinion regarding essential issue in the department?	4.45	0.522
“Efficacy to Influence School Resources”			
3.	How much your effort to prepare teaching-learning tools and materials that you need?	4.55	0.522
“Instructional Self-Efficacy”			
4.	How much your effort to affect your class in your department?	4.55	0.522
5.	How much can you manage to get through to the most complicated situation in class?	4.36	0.505
6.	How much your effort to foster learning of lack supportive environment of your students?	4.36	0.505
7.	How much can you do to help your students in solving difficult task?	4.27	0.786
8.	How much can you do to help students to recall what they have learned previously?	4.36	0.505
9.	How much can you do to improve students with low motivation in teaching and learning process?	4.55	0.522
10.	How much can you do to make your students work in pair or in group with other students?	4.00	0.632
11.	How much can you reduce or solve the unfavorable situation in teaching and learning process?	4.27	0.467
12.	How much your effort to motivate your students to finish assignment?	4.36	0.505
“Disciplinary Self-Efficacy”			
13.	How much can you do to encourage your students to obey class rules?	4.36	0.505

14.	How much can you do in order to regulate misbehavior in classroom?	4.00	0.632	
15.	How much can you do to avoid unpredictable situation in your department?	4.18	0.751	
“Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement”				
6	16.	How much your effort to make parents involved in teaching and learning activities?	4.45	0.522
	17.	How much your effort to make students achieve learning objectives?	4.27	0.467
	18.	How much can you do to provide comfortable atmosphere for parents who want to visit department?	4.27	0.467
“Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement”				
	19.	How much your effort in order to make other institution interested in partnering with your department?	4.36	0.505
	20.	How much can you do to engage religious institution in collaborating with your department?	4.36	0.505
	21.	How much your contribution to make business in collaborating with your department?	4.00	0.632
	22.	How much can you do to encourage local universities to collaborate with your department?	4.18	0.751
“Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate”				
15	23.	How much your effort to make a safe environment in your department?	4.64	0.505
	24.	How much can you do to help your students love going to campus?	4.55	0.522
	25.	How much your effort to make your students trust their teachers?	4.55	0.522
	26.	How much can you do to support other instructors to improve teaching ability?	4.36	0.505
	27.	How much can you do to improve coordination among teachers and staffs to ensure that the department works effectively?	4.36	0.674
	28.	How much your effort to reduce drop-out rate?	4.36	0.505
	29.	How much can you do in order to reduce absenteeism rate of your students?	4.45	0.522
	30.	How much your effort to make your students trust with theirself that they can achieve their learning goals?	4.18	0.603
Total		4.35	0.214	

According to the first indicator, “Efficacy in Influence Decision Making”, there were two items, the first one is “How much your effort to affect an outcome produced by the department?”, and the second is “How much can you openly speak your opinion regarding essential issue in the department?”. The highest mean score is found in the first item, which is 4.55 which shows that lecturers tend to feel that they can affect the decisions taken by the department.

The second indicator is “Efficacy to Influence School Resources”, there are only one item within this indicator that is “How much your effort to prepare teaching-learning tools and

materials that you need??" The mean score perceived from the questionnaire result is 4.55 means that can get many instructional materials and equipment both from the Department to support the teachers or any sources.

In the third indicator, "Instructional Self-Efficacy", there are nine items, the first item is "How much your effort to affect your class in your department?", then "How much can you manage to get through to the most complicated situation in class?", third "How much your effort to foster learning of lack supportive environment of your students?", next "How much can you do to help your students in solving difficult task?", fifth "How much can you do to help students to recall what they have learned previously?", the next is "How much can you do to improve students with low motivation in teaching and learning process?", then "How much can you do to make your students work in pair or in group with other students?", "How much can you reduce or solve the unfavorable situation in teaching and learning process?", and finally "How much your effort to motivate your students to finish assignment?". From those nine items, the highest mean score is in the first item and the sixth item with value 4.55 which indicates that lecturers have the sense that they can influence the size of the department and can motivate students well.

In the fourth indicator, "Disciplinary Self-Efficacy", there are three items, the first is "How much can you do to encourage your students to obey class rules?", then "How much can you do in order to regulate misbehavior in classroom?" and "How much can you do to avoid unpredictable situation in your department?". From all three items, item with the highest mean score is the first item which is question about lecturer influences the students to follow the rules with mean value 4,36, that indicates that majority of lecturers have the sense of efficacy that they have big influence at making their students follow classroom rules.

