

THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
SAKARYA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
MASTER OF ARTS PROGRAM IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

**THE POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS,
TEACHER IDENTITIES, AND CHOOSING TEACHING AS A CAREER FOR
EFL INSTRUCTORS**

A MASTER'S THESIS

BERFU DUYGUN

SUPERVISOR
ASSIST. PROF. DR. MERVE SAVAŞCI

AUGUST 2023

THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
SAKARYA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
MASTER OF ARTS PROGRAM IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

**THE POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS,
TEACHER IDENTITIES, AND CHOOSING TEACHING AS A CAREER FOR
EFL INSTRUCTORS**

A MASTER'S THESIS

BERFU DUYGUN

SUPERVISOR
ASSIST. PROF. DR. MERVE SAVAŞCI

AUGUST 2023

DECLARATION

In this study that I prepared in accordance with the Sakarya University Institute of Educational Sciences Thesis-Project Writing Guide, I declare:

- All the information I obtained, and documents included in the thesis are within the framework of academic rules and ethical conduct,
- I referred to the works I have used and cited them as a source,
- I have not made any changes in any data,
- I do not present the whole or any part of this thesis as another thesis study.



Berfu DUYGUN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I would like to sincerely thank my advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Merve Savaşçı, who contributed endlessly to me both during the course and thesis period, who gave me courage and self-confidence and stood by me at every step.

My dear friends, Gülcan, Aslı, Ceren, Hande, Özge and many others whose names I can't count. Glad you're in my life!

And special thanks to my dear family Büşra, Belgin and Yavuz, whom I always feel beside me even though they are far away, and finally to my guardian angel Olcay, who I am sure is watching over me above the sky.

And my dear Bella, you are the most precious gift ever!

Last but not least, I would like to thank my husband, Emre, who always made the right decisions in my education and career life, guided me and gave me the greatest support in my life.

In addition, I would like to thank everyone who is not mentioned in this thesis but who encouraged me with their support and contributions.

ABSTRACT

THE POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS, TEACHER IDENTITIES, AND CHOOSING TEACHING AS A CAREER FOR EFL INSTRUCTORS

Berfu DUYGUN, Master Thesis

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Merve SAVAŞCI

Sakarya University, 2023.

The aim of this sequential explanatory mixed methods study was fourfold: First, (1) to determine the self-efficacy levels of Turkish instructors teaching English at English Preparatory units of state and foundation universities in Istanbul, as well as to investigate whether their self-efficacy levels vary according to their educational levels, undergraduate field degrees, years of professional experience and gender. The second aim was (2) to identify what type of teacher identity the instructors have as well as to determine whether their teacher identities varied across their educational levels, undergraduate field degrees, years of professional experience and gender. The third aim was (3) to investigate the motivations why instructors chose teaching as a profession and whether these reasons varied according to their educational levels, undergraduate field degrees, years of professional experience and gender. The final aim of the study was (4) to explore whether there was a possible relationship between instructors' self-efficacy beliefs, their teacher identities, and their motivation for teaching profession as a career. In accordance with these aims, the study adopted a descriptive cross-sectional correlational research design. A total of 356 Turkish EFL instructors working in the English Preparatory Departments of 53 different state and foundation universities in Istanbul participated in this research voluntarily. The quantitative data of the study were obtained from three different Likert scale questionnaires, and the qualitative data were elicited from semi-structured interview questions. Findings illustrated that the instructors generally had high self-efficacy levels. These self-efficacy levels came to the fore in areas such as planning the teaching process and determining teaching strategies and classroom management. At the same time, it was also revealed that the teacher identities of the instructors, especially the pedagogical expertise, didactic expertise, and subject matter expertise, were highly developed. In addition, among the reasons why instructors chose the teaching profession as a career, the finding that stood out was their interest in language learning and seeing language teaching as a mental stimulant. Finally, while there was no

significant relationship between the self-efficacy levels of the instructors and their teacher identities, a significant relationship was found between self-efficacy and the reasons for choosing the profession, as well as between the teacher identities and the reasons for choosing the profession. According to the conclusion drawn from the study, universities should assign more importance to professional development (PD) activities and help lecturers improve their teaching skills. In addition, it was concluded that institutions should take the necessary steps to ensure the continuity of EFL instructors' intrinsic motivation.

Keywords: Self-efficacy, teacher identity, career motivation



ÖZET

İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRETEN ÖĞRETİM GÖREVLİLERİNİN ÖZ YETERLİK İNANÇLARI, ÖĞRETMEN KİMLİKLERİ, VE ÖĞRETMENLİĞİ KARIYER OLARAK SEÇMELERİ ARASINDAKİ OLASI İLİŞKİ

Berfu DUYGUN, Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Merve SAVAŞCI

Sakarya Üniversitesi, 2023.

Bu sıralı açıklayıcı karma yöntem çalışmasının amacı dört yönlüdür: Birincisi, (1) İstanbul'daki devlet ve vakıf üniversitelerinin İngilizce Hazırlık birimlerinde İngilizce öğreten Türk öğretim görevlilerinin öz-yeterlik düzeylerini belirlemek ve aynı zamanda öz-yeterlik düzeylerinin eğitim seviyelerine, mezun olunan lisans bölümüne, mesleki deneyim yıllarına ve cinsiyete göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini araştırmaktır. İkinci amaç (2) öğretim elemanlarının ne tür bir öğretmen kimliğine sahip olduklarını belirlemek ve öğretmen kimliklerinin eğitim seviyelerine, mezun olunan lisans bölümüne, mesleki deneyim yıllarına ve cinsiyete göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini belirlemektir. Üçüncü amaç ise (3) öğretim elemanlarının öğretmenliği meslek olarak seçme motivasyonlarını belirlemek ve bu motivasyonların eğitim seviyelerine, mezun olunan lisans bölümüne, mesleki tecrübe yılına ve cinsiyete göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini araştırmaktır. Araştırmanın en son amacı ise (4) öğretim elemanlarının öz-yeterlik inançları, öğretmen kimlikleri ve öğretmenlik mesleğini bir kariyer olarak seçme motivasyonları arasında olası bir ilişkinin olup olmadığını araştırmaktır. Bu amaçlar doğrultusunda çalışma, tanımlayıcı kesitsel korelasyonel araştırma tasarımını benimsemiştir. Bu araştırmaya İstanbul'daki 53 farklı devlet ve vakıf üniversitesinin İngilizce Hazırlık Bölümlerinde görev yapan toplam 356 Türk öğretim görevlisi gönüllü olarak katılmıştır. Araştırmanın nicel verileri üç farklı Likert ölçekli anketten, nitel verileri ise yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme sorularından elde edilmiştir. Bulgular, öğretmenlerin genel olarak yüksek öz-yeterlik düzeylerine sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu öz-yeterlik düzeyleri öğretim sürecinin planlanması, öğretim stratejilerinin belirlenmesi ve sınıf yönetimi gibi alanlarda öne çıkmaktadır. Aynı zamanda öğretim elemanlarının öğretmen kimliklerinin özellikle pedagojik uzmanlık, didaktik uzmanlık ve konu uzmanlığı alanlarında oldukça gelişmiş olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Ayrıca öğretim elemanlarının öğretmenlik mesleğini kariyer olarak seçme motivasyonları

arasında dil öğrenmeye olan ilgileri ve dil öğretimini zihinsel bir uyarıcı olarak görmeleri öne çıkan bulgudur. Son olarak öğretim elemanlarının öz yeterlik düzeyleri ile öğretmen kimlikleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmazken, öz yeterlikleri ile mesleği seçme motivasyonları arasında ve öğretmen kimlikleri ile mesleği seçme motivasyonları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Araştırmadan çıkan sonuca göre üniversitelerin mesleki gelişim faaliyetlerine daha fazla önem vermesi ve öğretim elemanlarının öğretim becerilerini geliştirmelerine yardımcı olmaları gerekmektedir. Ayrıca, yabancı dil öğreten eğitmenlerin içsel motivasyonunun sürekliliğini sağlamak için kurumların gerekli adımları atması gerektiği sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öz-yeterlik, öğretmen kimliği, kariyer motivasyonu



CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	ii
ÖZET.....	v
CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
CHAPTER I.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. The Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. The Aim and the Significance of the Study.....	2
1.2.1. Research Questions.....	4
1.3. Problem Sentence	6
1.4. Limitations.....	6
1.5. Definitions	7
CHAPTER II	9
LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1. Self-Efficacy.....	9
2.1.1. Theoretical Background (Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory).....	10
2.1.2. Sources of Self-Efficacy.....	11
2.1.3. Teachers’ Sense of Self-Efficacy	13
2.1.4. EFL Teachers’ Self-Efficacy.....	13
2.1.5. Studies on Self-Efficacy in EFL Context	14
2.1.5.1 Studies in the International Context	14
2.1.5.2. Studies in the Turkish EFL Context	16
2.2. Teacher Identity.....	20
2.2.1. Theoretical Background	20

2.2.2. EFL Teacher Identity	21
2.2.3. Studies on Teacher Identity	22
2.2.3.1. Studies in the International Context	22
2.2.3.2. Studies in the Turkish EFL Context	23
2.3. Career Motivation.....	27
2.3.1. Theoretical Background	27
2.3.2. Motivation for Choosing to Teach.....	27
2.3.3 Studies on Career Motivation in EFL Context	28
2.3.3.1 Studies in the International EFL Context	28
2.3.3.2. Studies in the Turkish EFL Context	30
2.4. The Potential Relationship between Self-efficacy, Teacher Identity and Career Motivation	33
CHAPTER III	34
METHODOLOGY	34
3.1. Research Design	34
3.2. Setting.....	35
3.3. Participants	36
3.4. Data Collection Instruments	43
3.4.2. Professional Identity Questionnaire.....	49
3.4.3. EFL Teacher Motivation Questionnaire	50
3.4.4. Semi-Structured Interviews	51
3.5. Data Collection Procedures	52
3.6. Data Analysis Procedures.....	54
CHAPTER IV	56
FINDINGS.....	56
4.1. Findings of Quantitative Data.....	56
4.1.1. Findings Related to the Self-Efficacy Levels of EFL Instructors	56

4.1.1.1. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Instructional Strategies.....	57
4.1.1.2. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Planning and Organising Teaching Processes	59
4.1.1.3. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Classroom Management.....	60
4.1.1.4. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Student Engagement.....	62
4.1.1.5. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Monitoring and Assessing Language Development.....	63
4.1.1.6. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Developing Language Skills	64
4.1.2. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Different Variables	66
4.1.2.1. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Education Level.....	66
4.1.2.2. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Undergraduate Program Field .	68
4.1.2.3. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Years of Professional Experience	69
4.1.2.4. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Gender	71
4.1.3. Findings Related to Teacher Identity.....	72
4.1.3.1. Findings Related to Pedagogical Expertise	73
4.1.3.2. Findings Related to Didactic Expertise	75
4.1.3.3. Findings Related to Subject Matter Expertise	77
4.1.3.4. Findings Related to Attitudes Towards Professional Development.....	79
4.1.4. Teacher Identity of Instructors According to Different Variables	81
4.1.4.1. Teacher Identities of Instructors According to Education Level.....	82
4.1.4.2. Teacher Identities of Instructors According to Undergraduate Program Field	83
4.1.4.3. Teacher Identities of Instructors According to Years of Professional Experience.	84
4.1.4.4. Teacher Identities of Instructors According to Gender	85
4.1.5. Findings Related to Career Motivations.....	86
4.1.6. Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Different Variables	89
4.1.6.1. Reasons for Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Education Level...	89

