

Allameh Tabataba'i University

Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages Department of English Language and Literature

The Relationship between Teachers' and Learners' Expectations of Teacher Efficacy and Selected Teacher and Learner Characteristics

Advisor: Dr. Zia Tajeddin

Reader: Dr. Mohammad Khatib

By: Neda Khodaverdi

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Studies Office in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in
Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Tehran, Iran

July, 2009

Dedication

Dedicated to whom I love

Acknowledgment

First and foremost I thank God for His help that made my journey to higher education possible. I would like to express my deepest admiration and gratitude to my advisor, Doctor Tajeddin. I have had the privilege to bask in the knowledge and expertise of a true master.

I am especially grateful to Doctor Khatib for his meticulous perusal of my thesis and academic advice throughout my research.

I would like to express my deepest thanks to Doctor Marefat for her invaluable support, time and commitment to my work for taking the quality of my research to the higher level.

Moreover, I would like to express my deep appreciation to all my colleagues and all the teachers in Simin Institute who kindly helped me in gathering my data.

My heartfelt thank goes to my parents and family for their patience and sacrifice throughout my life. Finally, I would like to acknowledge friends with whom I have shared my thoughts and emotion: Sepideh Farshchi, Hale Khodaverdi, Fariba Mortazavi, Azita Shoghi, and Ghazal Elmi. I wish all of you the best in coming years.

Abstract

Teacher training and teacher education have been in a state of flux for many years. In recent years teacher education has become a frequent subject matter in the area of language teaching and has been given a special attention as a result of many researches in different related fields such as the sub-field of teacher self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) which was the focus of this study. This study investigated the relationship between teacher's expectation and their students' expectation of teacher efficacy regarding the six sub-scales of teacher efficacy as developed by Bobbett, Dellinger, Ellet, and Oliver (2007), which were management/climate, communication/clarification, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning routines and higher order thinking skills. Furthermore, this study explored how significantly the aforementioned six sub-scales of teacher efficacy were related to three selected teacher characteristics. namely gender, years of experiencing teaching English as a foreign language, and their field of study. It also investigated the relationship between learners' expectation of teacher efficacy and two learner characteristics: their gender and language level. 629 students and 59 teachers took part in this study. They completed Efficacy Beliefs System-Self Form (TEBS-Self) designed by Dellinger, Bobbett, Olivier and Ellett (2007). Results indicated no significant relation between teacher's expectation and students' expectation of teacher efficacy regarding the aforementioned six sub-scales. The findings also showed that the three focused teacher characteristics, gender, experience and related field of study, were not significantly related to teacher selfefficacy; but, learners' characteristics their gender and language level were significantly related to their expectation of teacher self-efficacy. The findings of the present study posed several implications for teacher educators, researchers and classroom teachers such as making teachers aware of reflective method and keeping students motivated through the duration of their learning a new language by taking their needs and interest into consideration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Title | Page |
|---|------|
| Dedication. | ii |
| Dedication | ш |
| Acknowledgement | iii |
| Abstract | iv |
| List of Tables and Figures. | vii |
| CHAPTER 1: Introduction | |
| 1.1. Preliminaries | 1 |
| 1.2. Statement of the Problem | 4 |
| 1.3. Significance of the Study | |
| 1.4. Purpose of the Study | 6 |
| 1.5. Research Questions. | 7 |
| 1.6. Research Hypotheses | 8 |
| 1.7. Definitions of the Key Terms | |
| 1.8. Limitations and Delimitations | 11 |
| CHAPTER 2: Review of the Related Literature | |
| 2.1. Teacher Efficacy: Tracing its Roots, Finding its Meaning | 12 |
| 2.2. Social Cognitive Theory | 15 |
| 2.3. Sources of Efficacy Information. | 17 |
| 2.3.1. Mastery Experience. | 18 |
| 2.3.2. Physiological and Emotional Cues | 19 |
| 2.3.3 Vicarious Experiences | 19 |

