# THE IMPACT OF TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY ON TEACHING TECHNIQUES: TRADITIONAL OR CONTEMPORARY?

**Ümit Levent Değirmencioğlu[i]**
Uludağ University,
Turkey
orcid.org/0000-0002-2450-7338

**Abstract:**

There are countless factors that impact the process of second language learning and teaching in both positive and negative ways. These factors are not limited to only student-oriented factors since some of them might stem from teachers themselves as well. One of the teacher-oriented factors that shape the learning/ teaching process is teacher's levels of self-efficacy. For decades, teacher self-efficacy has been holding its position as being one of the most popular topics of investigation. Many studies have been conducted to further understand its effect on classroom environment. These studies have put forward a great deal of invaluable findings. However, only a few examined its effects on teaching methods and techniques used in the classroom. The present study set out to investigate this issue by collecting data from 64 EFL teachers, using both quantitative and qualitative methods with a three-staged survey. The findings showed: 1) Turkish EFL teachers have moderately high teacher self-efficacy, 2) age and gender are not factors affecting teacher self-efficacy while teaching experience is, 3) teachers with high self-efficacy use more modern techniques in their lessons and 4) high self-efficacy leads teachers to more implementations of communicative and collaborative tasks. The findings have numerous implications for further research that will be conducted in Turkey as they shed light on the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teaching methods. Teachers of foreign languages should also be aware of the teaching implications that have been suggested throughout the study and criticize their teaching techniques in terms of traditional or contemporary, by bearing in mind their levels of self-efficacy.

**Keywords:** teacher self-efficacy, teaching methods, EFL teachers, Turkish EFL context

## 1. Introduction

There is a great number of teacher-based factors affecting the language learning environment that learners are exposed to. These factors vary from teacher motivation to

---

[i] Correspondence: email ulevent.degirmencioglu@hotmail.com

burnout. One of the said factors, which has successfully gained the attention of the researchers working in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) in the recent decades is teacher self-efficacy. Self-efficacy –also called as perceived self-efficacy- was introduced and defined by the renowned social cognitivist Albert Bandura (1977; 1994) as one's personal opinions on his/ her capabilities to perform a specific task. Teacher self-efficacy stands for the self-efficacy within the scope of teachers, and it has been proven not only to have an impact on teachers' enthusiasm while carrying out the profession, but also on language learning environments and students' attitudes in both positive and negative ways (Moore & Esselman, 1994; Ross, 1992).

Although, it might seem that in quite a lot of ways self-efficacy resembles much to self-esteem, the two concepts differ from each other. While self-efficacy stands for people's personal ideas on their on-task performances, self-esteem refers to people's perceptions on their own competence and value (Sherer et al., 1982). In other words, self-esteem is respect and worth that a person has for himself whereas self-efficacy is believing in being able to accomplish specific tasks, thus resulting in a difference between the two terms that requires to be acknowledged.

Self-efficacy of teachers and its resulting effects have been hotly debated by many researchers in the field of SLA. While some researchers investigated its effect on teacher's psychology, some researchers investigated its effect on classroom executions.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1 Teacher self-efficacy

Teacher self-efficacy deals greatly with teachers' psychology, therefore studies regarding teacher self-efficacy so far have mostly discussed its psychological effects on teachers. One of the said effects is teacher burnout, which basically means the impact of stress on teachers' performances (Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982). In other words, teacher burnout level is related to teachers' level of emotional exhaustion from carrying out the profession. To investigate the effect of self-efficacy on burnout, Evers, Brouwers and Tomic (2002) conducted a study in the Netherlands with randomly selected 490 home-school teachers. In their study they used three questionnaires: the first one was assessing the burnout level of teachers; the second one was assessing self-efficacy; the last one was assessing teachers' attitudes towards home-schools. The findings of the study suggested that teachers' self-efficacy and burnout levels were significantly and negatively correlated with each other, indicating that high levels of teacher self-efficacy lead to low levels of job exhaustion and this situation will also occur vice versa, meaning that teachers' self-efficacy levels are affected by and affecting teacher burnout.

