

# Students' Perceptions on their EFL Teacher Efficacy: A Study on EFL Teachers' Language Proficiency and their Self-efficacy<sup>1</sup>

*Juanita Catalina Argudo Serrano<sup>2</sup>, Tammy Mercedes Fajardo-Dack<sup>3</sup>, Monica Patricia Abad Celleri<sup>4</sup>, Universidad de Cuenca, Cuenca, Ecuador & Homero Patricio Cabrera-Tenecela<sup>5</sup>, AiA Cia, Ltda, Cuenca, Ecuador*

## Abstract

Recent research has shown the increasing number of non-native English-speaking teachers (NNEST) around the world. Research has also considered different attributes these teachers need to have in order to be effective in their professional practices. In this light, this study examines the relationship between NNEST's language proficiency and their sense of self-efficacy in relation to students' perceptions about teacher efficacy in three different dimensions: Efficacy for instructional strategies, efficacy for classroom management, and efficacy for student engagement. A correlational quantitative design was used in which six private high schools from Cuenca, Ecuador, participated. Seventeen teachers from these schools were requested to provide an English proficiency certificate and respond to a self-efficacy survey. In the meantime, their 661 students completed a teacher's efficacy survey. The results revealed that although there are teachers who have a good level of language proficiency, according to their students, it is not necessarily an indicator of efficacy in their practices. Suggestions for further research that might help to explain the current situation are given.

## Resumen

Recientes investigaciones han demostrado el incremento de profesores de inglés no nativo hablantes (PINN) en todo el mundo. Se han considerado también diferentes atributos que estos docentes deben tener para ser efectivos en sus prácticas profesionales. En este sentido, el presente estudio analiza la relación entre el dominio del idioma inglés de PINN y su percepción de autoeficacia en relación con las percepciones de los estudiantes sobre la eficacia de su maestro en tres dimensiones diferentes: eficacia para las estrategias de instrucción, eficacia para el manejo del aula y eficacia para comprometer a los estudiantes. Para este estudio se utilizó un diseño cuantitativo correlacional en el que participaron seis colegios privados de Cuenca, Ecuador. Se solicitó a diecisiete profesores un certificado de dominio del inglés y sus respuestas a una encuesta de autoeficacia. Mientras tanto, sus 661 estudiantes completaron una encuesta para evaluar la eficacia de sus maestros. Los resultados revelaron que, aunque hay profesores que tienen un buen nivel de dominio del idioma, según sus estudiantes, no es necesariamente un indicador de eficacia en sus prácticas. Se dan sugerencias para futuras investigaciones que podrían ayudar a explicar la situación actual.

## Introduction

Teaching a foreign language effectively does not necessarily require teachers to be native speakers of the language they teach (Farrell & Richards, 2007). However, the optimum language level a non-native English-speaking teacher (NNEST) is something that has been called into question by research. Therefore, it seems crucial to determine the relation between teachers' language proficiency level not only with their sense of self-efficacy but also with their students' perceptions of their teacher's efficacy to define this relationship interaction with other aspects of teaching (Bailey, 2006; Kamhi-Stein, 2009). This is an important factor that needs to be taken into account as students' perceptions are a fundamental aspect in the evaluation of teachers' performance.

Regarding didactic and pedagogical knowledge, and skills needed by EFL/ESL teachers, common concern suggest these factors influence on students' learning and performance (Min & Chon, 2020). It is a situation that needs to be considered, since students are the center of teaching practices, and their development as well as their opinions are core elements in the effectiveness of this process. In order to help students to develop language abilities, teachers are commonly interested in improving not only their linguistic competence but also their didactical and instructional as well as motivational strategies that can be important tools in their classes (Choi & Lee, 2016). However, findings from several studies are not yet conclusive as to which of these elements EFL/ESL teachers need to teach their classes effectively according to students' opinions. Consequently, more studies are needed to gain insights in this topic.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to determine the impact that teachers' language proficiency level has on their sense of self-efficacy as well as their students' perceptions on teacher efficacy.

<sup>1</sup> This is a refereed article. Received: 13 August, 2020. Accepted: 20 October, 2020.