| 2.3.4. Verbal Persuasion | 20 |
|---|---------|
| 2.4. Cognitive Processes. | 22 |
| 2.5. Teacher Efficacy Measurement | 23 |
| 2.5.1. Rotter and Rand. | 23 |
| 2.5.2. Teacher Locus of Control. | 28 |
| 2.5.3. Responsibility for Student Achievement | 29 |
| 2.5.4. Webb Scale | 31 |
| 2.5.5. Gibson and Dembo Instrument | 32 |
| 2.5.6. Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument | 37 |
| 2.5.7. Ashton Vignettes. | 39 |
| 2.5.8. Bandura's Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale | 41 |
| 2.5.9. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy Model of Teacher Efficacy | 44 |
| 2.5.10. Teachers' Efficacy Belief System-Self Form. | 45 |
| 2.6. Teacher Efficacy and Teacher Self-Efficacy: a History of Confusion | 47 |
| CHAPTER 3: Methodology | |
| 3.1. Introduction | 51 |
| 3.2. Participants | 51 |
| 3.3. Design | 54 |
| 3.4. Instrumentation | 55 |
| 3.5. Data Collection Procedure | 57 |
| 3.6. Data Analysis Procedure | 59 |
| CHAPTER 4: Results and Discussion | |
| 4.1. Introduction. | 61 |
| 4.2. Restatement of the Research Hypotheses | 62 |
| 4.3. Discussion. | 72 |
| CAHPTER 5: Conclusions, Implications and Suggestions for F | 'urther |
| Studies | |
| 5.1. Introduction | 76 |
| 5.2. An Overview of the Study | 76 |
| 5.3. Conclusions | 77 |
| 5.4. Pedago gical Implications. | 79 |
| 5.5. Suggestions for Further Studies | 80 |

| References | 82 |
|--|------------|
| Appendix I: Teachers' Efficacy Beliefs System_ Self Form | 88 |
| Appendix II: TEBS-Self, Teacher's Version | 89 |
| Appendix III: TEBS-Self, Student's Version | 91 |
| Appendix IV: Frequency Distribution of Each Teacher's Students | 93 |
| Appendix V: Scheffé Test | 96 |
| List of Tables and Figures | |
| Title | Page |
| Table 3.1: Frequency Distribution of Participants. | 51 |
| Table 3.2: Frequency Distribution of Teachers' Gender | 52 |
| Table 3.3: Frequency Distribution of Teachers' Experience of Teaching Eng Foreign Language | |
| Table 3.4: Frequency Distribution of Teachers Based on Their Degrees | |
| Table 3.5: Frequency Distribution of Teachers Based on Relatedness of their | r Field of |
| Study to Language Teaching. | 53 |
| Table 3.6: Frequency Distribution of Students Based on their Gender | 54 |
| Table 3.7: Frequency Distribution of Students Based on their Proficiency Le | evel54 |
| Table 3.8: Items Related to Each Sub-scale of the TEBS-Self. | 57 |
| Table 4.1: Correlation Coefficient between Teacher's Expectation and Learn | iers' |
| Expectation of Teacher Efficacy | 63 |
| Table 4.2: Inferential Statistics for the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the Relationship between Teachers' Genderates and the Company of the | ler and |
| Teacher Efficacy | 64 |
| Table 4.3: Inferential Statistics for the Relationship between Teacher's Year | s of |
| Experience as Foreign Language Teacher and Teacher Efficacy | 66 |
| Table 4.4: Inferential Statistics for the Relationship between Teachers' Field | s of |
| Study and Teacher Efficacy | 68 |

| Table 4.5: Independent samples t-test for the relationship between learners' | |
|--|-----|
| expectation of teacher efficacy and learners' gender | 69 |
| Table 4.6: ANOVA for the Relationship between Learners' Expectation of Teacher Effic | acy |
| and Leamers' Proficiency Level | 71 |
| Figure 1: Differences between Teacher Self-efficacy Beliefs and Teacher | |
| Efficacy | 49 |

فرم گردآوری اطلاعات پلیان نامه ها

كتابخانه مركزى دانشگاه علامه طباطبايي

عنوان: تاثیر ویژگی های معلم بر انتظارات معلم از خود و انتظارات دانش آموز از کارآمدی معلم و مشخصات خاص معلم و دانش آموز

نویسنده/ محقق: ندا خداوردی

مترجم: ندارد

استاد راهنما: دكتر ضياء تاج الدين استاد مشاور: دكتر محمّد خطيب

استاد داور: دكتر فهيمه معرفت

کتابنامه: دارد **واژه نامه:** ندارد

نوع پایان نامه: بنیادی □ توسعه ای □ کاربردی ■

مقطع تحصیلی: 88-1387

محل تحصیل: تهران نام دانشگاه: علامه طباطبایی

دانشکده: ادبیات فارسی و زبانهای خارجی

تعداد صفحات:96 گروه آموزشی: زبان و ادبیات انگلیسی

کلید واژه ها به زبان فارسی:

کارآمدی معلم، باور معلم از کارآمدی خود، انتظارات معلم از کارآمدی خود، انتظارات معلم از نتایج کار، خرده

مقیاس های کارآمدی معلم.