Unsurprisingly, the situation was proven to be no different in Turkish educational contexts. Saricam and Sakiz (2014) investigated the connection between teacher self-efficacy and burnout. They conducted their study among special education teachers in a large city of Turkey. 180 teachers participated in the study by filling out Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale and Maslach Burnout Inventory. Findings proved significant

relationships between teachers' self–efficacy and burnout. The study also pointed out significant differences between genders. This investigation highlighted the importance of teacher self-efficacy in special education institutions in Turkey.

Self-efficacy is believed to affect teachers not only psychologically, but it also affects their classroom executions. Among these executions, there is of course classroom management skills. Researchers always believed that the greater self-efficacy the teacher had, the better the classroom management would be. To support –or maybe refute- this belief, Woolfolk, Rosoff and Hoy (1990) conducted a study with 55 religious school teachers and investigated the supposed relation between classroom management skills and teacher self-efficacy. They found that the teachers who believed their teaching was successful were more capable in solving classroom problems. The researchers also found that these teachers managed and controlled their classrooms in a more humanistic way. Although these are powerful findings and they support the old assumption of the positive relation between the two aspects, the study did not delve into classroom teaching techniques.

Unfortunately, there have not been many studies investigating the relation between teaching techniques and teacher self-efficacy especially in Turkey. One of the said few studies was conducted by Kaygisiz, Anagun and Karahan (2018). The study examined the correlation between teachers' self-efficacy levels and the methods they employ during their English teaching processes. The data collection method was quantitative, and the data were collected from 367 English teachers. The data were gathered from two instruments; 1) Context-Specific Teacher Efficacy Instrument and 2) Language Teaching Methods Scale. The results showed that the self-efficacy levels of the participated teachers were high and they used Communicative Approach more often in their lessons. The study also proved that teachers' self-efficacy was major predictors of the language methods they chose. Although with its purpose this study is parallel to the one we have presented; there are not many other studies to support or refute the idea.

## 2.2 Teaching methods

Methods have been hotly debated for many years in the field of SLA. While they were quite popular until the late 20th century, researchers are now well aware that there is no best method waiting to be found (Kumaravadivelu, 2006) and the methods of half a century ago were too narrow and insufficient at being applied to larger situational contexts (Brown, 2014). Therefore, the researchers nowadays emphasize the effectiveness of teachers' choosing their techniques and designs for particular contexts rather than sticking to one method (Bell, 2003). The term method in this study however has been used to refer to teachers' methodology in Richards and Rodgers's framework which is an umbrella term and consists of approach, design and procedure (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

The methods of the participant teachers will be divided into two; traditional and contemporary. Some examples of traditional methods could be the Grammar Translation Method (the GTM), The Audio Lingual Method (the ALM) to name a few (Nunan, 1999).

These methods include techniques that are mostly outdated in the 21st century. Although their goal was communication, they were ineffective at achieving their objective (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). The contemporary methods on the other hand, put communication in the center of language learning as well, yet they are more effective than traditional methods in this regard.

One of the indicators of difference between old and new methods is grammar teaching. Approaches to grammar teaching have undergone so many changes in the past (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011) yet it is easy to categorize them into three: First, it was considered quite crucial to teach grammar with the idea of Grammar Translation Method because it had lots of advantages such as allowing the students to grow intellectually or making the students more aware of their native languages' grammar (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). However, the method had no theory or approach behind (Richards & Rodgers, 2001) so it did not last for long. Along with the GTM losing its popularity, teaching grammar was put on the shelves at around the 70s-80s. This was because the educators started believing that languages are fundamentally social and therefore linguistic structures are not enough to communicate in the target language (Halliday, 1973). Bearing these thoughts in mind, much emphasis was put on communication while teaching a target language. These assumptions led to the birth of the Communicative Language Teaching (the CLT) which disregarded grammar teaching to some major extent (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Nonetheless, this did not end well for the learners either, since French immersion programs in the Northern America revealed that students did not learn target language effectively without grammar instruction (Swain, 2000). Finally, we are at a day and age where researchers and educators admit that teaching grammar is indeed necessary for effective acquisition/ learning of a target language (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Moreover, recent methodology supports the idea of teaching grammar embedded in meaningful contexts (Nassaji & Fotos, 2004) and this one of the major aspects that distinguish contemporary methods from the traditional methods.