<sup>2</sup> [juanita.argudo@ucuenca.edu.ec](mailto:juanita.argudo@ucuenca.edu.ec), ORCID: 0000-0002-3337-7803

<sup>3</sup> [tammy.fajardo@ucuenca.edu.ec](mailto:tammy.fajardo@ucuenca.edu.ec), ORCID: 0000-0002-9330-4622

<sup>4</sup> [monica.abad@ucuenca.edu.ec](mailto:monica.abad@ucuenca.edu.ec), ORCID: 0000-0001-8381-5982

<sup>5</sup> [pcabrera.aia@gmail.com](mailto:pcabrera.aia@gmail.com), ORCID: 0000-0002-1741-8804

This paper is organized as follows. First, some aspects related to effectiveness in an EFL/ESL class are considered in order to determine some important competences a teacher might have to be effective in the teaching process. Then, some evidence regarding the influence of teachers' language proficiency level and their sense of self-efficacy on their professional development are taken into account. Finally, some reflections about EFL/ESL students' perceptions and their impact on teachers' instructional strategies and practices are contemplated.

### Effectiveness in EFL/ESL Classes

Effectiveness in EFL/ESL classes is defined as "the quantity and quality of input, feedback, and classroom management" (Sadeghi et al. 2019, p. 3). Moreover, Farrell and Richards (2007) and Choi and Lee (2016) state that effective teaching in a second (SL) or foreign language (FL) environment depends on teachers having passed a sufficiency threshold in the use of the language. Otherwise, these teachers might use their native language most of the class time, restricting the use of the target language (TL) only to carry out book exercises. Consequently, language proficiency and efficacy are interdependent, since these two strongly influence teaching activities and strategies used by the teacher in the classroom. Therefore, EFL/ESL teachers need to be fluent and confident in the use of the target language in order to motivate their students and provide real and effective lessons (Sato, 2017), since, without students' engagement and commitment, learning does not occur in an effective way (Tsang, 2017).

In addition, Roberts (1998) and Farrell and Richards (2007) have argued that it is very important for teachers to maintain a level of linguistic competence, since EFL/ESL classes are increasingly pervasive in today's educational system; thus, the current number of NNESTs has increased significantly as stated by Freeman et al. (2015) and their language proficiency has become an essential issue. Hence, when language teachers stop improving and learning the language, it might affect not only their confidence as teachers and their teaching skills, but also their students' motivation and learning (Freeman et al., 2015).

In addition, it is crucial to refer to the contemporary notions of the teachers' knowledge base which focuses on pedagogical learner knowledge, seeing teachers as learners of teaching (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). The knowledge about teaching that teachers have comes from knowing their students, and of course from working with them. In other words, teachers learn to teach from their students, emphasizing the existence of a common interaction between teaching and learning; this is a key concept for an effective teacher (Le, 2018). Furthermore, as confirmed by Nakata (2010) it is necessary to consider the development of the EFL/ESL teachers' language proficiency as a reflective, cooperative, and pedagogical tool. Perhaps this will help teachers to better understand the necessity of an adequate interaction that would help them to gain confidence in their classroom. Complimenting this idea, Faez et al. (2019) suggested that language proficiency is an essential factor for EFL/ESL teachers; nevertheless, it is not the only factor to measure teaching efficacy. It would be a fallacy to consider EFL/ESL native speaker teachers better or more prepared than EFL/ESL non-native speaker teachers. Instead, it is necessary to contemplate NNEST teachers' classroom language proficiency considering the explicit tasks needed.

### Teachers' Language Proficiency in the Classroom Environment

EFL/ESL teachers' language proficiency is often associated with general English proficiency, and of course, with language use, without considering the language these teachers need in order to perform their work effectively. However, professional development usually offers language fluency courses without considering EFL/ESL teachers' specific professional needs. This has happened in Ecuador where EFL teachers were requested to take a language proficiency test and a language training course if they did not reach a B2 level to determine their teaching performance, as officially communicated on the website of the Ministerio de Educación (2014). However, there is no evidence of the classroom practice improvement after teachers have taken those courses (Faez et al. 2019). The fact that an EFL/ESL teacher is highly proficient in the TL is not necessarily an indicator that this person is an efficient teacher (Richards, 2011); however, it is still necessary to determine the required threshold level a language teacher needs to teach the language (Richards, 2011).

It is essential to distinguish between General English Proficiency (GEP) and Classroom English Proficiency (CEP). The former is defined by some teachers as "'the comfort in using English to teach', 'the ability to use English to teach English', 'the ability to do almost everything in English', 'the confidence in knowing when to say what', 'the flexibility to choose suitable expressions', and 'having more freedom in managing the class the way I want to'" (Pham, 2017, p. 345), while the latter is the language used in the classroom environment

(Pham, 2017). Having a high level of GEP does not necessarily guarantee a teacher can handle the specific language needed to carry out classroom tasks in English (Le & Renandya, 2017).