كليد واژه به زبان انگليسي:

Teacher Efficacy, Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs, Efficacy Expectation, Outcome Expectation, Teacher Self-Efficacy Sub-Scales.

الف. موضوع و طرح مسئله (اهميت موضوع و هدف):

این تحقیق با موضوع تاثیر ویژگی های معلم بر انتظارات معلم از خود و انتظارات دانش آموز از کارآمدی معلم و مشخصات خاص معلم و دانش آموز به انجام رسید. هدف از این تحقیق بررسی تفاوت موجود میان شناخت معلم از خود و آنچه شاگردانش در واقعیت و محیط کلاس با آن روبه رو هستند، بود.علاوه بر هدف اولیه ذکر شده، برخی مشخصات معلم و شاگردنیز به عنوان هدف ثانویه بررسی شد.

ب. مبانی نظری شامل مرور مختصری از منابع ، چارچوب نظری و پرسشها و فرضیه ها:

در سال های اخیر، توجه زیادی به مفهوم "کارآمدی معلم" شده است و تحقیقات زیادی نیز در این زمینه انجام شده است. این مفهوم اولین بار توسط آلبرت بندورا (1977) با تعریف مفهوم "خود کارآمدی" استفاده شد. تحقیقات در خصوص کارآمدی معلم ارتباط مستقیمی با پرسش نامه های تهیه شده در این زمینه دارد. تا سال 2007، نه پرسش نامه متفاوت تهیه و در تحقیقات مختلف استفاده شد. مدل شانن مورن وول فلک هوی معروف ترین آن ها بود که در سال 2001 تدوین گردید. در سال 2007 دلینگر و همکارانش پرسش نامه ای جامع تر با تقسیم بندی متفاوتی ارائه دادند که در این مطالعه از آن استفاده شده است.

برای بررسی اهداف این تحقیق شش سوال مطرح شد: 1. آیا بین انتظارات دانش آموز و معلم از کارآمدی خود در خصوص شش خرده مقیاس ار تبلطات، محیط کلاس، توجه به تفاوت های فردی، انگیزه های دانش آموزان، مدیریت روش های یادگیری و مهارت های فکری ار تبلطی و جود دارد؟ 2. آیا بین جسیت معلم و شش خرده مقیاس کارآمدی معلم تفلوت معنداری و جود دارد؟ 3. آیا بین سابقه تدریس معلم و شش خرده مقیاس کارآمدی معلم در دانشگاه و شش خرده مقیاس کارآمدی معلم ار تباطی و جود دارد؟ 4. آیا بین رشته تحصیلی معلم در دانشگاه و شش خرده مقیاس کارآمدی معلم تفاوت معناداری و جود دارد؟ 5. آیا بین جسیت دانش آموزان و انتظارات آن ها از کارآمدی معلم ار تباطی و جود دارد؟ بین معناداری و جود دارد؟ 6. آیا بین سلطح مهارت های زبانی دانش آموزان و انتظارات آن ها از کارآمدی خود در خصوص شش بر همین اساس شش فرضیه زیر نیز در نظر گرفته شد: 1. بین انتظارات دانش آموزان، مدیریت روش های یادگیری و مهارت خرده مقیاس ار تباطی و جود ندارد. 2. بین جسیت معلم و شش خرده مقیاس کارآمدی معلم تفاوت معناداری و جود ندارد. 3. بین سابقه تدریس معلم و شش خرده مقیاس کارآمدی معلم در دانشگاه و شش خرده مقیاس کارآمدی معلم در دانشگاه و شش خرده مقیاس کارآمدی معلم تفاوت معناداری و جود ندارد. 5. بین جسیت دانش آموزان و انتظارات آن ها از کارآمدی معلم از تباطی و جود ندارد. 6. بین معلم تفاوت معناداری و جود ندارد. 6. بین جسیت دانش آموزان و انتظارات آن ها از کارآمدی معلم از تباطی و جود ندارد. 6. بین معلم از تباطی و جود ندارد. 6. بین سطح مهارت های زبانی دانش آموزان و انتظارات آن ها از کارآمدی معلم از تباطی و جود ندارد.