Another indicator between the two types of methods is communication and collaboration among the students and it is not a new aspect. Communicative tasks play a pivotal role in recent language teaching approaches (Nunan, 2010) and communication in classroom is the most crucial tool to transfer classroom language to the real world (Allwright, 1984). Although the traditional methods had little or no communication between the learners, recent methodology involves plenty of peer interaction during language learning (Ellis, 2012). Thus, communicative tasks and activities are must-have in recent teaching designs.

The issue of methods is rather complicated, and teacher self-efficacy could be one of the aspects that is affecting it. Unfortunately, as it has been stated previously, there has not been ample number of empirical studies that investigate the relation between them. The present study, therefore, tries to shed more light on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' self-efficacy and teaching methods by answering the following research questions:

1) Do Turkish EFL teachers' have low or high self-efficacy?

2) Do gender, age and teaching experience play a role in affecting the self-efficacy of Turkish EFL teachers?
3) Is there a relation between high teacher self-efficacy and using contemporary teaching methods and techniques?
4) Do teachers with high self-efficacy implement communicative and collaborative tasks in their lessons and to what extent?

## 3. Material and Methods

The study follows a Mixed Research Method as the analyzed data have been gathered by using both Qualitative and Quantitative Data Collection Methods. This was done through a survey. The survey could be seen in appendices A, B and C. Both Quantitative and Qualitative Methods were needed in this study because, even though they are difficult to analyze, qualitative data give the researcher a more in-depth view of the subject matter. Therefore, the data regarding the demographic information and teacher self-efficacy were collected numerically, while the data regarding teaching implications were collected verbally.

### 3.1 The participants
64 Turkish EFL teachers participated in the study. The participants were selected by snowball sampling, through which they were basically asked to share the questionnaire with their colleagues. The participant teachers are working in private and state institutions in a large city of Turkey, teaching either preschool, elementary school, middle school, high school, university students or adults. 23 of the participants were male (35.9 per cent) and the remaining 41 of them were female (64.1 per cent). Most of the participant teachers (*n*= 55; 86%) were aged between 20– 35 and among all the participants, more than half of them (*n*= 34; %53.1) were rather novice teachers, having an experience of 1- 3 years.

### 3.2 Instruments
A three-staged online survey was prepared particularly for this study. The survey used the Mixed Method which gathered both qualitative and quantitative data. On the first stage of the survey, Quantitative Data Collection Method was used as the participants were asked to provide their demographic information and information regarding their profession (e.g. Q6: *How long have you been teaching English?*).

In the second step of the survey, Quantitative Data Collection Method was used again. In fact, in the second stage of the survey, the Classroom-School Context (CSC) (Friedmann & Kass, 2002) scale that examines teacher self-efficacy through two aspects; classroom context and school context. The two factors were revealed after the factor analysis was done on the data gathered from 555 participants. The classroom context in CSC Scale refers to sense of professional efficacy, educating and motivating the students and controlling the interaction between students. The school context refers to involving

in school activities, participation in decision making and taking part in the school's organizational politics. The scale initially had 36 items, however three of them were discarded since they had low item-total correlation.

The reason of adopting this scale is although there are multiple scales that assess self-efficacy of teachers, this one was conducted in an arguably similar geographical location, Israel. Therefore, it had been thought that the scale might provide with similar results when conducted in Turkey. All 33 items of the scale have been transferred to the questionnaire without any modifications. As the name suggests, CSC assesses teacher self-efficacy in classroom and school contexts. First 19 items of this scale are assessing the former factor, while the remaining items (20-33) are assessing the latter factor. Each item was measured on a five-point likert scale varying between 1, 'strongly disagree' and 5, 'strongly agree'.

In the third and final section of the online survey, the participants answered six open-ended questions. The questions were asking the teachers' perceptions regarding their classroom implications.