NNESTs who have some “language resources at their disposal in the classroom can address – and perhaps even help to overcome—the teachers’ feelings of professional deficit that they are not ‘fluent enough’ to teach in English and thus that they are not meeting the public perception of ‘being a good ELT teacher’” (Freeman et al. 2015, p. 5). Pham (2017) has stated that language is just another tool that might help teachers to manage the class properly, which is why even English native speaker teachers have to learn and acquire specific communication abilities to be able to teach the language efficiently.

In this regard, experienced EFL/ESL teachers are aware of the language necessary to carry out optimum classes, these teachers are defined as ‘native to their classroom’ meaning that they know what they want to achieve from their teaching practices (Sadeghi et al., 2019). Therefore, receiving CEP training helps teachers to use adequate classroom expressions as well as to understand the different characteristics classroom language has. This English-for-teaching component is a necessary attribute that native speakers do not always have (Pham, 2017). Additionally, Sadeghi et al. (2019) and Pham (2017) found that teachers consider CEP training more practical and useful than GEP training in their professional development.

### EFL/ESL Students’ Perceptions

Student perceptions provide insights into the influence teachers have on EFL/ESL classes which affects the students’ development of knowledge, motivation, and engagement (Min & Chon, 2020). Students might not think the content is important; however, they might feel curious about it. In this sense, the material, the atmosphere, and the teacher’s performance are relevant factors to foster student engagement.

Research has shown that it is not easy for teachers to maintain student engagement in EFL/ESL classes. Repetitive classes and some teacher behavior and personal attitudes might make students lose interest, whereas dynamic, flexible, interesting and appealing teachers attract students’ attention (Tsang, 2017). Similarly, the motivational strategies used by the teachers need to be perceived as valuable by their students (Min & Chon, 2017). In this sense, when preparing their classes, teachers need to reflect and analyze the kinds of strategies they use to create positive student perceptions as these perceptions might influence the teachers’ behavior in their pedagogical practices.

Regarding students’ opinions, highly proficient teachers sometimes are not really effective in their practices, and of course, some limited proficient teachers are perceived as effective teachers (Tsang, 2017). Even though a teacher may have a high level of proficiency, the lesson context and environment may not be adequate (Sadeghi et al., 2019); whereas a teacher with a low level of proficiency may manage the class better taking advantage of other conditions they have (Freeman, 2015). Teachers use what they know about the language, and of course, about pedagogy to apply in their teaching activities. In this regard, students consider that not only language plays an important role in teaching a language but also factors such as materials, environment, teacher and students’ interaction, motivation to learn, desire to communicate, among others (Min & Chon, 2020).

Thus, EFL/ESL teacher language proficiency level is not the only factor that influences teaching practices and student perceptions; there are many other aspects. For this reason it is necessary to investigate what students consider the qualities of an effective teacher in relation to teacher language proficiency and their sense of self-efficacy. NNESTs have become an important subject of study in the field of applied linguistics (Eslami and Fatahi, 2008). This can orient future research aimed at helping to improve education in this area.

Consequently, this study addresses the following research question:

*To what extent does EFL teachers’ language proficiency level impact their sense of self-efficacy and their students’ perceptions of their teacher’s efficacy?*

### **Methodology**

This study is correlational because it analyzes the different possible existing associations in the conditions and the variables (Mertens, 2015). A quantitative design measures objective concepts to draw different relations with the variables; these relations can be evaluated with statistical techniques (Creswell, 2014).

The objective of this research was to study English teachers and their students in schools in Cuenca, Ecuador. Meetings were held with the school administrator as well as with the EFL teachers invited to be

part of the study, these meetings were to explain the objective, the possible benefits, the teachers and students' roles and activities, the participants' confidentiality and privacy rights, and the implications of the study, to procure necessary permissions. Furthermore, informed consent letters were signed by participating teachers as well as by the parents of the students that agreed to be part of the study.

As proficiency self-evaluation lacks objectivity (Denis & Janssen, 2016), participant teachers were asked to provide a certificate to demonstrate their proficiency level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) . They also completed a survey to evaluate their sense of self-efficacy. On the other hand, to examine students' perceptions regarding their teacher's efficacy a translated and adapted version of the same survey was used. This instrument was administered by the researchers to avoid having students influenced by the presence of the teacher.