4.1.6.2. Reasons for Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Undergraduate Program Field	92
4.1.6.3. Reasons for Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Years of Professional Experience	94
4.1.6.4. Reasons for Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Gender	97
4.1.7. Potential Relationship Between Self-Efficacy, Teacher Identity, and Career Motivations.....	100
4.2. Findings of the Qualitative Data.....	104
4.2.1. Findings Related to the Self-Efficacy Levels of Instructors.....	104
4.2.2. Findings Related to the Teacher Identity of EFL Instructors	106
4.2.3. Findings Related to the Career Motivations of EFL Instructors	108
4.2.3. Findings Related to the Relationship between Self-Efficacy Levels, Teacher Identities, and Career Motivations of EFL Instructors	110
CHAPTER V	112
CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS	112
5.1. Conclusion and Discussion.....	112
5.2. Implications	128
5.3. Limitations.....	130
5.4. Suggestions for Future Studies	130
APPENDICES	145

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographics of the Participants According to Age.....	37
Table 2. Demographics of the Participants According to Gender.....	38
Table 3. Demographics of the Participants According to Undergraduate Field.....	38
Table 4. Demographics of the Participants According to Education Level.....	39
Table 5. Demographics of the Participants According to Teaching Experience.....	40
Table 6. Demographics of the Participants According to Type of Institution.....	40
Table 7. Background Information of the Interviewees in the Qualitative Stage.....	41
Table 8. Data Collection Tools Regarding the Research Questions.....	43
Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of Self-Efficacy According to Its Sub-dimensions.....	57
Table 10. Self-efficacy Levels for Instructional Strategies.....	58
Table 11. Self-efficacy Levels for Planning and Organising Teaching Processes.....	58
Table 12. Self-efficacy Levels for Classroom Management	61
Table 13. Self-efficacy Levels for Student Engagement.....	62
Table 14. Self-efficacy Levels for Monitoring And Assessing Language Development....	63
Table 15. Self-Efficacy for Developing Language Skills.....	63
Table 16. Self-efficacy Levels According to Education Level	67
Table 17. Self-efficacy Levels According to Undergraduate Program Field.....	68
Table 18. Self-efficacy Levels According to Years of Professional Experience	70
Table 19. Self-Efficacy Levels According to Gender	71
Table 20. Teacher Identities According to Its Sub-dimensions.....	72
Table 21. Teacher Identities for Pedagogical Expertise	73
Table 22. Teacher Identities for Didactic Expertise	75
Table 23. Teacher Identities for Subject Matter Expertise	79
Table 24. Teacher Identities for Attitudes Towards Professional Development.....	79

Table 25. Teacher Identities According to Education Level	82
Table 26. Teacher Identities According to Undergraduate Program Field.....	83
Table 27. Teacher Identities According to Years of Professional Experience	84
Table 28. Teacher Identities According to Gender.....	85
Table 29. Career Motivation According to Its Sub-dimensions.....	86
Table 30. Career Motivation According to the Items.....	87
Table 31. Career Motivation According to Education Level	100
Table 32. Career Motivation According to Education Level	90
Table 33. Career Motivation According to Undergraduate Program Field.....	92
Table 34. Career Motivation According to Undergraduate Program Field.....	93
Table 35. Career Motivation According to Years of Professional Experience	94
Table 36. Career Motivation According to Years of Professional Experience	95
Table 37. Career Motivation According to Gender	97
Table 38. Career Motivation According to Gender	98
Table 39. Relationship Between Self-efficacy, Teacher Identity and Career Motivation....	100
Table 40. Crosstabulation between Self-efficacy and Teacher Identity	101
Table 41. Crosstabulation between Teacher Identity and Career Motivation	102
Table 42. Crosstabulation between Self-efficacy and Career Motivation.....	103
Table 43. Themes Related to Self-efficacy	104
Table 44. Themes Related to Teacher Identity	107
Table 45. Themes Related to Career Motivation.....	109

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CoHE:	The Council of Higher Education
EFL:	English as Foreign Language
ELT:	English Language Teaching
AME:	American Culture and Literature
B.A.:	Bachelor of Arts
M.A.:	Master of Arts
Ph.D.:	Doctor of Philosophy
OECD:	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
TALIS:	Teaching and Learning International Survey
TSES:	Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale
TEBS-Self:	Teachers' Efficacy Beliefs System-Self-Form
FIT-Choice:	Factors Influencing Teaching Choice
MANOVA:	Multivariate analysis of variance
ALES:	Academic Personnel and Postgraduate Education Entrance Exam
YDS:	Foreign Language Exam
SPSS:	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
KPSS:	Public Personnel Selection Examination
PD:	Professional Development
TD:	Teacher Development

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Chapter I provides information about the background of the study, followed by the aims, significance, and the research questions of the current study. The chapter also thoroughly addresses the problem sentences, sub-problems, limitations, and definitions of the key terminology.

1.1. The Background of the Study

Career choice is an essential part of shaping people's future lives. It is not just an occupation, but it involves someone's whole life (Patton & McMahon, 2006). That is why many people plan their careers before they complete their studies. Numerous issues might have an influence on an individual's decision while choosing a career (Watt & Richardson, 2007), though, and individuals tend to take into account their own needs, wishes, and abilities. The choice of career is undoubtedly even more important for teachers who start shaping the lives of individuals from a young age (Richardson & Watt, 2006). Some people are driven to teach because they have a sincere enthusiasm for the subject matter, they want to improve the lives of their students, or because they want to promote social justice and educational parity. Others might have been motivated by teachers who had a big impact on their own lives. By influencing the next generation, advancing education, and encouraging personal development, teaching presents a special chance to benefit society (Kyriacou, Hultgren, & Stephens, 1999).

Considering these benefits, teachers who want to provide a worthwhile education to their students must possess certain qualifications. One of the issues to be considered when choosing the teaching profession is self-efficacy beliefs. Self-efficacy belief is a concept that expresses the belief that a person can do a certain job (Kotaman, 2008). In other words, individuals can convince themselves that they have more or less power than they can actually do. Albert Bandura (1977), a psychologist, first proposed it as a foundational idea for his Social Cognitive Theory. He defined self-efficacy in teaching as related to a teacher's confidence in their ability to successfully promote learning, control classroom dynamics,

and have a good impact on students' social and intellectual growth. Therefore, teachers possessing high self-efficacy levels are more likely to establish ambitious goals, persevere in the face of challenges, and employ successful teaching techniques (Bandura, 1977). From a similar point of view, teachers' self-efficacy beliefs help to gather crucial information on the preparation of instructors who can serve the proficiency required for the profession, be selfless, and deal with challenges (Yeşilyurt, 2013).

A different concept related to self-efficacy is identity (Kartopu, 2016). From a general perspective, identity is expressed as a person's expressing himself as an individual and recognizing himself in a certain context (Gee, 2001). The term teacher identity, similarly, refers to how teachers perceive themselves as professionals, define their roles, and reflect their personal and social roles to their professional selves (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004). Teacher identity begins to develop during teacher education and continues to change and develop throughout his teaching life. The self-efficacy of a teacher can be substantially impacted by their identity. A teacher is more likely to have higher levels of self-efficacy in relation to their teaching skills if they strongly identify with the position of an excellent educator (Bandura, 1977). Greater confidence in managing various classroom settings might result from having a clear sense of one's own positive identity as a teacher. Also, teachers who have a strong sense of who they are better able to deal with the difficulties and failures that come with the job. A sense of purpose and perseverance that comes from a strong sense of self as a teacher can lead to better self-efficacy by allowing instructors to persevere in the face of challenges (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004). Due to their importance in the field of educational sciences, studies on self-efficacy, teacher identity, and choosing teaching as a profession are increasing their popularity in both the Turkish and international contexts.

1.2. The Aim and the Significance of the Study

According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy is the belief that a person has in their capacity to carry out particular tasks successfully. Accordingly, teacher self-efficacy is a crucial element that can have a big impact on how well EFL teachers teach and how well their students learn. EFL teachers who have high levels of self-efficacy frequently approach their teaching responsibilities with confidence and enthusiasm, which generally results in more effective instruction (Chacón, 2005). On the other hand, teachers with low self-efficacy

could feel anxious and uncertain while teaching, which could have a negative impact on their teaching performance. In order to enhance teaching methods and student accomplishment, it is essential to comprehend the function that self-efficacy plays in EFL teachers.

The beliefs, values, and self-concepts that teachers have in connection to their job as educators are all included in the concept of teacher identity (Pennington & Richards, 2016). A teacher's teaching style and relationships with students can be greatly influenced by their teacher identity in the context of EFL instruction. It affects decisions about how to teach, how to manage the classroom, and how a teacher presents themselves professionally (Lasky, 2005). In order to get insight into the personal and professional aspects that influence EFL teachers' teaching methods and consequently have an impact on students' learning experiences, teacher identity research is crucial.

It is crucial for successful human resource management and professional growth within the industry to comprehend the career motivations of EFL teachers (Borchert, 2002). Motivation is a major factor in determining job satisfaction and commitment, both of which have an impact on the effectiveness of instruction and retention rates. EFL teachers are likely to be more devoted and productive in their jobs if they are driven by intrinsic reasons including a feeling of purpose, a love of teaching, and personal fulfilment (Wilensky, 1968). On the other hand, those who are driven solely by extrinsic considerations like pay or job security could be less engaged and dedicated to their teaching jobs. Educational institutions can better tailor their recruitment, training, and support programs to attract high-quality educators by looking at the career motivations of EFL teachers.