### 3.3 Procedure

The study took place in a large city in Turkey. The first participants were contacted through e-mails with the link of the online survey. They were kindly asked voluntarily to participate in the study and fill out the online survey. The average completion time of the survey was reported to be 15 minutes by the participants. The participant teachers were also asked to share the link of the survey with their colleagues. To reduce any bias, names of the participants were not asked.

### 3.4 Data analysis

The quantitative data were evaluated by using SPSS. The first part of the questionnaire involved demographic information and to assess that, independent T-tests and one-way ANOVA tests were used. Statistical analysis of the answers that the participant teachers gave to the CSC scale on the second part of the questionnaire showed that there is an internal consistency among the given answers. The overall reliability score of both factors was $\alpha=.884$, the first sub scale was $\alpha= .906$ and the second sub scale was $\alpha=.797$. These high reliability scores might stem from voluntary participation of the teachers. While assessing the normality of the two factors, Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used as the number of the participants were higher than 50. Normality scores of the factors were revealed to be respectively $p= .174$ and $p= .017$. This indicated that the first factor of the CSC Scale was normally distributed while the other was not. Therefore, for the Classroom context, parametric tests were used while for the School context, non-parametric tests were used.

In the first part of the CSC Scale (Classroom context) no items were reverse coded yet in the second part (School context) items 20, 22, 24, 28, 30, 31 and 33 were reverse coded. This was done through SPSS program and the normality and reliability scores included the reversed and final forms of the data.

Qualitative data in the open-ended part of the questionnaire were assessed individually and later was put on a table to divide in categories.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1 Findings concerning self-efficacy

Our first research question asked whether participant teachers' self-efficacy levels were high or low. Mean score of overall self-efficacy levels of the teachers was revealed to be 3.88 (*SD* = .45791) which is moderately high. Moreover, when assessed individually, while the participant teachers' self-efficacy mean score regarding the first factor, the classroom, was 4.08 (*SD* = .51636), it was 3.62 (*SD* = .61020) regarding the second factor, the school.

The second research question intended to investigate whether age, gender and teaching experience would affect Turkish EFL teachers' self-efficacy levels. To assess this, independent T-tests and one way ANOVA tests were used. Gender was assessed by using independent T-tests. The results indicated that gender does not affect teachers' self-efficacy (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Gender, Graduation and Working Place variables' mean scores

|  | Variables | N | M | SD | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender and self-efficacy level | Male | 23 | 3.86 | 0.54 | 0.820 |
|  | Female | 41 | 3.89 | 0.41 |  |

The remaining two variables; age and teaching experience had more than two sub groups, therefore one-way ANOVA test was applied to evaluate these variables. The findings revealed that age does not affect self-efficacy of Turkish EFL teachers.

On the other hand, after one-way ANOVA test was carried out, years of experience the participants had were revealed to be a significant variable (*p* = .011). To check the size of the effect that stems from years of teaching experience, partial eta squared method was applied and the result of the size of the effect was revealed to be relatively small (*f* = .169). The related data can be observed underlined in Table 2, under 'Sig.' and 'Partial Eta Squared' rows.

**Table 2:** Results of one-way ANOVA test concerning years of experience

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 2.238 | 3 | 0.746 | 4.079 | .011 | .169 |
| Within Groups | 10.972 | 60 | 0.183 |  |  |  |
| Total | 13.210 | 63 |  |  |  |  |

More specifically, the youngest –novice- teachers were the ones with the lowest overall self-efficacy level (*M*= 3.71) while the participants with 4-8 years of experience had the highest overall self-efficacy score (*M*= 4.11). The significant value of 1-3 experience was also supported by Tukey Post-Hoc test which suggested that the significance scores of 1-

3 years with 4-8 and 9-15 years were both $p$ = .45. In other words, the participants with the experience of 1-3 years scored significantly different in overall self-efficacy levels and this was understood because the significance level was under $p$ = .05.