To maintain confidentiality and anonymity, students were asked not to mention their names under any circumstances (Mackey and Gass, 2005). Additionally, the different schools and the teachers were given a code. The various steps that were going to be taken during the project were explained, and students knew they could withdraw from the project at any time if they wished it.

### Context

Before describing the participants of the study, it is necessary to describe the EFL educational system in Ecuador. In this country, the national curriculum includes EFL classes from the second year of basic education to the third year of high school, expecting that students reach at least a B1 level when graduating, according to the CEFR (Ministerio de Educación, 2016). However, despite the fact that English is taught for twelve years, the results of the English Proficiency Index showed that Ecuador ranked 81st (among 100 countries) in English proficiency. Among 20 Latin American countries, Ecuador ranked 20th, placing it in the group of countries with very low proficiency level (English First, 2019).

### Participants

Twenty private high schools were invited to participate in this study; nevertheless, only six of them agreed to be part of the research. It is necessary to mention that it was proposed to work with this population due to the openness and interest of these institutions to know their real and current situation regarding the EFL teaching – learning process, and thus take the needed corrections, if necessary, based on the results. Public educational institutions are excluded since access to participants is restricted by bureaucratic procedures with the authorities of the institutions and the Educational Coordination of the country.

Seventeen teachers were asked to answer a profile questionnaire, a self-efficacy survey, and to present a certificate with their proficiency level according to the CEFR, In this sense, it is important to mention that two proficiency tests were provided: the TOEFL and the First Certificate (FC) tests. These test reports were still valid when the study was conducted. The teachers' results show that 16.1% were male, 83.9% were female, 80.6% had bachelor's degrees, 54.8% had bachelor's degrees in TEFL, none held a master degree, 20% had a B1 level according to the CEFR, 56.1% had B2, and 23.9% had C1 level. The teachers' minimum age was 20 and the maximum was 57, the mean was 40 years old.

Six hundred and sixty-one students who were taking EFL classes with these teachers were surveyed. For these 661 students, a *post hoc* analysis of the sample quality was performed with the G \* Power software (Faul, et al., 2007) for correlation tests establishing an average effect size equivalent to 0.3, a probability ( $\alpha$ ) of error of 5%, a bilateral hypothesis (two tails) and a statistical power of 100% ( $1-\beta$  err prob).

		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
High School	A	72	10.9
	B	210	31.8
	C	118	17.9
	D	133	20.1
	E	86	13.0
	F	42	6.4
Students' age	12-15 years	273	41.1
	16-19 years	388	58.4
Students' gender	Male	269	40.7
	Female	392	59.3

Table 1: Participant students' information

As shown in Table 2, the teachers have different English proficiency levels, determined by the certificate they provided (TOEFL and FC) to the researchers. It is important to mention that some schools have a policy of only hiring new teachers with a certain language proficiency level.

<b>N</b>	<b>Proficiency level</b>
4	C1
9	B2
4	B1
17	

Table 2. Teachers' Proficiency Level

### Instruments

To contrast teachers' sense of self-efficacy with their students' perceptions of their teacher's efficacy, teachers and students completed Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk's (2001) survey. This is an effort to create a scale that was specifically aimed at measuring EFL/ESL teaching efficacy. The scale contains three dimensions: (1) Efficacy for instructional strategies, (2) Efficacy for classroom management, (3) Efficacy for students' engagement. It uses a five-point Likert scale to inquire and measure the frequency with which these teachers use different teaching strategies. This instrument was used in the study since it includes the aspects mentioned above with the aim of describing classroom events and episodes that occur in the teaching context.

For the purposes of the study, the original survey was completed by the teachers (Appendix 1). A version translated to Spanish of the same survey was completed by the students. Filep (2009) suggests that for participants who do not master the language, and to assertively understand and express their feelings and perceptions, it is better to resort to their mother tongue (Appendix 2). When translating the survey to Spanish some terms needed to be adapted to the context where it was to be applied. The survey was also validated with EFL students of the first level of the Language Department at the University of Cuenca. It is important to mention that these students were young adults who were just starting their studies at the University level; therefore, their age did not differ much with high school students' age. After the validation process, the survey reported a reliability of 0.85, according to the Cronbach alpha coefficient.