In the fifth indicator, "Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement", there are three items, the first is "How much your effort to make parents involved in teaching and learning activities?", the next "How much your effort to make students achieve learning objectives?", and "How much can you do to provide comfortable atmosphere for parents who want to visit department?". From all three items, item with the highest mean score is the first item which is questioning lecturers' role in involving parent at department activities with mean value 4,45, that indicates that lecturers have the sense of efficacy that they can influence parents to involve in department activities.

In the sixth indicator, "Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement", there are fourth items, the first is "How much your effort in order to make other institution interested in partnering with your department?", "How much can you do to engage religious institution in

collaborating with your department?”, “How much your contribution to make business in collaborating with your department?”, and “How much can you do to encourage local universities to collaborate with your department?”. From those four items, the highest mean values were the first and also second ones which question the teacher’s role to influence community and religious institution to cooperate with the department’s activities with mean score of 4,36.

The last indicator, “Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate”, there are eight items, the first is “How much your effort to make a safe environment in your department?”, the second “How much can you do to help your students love going to campus?”, the next is “How much your effort to make your students trust their teachers?”, fourth is “How much can you do to support other instructors to improve teaching ability?”, fifth is “How much can you do to improve coordination among teachers and staffs to ensure that the department works effectively?”, the next is “How much your effort to reduce drop-out rate?”, “How much can you do in order to reduce absenteeism rate of your students?”, “and “How much your effort to make your students trust with themselves that they can achieve their learning goals?”. Based on the all eight items, the highest mean score one is the first item which asked the teacher about their role to create the department environment that make students feel safe with mean score which is 4,64. The whole total of mean score was 4.35.

4.2 Relationship Between Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Language Proficiency

From the Bandura’s Instrument of Teacher’s Self-Efficacy Scale data were collected, the correlation between teacher’s self-efficacy and language proficiency were measured by using Pearson Product-Moment correlation. This statistical procedure was used to answer the research problem of the study. Cohen (2007) says that Pearson Product-Moment correlation is a statistic to measure the degree of association between two interval or ration variables. The Pearson correlation is reported in table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Pearson Product Moment Correlations between Self-Efficacy and Language Proficiency

	Language Proficiency	Self-efficacy
Language Proficiency	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.779**
	N	11
Self-Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	0.779**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	11

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

Pearson correlation coefficients symbolized by r that is ranged between -1 to +1. When the r -score closer to 1, it shows that the result has stronger relationship, and vice versa. A significant correlation can be observed when there is an increase in one variable that is followed by an increase in another variable. Positive relationships are predefined with a plus (+) sign and negative correlations are prefaced with a minus (-) sign. Therefore, + 1.0 reflected a perfect positive relationship. On the other hand, a negative correlation can be found when there is an increase in one variable is followed by a decrease in another variable. Therefore, - 1.0 reflected perfect negative relationship. However, if the coefficient is 0 (zero), it implies that there is no correlation between two variables. It suggests that the people's performance on one variable is unrelated to their performance on the second variable.

Based on the Table 4.2, it shown that Teacher's self-efficacy correlate with language proficiency with the score 0.779 ($r=0.77$). It falls into high correlation since it is in range of 0.60 – 0.799. The sign of two stars above the score indicate that the correlation coefficient is significant at the level of 0.01. Based on the correlation coefficient Table of Pearson Product-Moment calculated with Microsoft excel, because the sample used in this study is 11 teachers, the r -score must be greater than r -table ($r > 0.633$), so, it shows that there is a correlation between two variables. Since the score of r is greater than r table ($0.77 > 0.633$), it shows that there is a correlation or relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and Language proficiency.

Another piece of information is whether or not the relationship is statistically significant. The significant level is calculated automatically by SPSS. The significance of correlation is seen by the significance score (p). When the score of $p < .05$, the correlation is significant and when the score of $p > .05$, the correlation is not significant. Based on the result of Pearson Product-Moment analysis shown in the Table 4.2, it is obtained that the p -score is less than 0.05 ($p=.001$). Then, it can be concluded that self-efficacy found to have statistically significant correlation with language proficiency. The last information is N or the number of cases for which a study has information on both variables. Based on the result of Pearson Product-Moment analysis shown in the Table 4.2, it is obtained that the total of sample used in this study is 11 ($N=11$).

In order to see if the level of proficiency could predict the changes in the dependent variable, that is the self-efficacy, a Regression analysis was carried out. The results are depicted in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Regression Results for Proficiency Predicting Efficacy

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	39.635	2.483		18.043	0.000
Proficiency	6.043	1.793	.779	5.297	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Efficacy

According to Table 4.3, the regression model statistically significantly predicted the efficacy variable showing that it is a good fit for the data ($\beta = 0.779$, $p = .000$). The quantitative analyses of the data clearly showed a significant relationship between the teachers' level of proficiency and their self-efficacy ratings. English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' high sense of efficiency suggests their commitment. The commitment naturally brings with itself the spending of more time to the areas of difficulty in teaching and the devotion of more time to academic subjects, which requires a high level of linguistic capability. In fact, this result was quite relevant since linguistic competence brings about the adequate skills of handling the classroom, dealing with challenges and keeping the necessary efficacy for the fulfillment of the job.