پ: روش تحقیق شامل تعریف مفاهیم ، روش تحقیق، جامعه مورد تحقیق، نمونه گیری و روشهای نمونه گیری، ابزار اندازه گیری، نحوه اجرای آن ، شیوه اجرای آن و تجزیه و تحلیل داده ها:

جامعه مورد تحقیق شامل دو گروه بود. 629 دانش آموز و 59 معلم در این تحقیق شرکت داشتند. پرسش نامه استفاده شده در این تحقیق، در واقع معل ترجمه شده پرسش نامه دلینگر و همکارانش البته با کمی تغییر می باشد. دانش آموزان و معلمان هر کدام پرسش نامه های مربوط به خود را پر کردند. معلم ها پرسش نامه ها را در زمان بین دو کلاس پر کردند و برخی هم پس از یک یا دو هفته آن را تحویل منشی موسسه دادند. پرسش نامه مربوط به دانش آموزان در ده دقیقه آخر کلاس توزیع گردید و در برخی کلاس ها نیز زمان توزیع آن به خود معلم سپرده شد. نکته مهم این بود که دانش آموزان پرسش نامه را در رابطه با معلم همان ترم و در محیط همان کلاس تکمیل کردند. پس از جمع آوری اطلاعات، با استفاده از نرم افزار SPSS تحلیل آماری انجام شد. تلیل آماری با استفاده از آزمون های همبستگی پیرسون، تی مستقل و آنالیز واریانس انجام شد.

ت: يافته هاى تحقيق:

یافته های این تحقیق نشان داد که هیچ گونه ارتباطی بین انتظارات معلم و دانش آموزان از کارآمدی معلم در خصوص شش خرده مقیاس نکر شده وجود ندارد. همچنین نتایج نشان داد که بین سه مشخصه معلم یعنی جنسیت، سابقه تدریس و مرتبط بودن رشته تحصیلی و کارآمدی معلم نیز ارتباط معناداری و جود ندارد. بنا بر یافته ها، بین جنسیت و سطح مهارت زبانی دانش آموزان و انتظارات آن ها از کارآمدی معلم ارتباطات در بیشتر خرده مقیاس ها معنادار شد.

ث: نتیجه گیری و پیشنهادات:

نتایج نشل داد که دانش آموزان در مقاطع ابتدایی یادگیری زبان بسیار با انگیزه هستند ولی رقه رفته انگیزه هلیسان کم رنگ می شود. بنا براین معلم ها باید سعی کنند انگیزه شاگردان را تا مقاطع بالای یادگیری زبان از طریق مختلف حفظ کنند. یکی از این روش ها آگاه کردن معلم ها از متد بازنگری می باشد. بنابر این پیشنهاد می شود که مسئولین و مدیران موسسات، معلم ها را از این شیوه آگاه کنند تا آن ها بعد از هر جاسه تدریس نکات مثبت و منفی آن جاسه را در نظر بگیرند. البته مسئولین باید در نظر داشته باشند که پرسش نامه به تنهایی برای ارزیابی معلم ها و شاگردان کافی نیست، بلکه استفاده از مصاحبه و مشاهده نیز توصیه می شود. پیشنهاد می شود در تحقیقات آتی، جمعیت گسترده تری از معلم ها پرسش نامه ها را تکمیل کنند تا نتایج دقیق تری حاصل آید. همچنین در نظر گرفتن دیگر مشخصات معلم ها و زبان آموزان و بررسی دوباره پرسش نامه ترجمه شده توصیه می شود.

| را گواهی می نمایم. | در فرم | امه و ضوابط مندر ج | بر اساس مدتوای پایان ن | در این فرم ب | صحت اطلاعات مندرج |
|--------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
|--------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------|

نام استاد راهنما:

سمت علمي:

نام دانشکده:

رئيس كتابخانه:

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. Preliminaries

How effectively we teach, as Biggs and Tang (2007), argue depends, first, on what we think teaching is. Three levels of thinking about teaching are distinguished. The first two are "blame" models, the first blaming the learner, the second, the teacher. The third model integrates learning and teaching, seeing effective teaching as encouraging students to use the learning activities most likely to achieve the outcomes intended. To do this requires some knowledge of how students learn. Biggs and Tang (2007) discuss that students may use inappropriate or low-level activities resulting in a surface approach to learning, or high-level activities appropriate to achieving the intended outcomes, resulting in a deep approach to learning. Good teaching supports those appropriate learning activities and discourages inappropriate ones.