Additionally, when we compare the novice teachers with the teachers with 4-8 years of experience, there is an apparent rise in 3 teacher self-efficacy factors namely, overall self-efficacy, classroom self-efficacy and school context self-efficacy. The latter teachers outmatch the former teachers in all of the self-efficacy scores. For the overall self-efficacy levels, teachers with 1-3 years of experience as while the latter had 3.71. For the self-efficacy inside the classroom, the novice teachers had 3.91 classroom self-efficacy score, on the other hand the teachers with 4-8 years of experience had 4.24. Likewise, the novice teachers had 3.44 self-efficacy score in school context while the other group had 3.93 (table 3).

**Table 3:** Self-efficacy scores and years of experience

| Experience | N | Overall | Classroom Context | School Context |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-3 years | 34 | 3.71 | 3.91 | 3.45 |
| 4-8 years | 11 | 4.11 | 4.24 | 3.93 |
| 9-15 years | 13 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 3.87 |
| Above 15 years | 6 | 4.03 | 4.42 | 3.50 |

In summary, the first section of the results has given answers to the first two research questions. The other two research questions will be answered in the following section.

## 4.2 Findings concerning classroom implications
In this section, we will try to categorize participant teachers' teaching strategies into two; traditional or contemporary. Some of the participants chose not to answer to the open-ended questions at the end of the survey. Therefore, for each question, the total number of given answers and the percentages will be provided.

## 4.3 Techniques at the beginning of the lesson
In the first question of the last part of the questionnaire, we asked the participants to describe their pedagogical strategies at the beginning of their lessons. 36 participants answered this question. Among these 36, only 5 of them (13.9 per cent) revealed to be using traditional methods while the remaining 31 (86.1 per cent) were using contemporary methods. All of the latter stated that they start their lessons by implementing warm-ups. These warm-ups include discussions about their days, talking about previous lessons, activating schemata activities and brainstorms. A couple of other participants again in the latter group stated that they were teaching in elementary schools and therefore they start lessons by singing songs and dancing. One teacher wrote, *"Sometimes I start with a video or with a question about the last lesson."* Another wrote, *"I usually tend to start my lessons by asking some related questions about a specific topic and showing videos to catch students' attention."*

5 participants who reported they were using traditional starts in beginning of their lessons said they do either chain drills or directly open their books and start to the topic.

## 4.5 Techniques for grammar teaching

To understand whether their grammar teaching practices were arguably more contemporary or traditional, we asked the participants to elaborate their activities they use while teaching grammar in the second question of the last part of the questionnaire. To this question, a total of 50 teachers gave answers. The categorization of the answers from the teachers could be seen in table 4 below. One data is missing in the table as one participant stated she was not teaching any grammar to her students.

**Table 4:** Categorization of methods used in grammar teaching

| Techniques | N |
|---|---|
| Inductive (Guided-discovery) | 26 |
| Traditional (the GTM or the ALM) | 10 |
| Mixed | 6 |
| The CLT | 4 |
| Holistic | 3 |
| Total | 49 |

In the table, Inductive, holistic and the CLT teachings are considered contemporary grammar teaching methods. Moreover, combination of both contemporary and traditional methods (mixed) is also considered as contemporary since most of these teachers stated they change their teaching techniques according to their target audience. Therefore, the total percentages for the techniques are; 10 participants (20.4 per cent) for traditional and 39 participants (79.6 per cent) for contemporary.

The teachers that were using traditional teaching techniques gave examples such as repetition, providing explicit grammar formulas and so on. One of these participants wrote, *"I draw tables and I teach explicitly."* Another wrote, *"First I try to teach in English and then I translate into Turkish."* The remaining participants stated that they were using inductive and communicative ways of teaching grammar such as guided discovery, pair discussions, role-playing activities to name a few. Some of these participants expressed that they were teaching grammar inside meaningful authentic contexts with the emphasis on first meaning and later on form. One of these teachers noted:

> *"First, I start with a story or a related situation that can be connected to the students and show the need for the specific grammar point that I am aiming for; and then, I will give an example of that grammar point emphasizing the meaning. Finally, I would talk about the grammar technicalities of that structure. Of course, all of this is usually done with the students as a discussion. After that, I provide some more examples in different situations and ask the students to provide some more examples that are true for them (if possible)."*

It is also worth noting that all three teachers that expressed the use of Holistic Approach, another communicative approach that sees language learning as a whole, were teaching young learners. These teachers stated they were using lots of movement, singing and dancing in their lessons and Holistic teaching was the most appropriate for them.