Apart from these three concepts, teacher research has drawn a lot of interest in recent years, and numerous studies have made significant contributions to our knowledge to improve teaching practices and empower teachers (İşsever, 2020). Specifically, teachers' sense of efficacy and awareness of their identities can be seen as crucial elements in their professional development (Moslemi & Habibi, 2019). Moreover, according to Coşkuner (2001), teachers' perception of their occupation as a career is a significant indicator of their success. That is to say, teachers who do not value their profession as a course of life do not generally make any effort to improve themselves. In relation to that, many studies related to self-efficacy, teacher identity, and career motivation have been carried out in both the Turkish and international contexts. It is seen in literature that most studies carried out in Türkiye earlier tend to focus on teacher self-efficacy (e.g., Baş, 2010; Can, 2019; Doğan,

2014; İşsever, 2020; Karakaş, 2016; Taşer, 2015; Taşçı, 2019; Yılmaz, 2020), teacher identity (e.g., Arpacı, 2015; Balban, 2015; Karakaş, 2016; Sayar, 2014; Taşdemir, 2021) and career motivation of EFL teachers (e.g., Coşkuner, 2001; Damar, 2018; Ekin, Yetkin & Öztürk, 2021; Ölçü, 2014; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012). Despite the awareness of the significance, only a few studies were conducted in the university English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context (e.g., Coşkuner, 2001; Doğan, 2014; Taşçı, 2019). Moreover, regarding the relationship between the self-efficacy levels, teacher identities, and reasons for choosing teaching as a career, no studies were found in the literature to the best of the researcher's knowledge. Accordingly, the significance of this study lies in its potential to advance our knowledge of the complex interplay between EFL instructors' self-efficacy, teacher identity, and career motivations. By examining these factors, one can gain valuable insights about what contributes to EFL instruction, job satisfaction, and long-term dedication to the occupation. This knowledge can be used to develop teacher training programs, targeted interventions, and institutional policies that will enhance the standard of EFL instruction and the general well-being of EFL instructors. The results of the study could also have broader implications for the whole field of education. Effective teaching encompasses a variety of educational environments and is not only limited to EFL instruction. As a result, best practices in teacher training and professional development across disciplines may be influenced by the insights gained from this research. In conclusion, the relationship between self-efficacy, teacher identity, and career motivations of EFL instructors is a potential area that could have significant implications for the field of EFL education and the larger field of pedagogy. The aim of this study is to advance the understanding of these elements and the role they play in influencing the experiences and results of EFL instructors. The findings of the study may ultimately pave the way for more efficacious teaching methods, improved teacher retention rates, and increased student learning opportunities in EFL classrooms worldwide.

1.2.1. Research Questions

In light of the aims of this study, the following research questions are addressed in this study:

1. What are the self-efficacy levels of instructors who teach EFL in the university-level English Preparatory Programs in Türkiye?

1.1. Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to education level?

1.2. Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to the undergraduate program field?

1.3. Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to years of professional experience?

1.4. Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to gender?

2. What kind of teacher identities do the EFL instructors in the university-level English Preparatory Programs in Türkiye have?

2.1. Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to education level?

2.2. Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to undergraduate program field?

2.3. Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to years of professional experience?

2.4. Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to gender?

3. What are the motivations for EFL instructors in the university-level Preparatory Programs in Türkiye to choose teaching as a profession?

3.1. Do the motivations of instructors choosing teaching as a profession vary according to education level?

3.2. Do the motivations of instructors choosing teaching as a profession vary according to undergraduate program field?

3.3. Do the motivations of instructors choosing teaching as a profession vary according to years of professional experience?

3.4. Do the motivations of instructors choosing teaching as a profession vary according to gender?

4. Is there a correlation between self-efficacy beliefs, teacher identities, and career motivations of instructors who teach English as a foreign language in the university-level English Preparatory Programs in Türkiye?

1.3. Problem Sentence

The field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education has witnessed an increasing interest in recent years due to the growing importance of English as a global lingua franca. Language learning experiences and outcomes for students are significantly shaped by EFL instructors. However, a deeper understanding of the elements affecting EFL instructors' self-efficacies, teacher identities, and career motivations is required. When the literature is reviewed, many researchers have conducted studies on teacher self-efficacy, teacher identity, and their career choices separately; however, the limited number of studies focusing on their potential relationship presents a gap in the field. As the literature review suggests, some studies focused on the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teacher identity (e.g., İlgör, 2019; Karakaş, 2016; Marschall, 2021; Moslemi & Habibi, 2019) or on the career motivations (e.g., Damar, 2018; Ölçü, 2014; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012). However, most of these earlier studies were carried out with pre-service (e.g., Damar, 2018; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012) or high school (e.g., Çelebi & Aktekin, 2017) EFL teachers. As such, EFL instructors working at the university-level seem to be overlooked from this point of view. To this end, investigating self-efficacy beliefs, teacher identities, and reasons for choosing teaching as a profession of EFL instructors were the primary foci of the present study.

1.4. Limitations

There are certain limitations to the current study that should be considered. First, the sample of this study was limited to 356 EFL instructors teaching in English Preparatory Schools at state and foundation universities in İstanbul, Türkiye. Therefore, if a comparable study is conducted with a larger number of participants from cities all around Türkiye, the results will presumably be more generalizable. Second, because it primarily focuses on English teachers employed in university English Preparatory Programs, the scope of the study is not broad enough. Further research could be replicated by including teachers teaching at different levels of education, including pre-primary, primary, and secondary education. In other words, future researchers can also investigate if there is a difference between the self-efficacy levels of English teachers, their teacher identities, and the possible relationship

between their career motivations, according to the educational level they teach at. In addition, the number of participants for in-depth interviews was limited to 7. In future studies, more instructors can be interviewed, and quantitative data can be made more meaningful. Furthermore, data collection tools to be used in future studies can be developed or adapted specifically for Turkish EFL instructors working in Türkiye.

1.5. Definitions

Self-efficacy: The belief that one can carry out a specific activity or achieve a specified result is known as self-efficacy. In the context of teaching, self-efficacy has been shown to be a potent predictor of teacher effectiveness, student learning, and job satisfaction (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

Teacher self-efficacy: A teacher's judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated" (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Teacher identity: "It refers to who one is as a teacher and is conceptualized such that it is constructed both personally and socially, has relational and affective dimensions, informed by contexts, constructed through stories, multifaceted and constantly evolving, includes a sense of belonging and affinity with the group. It is a dynamic and continuous process of (re)construction and (re)negotiation of self." (Taşdemir, 2021, p.7)

Career motivation: The set of personal qualities and related job choices and behaviours that reveal an individual's career identity, understanding of the forces influencing that career, and fortitude in the face of challenging professional circumstances. (London, 1983).

Intrinsic motivation: "Doing of an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable consequence" (Ryan & Deci, 2022, p. 56).

Extrinsic motivation: "A construct that pertains whenever an activity is done in order to attain some separable outcome" (Ryan & Deci, 2022, p. 60).

Altruistic motivation: Altruistic motives for teaching are driven by a genuine desire to benefit others and make a positive impact on students' lives and society as a whole. Teachers with altruistic motives are driven by a deep sense of empathy, compassion, and a

commitment to contribute to the well-being and development of their students (Batson, 1987).



CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter introduces the definition of the terms self-efficacy, teacher identity, and career motivation. It subsequently continues with the concepts of self-efficacy, teacher identity, and career motivation within the context of English as a foreign language (EFL). Finally, the chapter offers a thorough discussion of earlier studies conducted in the international and Turkish contexts.

2.1. Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is defined as the self-judgement of individuals about their capacity to be successful by organising the necessary factors to show their performance (Bandura, 1986). In other words, it refers to self-judgement and self-belief about how successful individuals can be in overcoming the difficulties they may encounter in the future. Self-efficacy is more about how people see their abilities with their talents than it is about the skills themselves (Senemoğlu, 2012). In order to be successful, it is not enough just to have the required knowledge and skills; apart from knowledge, the belief in using this knowledge bears importance that supports the success of individuals. For this reason, in order to be successful, individuals' perceptions of their own capacities must be positive, and these perceptions determine the self-efficacy levels of individuals (Köroğlu, 2018). Self-efficacy beliefs of individuals determine their choices, motivations, and goals in life, as well as how much they will try to achieve these goals, and how much they will tolerate the difficulties they encounter (Zimmerman, Bandura, & Martinez-Pons, 1992).

Teacher self-efficacy in the EFL context refers to a teacher's mindset and confidence in their ability to instruct English to non-native speakers in a foreign language setting. It is a crucial concept for comprehending and raising student learning outcomes as well as teacher effectiveness (Bandura, 1997). To begin with, teacher performance and instructional quality are significantly influenced by teacher self-efficacy (Gavora, 2010). When teachers feel confident in their ability to teach English to non-native speakers, they are more likely to

apply effective instructional strategies and cutting-edge teaching techniques, as well as persevere in the face of challenges (Artino, 2012; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Henson, 2001; Schiefele & Schaffner, 2015). This improves the standard of instruction given to EFL students. In the EFL context, teacher efficacy also affects classroom management (Giallo & Litte, 2003). High self-efficacy teachers appear to be better able to create and maintain a positive learning atmosphere in the classroom, successfully manage student behavior, and provide a conducive environment for language learning (Dibapile, 2012). They can create a supportive and effective learning environment because they have confidence in their ability to handle a variety of learners' demands and obstacles (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Teacher efficacy has a tremendous impact on student engagement and motivation, too. Teachers who are confident in their capacity to assist students in learning a language are more likely to use engaging teaching strategies, provide constructive criticism, and create opportunities for meaningful learning (Anthony & Kritsonis, 2007). These instructors can motivate students, increase their self-esteem, and foster a positive outlook on learning the English language (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Teacher self-efficacy also affects teachers' relationships with students. Teachers with high self-efficacy levels frequently have a good rapport with their students and offer them encouragement. They offer tailored guidance, promote student involvement, and provide insightful feedback, all of which help to build trust and improve learning results (Cheung, 2008). The self-development of teachers also involves their sense of self-efficacy. Teachers who have a high level of self-efficacy are more likely to look for professional development opportunities, engage in reflective practices, and use novel teaching techniques (Ross, 1998; Hoy & Spero, 2005). They pursue ongoing learning and development for the benefit of both themselves, and their students because they are confident in their capacity to become better instructors (Bolinger, 1988).

2.1.1. Theoretical Background (Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory)

Self-efficacy is a notion that is based on Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1960), which argues that the individual's behaviour is a result of personal factors and the environment. According to Social Cognitive Theory, learning is a process that takes place in a social context, through interaction, observation, and imitation. The psychologist who determined the most advanced theoretical framework of Social Learning Theory is Albert Bandura. According to Bandura (2006), people can gain a lot of knowledge by seeing how others

behave. Human behaviour occurs either with the stimulation of internal or environmental stimuli. This psychological functioning can be explained by the mutually ongoing personal and environmental interaction. Overall, human behaviour is the result of the interaction of personal and environmental factors (Pajares, 2002).

The stages of social cognitive behavior include those involving motivation, imitation, memory, and attention. By including imitation and identification in the idea of classical conditioning, Bandura expanded upon it. He also discussed learning as a social process by arguing that the theory's personal, environmental, and biological variables are all mutually causally related. He defined this situation as “mutual determination” (Bandura, 2006). In the context of EFL learning, Bandura's theory suggests that students can learn language skills by observing and imitating the behaviour of competent speakers of the target language. This may involve observing teachers, peers, or native speakers in real-life or simulated settings (Tatlıoğlu, 2021).