Data were analyzed with the IBM SPSS 22 software (Field, 2018). Descriptive statistics to calculate central tendency measures (means), variability measures (Standard deviations), and minimum and maximum for each dimension measure was used. The distribution of each dimension of self-efficacy and teachers' language proficiency were evaluated. The analyses of an inferential non-parametrical test were used to demonstrate 1) the correlation between teachers' self-efficacy and the teachers' language proficiency; 2) the correlation between teachers' efficacy evaluated by students with the teachers' language proficiency; 3) the correlation between teachers' self-efficacy and teachers' efficacy evaluated by students. Spearman's correlation was conducted with a significant value at .01 and .05 levels (2 tails).

### **Findings**

The studied variables that were considered in this study were the EFL teachers' language proficiency, teachers' sense of self-efficacy and the students' perceptions of their teacher's efficacy in the three dimensions mentioned before. Teachers' self-efficacy is correlated in its three factors with the proficiency level. Teachers' self-efficacy for instructional strategies showed a medium correlation (Spearman's correlation=.484, sig.= .000). Teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management showed a low correlation (Spearman's correlation=.111, sig.= .000). In addition, teachers' self-efficacy for students' engagement also showed a low correlation (Spearman's correlation=.162, sig.= .000).

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Correlation with Teachers' language proficiency</b>
Teachers' self-efficacy for instructional strategies	2.36	0.53	1.25	3.00	.484*
Teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management	2.47	0.45	1.25	3.00	.111*
Teachers' self-efficacy for students engagement	2.28	0.52	1.25	3.00	.162*
Teachers' language proficiency	3.04	0.66	2.00	4.00	1

\*The correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 tails).

Table 3. Descriptive report and Spearman's correlation between teachers' self-efficacy and teachers' language proficiency

To establish the influence of the teachers’ language proficiency on the students’ perceptions, a correlation test was carried out. The results shown in Table 4 indicate that only one factor of the variable teacher efficacy as evaluated by the students showed a correlation with the teachers’ language proficiency. This factor refers to teacher efficacy for classroom management which has a low positive correlation (Spearman correlation=.090, sig.021). The other two factors are not correlated, teachers’ efficacy for instructional strategies (Spearman correlation=.038, sig. .333) and teachers’ efficacy for students’ engagement (Spearman correlation=.044, sig. =.255).

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Correlation with teachers’ language proficiency
Teachers’ efficacy for instructional strategies evaluated by students	3.02	0.75	661	0.00	.038
Teachers’ efficacy for classroom management evaluated by students	3.26	0.67	661	0.00	.090*
Teachers’ efficacy for students’ engagement evaluated by students	3.05	0.79	660	0.00	.044
Teachers’ language proficiency	3.04	0.66	2,00	4.00	1

\*The correlation is significant at the .05 level (2 tails).

Table 4. Descriptive report and Spearman’s correlation between teachers’ efficacy evaluated by students with the teachers’ language proficiency

To support the findings obtained from the three factors of the teachers' self-efficacy survey, a correlation test was carried out with the teacher efficacy evaluated by students. There were three negative low correlations according to each factor. Teachers' self-efficacy for instructional strategies and teacher efficacy for instructional strategies evaluated by students had a very low correlation of -.128 (sig.=.000). Teacher self-efficacy for classroom management and teacher efficacy for classroom management evaluated by students had a very low correlation of -.076 almost significant (sig.=.051); moreover, teacher self-efficacy for students’ engagement and teacher efficacy for students’ engagement evaluated by students had a very low correlation of -.386 (sig.=.000).

Variable	Teacher efficacy for instructional strategies evaluated by students	Teacher efficacy for classroom management evaluated by students	Teacher efficacy for students’ engagement evaluated by students
Teacher self-efficacy for Instructional strategies	<b>-,128*</b>	-,129*	-,178*
Teacher self-efficacy for Classroom management	-,286*	<b>-,076</b>	-,309*
Teacher self-efficacy for Students engagement	-,310*	-,301*	<b>-,386*</b>

\*The correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 tails).

Table 5. Spearman’s correlation between teacher self-efficacy and teacher efficacy evaluated by students

**Discussion**

The objective of this study was to explore the influence EFL teachers’ language proficiency level has on their sense of self- efficacy and on their students’ perceptions about their teacher’s efficacy.

The results show that EFL teachers’ language proficiency level is correlated with the three dimensions of self-efficacy evaluated in the study, This fact was also found by Freeman at al. (2015) who reported that EFL teachers with a low language proficiency are not confident enough with their teaching skills, a situation that might also affect their students’ motivation and learning. Thus, it would be imperative to work with these teachers to help them not only to improve their language proficiency level but also their awareness of different available tools and strategies than can help them to improve their teaching practices as well as their self-confidence.