### 4.6 Techniques to consolidate newly-learned information

In the third question, the participants were asked to deliver information on how they consolidate new aspects of language that they teach. There were 43 answers totally. 6 teachers (14 per cent) reported they were only using traditional techniques such as repetitions and drills while 37 (86.1 per cent) were using contemporary techniques. These contemporary techniques included gamification, role-playing tasks and Web 2.0 tools. Some stated that they found combining gamification and Web 2.0 tools effective. One of the teachers that support this idea noted, *"I use web tools a lot, especially game-based English teaching websites to make students practice newly learned vocabulary or a structure."*

### 4.7 Techniques to increase student talking time (STT)

When we asked the fourth open-ended question of questionnaire, we wished to observe whether participant teachers were providing their students with ample number of opportunities in terms of communicating orally. 50 teachers gave answers to this question and many (n= 25, 50 per cent) stated that they were using pair and group discussions to promote student speaking. For instance, one teacher wrote, *"I try to encourage pair or group work, give my students time to elicit the answers, I usually ask open ended questions."* Another participant noted, *"Group and pair works are an easy way to facilitate STT. I also use poster presentations and role-play activities."* Some participants (n= 7, 14 per cent) stated they were also using some other CLT techniques such as role playing, information-gap activities, strip stories to name a few. The remaining 18 participants (36 per cent) reported they were asking thought provoking questions to their students. No traditional implication was observed in the answers to this question.

### 4.8 Techniques to engage students in communicative tasks and activities

In the fifth question, the participants were asked if they were frequently implementing communicative tasks and activities in their lessons. 42 teachers answered this question. 7 teachers (16.7 per cent) stated that they cannot implement such tasks. Some of these teachers showed the crowdedness of classes for reason. One wrote *"I have 42 students in my classes, are you kidding with me?"* The remaining participants stated that they were consistently using these activities and the frequencies could be seen in table 5 below. Moreover 22 (52.4 per cent) teachers expressed that they were using a wide range of activities varying from jigsaw activities to scavenger hunts. Their categorization is given under 'Other' in the same table below.

**Table 5:** Frequencies of used communicative techniques

| Techniques | N |
|---|---|
| Pair/ Group Discussions | 10 |
| Games | 4 |
| Other | 22 |
| Total | 36 |

## 4.9 Techniques to promote collaboration among students

In the sixth and final question of the questionnaire, the participants were asked if they believed in the effectiveness of collaboration among students and how much they were using it. There were 38 returned answers among which, 2 of them stated they do not implement collaborative activities during lessons. One participant wrote, *"I don't implement collaborative activities because the number of my students is not appropriate for such activities."* On the other hand, the remaining 36 teachers believed such activities are important. One wrote, *"In all of my lessons, collaboration is the key to form the social environment of the classroom."* and another wrote *"I get students to work together a lot so that they can build confidence in their learning and have more time to speak. It also gives them a sense of achievement when they work together to reach a communicative goal."* The frequencies of the techniques used by the participants could be seen in table 6 below

**Table 6:** Frequencies of used collaborative techniques

| Techniques | N |
|---|---|
| Pair/ Group works | 24 |
| Other | 12 |
| Total | 36 |

As can be seen in the table, almost all participants stated they were using pair/ group works to promote collaboration among students. Yet, 12 participants gave different examples such as role-playing activities, games, presentations to name a few.

In this section, findings regarding the third and fourth research questions were presented. However, the analyze of them will be done in the following section.

## 5. Discussion

In the view of the data analyzed, the results suggest the following aspects. Firstly, the study asked whether Turkish EFL teachers had high or low self-efficacy. The findings indicated the participated teachers have indeed moderately high self-efficacy. Furthermore, they had even higher self-efficacy in classroom contexts, compared to school contexts. Since the study was conducted in a large city of Turkey, this finding could be generalized to other EFL teachers around the country. However, the sample was not quite big, thus for stronger assumptions on generalization, a bigger sample is needed in future studies.