Bandura's theory also emphasizes the importance of one's self-efficacy, or confidence in one's ability to execute a task successfully. In the EFL context, self-efficacy can be fostered through a variety of means, such as providing students with opportunities for success, offering feedback and praise for progress, and setting achievable goals (Köroğlu, 2018).

Finally, Bandura's theory highlights the importance of reinforcement and feedback in learning. This may involve providing learners with positive feedback for correct responses or productive language use, as well as offering corrective feedback for errors or inaccurate language use (Bandura, 1999).

Overall, Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory offers valuable insights into the learning process and can be applied in various ways to support EFL learners in achieving their language learning goals.

2.1.2. Sources of Self-Efficacy

According to Bandura, the growth of self-efficacy is enabled by four fundamental causes. In other words, people attain their self-efficacy beliefs from four major sources: *enactive mastery experiences*, *social modelling*, *verbal persuasion*, and *psychological and affective states*.

Enactive mastery experiences are the most effective source of self-efficacy; that is, the individual's direct successful or unsuccessful experiences. Teachers evaluate their performance at the end of their teaching and develop a judgement of competence about their capacity to realise similar performances and act according to these beliefs in their subsequent teaching (Capa, Uzuntiryaki, Temli & Tarkın, 2013). Mastery experiences are gained by taking successive achievable steps in solving problems. According to Bandura (1999), while achievements enable the individual to form a strong self-efficacy belief, failure undermines this. However, after developing a strong feeling of self-efficacy, a person may not be as easily affected by failure (Açıkgöz, 2016).

Social modelling, also called vicarious experiences, is another source that creates self-efficacy in individuals. It states the significance of observation, modelling, and imitation of behaviours and manners of others. Another source that creates or strengthens self-efficacy is the individual's indirect observations (Bandura, 1999). By observing people who are similar to themselves, individuals think that they can be successful in the activities they are successful in. On the other hand, their failure, despite the efforts made, influences their self-efficacy beliefs in a negative way (Bandura, 1993).

Thirdly, verbal persuasions about whether or not an individual can succeed also have an effect on self-efficacy. Through verbal persuasion, the individual listens to what other people around him say about his skills, and therefore advice and support about what he can or cannot achieve affect his self-efficacy judgements about himself (Senemoğlu, 2012).

Finally, individuals' physical and mental conditions have an impact on their perceptions of their own self-efficacy. In the shortest definition, it is the individual's expectation and feedback from his body; feedback from the body to assess an individual's strength, vulnerability, and ability (Senemoğlu, 2012). The individual questioning his abilities also considers his physical and emotional states. He interprets negative emotions such as excitement, anxiety, fear, and stress as a sign of personal inadequacy (Bandura, 1999). For this reason, one way of increasing the self-efficacy beliefs of individuals is to strengthen physical conditions and reduce negativity.

2.1.3. Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy

For more than three decades, teachers' self-efficacy has been characterized as their conviction that their actions may influence students' behavior patterns and academic performance, particularly those with poor motivation and learning challenges (Friedman & Kass, 2002). Teacher self-efficacy has been the subject of much research after the Self-efficacy Theory put forward by Bandura in 1977 (Sakız, 2013). Teachers' understanding of personal values is the determinant of their behaviour and goals at school. In addition, these values are also supportive of individual self-efficacy and subjective well-being. Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, in other words, their belief in their professional duties and responsibilities and their ability to deal effectively with the challenges they encounter, have important implications for student success and motivation in their professional fields (Barni, Danioni, & Benevene, 2019). In the same way, according to Chacón (2005), teachers' self-efficacy beliefs are connected to their deeds and, consequently, to the results of their students. Likewise, Bandura (1993) indicates that teachers' perception of self-efficacy has a significant impact on their teaching styles. Such perception also affects the task that teachers will use to enable students to learn, as well as create the necessary environment for learning to take place.

2.1.4. EFL Teachers' Self-Efficacy

EFL teachers' self-efficacy is described as teachers' judgments of their capacity to successfully teach English in foreign language instruction, yet it is not independent of teacher self-efficacy. (Thompson, 2016). Qualified English teachers ought to have a perception of efficacy in order to become an idol for their students and affect their performance (Ghaemi & Damirchiloo, 2015). Similarly, in addition to their knowledge and abilities, the self-efficacy of these teachers is important. According to Güven and Çakır (2012), the connection between the teacher and the learner is dynamic in language instruction and is closely linked to human psychology. By taking into consideration students' needs, it is crucial that EFL teachers should possess a variety of skills, competencies, and knowledge. In other words, in-class instruction, reflective teaching,

classroom management, student engagement, and motivation become a necessity for a language teacher (Güven & Çakır, 2012).

Many studies suggest that EFL teacher self-efficacy can be effective in teaching effectiveness and student outcomes (e.g., Can, 2019; Chan, Maneewan & Koul, 2021). Teachers who have high levels of self-efficacy are frequently more assured in their ability to instruct, which can lead to increased motivation, engagement, and persistence in their students (Yentür, 2023). Furthermore, teachers who have high levels of self-efficacy are more likely to employ a variety of pedagogical techniques and adjust their instruction to the requirements of their students (Can, 2019). On the other hand, teachers with low self-efficacy may feel less assured in their capacity to instruct English, which can cause worry or feelings of inadequacy (Bandura, 1997; Merç, 2015). This can negatively impact their teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes (İpek et al., 2018). To ensure the success of both their teaching methods and their students, EFL teachers must develop and maintain high levels of self-efficacy.

2.1.5. Studies on Self-Efficacy in EFL Context

2.1.5.1 Studies in the International Context

Numerous research on teacher self-efficacy have been conducted in a variety of contexts worldwide. In these studies conducted with participants teaching at different levels, the potential relationship between EFL teacher self-efficacy and several factors was investigated, including professional development (e.g., Almuhammadi, Assallahi & Madini, 2020; Safari, Davarabina & Khoshnevis, 2020), professional identity and critical thinking skills (e.g., Moslemi & Habibi, 2019) and perceived competencies (e.g., Chacon, 2005).

When the earlier studies with EFL instructors in the tertiary educational context are examined, there seems to be a small number of studies addressing the relationship between instructors' self-efficacy and professional development. To begin with, in the Saudi Arabian context, Almuhammadi, Assallahi, and Madini (2020) recently conducted a study with female EFL instructors (N= 6) teaching at King Abdulaziz University, where teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and its relevance to their professional development were investigated. Data were collected only qualitatively, by semi-structured interview method. Findings showed

that the self-efficacy of the participants was directly related to their knowledge, experience, and professional skills. Although these findings were in line with Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy sources, the scope of the study was constrained by the few participants and the fact that only qualitative data were collected.

Safari et al. (2020) studied the potential influence of Iranian EFL teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction on their professional development in a distinct study studying a related relationship at related times. Data came from 212 EFL teachers who taught at various levels at universities, language programs, and schools. According to the findings collected via questionnaires, the biggest predictor of teachers' professional development was their self-efficacy. Similarly, a significant positive link between teachers' professional satisfaction and self-efficacy was discovered. These findings revealed how effective these variables are on the professional development of EFL teachers.

In a comparatively earlier study conducted in the Iranian context by Moslemi and Habibi (2019), the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' self-efficacy, professional identity, and critical thinking skills was explored. 75 experienced participants representing various age groups and private language institutions were studied. In this study, the Professional Identity questionnaire, the Teachers' Efficacy Beliefs System-Self-Form (TEBS-Self) questionnaire, and the Watson Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal Test were used to collect the data. Not surprisingly, the study confirmed a correlation between EFL teachers' professional identity and self-efficacy. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) emphasised that teacher self-efficacy has an important role in their professional identity development. These findings illustrated that teachers' awareness of their self-efficacy and professional identity is one of the biggest factors in achieving professional success.

From a different perspective, Wazir (2019) investigated the factors affecting the self-efficacy of EFL instructors in Saudi Arabian universities. He concluded in his study that the most important factors affecting teacher self-efficacy were mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and physiological states. On the other hand, he stated that an important determinant of teacher self-efficacy was variables that vary from person to person, such as social background, cognitive behaviour, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, level of competence and knowledge, and work environment. Findings demonstrated that teachers with high self-efficacy were more patient and flexible with their students, which turned into an advantage in the professional field compared to teachers with low self-efficacy. Of

course, the factors affecting teacher self-efficacy were not limited to these, so more comprehensive studies should be conducted in the future.

Considering the self-efficacy beliefs of EFL teachers teaching at secondary schools, a comprehensive study by Chacon (2005) was conducted to investigate the relationship between the self-efficacy and the perceived competence of EFL teachers working at secondary schools in Venezuela. 104 EFL teachers from 51 private and public schools participated in this study. Data for self-efficacy came from the English Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (ETSES), while self-reported data was used to measure teachers' English proficiency. Afterwards, 20 volunteer teachers were selected from the participants, and open-ended questions were asked. Findings indicated a positive relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and language proficiency. As the participants' language proficiency increased, this reflected in their self-efficacy, which supported Bandura's (1997) theory that teacher self-efficacy affects teaching practices.

2.1.5.2. Studies in the Turkish EFL Context

Various studies have also been carried out in Türkiye on the self-efficacy of EFL instructors. These studies focused on the relationship between instructors' self-efficacy beliefs and teaching strategies (e.g., Can, 2019; Özdemir, 2020; Solar Şekerci, 2011; Taşer, 2015), foreign language teaching anxiety (e.g., Eren, 2020) or occupational stress (e.g., Doğan, 2014; İpek, Akçay, Bayındır Atay, Berber, Karalık, & Yılmaz, 2018), and socio-demographic predictors of self-efficacy (e.g., Ülkümen, 2013; Yavuz, 2007). For example, one line of research examined the relationship between instructors' self-efficacy beliefs and instructional strategies. Can (2019) investigated the self-efficacy beliefs of EFL instructors working at university and its potential relationship with the personal characteristics, language proficiency, and teaching strategies. A total of 374 instructors from different universities in Türkiye participated in the study. Data on gender, experience, demographic information, self-efficacy beliefs, and instructional strategies were obtained through questionnaires, while perceived self-efficacy beliefs and instructional strategies were investigated by conducting semi-structured interviews with 25 instructors selected on the basis of voluntary participation. Findings revealed that the self-efficacy levels of the instructors were high. It was also concluded that instructors considered themselves

sufficient in terms of teaching strategy and classroom management. More importantly, researchers also reported a significant relationship between the instructors' self-efficacy beliefs, language proficiency, and teaching experience. However, while measuring the language proficiency and self-efficacy of the instructors in the research, only the self-reports of the individuals were taken as a basis, and no tools were used to measure, presenting a limitation. Moreover, the teaching strategies of instructors were also reported as self-declared, not by observation or any other means.