5. Conclusion

In the teaching area, proficiency and efficacy has been an arguable issue, with different findings. Nhung (2017) Proposed that instructional proficiency is the main determinant of self-efficacy beliefs for teachers, both linguistic and pedagogical competences which are become significant contributors to understand their professional status, developments and instructional approaches which are implemented by English teachers. He also mentioned that educational program plays a big role to emerge and develop the teacher's sense of self-efficacy and the development of instructional abilities. Then, Freeman *et al* (2015). in his respectful argument states that experience of training which help teachers to success the teaching task will give a big foundation to develop the efficacy sense in their career development. The assumption is that efficient training has to give teachers some opportunities to extend their training activities for teaching. Hence, the teaching efficacy belief can be improved and strengthened, in turn, it can lead their teaching ability to deliver better in the class.

Some available other ways to help to increase which teachers' self-efficacy can be emerged. One way is the receiving of constructive feedback and support from others (Azizah *et al*, 2018). Bandura, 1997, p.106) proposes that "mentors must be good diagnosticians of strengths and weaknesses and knowledgeable about how to tailor activities to turn potentiality into actuality". Feedback to teachers can be effective only if it is presented constructively and

balanced with positive feedback. When teachers are provided clear and effective feedback, they need to be guided to reach the development of competence (Sadhegi et al, 2019). Another way of increases teacher's self-efficacy ability is that they can be given an opportunity by their trainers to observe a model teacher (Gearing, 1999). This does not mean "the initiation by imitation" in (Widdowson, 2003) terms. In the opinion of Widdowson (2003, p.3), "It is widely supposed that the most effective kind of preparation for novice teachers is to develop common sense or "know how" by following the example of teachers who have already become expert by experience". He argues that there are problems with this approach. It presupposes that the experience and the expertise of teachers are relevant and effective for the present needs of novice teachers. If novice teachers are to learn from their more experienced colleagues, it should not be limited to uncritical and passive imitation. Teachers shall face and adapt the activities of more expert teachers to their own classroom contexts. They should be reflective upon the teaching they do.

References

- Akbari, R., & Tavassoli, K. (2014). Developing an ELT ContextSpecific Teacher Efficacy Instrument. *RELC journal*, 45(1), 27-50.
- Ayoobiyan, H., & Soleimani, T. (2015). The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Language Proficiency: A Case of Iranian Medical Students. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(4), 158-167.
- Azizah, U. A., Nurkamto, J., Drajadi, N. A., & Tosraji, T. (2018). In-Service English Teacher's Perceptions of Reflective Teacher Diary to Promote Professional Development. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 5(2), 1-8. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v5i2.119>
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. . *Educational Psychologist*, 28, 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Butler, Y. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL? Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 245-278.
- Cohen, L. (2007). *Research methods in education: Sixth Edition*. London: Taylor and Francies.

- Dellinger, A. B. (2008). Measuring teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: development and use of the TEBS-self. *An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 24, 751-766.
- Eslami, Z. R., & Fatahi, A. (2008). Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy, English Proficiency, and Instructional Strategies: A Study of Nonnative EFL Teachers in Iran. *TESL-EJ*, 11(4), 1-19.
- Faez, F., & Karas, M. (2017). Connecting Language Proficiency to (Self-Reported) Teaching Ability: A Review and Analysis of Research. *RELC journal*, 48(1), 135-151.
- Freeman, D., Katz, A., Gomez, P. G., & Burns, A. (2015). English-for-Teaching: rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *ELT journal*, 69(2), 129-139. doi:10.1093/elt/ccu074
- Gearing, K. (1999). Helping less-experienced teachers of English to evaluate teachers' guides. *ELT journal*, 53(2), 122-127. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/53.2.122
- Khanshan, S. K., & Yousefi, M. H. (2015). The Relationship between Tertiary Level EFL Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions and Their Level of Linguistic Proficiency. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Discourse Analysis*, 3(2), 73-89.
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Nakata, Y. (2010). Improving the Classroom Language Proficiency of Non-native Teachers of English: What and How?. *RELC journal*, 41(1), 76-90.
- Nhung, P. T. (2017). General English Proficiency or English for Teaching? The Preferences of In-service Teachers. *RELC journal*, 47(1), 1-14.
- Nuril, F. (2011). The application of language learning strategies and their relationship with English proficiency: a study at international undergraduate program of faculty of economics and business university of brawijaya. *Unpublished Thesis*.
- Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Nurkamto, J. (2018). Language Proficiency in Indonesia: Issue and Prospects. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(3), 618-629. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.4.618
- Richards, J. C. (2010). Competence and Performance in Language Teaching. *RELC journal*, 41(2), 101-122.

- Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, Pedagogy and Performance. *RELC journal*, 48(1), 7-30.
- Sadhegi, K., Richards, J. C., & Ghaderi, F. (2019). Perceived versus Measured Teaching Effectiveness: Does Teacher Proficiency Matter? *RELC journal*, 47(1) 1-14. doi:10.1177/0033688219845933
- Sahin, I., & Yildirim, A. (2016). Transforming professional learning into practice. *ELT journal*, 70, 241-252.
- Siew, M., & Wong, L. (2005). Language Learning Strategies and Language Self-Efficacy. *RELC journal*, 36(3), 245-269.
- Tsang, A. (2017). EFL/ESL Teachers' General Language Proficiency and Learners' Engagement. *RELC Journal*, 49(1), 99-133.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental process*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Language Proficiency

ORIGINALITY REPORT

12%

SIMILARITY INDEX

8%

INTERNET SOURCES

7%

PUBLICATIONS

9%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

- 1** Farahnaz Faez, Michael Karas, Takumi Uchihara. "Connecting language proficiency to teaching ability: A meta-analysis", Language Teaching Research, 2019
Publication 2%

- 2** bib.convdocs.org
Internet Source 1%

- 3** journals.sagepub.com
Internet Source 1%

- 4** Submitted to Universiti Teknologi MARA
Student Paper 1%

- 5** Cipto Wardoyo, Aulia Herdiani, Sulikah Sulikah. "Teacher Professionalism: Analysis of Professionalism Phases", International Education Studies, 2017
Publication 1%

- 6** pt.scribd.com
Internet Source 1%

- 7** www.theibfr.com

Internet Source

<1%

8

Submitted to National Institute of Education

Student Paper

<1%

9

repository.uinjkt.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

10

www.tesl-ej.org

Internet Source

<1%

11

etd.lib.metu.edu.tr

Internet Source

<1%

12

ijbssnet.com

Internet Source

<1%

13

Submitted to Oklahoma City University

Student Paper

<1%

14

www.tandfonline.com

Internet Source

<1%

15

Submitted to Dublin City University

Student Paper

<1%

16

Bernard, Jessica A., and Rachael D. Seidler. "Hand Dominance and Age Have Interactive Effects on Motor Cortical Representations", PLoS ONE, 2012.

Publication

<1%

17

Submitted to University of Leicester

Student Paper

<1%

18

www.slideshare.net

Internet Source

<1%

19

www.science.gov

Internet Source

<1%

20

Submitted to Glyndwr University

Student Paper

<1%

21

Submitted to University of Durham

Student Paper

<1%

22

doczz.es

Internet Source

<1%

23

www.mcser.org

Internet Source

<1%

24

digitalcommons.wku.edu

Internet Source

<1%

25

jssm.org

Internet Source

<1%

26

wrap.warwick.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1%

27

Submitted to Grand Canyon University

Student Paper

<1%

28

Submitted to IIT Delhi

Student Paper

<1%

29	Submitted to University of Edinburgh Student Paper	<1%
30	acikerisim.pau.edu.tr:8080 Internet Source	<1%
31	Submitted to Queensland University of Technology Student Paper	<1%
32	mafiadoc.com Internet Source	<1%
33	Submitted to Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Student Paper	<1%
34	www.geistscience.com Internet Source	<1%
35	Submitted to University of Huddersfield Student Paper	<1%
36	theses.whiterose.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%
37	Rohaida Mohd. Saat, Juliana Othman. "Meeting linguistic challenges in the science classroom: pre-service ESL teachers' strategies", Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 2010 Publication	<1%
38	Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan	<1%

39

Submitted to University of Sydney

Student Paper

<1%

40

Yilmaz, Cevdet. "Teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies", *Social Behavior and Personality An International Journal*, 2011.

Publication

<1%

41

vdocuments.site

Internet Source

<1%

42

Fakieh Alrabai. "The Association between Self-efficacy of Saudi Learners and Their EFL Academic Performance", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2018

Publication

<1%

43

Submitted to University College London

Student Paper

<1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On

Language Proficiency

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14

PAGE 15

PAGE 16

PAGE 17