Effective teaching requires that we eliminate those aspects of our teaching that encourage surface approaches to learning and that we set the stage properly so that students can more readily use deep approaches to learning. This involves getting students to agree that appropriate task engagement is a good and impelling idea (otherwise known as motivation), and establishing the kind of climate that will optimize appropriate interactions with our students. An important aspect of effective teaching is reflective practice which enables teachers to create an improved teaching environment suited to their own context.

Following the rise of the postmethod debate, according to Akbari (2007) teachers' qualifications and personality features have become objectives of interest to many teacher educators. Through the use of reflective models, teachers are required to be competent practitioners who can directly solve their learners' problems and make crucial decisions related to their students' learning outcomes; in other words, language teacher profession has become aware of the centrality of teacher's roles in learners'

success. The rise of reflective teaching in ELT can be regarded as one of the consequences of the postmethod debate (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, 2001, 2006; Prabhu, 1990). As Akbari (2007) argues, care should be taken regarding the misinterpretations of reflection but the idea of reflection, is valuable because it gives practitioners a stronger sense of autonomy and gives them authority to make decisions in the classroom instead of waiting for academic sections as to what can or cannot be done. Biggs and Tang (2007) believe that wise and effective teaching is not, however, simply a matter of applying general principles of teaching according to rules; they need adapting to each teacher's own personal strengths and teaching context, so good teachers have willingness to collect student feedback on their teaching in order to see where their teaching might be improved. Expert teachers continually reflect on how they might teach even better. Research in the field of teacher efficacy can be regarded as one of the sub-branches of research through reflective approach because right at the moment that a teacher think whether he/she is efficacious or not, that's a starting point of being reflective.

Teachers' concerns about their professional practice have attracted the attention of researchers for quite some time now. Researchers have identified a wide range of teaching concerns as teachers to handling the demands of teaching tasks, having an impact on students learning, and improving the educational system more generally. Furthermore, the literature has identified several personal and contextual variables that influence the development of teaching concerns. Among these variables are gender, previous experiences, and overall experiences as Ghaith and Shaaban (1999) discussed.

The role of self-efficacy in teaching and learning is one of the interests of researchers and practitioners. Teachers' sense of efficacy or their judgments about

their abilities to promote students' learning was identified over two decades as one of the few teacher characteristics related to student achievement (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Teacher's sense of efficacy appears to be a powerful belief that affects teaching and learning, teacher educators, administrators, and policy makers.

In order to be effective, teachers need more than content and pedagogy knowledge. Teachers' beliefs about their own teaching capabilities and professional practice have powerful influence on their teaching effectiveness. Teacher's sense of efficacy has been defined as "the teacher's belief in his or her capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplishing a specific teaching task in a particular context" (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p. 233). Another definition by Guskey and Passaro (1998) is "teachers' belief or convictions that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated" (cited in Brouwers & Tomic, 2000, p.240). Knoblauch and Woolfolk Hoy (2007) believe that teacher's sense of efficacy can be viewed as self-efficacy beliefs directed toward a teaching context and it is grounded within social cognitive theory. These efficacy beliefs have been shown to powerfully predict choice of task, effort, persistence, and the level of success achieved (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997). A growing body of empirical research supports Bandura's (1977) theory that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs would be related to the effort teachers invest in teaching, the goal they set, their persistence when things do not go smoothly, and their resilience in the face of setbacks (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

The researcher in this study focuses on six sub-scales of teacher efficacy, namely communication/clarification, management/climate, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning routines, and higher-order thinking skills and their relation to teachers' characteristics such as gender, years of

experiencing teaching English as a foreign language, and their field of study. Also the relationship between learners' expectation of teacher efficacy and learners' gender and their language level was investigated.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Bandura (1977) introduced the concept of self-efficacy beliefs as an assessment of one's capabilities to attain a desired level of performance in a given endeavor. He proposed that belief in one's abilities was a powerful drive influencing motivation to act, the effort put forth in the endeavor, and the persistence of coping mechanisms in the face of obstacles. Self-efficacy theory, applied in the education realm, has inspired a lot of researchers into how teachers' self-efficacy beliefs are related to their actions and to the outcomes they achieve (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). According to social cognitive theory, teachers who do not expect to be successful with certain students are likely put forth less effort in preparation and delivery of instruction, and to give up easily at the first sign of difficulty, even if they actually know of strategies that could assist these students if applied.