In another study, comparatively a more recent one, conducted by Özdemir (2020), 323 non-native EFL instructors working at Schools of Foreign Languages of public and foundation universities participated. The study aimed to examine the relationship between instructors' self-efficacy beliefs and teaching strategies, classroom management skills, and ensuring students' participation in the lesson. Data were collected through a demographic inventory form, Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), and Teaching Styles Inventory (Grasha, 1996). Descriptive statistics analysis showed that the self-efficacy levels of the instructors were high in instructional strategies and low in ensuring students' participation in the lesson. It was also found that the instructors mostly preferred the facilitator teaching style. However, since the results of the study were based on quantitative data, the findings were limited to statistical results only.

In a similar study, Taşer (2015) investigated to what extent English instructors' self-efficacy beliefs were affected by the factors of classroom management, teaching strategies, and student participation in the lesson. 434 Turkish EFL instructors from various universities participated in the study, and both qualitative and quantitative data were collected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Similar to Can's (2019) and Özdemir's (2020) studies, the self-efficacy levels of the instructors were quite high. At the same time, they were quite competent in terms of classroom management and instructional strategies.

In a more comprehensive study, Solar Şekerci (2011) examined the self-efficacy levels of 257 EFL instructors under three main headings, namely ensuring the participation of the students in the lesson, lecture strategies, and classroom management. Data were collected through the adopted version of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), Self-reported English Proficiency Scale (Chacon, 2005), and Language Teaching Methods Scale (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008). Findings revealed that the self-efficacy levels of EFL instructors were high. Specifically speaking, they had higher self-efficacy in classroom management than in instructional strategies, and the lowest self-

efficacy rate was in ensuring students' participation in the lesson. She also reported that the instructors' self-efficacy beliefs were mainly predicted by their competency in the English language and self-reported proficiency.

In a more recent study conducted by Eren (2020), perceptions of teacher self-efficacy and foreign language teaching anxiety were investigated. To this end, 53 native speakers of English and 180 non-native speakers of English instructors teaching English at universities in Türkiye participated in the study. Quantitative data collected through an online self-reporting questionnaire showed that the anxiety levels of the instructors whose mother tongue is not English were higher than those of the instructors whose mother tongue is English, but no significant difference was found between their self-efficacy perceptions. In addition, the study showed that the anxiety level of the participants was low, and their self-efficacy perceptions were high. However, it is worth noting that investigating teacher self-efficacy only with self-report tools may not always reveal an accurate and profound conclusion about the subject, as when data are collected with these tools, their immediate emotional state may affect their reactions.

To provide a general picture of self-efficacy beliefs, Doğan (2014) conducted a study with English instructors (n= 151) working at state universities, focusing on the self-efficacy beliefs of the instructors and its possible relationship with their stress levels. Instructors' self-efficacy was measured using the English Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Findings illustrated that instructors' self-efficacy levels were high but no significant relationship between the instructors' self-efficacy beliefs and their stress levels. However, the fact that the study was conducted using only quantitative data and that the participants were selected only from state universities could have limited the results of the research.

Similar to the results of Doğan's (2014) study, a study conducted by İpek et al., (2018) did not find no relationship between professional stress and teacher self-efficacy, either. 84 EFL instructors working in preparatory classes at a state university in Türkiye participated in the study, and the data came from the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). No significant relationship was found between teacher self-efficacy and occupational stress.

In order to search the socio-demographic predictors of teacher efficacy, Yavuz (2007) conducted research with EFL instructors (n= 226) teaching preparatory classes at private

and public universities in Istanbul. Both native (n= 31) and non-native (n= 195) instructors took part in the research. In order to measure the self-efficacy beliefs of the participants, OSTES (Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale, 2001) was administered. According to the findings, gender, professional development activities, number of students in classes, type of institution, and working position predicted the differences between instructors' self-efficacy beliefs. Although the general self-efficacy perceptions of the instructors were high, their proficiency in terms of student engagement was lower than their proficiency in classroom management and teaching proficiency. Teacher proficiency was higher among female instructors, instructors working in administrative positions, and instructors working at foundation universities.

In a similar study by Ülkümen (2013), 285 EFL instructors from various public and private universities in Ankara participated. The aim was to identify whether university type, teaching experience, undergraduate program field, colleague support, and administrative support would predict the self-efficacy beliefs of EFL instructors. The self-efficacy of the instructors was evaluated in the areas of instructional strategies, classroom management, and ensuring students' participation in the lesson. In order to measure self-efficacy, the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) was used. Based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that the years of teaching experience, administrator support, and the type of university employed significantly predicted the instructors' self-efficacy towards teaching strategies. In addition, years of teaching experience, managerial support, and the type of university studied significantly predicted instructors' self-efficacy for student participation. Their self-efficacy towards classroom management was predicted by teaching experience. Also, the experience of the instructors was the most important predictor of their self-efficacy, yet no significant relationship was found between their self-efficacy beliefs and undergraduate majors.

Overall, as the review of the literature indicated, teaching self-efficacy seems to be affected by several variables. Examining the studies conducted in other EFL contexts outside of Türkiye, findings illustrated that teacher self-efficacy is directly related to experience, knowledge, and skills in the school (Almuhammadi et al., 2020; Chacon, 2005). In parallel, it is clearly seen how important teacher self-efficacy is in professional development (Safari et al., 2020). Another variable that is related to self-efficacy is the concept of professional identity. It has been determined that the level of self-efficacy is also high in EFL teachers with a high perception of teacher identity (Moslemi & Habibi, 2019). Finally, when all the

studies are examined, it has been concluded that the factors affecting self-efficacy are personal experiences, social background, motivation, knowledge, and work environment, which is similar to the studies above. If the studies conducted especially in Türkiye are taken into account, it can be easily seen that the self-efficacy levels of EFL instructors tend to be high (Can, 2019; Eren, 2020; Özdemir, 2020; Solar Şekerci, 2011; Taşer, 2015; Yavuz, 2007). Similarly, it has been stated that EFL instructors with high self-efficacy are better in classroom management, instructional skills, and language proficiency (Can, 2019; Özdemir, 2020; Solar Şekerci, 2011; Taşer, 2015). Another line of studies on self-efficacy has reported the predictors of teacher self-efficacy. From this point of view, it has been observed that self-efficacy varies according to the factors of gender, professional development activities, class size, type of institution, and position (Yavuz, 2007). In addition, it can be seen that years of professional experience and administrative support are the predictors of teacher self-efficacy (Ülkümen, 2013).

In summary, teacher self-efficacy is very important in terms of professional development, and it is worth studying in the context of variables that are thought to be related. Another construct that supports and shapes each other is teacher identity, which continuously influences and interacts with self-efficacy.

2.2. Teacher Identity

2.2.1. Theoretical Background

The concept of teacher identity, which is at the centre of the teaching profession, has been the subject of many studies in the field of educational sciences (e.g., Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Beijaard, et al., 2004; Karakaş, 2016). This concept has been defined in different ways by different researchers. At a basic level, Lasky (2005) defined the professional identities of teachers as how teachers describe themselves to themselves and to others. Similarly, Hseih (2010) defines teacher professional identity as an individual's attitudes and beliefs about being a teacher.

Indeed, the teacher identity development process is about how individuals introduce themselves in teaching environments and how they are recognised by others. In this process, teachers shape how they will behave in teaching and working environments according to

the identity they define themselves in (Matheny, 2016). Teacher identity formation is vital for future teachers; therefore, one must first start with self-examination in deciding on teacher education (Bullough, 1997). Besides this awareness, the formation of teacher identity is a process that changes and develops over time. Keller (2021) stated that the identity of a teacher is formed by the lived experiences of the person. Teachers make sense of and define their own roles as a result of their relationships with colleagues and other individuals (Sachs, 2005), thereby making it an ongoing process. Parallel to this, it was also stated that teacher identity is not a stable but a dynamic process that constantly evolves (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Beijaard et al., 2004). In other words, teacher identity can be expressed as experiences and meaning derived from these experiences rather than being an imposed concept (Sachs, 2005). The awareness of professional identities contributes to the development of the teachers' professional awareness and, accordingly, to their success in their teaching profession (Zivkovic, 2018); otherwise, difficulties might be encountered, especially in the first few years of the profession (Arpacı, 2015).

2.2.2. EFL Teacher Identity

Teacher identity refers to the way in which a teacher understands and perceives themselves as a professional in relation to their teaching practice, beliefs, and values. In the EFL context, likewise, teacher identity can play a significant role in shaping how teachers approach their teaching and interact with their students.

Both professional and personal self-perceptions of language teachers are considered to affect their students' learning as well as their personal motivation, determination, and self-confidence (Goh, Zhang, Ng & Koh, 2005). Considering that teacher identity is at the centre of the teaching profession, it yields great importance both in the pre-service preparation processes of teachers and in the processes of increasing the competencies of in-service teachers (Cheung, Ben-Said & Park, 2015). It is, therefore, necessary to improve the quality of teaching and to maintain it, which is a notable part of language education (Day, Kington, Stobart & Sammons 2006). Accordingly, teacher identity studies in the field of foreign languages can serve both learning and teaching purposes.

According to Singh and Richards (2006), teacher learning is not only the ability to teach languages, but also to know what it is to be a language teacher. For this reason, the concept

of identity has an even more important place in the field of teaching compared to other professions. An individual's identity as a language teacher is directly related to his language proficiency and language background (Pennington & Richards, 2016). Especially when teaching a foreign language, teachers who feel insecure thinking that they do not have as much command of the language as a native may feel that they are judged as inadequate. On the contrary, teachers who can make strategic decisions and think logically while teaching a foreign language can successfully build a language teacher identity thanks to their past experiences, knowledge, and skills (Pennington & Richards, 2016). In short, the concept of language teacher identity is directly related to language teaching, and an individual's teacher identity can be developed through teacher education and experiences (Pennington & Richards, 2016).

In brief, it is important for EFL teachers to reflect on their own identities and beliefs, as well as the diverse identities and beliefs of their students, in order to create an inclusive and culturally responsive classroom environment. By doing so, EFL teachers can create a positive learning environment that supports the academic and personal growth of all students.

2.2.3. Studies on Teacher Identity

2.2.3.1. Studies in the International Context

There have been numerous studies on teacher identity in EFL contexts around the world. For example, a study by Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, and Johnson (2005) examined the teacher identity of non-native English-speaking teachers in the US. The study found that these teachers often felt marginalised and struggled to balance their own cultural identity with the expectations of the American educational system. The study also found that these teachers often drew on their own experiences as language learners to inform their teaching practices.

In a metaphor analysis study with 23 second-year Malaysian university students, Nikitina and Furuoka (2008) asked students to describe their language teachers using metaphors by completing the sentence "A language teacher is like..." and explain this in a few sentences. The collected data were coded according to the types of metaphors, and according to the

findings, students mostly indicated their teachers using "teacher as a caretaker" (mother, father, nanny), "teacher as a giver" (candle, ant, plant or animal, cook), "teacher as essential element" (vitamin, water, sunshine, computer operating system) metaphors. It can be seen from the analysis that students mostly had a positive sense of language teachers.