The findings also show a low positive correlation between teachers’ language proficiency and efficacy in classroom management as evaluated by students. It is important to mention that Farrell and Richards (2007), Richards (2011), and Choi and Lee (2016) found a similar situation when describing that low English proficiency will limit teachers’ effective management of procedures and teaching protocols in the classroom,

Teachers who have a low language proficiency are not able to use the TL during the class time; therefore, it affects their teaching practices.

According to Sato (2017), EFL/ESL teachers' fluency and comfortability in the use of the TL is a crucial factor that determines students' commitment and engagement. Contrary to this fact, no correlation between teachers' language proficiency level and students' engagement was found in this study. These research findings coincide with Tsang (2017) who revealed that teachers' language proficiency has an important role in EFL/ESL classrooms; however, it influences students' engagement when they have reached a proficiency threshold. As mentioned before, Ecuador is in the group of countries with very low English proficiency level (English First, 2019); this could be the reason why students in this study do not consider their teachers' language proficiency is a determining factor in their engagement.

Teachers' language proficiency is an important element for EFL teaching practices; however, it does not have to be considered the only feature for teaching efficiently and effectively (Faez et al., 2019). This agrees with what was found in this study, as students perceive their teachers' language proficiency does not interfere their teachers' efficacy for giving instructions nor with their engagement in the EFL classes. The abovementioned authors suggested that teachers' what should be taken into account is language proficiency in relation to the specific teaching tasks and not general language proficiency.

Moreover, even though some teachers in this study do not have a high language proficiency level, they should not feel less capable of carrying out their EFL classes, because as students suggest, besides the English proficiency level, there are other important aspects needed to be effective teachers.

Farrell and Richards (2007) and Choi and Lee (2016) have stated that teachers need an adequate TL proficiency level, otherwise they will not use it in class. This is prejudicial to the students who take these classes to learn a TL. Furthermore, it influences the strategies and activities used by the teacher. This was also found in this study, as students perceive teachers with a high language proficiency could manage their classes in an efficient way. On the other hand, this study also coincides with Faez et al. (2019) who indicated that to motivate students, and achieve their commitment, EFL teachers need to manage several didactic strategies and abilities as well as socio-affective skills.

### **Limitations**

Due to the limited number of schools involved in the study and the nature of a correlational research, the results are suggestive only and claims cannot be generalized. It is important to mention that in order to reach a wider range of conclusions, additional variables such as private versus public schools should also be investigated. More research aiming to study the influence of EFL/ESL teachers' language proficiency on their professional practices as well as on their students' performance and commitment would also provide further insights into the extent to which this variable has an impact on the way students perceive effectiveness in language teaching practices.

### **Conclusion**

The results in this study indicate that a high proficiency level is not synonymous with students' perceptions of efficacy. There could be many other external elements which affect their perceptions of efficacy such as socio-affective aspects, didactic practices, student proficiency level, among others, Language proficiency is a factor of great influence in the way the teacher plans and manages the class, because if a teacher masters the TL (not necessarily with a native like proficiency or accent), they can feel comfortable using it in class, Students perceive the teacher's skill and level of comfort as a positive element in the learning process, but it is not the most relevant aspect to be considered when measuring teachers' efficacy.

Students can perceive that their teacher has a high language proficiency level. Still, it seems that they do not feel involved in teachers' instructional strategies, classroom management, and teachers' efforts to engage them in class. This finding has a great impact on the EFL/ESL field, since pre-service and in-service programs need to start thinking about this issue while addressing training courses for these teachers. It is necessary to conduct further research where teaching-learning stated practices would be researched, looking at whether or not students' beliefs about their teachers' practices are reflected in what teachers actually do in their classrooms. The literature suggests that while EFL/ESL teachers' language proficiency is important in providing good models for students to learn the target language, the relationship between GEP and CEP use is not always straightforward.

Regarding the fact that some EFL/ESL teachers have a low language proficiency, it might be compensated with a high level of creativity and motivation. These teachers can also use the variety of available

technological resources to help their students take advantage of such opportunities in the language learning process. Another important aspect to consider in EFL classrooms is the fact that, in addition to language proficiency, instructional strategies, classroom management, students' engagement strategies, and socio-affective skills can help teachers motivate their students and have more effective classes. This is because a high competence in the target language does not automatically give EFL/ESL teachers advantages in language teaching.