Secondly, the study aimed to investigate the effect of teachers' age, gender and experience variables. While neither age nor gender did, years of experience affected teachers' self-efficacy levels. The teachers with the lowest self-efficacy were the novice teachers, having an experience between 1-3 years. Since they are fairly new to carrying out the profession, their beliefs in their own teaching must have started to get shaped quite recently. Through time, it is most likely that they become more aware of their own capabilities, resulting in their self-efficacy levels rise even higher. This idea can be supported by the data that compares novice teachers and teachers with 4-8 years of experience as the latter outscored the former in self-efficacy score, indicating that the more teaching experience teachers have, the more self-efficacious they are. This finding is supported by what Penrose, Perry and Ball (2007) pointed out; age and gender does not affect teachers' levels of self-efficacy whereas the length of experience does.

The third finding that the study has proposed was teachers with high self-efficacy levels used more modern pedagogical strategies to teach a foreign language. The sample group had a moderately high self-efficacy score and they were using modern methods of teaching. For instance, the first open-ended question asked whether the teachers were using warm-ups to start a lesson. This question was added because warm-ups have a vital position in effective teaching and learning of a target language (Cheung, 2001) along with playing a supportive role by creating a comfortable environment for the learners to be actively involved in their own learning (Hansen & Liu, 2005). Almost all of the participants stated that they were indeed using warm-ups to start their lessons.

Furthermore, very few teachers stated they were mostly using techniques from old teaching methods such as the Grammar Translation Method or the Audio-Lingual Method. Grammar teaching methods was one of the major indicators which shows the participated teachers are using contemporary methods because most of them stated they were teaching grammar through meaningful contexts. This way of grammar teaching has also been suggested by many researchers (e.g. Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2002; Long, 1998) therefore it is safe to say that the majority of the participant teachers were using rather contemporary techniques to teach grammar. This finding indicates that teachers' use of contemporary techniques indeed might be stemming from their moderately high teacher self-efficacy and the higher self-efficacy the teachers have, the more likely they will use innovative approaches in designing their lessons.

The fourth and last finding of the study suggested that it is highly possible that the teachers with high self-efficacy are trying to carry out their lessons by putting the learner and the learning into center. These teachers showed they care about communicative and collaborative activities, which leads to more student talk and more learning centered lessons. The study points out that teachers with high self-efficacy will most likely implement communicative and collaborative tasks/ activities in their lessons. These findings corroborate the ideas of Eslami and Fatahi (2008) who suggested that if the teachers feel more efficacious, they are more inclined to use communicative-based strategies. The findings are also in agreement with Kaygisiz, Anagun and Karahan's (2018) findings which suggested teachers' self-efficacy levels were significant predictors of their

language teaching methods and higher self-efficacy led to more Communication-Oriented teachings.

Of course, all these results may not be generalizable to a broader range as they are based on a small sample. Further empirical studies with bigger samples are needed to strengthen the assumptions proposed by the findings of this study.

## 6. Recommendations & Limitations

The findings of this study will help the researchers who are interested in the same field of investigation by providing a nice insight for their future studies. However, the fact that there is not enough empirical studies on this gap in the field makes it difficult to support the findings and interpretations of this study. Further studies are needed to be more certain on the effect of teacher self-efficacy on teaching methods. This study also suffers from having a small sample group. For better assumptions and generalizations, there needs to be more participants to help the study. Finally, lack of sample with low teacher self-efficacy made it impossible to compare two groups. That would have given a more accurate understanding of teacher self-efficacy's relationship with teaching methods. Further researches should explore the same issue without the counted limitations.

## 7. Conclusion

This study has examined the role of teacher self-efficacy on teaching methods and presented findings to prove the relationship between them. The study maintains its importance at investigating the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and used teaching methods. The reason of this is because prior studies, if they focused on teaching methods, investigated whether the used method is Communication Oriented or not (e.g. Eslami & Fatahi, 2008; Kaygisiz et al., 2018). However, this study found a huge gap in the field and tried to examine the outcomes of teacher self-efficacy on the used teaching method by focusing on its novelty. Whether the used method is novel or not seems to be affected by teachers' beliefs on their capabilities while carrying out their professions. Since higher teacher self-efficacy will lead to more effective teaching, more contemporary methods will have the identical effect.