Another study conducted by Kanno and Stuart (2011) explored the identities of six Japanese language teachers who taught in the United States. The study found that the teachers' identities were influenced by their experiences of being both an "insider" and an "outsider" in the US context. For example, some teachers felt a strong connection to their Japanese culture and language, while others wanted to distance themselves from it in order to fit in with American culture.

In a study by Wang and Gu (2016), Chinese English teachers were interviewed about their identities and the impact of the Chinese education system on their teaching practices. The study found that teachers' identities were influenced by their experiences of being both a teacher and a learner of English, as well as by the cultural values and expectations of the Chinese education system.

Overall, these studies suggest that teacher identity in EFL contexts is complex and influenced by a range of factors, including cultural background, educational system, and personal experiences (e.g., Varghese et al., 2005). Understanding teacher identity can help improve teacher training and development programs, and ultimately lead to more effective language teaching practices.

2.2.3.2. Studies in the Turkish EFL Context

Although the literature on the concept of identity is broad in general, not much research has been done on teacher identity in the Turkish EFL context. In earlier studies, different data collection methods such as semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and field notes were used. In addition, these earlier studies were conducted with different groups of participant teachers, including pre-service teachers (e.g., Çelebi & Aktekin, 2017), novice teachers (e.g., Balban, 2015), and experienced teachers (e.g., Yavuz, 2010). In general, the literature focused on how EFL teachers define their professional identities and how it is identified by their students (e.g., Sayar, 2014), and what factors play a role in their identity formation (e.g., Balban, 2015; Çelebi & Aktekin, 2017; Yavuz, 2010).

According to Lutovac (2020), one of the factors that play a role in shaping the identity of a teacher is the teacher education they receive. In the Turkish context, a study was conducted by Çelebi and Aktekin (2017) to investigate the formation of teaching identity during teacher education. The participants were students studying in 4-year ELT programs. The study consisted of three stages: In the first stage, the key terms "language learning strategies", "inventory formulation", "teacher roles" and "reflection" were introduced to teacher candidates. Afterwards, they developed inventory items by collaborating with other student-teachers for a questionnaire on learning strategies to be piloted with the high school students. In the second stage, the prepared questionnaire was transferred to an online environment and high school students were allowed to respond to the questionnaire. In doing so, they reviewed the literature on language learning strategies, and visited their schools to gather information about students. In the third and final stage, they interpreted the data collected from high school students and prepared a report with the findings. During these stages, pre-service teachers reflected on their adopted teacher identities. 8 reflective journals collected from each of the pre-service teachers, that is, a total of 166 reflective journals, were interpreted qualitatively. Common points in the themes were determined by each researcher and a draft was created under general headings (identity, development etc.). The findings of the study showed that pre-service teachers developed a sense of familiarity with their future profession and started to adopt new perspectives. And this study offers an example of some initial steps that can be taken towards encouraging the teacher identity formation of ELT students in their early years of pre-service education.

In order to investigate the teacher identities of new teachers and the factors affecting its development, a long-term case study lasting 22 weeks was conducted with the EFL instructors working in the English Preparatory Department of a foundation university in Ankara. 3 novice instructors with only 1 year of teaching experience participated in this study conducted by Balban (2015). In-class observations, interviews and field notes were used as data collection tools. Semi-structured interview questions prepared by the researcher were asked to the participants every 2-4 weeks, and the answers were recorded and transcribed verbatim. In addition, the participants were observed twice in each semester, and the purpose of these observations was stated as understanding the experiences and emotions of the participants. After the observation was over, the researcher aimed to make the data permanent by keeping his own field notes. After carefully reading the transcribed data, coding was done, and the encoded data were categorised. When the data obtained were

interpreted, it was determined that all three participants considered themselves knowledgeable, competent and important in language teaching. Participants described it as "tiring", "difficult" and "disappointing" when it comes to their first year in the profession, however, some of the opportunities and advantages provided by the institution kept them motivated. This process was interpreted as "motivating", "encouraging" and "productive" and as a result, it was stated that these changes contributed to the development of the participants' teacher identities. In addition, factors such as workload and student profile were also found to be related to teacher identity views.

One of the most important factors affecting the professional identities of teachers is the events in the past of the person. Good or bad life experiences of teachers during their childhood and education life play a role in the development of their professional identities (Cheng, 2021). In order to investigate the relevance of EFL teachers' past experiences on their teacher identities, Yavuz (2010) conducted a study including 4 EFL teachers working at different public schools in Ankara and with an experience ranging from 3 to 25 years. Qualitative data required for the study were obtained by questioning in the form of stories, and in-depth interviews were conducted with the participants one by one in Turkish. The conversations made during the interviews were recorded, transcribed and translated into English. Points of interest on the obtained English text were determined and data analysis was done. According to the findings, it was seen that the personal and professional experiences of the participants throughout their school life had a great impact on the formation of their teacher identities. A turning point has been determined for each participant, which is a factor in the formation of their professional identity. As Keller (2021) stated, past life experiences play a role in shaping the identity of the teacher. For instance, an English teacher whom they took as a role model or had a good relationship with played a great role in the development of their teacher identity. However, the use of only individual qualitative data in the study prevents generalisation of this study.

In terms of the concept of professional identity, it is important not only how language teachers express themselves, but also how students define their teachers (Sayar, 2014). In this respect, 10 Turkish EFL instructors teaching at Düzce University and 200 English Preparatory Program students taught by these instructors participated in Sayar's (2014) research, which was conducted to measure the harmony and incompatibility of expressions between both groups. The data of the study was collected through semi-structured interviews, and the collected data were analysed with metaphor analysis, which is a

qualitative research method. As a result of the analysis, it was observed that the instructors evaluated themselves in 6 different categories, while the students evaluated their instructors in 14 different categories. While there were similarities between some of the evaluations, some of them were evaluated completely different from each other. For example, while the descriptions of "teacher who is a source of entertainment" and "teacher who is interesting" were common in both groups, students described their instructors differently as "a teacher with double personality", "teacher who can keep secrets" and even "life-draining teacher". As a result, while some of the students' expressions overlapped with the teachers' identity definitions, some differences were revealed. Undoubtedly, a single statement may not be sufficient for teachers to describe themselves, so there is a need for different studies that include more comprehensive metaphors. In addition, in some cases, there may be differences between what teachers are trying to be and what they really are. Therefore, not only teachers' own statements, but also external observation may be required.

As a result, teachers frequently reflect on how their personal identities interact with the career paths they have chosen. Understanding one's identity, which consists of views, values, experiences, and cultural background, can have a big impact on whether or not someone decides to become an educator. Some teachers are attracted to the profession because their identity and the role of a teacher are strongly aligned. They see teaching as a way to live out their principles, express their passions, and have a beneficial influence on students' lives. While attempting to establish open and varied classrooms that honor many cultures, some people could decide to use teaching as a way of navigating their own identity journeys. Furthermore, educators frequently consider how their identity influences their pedagogical practices, classroom management, and interactions with students. Understanding the complex relationship between one's identity and the teaching profession helps one make career decisions and enhances the educational process by promoting authenticity, empathy, and a keen awareness of the various needs of pupils.

2.3. Career Motivation

2.3.1. Theoretical Background

Different definitions of the concept of profession have been made over time. Liebig and Sansonetti (2004) defined professional occupations of individuals as qualifications that require a certain educational process and are necessary to handle some responsibilities. With a similar definition, Ramaswami, Dreher, Bretz, and Wiethoff (2010) stated that there are a number of competencies required by professions. The concept of career, on the other hand, is defined as the series of occupational positions that people are in and undertake during their professional life (Liebig & Sansonetti, 2004), a combination of roles that a person has assumed throughout his professional life (Wilensky, 1968) and the process of development of individuals' professional experience over time (Lawrence, Arthur & Hall, 1989). The choice of profession is considered the first important step that individuals take in reaching their career goals and it is the determinant of the life they desire to have in the future, because this decision could significantly affect the rest of their lives (Borchert, 2002). Naturally, there are certain factors that affect people's career motivations (Ekin, Yetkin, & Öztürk, 2021). Elements such as environmental factors, personal characteristics, opportunities obtained (Borchert, 2002), gender, self-efficacy, personal goals (Moeketsane, 2014) play a role in affecting the career motivations of individuals. It may also differ depending on the changes in the society, culture and politics in which they live. Since these dependent reasons change frequently in a society, the motivations of student teachers in choosing the teaching profession should also be examined continually. In this context, the motivations of individuals who choose teachers as a profession have been the subject of many studies (Ekin et al., 2021).

2.3.2. Motivation for Choosing to Teach

Without sufficient long-term motivation, even the most talented people may not be successful at what they do (Dörnyei, 2005). If teachers are sufficiently motivated to teach, this will likely reflect on their students (Dörnyei & Ushido, 2011). It is generally thought that the education level of countries is related to how qualified their teachers are. Therefore,

studies to investigate these motivations have been going on for more than sixty years (Damar, 2018). Studies conducted in this area have stated that there are three different basic motivations for choosing teaching as a profession; external motivations such as vacation length and salary, personal experiences; internal motivations such as intellectual satisfaction and interest; and altruistic motivations such as playing a role in the development of an individual (Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012; Yong, 1995). In addition to the teacher shortage that occurs in most developed countries, the high rate of teacher attrition has led researchers in the field of educational sciences to investigate the motivation to teach (Erten, 2014; Richardson & Watt, 2006; Saban, 2003). In this context, some of the studies carried out with either student-teachers or in-service teachers in Türkiye and around the world are as follows.

2.3.3 Studies on Career Motivation in EFL Context

2.3.3.1 Studies in the International EFL Context

The subject of choosing teaching as a profession has been the subject of interest of various researchers in different countries, and similar studies have been carried out in this field. These studies mainly focused on why EFL teachers chose teaching profession (Alloush, Chaleila & Watted, 2020; Olan & Bello, 2016; Shih, 2016) in different EFL contexts. First of all, in the Taiwanese EFL context, Shih (2016) investigated why EFL teachers chose teaching as a career within a case study. Data were collected by semi-structured interview technique from 38 EFL teachers from various backgrounds, 28 of whom were native speakers of Mandarin Chinese, and the remaining 10 were English, Ukrainian, and Southern Min. The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed for data analysis. While analysing the data, not only the themes extracted from the transcriptions, but also the stories of the participants were carefully examined in order to understand their past experiences and lives. Categorising the different themes found was based on Watt and Richardson's (2007) FIT-Choice framework. According to the results, it was determined that choosing teaching as a profession did not depend only on motivation. It was determined that the most important factor in choosing this profession was the intrinsic career value and salary factors. It was stated that intrinsic factors were generally related to their interest in English as a language or their desire to be a teacher from a young age, while the salary satisfaction factor was

associated with a high income as well as the establishment of a work-social life balance. Surprisingly, few respondents mentioned personal utility values as motivation (such as job security, time for family and job transferability). It can be seen in the study of Hayes (2008) that people who chose English teaching as a profession in Taiwan, where the study was conducted, generally have a low socio-economic level and live in small villages. This may indicate that people choosing the teaching profession trigger a sense of belonging to a higher social class.