Teachers themselves, as well as school authorities, should become involved in language development as an element in methodology training courses. In this way, teachers can have opportunities to improve their linguistic competence skills while learning some instructional strategies.

It is necessary for EFL/ESL teachers to use these findings not only to start understanding their situation better but also to understand their students' needs as they have essential implications in EFL/ESL teachers' practices, and, consequently in their professional development. Pre-service and in-service EFL development programs should invest in English teachers' language competence, as well as in developing other skills to improve and use teaching materials, resources, and motivational topics in the EFL classroom. Moreover, teachers should try to include a variety of teaching methods, resources, and strategies which would address all their students' needs. It is also important to inquire about their students' views and opinions on different aspects of the EFL/ESL lesson that could help the teachers understand what is expected from them, and use this information to design more dynamic, engaging, and effective lessons. Although these findings are directly related to private EFL teachers, they can be used as a starting point to improve EFL/ESL teaching practices since the more we know about effective EFL/ESL teachers' features, the more we can help them to improve.

#### Acknowledgments

The authors of this paper would like to express sincere gratitude to *Dirección de Investigación de la Universidad de Cuenca (DIUC)*, for the opportunity to work on this research project.

This paper resulted from the research project entitled *El nivel de suficiencia del idioma inglés de los docentes de colegios privados de la ciudad de Cuenca y la influencia en sus prácticas pedagógicas*, of the *XVI Convocatoria, I Concurso Universitario de Proyectos de Investigación de Asignación Horaria Exclusiva de la Universidad de Cuenca, Facultad de Filosofía*.

We would also like to thank Dr. Dario Luis Banegas for his expert advice and encouragement during the process of writing this paper.

#### References

- Bailey, K. M. (2006). *Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Choi, E., & Lee, J. (2016). Investigating the relationship of target language proficiency and self-efficacy among nonnative EFL teachers. *System*, 58, 49-63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.02.010>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). SAGE.
- Ministerio de Educación (2016). *Currículo 2016 Lengua Extranjera*. [Foreign Language Curriculum]. <https://educacion.gob.ec/curriculo-lengua-extranjera>
- Denis, K., & Janssen, R. (2016). Country and gender differences in the functioning of CEFR-based can-do statement as a tool for self-assessing English proficiency. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 13(3), 251-76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2016.1212055>
- Education First. (2019). *EF EPI: Índice del EF English Proficiency*. <https://www.ef.com.ec/epi/regions/latin-america/Ecuador>
- 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). <http://tesl-ej.org/ej44/a1.html>
- Faez, F., Karas, M., & Uchiyara, T. (2019). Connecting language proficiency to teaching ability: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362168819868667>
- Farrell, T. S. C., & Richards, J. C. (2007). Teachers' language proficiency. In T. S. C. Farrell, (Ed.), *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice*. (pp. 55-66). Continuum.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). SAGE.
- Filep, B. (2009). Interview and translation strategies: Coping with multilingual settings and data. *Social Geography*, 4, 59-70. <https://doi.org/10.5194/sg-4-59-2009>
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 397-417. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588114>
- Freeman, D., Katz, A., Garcia Gomes, P., & Burns, A. (2015). English-for-teaching: Rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 69(2), 129-139. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu074>
- Khamhi-Stein, L. D. (2009). Teacher preparation and nonnative English-speaking educators. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.) *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 91-102). Cambridge University Press, 91-101.
- Le, V. C. (2018). Remapping the teacher knowledge-base of language teacher education: A Vietnamese perspective. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362168818777525>
- Le, V. C., & Renandya, W. (2017). Teachers' English proficiency and classroom language use: A conversation analysis study. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 67-81. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688217690935>

- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mertens, D. M. (2015). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) SAGE.
- Min, M. H., & Chon, Y. V. (2020). Teacher motivational strategies for EFL learners: For better or worse. *RELC Journal [Online First]*. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688219900812>
- Ministerio de Educación, (2014). *National curriculum guidelines: English as a foreign language*, <http://educacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2014/09/01-National-Curriculum-Guidelines-EFL-Agosto-2014.pdf>
- Nakata, Y. (2010). Improving the classroom language proficiency of non-native teachers of English: What and how? *RELC Journal*, 41(1): 76–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688210362617>
- Richards, J. (2011). JALT2011 Plenary speaker article: Exploring teacher competence in language teaching. *JALT Journal*, 35(4). <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTTLT35.4-2>
- Roberts, J. (1998). *Language teacher education*. Arnold.
- Sadeghi, K., Richards, J. C., & Ghaderi, F. (2019). Perceived versus measured teaching effectiveness: Does teacher proficiency matter?. *RELC Journal*, 51(2). 280-293. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688219845933>
- Sato, R. (2017). Fluctuations in an EFL teacher's willingness to communicate in an English-medium lesson: An observational case study in Japan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(2), 105-117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2017.1375506>
- Pham, T. H. N. (2017). General English proficiency or English teaching? The preferences of English teachers. *RELC Journal*, 49(3): 339-352. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688217691446>
- Tsang, A. (2017). EFL/ESL teachers' general language proficiency and learners' engagement. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 99-113. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688217690060>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)