Bandura (1997) repeatedly distinguishes between efficacy expectation and outcome expectation by discussing differences in the chronology of occurrence and focus of each type of expectation. In foreign language teaching context, there is usually a mismatch between teachers' and students' expectations. These mismatches might emanate from different factors such as communication, management, individual differences, motivation, learning routines, and higher order thinking. These factors may be affected on one hand by teachers' gender, related field of study, and their teaching experience and on the other hand by learners' expectations of teacher

efficacy regarding their gender and language level. So this study investigates the relationship among the aforementioned factors.

1.3. Significance of the Study

Teacher efficacy has been shown to be related to a number of important issues, including selected teacher characteristics (Ghaith & Shaaban, 1999), amount of teaching experience in in-service and prospective teachers (Torre Cruz & Casanova Arias, 2007), the influence of contextual factors (Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008), burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Fives, Hamman, & Olivarez, 2007; Akbari & Allvar, 2007), teachers' predictions of student success (Tournaki & Podell, 2005), and self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

In the last three decades, teacher efficacy has gained a lot of significance and from the time of its conception, the construct of teacher efficacy has been closely linked to the measures by which it is assessed; therefore, any discussion of its meaning is linked to the measurement issues. Teacher efficacy was originally developed by Rand researchers using Rotter's work (1966) on locus of control and then its meaning was extended by lots of other researchers until Albert Bandura's (1977) social cognitive theory aroused. Lots of researches have been done in this regard as mentioned above and many researchers have tried to explore the relationship between the construct of efficacy and its role in the teaching experience. According to the researcher investigation there is a gap in literature regarding the relationship between how capable the teachers are and what their students think of their abilities considering sub-scales of efficacy namely the six teacher communication/clarification, management/climate, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning routines, and higher-order thinking skills and their relation with both teacher's characteristics such as gender, years of experience as a foreign language teacher and related field of study and learners' characteristics such as gender and their language level. So this study could have some implications for further research in Iran EFL context.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

Usually teachers who have been experiencing teaching English for many years have their own teaching routines. They stick to these methods or even a single method for many years. The basis of these routines is their own experience of their first year of teaching English as a foreign language. Whatever they gain those days as their own experience or from reading books or teacher training courses, they save it for their whole teaching life. Nowadays some teachers try to keep themselves up to date but many others don't like changing their usual methods of teaching. They believe that whatever they are doing in their closed-door classes is the best; however, what their students think about them can be totally vice versa. As an explicit example, the researchers can point to how teachers behave facing their students. Usually teachers think that they don't have an apple of eye in a class but if you talk to their students you will come up with some other results. Many researches have been done focusing each on some variables such as teacher burnout, teacher age, teacher experience, teacher personality type and lots of others and teacher efficacy.

The purpose of this study is investigating the relationship between teacher's expectation and their students' expectation about teacher efficacy regarding the six sub-scales of teacher efficacy: communication/clarification, management/climate, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning

routines, and higher-order thinking skills. Furthermore, this study explores how significantly the aforementioned six sub-scales of teacher efficacy are related to three selected teacher characteristics, namely gender, years of experiencing teaching English as a foreign language, and their field of study. It also investigates the relationship between learners' expectation of teacher efficacy and two learner characteristics: their gender and language level. In order to examine these issues the following research questions are raised.

1.5. Research Questions

- 1. Is there any relationship between students' expectation and teacher's expectation of teacher efficacy regarding the six sub-scales of communication/clarification, management/climate, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning routines, and higher-order thinking skills?
- 2. Is there any significant difference between teachers' gender and the six subscales of communication/clarification, management/climate, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning routines, and higher-order thinking skills?
- 3. Is there any relationship between teachers' years of experiencing teaching English as a foreign language and the six sub-scales of communication/clarification, management/climate, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning routines, and higher-order thinking skills?

- 4. Is there any significant difference between relatedness of teachers' field of study to teaching English and the six sub-scales of communication/clarification, management/climate, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning routines, and higher-order thinking skills and the?
- 5. Is there any significant difference between learners' expectations of teacher efficacy and learners' gender?
- 6. Is there any relationship between learners' expectation of teacher efficacy and learners' proficiency level?

1.6. Research Hypotheses

- 1. There is no relationship between students' expectation and teacher's expectation of teacher efficacy regarding the six sub-scales of communication/clarification, management/climate, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning routines, and higher-order thinking skills.
- 2. There is no significant difference between teachers' gender and the six subscales of communication/clarification, management/climate, accommodating individual differences, motivation of students, managing learning routines, and higher-order thinking skills.