25 EFL teachers from Middle Eastern, Latin American, Asian and African countries participated in another international study examining the reasons behind individuals becoming EFL teachers. In this study conducted by Olan and Bello (2016), a questionnaire containing questions about factors affecting career motivation and career determination processes, and written documents containing demographic information of participants were used as data collection tools. At the same time, narratives, including the experiences of the participants, were given to detail the questions in the questionnaire. When the findings were examined, the reasons for choosing the teaching profession include awareness of individuals' own abilities and interests, interest and passion in learning and teaching English, and English language skills. This shows that one of the important reasons for language teachers in different parts of the world to choose the teaching profession as a career is the personal realisation motives of individuals, which emphasises their intrinsic career values.

When the Arab EFL context was examined, 100 Arab-Israeli students ranging from first to fourth year in a university in Israel participated in one of the recent studies conducted by Alloush, Chaleila, and Watted (2020). Mixed-method design was applied in the study, and quantitative data was collected both online and on paper-based basis through the FIT-Choice Scale developed by Watt and Richardson (2007). The items in the questionnaire were categorised into two separate groups; to measure lower-order factors “intrinsic career value”, “fallback career”, “prior teaching and learning experiences”, “ability for language”, “social influences” and to measure higher order factors “personal utility value” and “social utility value”. The personal utility value also contained three lower-order values; these were “job for security”, “time for family” and “job transferability”. The social utility value factor included four different lower-order factors; “to shape the future of children”, “to enhance social equality”, “to make a social contribution” and “to work with children”. In addition to the questionnaire administered to the participants, qualitative data was also collected through semi-structured interviews with 20 participants. The interviews were audiotaped

and accompanied by a diary. According to the results of the research, the motivation' choice was found to be mostly driven by intrinsic factors. Teacher candidates were found to have a strong interest in teaching and English language. Moreover, extrinsic factors such as the comfort of being an EFL teacher and the similarity of teaching with motherhood were also very important for the candidates. In addition, most of the participants stated that they chose EFL teaching as a last resort choice or as a default career. Altruistic motivations, however, were given the minimum ratings on the questionnaire. Findings were also in line with the themes found in the semi-structured interviews. It can be clearly seen that, similar to the previous studies, participants were mostly driven by intrinsic motivations. However, the position of teachers in Israel is considered to be low and being a teacher is regarded as a less prestigious job (Wongruvitch & Yitzhak, 2018) and this might be the reason for the profession to be chosen as a last resort choice.

2.3.3.2. Studies in the Turkish EFL Context

When the literature is reviewed in relation to the motivations of choosing EFL teaching as a career, it can be seen that many researchers have been interested in understanding the reasons behind it. In one of the studies, Topkaya and Uztosun (2012) aimed to identify the common motivational reasons for choosing language teaching as a career. 207 students (104 of whom were first grade and 103 were fourth grade learners) from the ELT department at a state university in Türkiye participated in the study and as there were a large number of participants, survey method was taken up as the main methodology. A two-part questionnaire was prepared to collect the data: In the first part, questions were asked to collect the demographic information of the students, and in the second part, in order to determine the motivational reasons, the adapted version of the Factors Influencing Teaching Choice (FIT-Choice) Scale (Watt & Richardson, 2007) was used. Collected data analysed through descriptive analysis revealed that the main factors determining the professional motivation of the participants were social benefit and intrinsic values of teaching, followed by their beliefs about ability. While both male and female participants were more internally and socially motivated, male participants prioritised job security and employment opportunities which was not surprising. Also, it was pointed out that choosing teaching as a career was voluntary for students rather than a fallback career. Another striking finding was that fourth-grade students had higher results than first grade students in other factors, except

for intrinsic motivations. This can be interpreted as the effect of three years of teacher education on students.

In another study by Damar (2018), conducted with 137 ELT students at a state university in Türkiye, the FIT-Choice motivation scale adapted by Kılınç et al. (2012) was administered to the participants. Similar to the previous study, the content of the scale included sub-dimensions measuring different types of motivation. These sub-dimensions were "intrinsic values" measuring pre-service teachers' interest and passion for teaching, "personal utility values" measuring motivations related to job security, time for family and time transferability, "social utility values" which measures pre-service teachers' passion for shaping individuals' futures and motivations such as social contribution, "self-perceptions of their abilities" which measures the perceptions of the teacher candidates about their teaching abilities, "fallback career choice" related to the choice of teaching profession due to their inability to fulfil their priority career preferences, and finally, "social influences" subscale in order to measure the reason depending on their learning-teaching experience or parent-peer influences (Watt & Richardson, 2007). Immediately after the scale was administered to the participants, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 32 pre-service teachers in order to obtain more in-depth results. As both qualitative and quantitative data were collected, analyses were performed accordingly. According to the findings, it was determined that the pre-service EFL teachers who chose teaching as a profession were highly motivated towards the profession. When the sub-dimensions were examined, it was stated that the highest rate was in the "social utility values" category. In the semi-structured interviews, pre-service teachers stated that they love spending time with students and teaching them something. At the same time, it was reported that most of the participants had experienced teaching the people around by mentoring them during their school years in the past. The results of the study were in line with Topkaya and Uztosun's (2012) studies, in which also the FIT-Choice scale was used to collect the data. In addition, both according to qualitative data and as a result of semi-structured interviews, it was observed that the motivation rate was higher in students who received professional orientation or guidance service related to teaching before choosing the teaching profession, compared to those who did not. Judging by the results here, it has been revealed that, as Bosnyak and Gancs (2012) stated, not only intrinsic motivation but also appropriate education and orientation play an important role among the needs of the teaching profession and shape the prejudices regarding choosing the teaching profession.

In a similar recent study conducted with the fourth and first grade ELT students, in order to find out the career motivations and perceptions Ekin et al. (2021) investigated 104 student teachers 48 of whom were first year students and 54 were fourth year students at a state university in Türkiye. First of all, a questionnaire including the students' background information was used in the study. Then, a scale developed by Watt and Richardson (2007), and translated, adapted and validated into Turkish context by Kılınç, Watt, and Richardson (2012) was given to participants. Findings revealed that the main reasons for the motivation of the students in both groups were their past teaching-learning experiences and altruistic reasons. In addition, satisfaction factors underlying their choice of teaching were generally interpreted as intrinsic career values, altruistic reasons, and salary and status values brought by the profession. However, the fourth-year students appeared to be significantly different from first year students in terms of intrinsic career values and social differences. The reason for this can be interpreted as the EFL education of the fourth-year students in the past years, while pushing them to be good in the profession, the first-year students do not know the field sufficiently and do not develop an intrinsic motivation in this field.

It can be understood from the above studies that those who choose teaching as a career appear to have different reasons and motivations. However, when studies are examined in general, it can be seen that both in Türkiye and in international studies, the common motivation sources of people who choose EFL teaching as a profession are intrinsic values (Alloush et al., 2020; Damar, 2018; Ekin et al., 2021; Olan & Bello, 2016; Shih, 2016; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012). Although the intrinsic motivations of student teachers are not sufficient in the first years of their education, it is apparent that they have improved in this respect throughout their education (Ekin et al., 2021; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012). At the same time, it can be seen how important the orientation training received by students before choosing a profession is in their decision making (Damar, 2018). Apart from these, it is understood that the salary factor is an important motivation for choosing teaching as a profession (Ekin et al., 2021; Shih, 2016). Of course, studies investigating career motivations are not limited to the above. Nevertheless, the need to meet the increasing need for teachers in Türkiye, especially in the field of ELT, necessitates studies in the field of career choice motivation (Damar, 2018).

2.4. The Potential Relationship between Self-efficacy, Teacher Identity and Career Motivation

The concept of teacher identity is intimately tied to both teacher self-efficacy and the desire to choose teaching as a profession (Moslemi & Habibi, 2019). According to Bandura (1986), self-efficacy is the idea that a person believes they can achieve in a certain task or function. For teachers, self-efficacy is strongly related to their belief in their capacity to facilitate student learning and provide instruction effectively. Teachers with high self-efficacy levels are, therefore, more likely to rise to new challenges, insist upon difficulties, and have faith in their abilities to have a positive impact on their students (Barni, Danioni, & Benevene, 2019).

The relationship between self-efficacy and teacher identity could be considered significant as well. Teachers are more likely to possess high self-efficacy levels if they have a strong sense of who they are as people and what they believe about teaching. This strong sense of self empowers teachers to make informed choices, overcome obstacles, and promote student learning. Similarly, teachers with high levels of self-efficacy are more likely to exhibit a strong sense of self and dedication to their profession (İlgör, 2019).

Furthermore, it is crucial to consider the connection between teacher identity, self-efficacy, and teaching as a profession. Teachers are more likely to be satisfied with their careers and stay in the field for a long time if they have a strong sense of who they are and what they believe about teaching. This sense of identity fosters teachers to feel more a part of their profession and more determined to have a positive influence on their students (Can, 2019). On the other hand, instructors who lack a strong sense of their own identity and teaching principles as well as those who struggle with self-efficacy might be more prone to experience burnout and quit their jobs (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Chwalisz, Altmaier, & Russell, 1992; Emmer & Hickman, 1991). This is due to the fact that they could feel overburdened by the difficulties of teaching and uncertain of their capacity to facilitate student learning in an efficacious manner.

In conclusion, there are many different ways in which teacher identity, self-efficacy, and teaching as a profession could be related. Therefore, this study aims to find out the possible relationship between EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels, teacher identities and the reasons for choosing teaching profession.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the research methodology of the current study is presented. Within this frame of reference, design of the study, participants, data collection tools, as well as data collection and analysis procedures are respectively discussed in detail.

3.1. Research Design

A paradigm in research is a set of basic assumptions, ideas, standards, and procedures that characterise a specific method of conducting research (Creswell, 2014). It includes a framework for comprehending the nature of the research topic, the procedures used to gather and analyse data, and the processes required to create and disseminate knowledge. A paradigm can be general or specific, and it can evolve over time when new knowledge is discovered or new techniques are created (Kazımlar, 2019; Morgan, 2007).

To that end, a mixed method paradigm was adopted in this study, where both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used to gather data. According to Creswell, Plano, Clark, Gutmann, and Hanson (2003), mixed method study combines both types of research methods to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem, by triangulating the data from different sources. By integrating both qualitative and quantitative research methods, one can gain a more comprehensive understanding of complex research problems (Creswell, 2014). With this in mind, a mixed-method design was adopted for this research.

According to Creswell (2014), there are three basic kinds of mixed methods design: (1) convergent parallel design, (2) explanatory sequential design, and (3) exploratory sequential design. An explanatory sequential design intends to use quantitative methods first, and then use qualitative methods to help explain the quantitative results in depth. With this in mind, the explanatory sequential design was considered more suitable for the current study given that it enables the researcher to explain statistical data with the help of qualitative results.