## Appendix 1

### Teachers' Self-Efficacy Survey

#### Factor 1: Efficacy for instructional strategies

1. To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?
2. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?
3. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?
4. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?
5. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?
6. How much can you do to adjust your lesson to the proper level for individual students?
7. To what extent can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?
8. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

#### Factor 2: Efficacy for classroom management

9. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?
10. How much can you do to help children to follow classroom rules?
11. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?
12. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?
13. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?
14. How well can you respond to defiant students?
15. To what extent can you make your expectation clear about student behavior?
16. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?

#### Factor 3: Efficacy for students' engagement

17. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?
18. How much can you do to help your students value learning?
19. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?
20. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?
21. How much can you do to help your students think critically?
22. How much can you do to Foster student creativity?
23. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?

## **Appendix 2**

### **Students' Perception of their Teacher's Efficacy Survey**

#### **Factor 1: Eficacia para estrategias de instrucción**

1. El profesor utiliza varias estrategias de evaluación
2. El profesor proporciona una explicación alternativa cuando los estudiantes están confundidos
3. El profesor formula preguntas interesantes
4. El profesor implementa estrategias alternativas en la clase
5. El profesor puede responder hasta las preguntas más difíciles de los estudiantes
6. El profesor ajusta su lección dependiendo de las dificultades individuales de cada estudiante
7. El profesor mide la comprensión de los estudiantes en referencia a lo que ha enseñado
8. El profesor proporciona desafíos apropiados para estudiantes más avanzados

#### **Factor 2: Eficacia para el manejo del aula**

9. El profesor controla la disciplina en el aula
10. El profesor puede manejar eficazmente a estudiantes con comportamiento inadecuado
11. El profesor indica claramente el comportamiento que espera de los estudiantes
12. El profesor hace que los estudiantes respeten las reglas de la clase
13. El profesor puede manejar eficazmente a estudiantes con comportamiento inadecuado

#### **Factor 3: Eficacia para mantener la atención del estudiante**

14. El profesor hace sentir a los estudiantes que pueden hacer bien las tareas escolares
15. El profesor ayuda a los alumnos a valorar el aprendizaje
16. El profesor motiva a los estudiantes que muestran poco interés en el trabajo escolar
17. El profesor ayuda a mejorar la comprensión del contenido de la materia a estudiantes con bajo rendimiento
18. El profesor motiva a los estudiantes a tener pensamiento crítico
19. El profesor fomenta la creatividad de los estudiantes
20. El profesor busca estrategias para que los estudiantes que no prestan atención se involucren en la clase

## **Translated Version of Appendix 2**

### **Factor 1: Efficacy for instructional Strategies**

1. The teacher uses a variety of assessment strategies.
2. The teacher provides an alternative explanation when students are confused.
3. The teacher asks craft good questions for his/ her students.
4. The teacher implements alternative strategies in his/her classes.
5. The teacher responds to difficult questions from his/her students.
6. The teacher adjusts his/her lesson to the proper level for individual students.
7. The teacher measures student comprehension of what he/she has taught.
8. The teacher provides appropriate challenges for very capable students

### **Factor 2: Efficacy for classroom management**

9. The teacher controls disruptive behavior in the classroom.
10. The teacher can calm a student who misbehaves.
11. The teacher can establish a classroom management system with each group of students.
12. The teacher can make his/her expectation clear about student behavior
13. The teacher can establish routines to keep activities running smoothly

### **Factor 3: Efficacy for students' engagement**

14. The teacher gets students to believe they can do well in schoolwork
15. The teacher helps his/her students value learning
16. The teacher motivates students who show low interest in schoolwork.
17. The teacher improves the understanding of a student who is failing.
18. The teacher helps his/her students think critically.
19. The teacher fosters students' creativity.
20. The teacher uses strategies to get through to the most difficult students.