With each new era of language teaching, new assumptions on teaching more effectively arise. In this day and age, it is almost impossible to expect effective results by implementing the 'dead' methods of 50-60 years ago. What teachers of the 21st century need to realize is that the classroom implementations should keep up with the recent trends. It is obvious that in the 21st century, we need EFL teachers with high self-efficacy who diversify their teaching with novel methods instead of sticking to one method.

Given that the new era of SLA requires contemporary teaching that cares deeply about the inclusion of communication, collaboration and differentiated learning, teachers' levels of self-efficacy play a huge role. Higher teacher self-efficacy means more contemporary teaching, and that is why one of the most important aspects that English

teachers should improve is their levels of self-efficacy. Since the increased teacher self-efficacy has a chance to impact the teaching designs directly, it should be one of the utmost goals of EFL teachers that they find ways to achieve higher levels of self-efficacy to implement more contemporary teaching.

**Conflict of Interest Statement**

The author declares no conflicts of interests.

**About the Author**

The author of the study, Ümit Levent Değirmencioğlu is a master of arts student at a respectable university in Bursa, Turkey. Currently, he is writing his thesis on the Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions towards grammar teaching. The author's fields of interest are namely, teacher training, approaches and methodology and post-method teaching.

**References**

Allwright, R. L. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied linguistics*, *5*(2), 156-171.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2), 191.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press.

Bell, D. M. (2003). Method and postmethod: Are they really so incompatible?. *TESOL quarterly*, *37*(2), 325-336.

Bradley, L., Lindström, B., & Rystedt, H. (2010). Rationalities of collaboration for language learning in a wiki. *ReCALL*, *22*(2), 247-265.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2003). A test of the factorial validity of the teacher efficacy scale. *Research in Education*, *69*(1), 67-79.

Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching (5th ed.). Pearson Education.

Cheung, C. K. (2001). The use of popular culture as a stimulus to motivate secondary students' English learning in Hong Kong. *ELT journal*, *55*(1), 55-61.

Dembo, M. H., & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. *The elementary school journal*, *86*(2), 173-184.

Evers, W. J., Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2002). Burnout and self-efficacy: A study on teachers' beliefs when implementing an innovative educational system in the Netherlands. *British Journal of educational psychology*, *72*(2), 227-243.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2002). Doing focus-on-form. *System*, *30*(4), 419-432.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. John Wiley & Sons.

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), n4.

Friedman, I. A., & Farber, B. A. (1992). Professional self-concept as a predictor of teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *86*(1), 28-35.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). Explorations in the functions of language.

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT journal*, *59*(1), 31-38.

Huba, M. E., & Freed, J. E. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning*. Allyn & Bacon, 160 Gould St., Needham Heights, MA 02494.

Kaygisiz, S., Anagun, S. S., & Karahan, E. (2018). The Predictive Relationship between Self-Efficacy Levels of English Teachers and Language Teaching Methods. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *18*(78), 183-202.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Routledge.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University.

Long, M. H. (1998). Focus on form Theory, research, and practice Michael H. Long Peter Robinson. *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, *15*, 15-41.

Moore, W. P., & Esselman, M. E. (1994). Exploring the Context of Teacher Efficacy: The Role of Achievement and Climate.

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2004). 6. Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *24*, 126-145.

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. Routledge.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 7625 Empire Dr., Florence, KY 41042-2978.

Nunan, D. (2010). *Teaching English to young learners*. Anaheim University.

Penrose, A., Perry, C., & Ball, I. (2007). Emotional intelligence and teacher self-efficacy: The contribution of teacher status and length of experience. *Issues in educational research*, *17*(1), 107-126.

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'education*, 51-65.

Schwab, R. L., & Iwanicki, E. F. (1982). Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and teacher burnout. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *18*(1), 60-74.

Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological reports*, *51*(2), 663-671.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, *97*, 114.