Moreover, a correlational design was adopted in this study since it examines the possible correlation between instructors' self-efficacy, teacher identities, and teaching motivations. A non-experimental research design known as a correlational design is employed in studies to evaluate the relationships between two or more variables. In a correlational study, researchers observe and quantify the variables of interest as they naturally occur without changing any of the variables (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2011). Finding out whether there is a statistical relationship or association between variables, as well as the strength and direction of that association, is the main objective of a correlational design. It can provide valuable insights into patterns and relationships in naturally occurring data (Creswell, 2014).

From another perspective, this study also adopted a cross-sectional research design. Cross-sectional studies differ from other types of research in that they collect the pertinent information (data) at a certain period. There is no time dimension in cross-sectional research because all data are acquired and often correspond to the time at or around the time of the data collection (Spector, 2019). In this study, data was collected at a single point in time. Furthermore, cross-sectional research design gives an advantage to the researcher as it is inexpensive, takes little time, and can assess multiple variables at once. As there were different variables serving the research questions, cross-sectional design was suitable for this study. Furthermore, as the samples are often drawn from the entire population, one can estimate the prevalence of an interesting outcome (Levin, 2006). Considering these advantages, this study employed a cross-sectional design.

3.2. Setting

The data of the present study were collected from a total of 53 universities, 10 of which are state and 43 of which are foundation, located in the province of İstanbul, Türkiye. The reason why İstanbul was chosen for the research is that the majority of 208 universities in Türkiye are located here. The participants were selected from the School of Foreign Languages, in other words, the English Preparatory Schools, units of the universities. Among the selection criteria of the participants were that they teach English as a foreign language in the preparatory units of these universities and that they are Turkish.

In the higher education system in Türkiye, all the universities are coordinated, regulated, and improved by the Council of Higher Education (CoHE). It is a government agency which

is responsible for supervising the higher education system. It is in charge of planning, coordination, and governance of all the 208 universities in Türkiye. These universities comprise 2-year associate degree programs (i.e., vocational schools), 4-year undergraduate programs (i.e., faculties), and institutes that include graduate (M.A.), and post-graduate (Ph.D.) programs.

In addition to providing these programs, most universities offer foreign language education via Schools of Foreign Languages, which usually lasts for one year. Preparatory education is compulsory for students who are enrolled in English-medium universities or departments, and the others can optionally enroll in preparatory classes. In these units, which mostly provide foreign language education under the name of the School of Foreign Languages, students are placed in classes according to their foreign language level and continue their education until they reach a required language level.

In School of Foreign Languages, whose main purpose is to offer foreign language education, lecturers are appointed according to the criteria determined by the CoHE. One of these criteria is to get a minimum of 70 points from the ALES (Academic Personnel and Postgraduate Education Entrance Exam) exam, and the other is to get a minimum of 85 points from the YDS (Foreign Language Exam) or an equivalent score from other international foreign language tests accepted by the CoHE (e.g., TOEFL, Pearson PTE, etc.). In addition, permanent instructors are required to possess a master's degree in their field. Since this rule is valid for new appointments made in 2020 and afterward, this condition does not apply to all lecturers currently working at universities.

Another condition for appointments is the department from which they graduated. Instructors have to graduate from a department whose main purpose is to study the English language, such as English Language Education, English Language Literature, American Culture and Literature, English Translation and Interpretation, and English Linguistics. This is why the participants could have different educational backgrounds.

3.3. Participants

Participants consisted of 356 EFL instructors working at the School of Foreign Languages of 53 universities in Istanbul in the 2022-2023 academic year, Spring term. Participants were chosen by using the convenience sampling method. As a non-probability sampling

method, convenience sampling involves choosing participants based on their availability and accessibility to the research site. In other words, rather than choosing participants at random, the researcher chooses people who are easily accessible and eager to participate in the study. According to Kuş (2007), the researcher may prefer accessible resources while determining the study group. While determining the study group of the research, state, and foundation universities in İstanbul were the focus. Turkish instructors who teach English as a foreign language in English preparatory classes were invited to participate in the research.

Demographics of participants were collected via items placed at the beginning of the data collection instrument set. Seven different items aimed at obtaining the demographic information of the participants were included. These items included participants' age (Item 1), gender (Item 2), undergraduate field degree (Item 3), highest qualification (Item 4), overall teaching experience (Item 5), where they currently teach (Item 6), and how long they have been teaching at the university-level (Item 7). The distribution of the instructors who participated in this study according to their age, gender , undergraduate field degree , highest qualification , overall teaching experience, and type of school (e.g., foundation or state) are tabulated in Table 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, respectively.

Table 1

Demographics of the Participants According to Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
22-30	66	18.5
31-45	198	55.7
46-60	78	21.9
61+	14	3.9
TOTAL	356	100

Table 1 demonstrates that the ages of the participants range between 22-30 (n= 66), 31-45 (n= 198), 46-60 (n= 78) and 61+ (n= 14), with a mean of 39.50.

Table 2

Demographics of the Participants According to Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	83	23.3
Female	273	76.7
TOTAL	356	100

As seen in Table 2, considering their gender, while 273 (76.7%) of the participants were female, 83 (23.3%) were male.

Table 3

Demographics of the Participants According to Undergraduate Field Degree

Undergraduate field	Frequency	Percentage (%)
English Language Teaching (ELT)	173	48.6
Others (non-ELT)	183	51.4
TOTAL	356	100

Table 3 shows that when it comes to the undergraduate field degree of the instructors, it is discovered that 173 (48.6%) participants graduated from English Language Teaching departments, while 183 (51.4%) of the instructors graduated from other language-related departments [e.g., English Language and Literature (n= 125), American Culture and Literature (n= 30), Translation and Interpreting (n= 20), Linguistics (n= 5), Business Administration (n=1)].

Table 4

Demographics of the Participants According to Education Level

Education level	Frequency	Percentage (%)
B.A.	89	25
M.A.	241	67.7
Ph.D.	26	7.3
TOTAL	356	100

B.A.= Bachelor of Arts, M.A.= Master of Arts, Ph.D.= Doctor of Philosophy

Another variable demonstrated in Table 4 is their educational background. It can be seen that there are 89 (25%) instructors with a B.A. degree, 241 (67.7%) instructors with an M.A. degree, and 26 (7.3%) instructors with a Ph.D. degree.

Table 5

Demographics of the Participants According to Teaching Experience

Overall teaching experience	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1-5	43	12.1
6-16	164	46.1
16-30	125	35.1
31+	24	6.7
TOTAL	356	100

As seen in Table 5, according to overall teaching experience 43 instructors (12.1%) have 1-5 years of experience while a majority of them (n= 164, 46.1%) have 6-16 years of experience. In addition, while the number of instructors having 16-30 years of experience is 125 (35.1%), 24 of them have more than 30 years of experience. In particular, instructors' teaching experience ranges from 1 to 54 (M= 15.74 years).

Table 6

Demographics of the Participants According to Type of Institution

Type of institution	Frequency	Percentage (%)
State	90	25.3
Foundation	266	74.7

When the type of institution of the instructors are analysed, it can be seen that 90 (25.3%) of them work in state universities, while 266 (74.4%) of them work in foundation universities in İstanbul.

In terms of the qualitative part of the study, 20 participants were purposefully chosen among the participant pool to participate in semi-structured interviews. Additionally, the participants in the qualitative part of the study were chosen using the maximum variation sampling method. In order to ensure that the study included the perspectives of a wide range of subjects who experienced the phenomenon being studied in their professional lives, this approach sought to engage participants from a variety of backgrounds. In order to find common patterns that can be seen across various cases that shed light on the fundamental components and the variable aspects of phenomena, maximum variation, one of the purposeful sampling techniques, calls for choosing subjects that differ from one another as much as possible (Suri, 2001). The participants were kindly asked to write their contact information during the quantitative data collection phase if they would like to volunteer to take part in the study's qualitative part. All of the participants' names were changed to numbers to maintain their confidentiality. Everything about them, with the exception of their names, remained the same. Table 7 gives information about the participants, namely interviewees, who took part in the qualitative stage of the study.

Table 7

Background Information of the Interviewees in the Qualitative Stage

Category	Int1	Int2	Int3	Int4	Int5	Int6	Int7
Age	35	36	32	33	42	33	48
Gender	F	M	F	F	F	M	F

B.A. degree	TRI	ELT	TRI	TRI	ELL	AME	ELT
Highest degree	M.A.	M.A.	M.A.	M.A.	B.A.	M.A.	B.A.
Years of teaching	10	13	11	12	11	10	21
Type of school	F	F	S	F	S	F	S
Self-efficacy level	Mid-high	Mid	High	Mid-high	High	Mid-high	High
Identity type	Subject matter expertise	Didactic expertise	Didactic expertise	Subject matter expertise	Pedagogical expertise	Didactic expertise	Pedagogical expertise
Career motivation	Altruistic	Social	Altruistic	Intrinsic	Altruistic	Altruistic	Altruistic

Int= Interviewee

Gender, M= Male, F= Female

B.A. Degree, TRI = Translation and Interpreting, ELT= English Language Teaching,

ELL= English Language and Literature, AME= American Culture and Literature

Highest Degree, M.A.= Master of Arts, B.A.= Bachelor of Arts

Type of School, F= Foundation university, S= State university

As seen in Table 7, seven instructors took part in the qualitative stage of the study. 5 of the interviewees were female, while 2 of them were male, and their ages range between 32 and 48. As for the undergraduate field degrees, 2 of them graduated from English Language

Teaching departments while 1 of them graduated from English Language and Literature and 3 of them from Translation and Interpreting and 1 of them American Culture and Literature. 2 of the instructors completed a B.A. degree, while 6 of them completed their M.A. degrees. The group involves instructors with different teaching experiences. While 6 of them have less than 15 years, 1 of them have more than 20 years of experience. In addition, 3 of the interviewees work at state universities, while 4 of them work at foundation universities. There is also a variety of participants regarding their self-efficacy beliefs, teacher identities and career motivations.

3.4. Data Collection Instruments

Data for this study came from both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments. Quantitative data were collected through three different questionnaires: (1) the EFL Instructor Self-Efficacy Questionnaire, (2) the Professional Identity Questionnaire (Ölmez Çağlar, 2016), and (3) the EFL Teacher Motivation Questionnaire (Karavas, 2010). The qualitative data, on the other hand, were collected through semi-structured interview protocols developed by the researcher. Detailed information about the data collection tools is tabulated in Table 8, showing the data collection tools that served each research question in the study.

Table 8

Data Collection Tools Regarding the Research Questions

Research Questions	Data Collection Tools
1. What are the self-efficacy levels of instructors who teach English as a foreign language in the university-level English Preparatory Programs in Türkiye?	EFL Instructor Self-Efficacy Questionnaire Semi-structured Interview Questions

1.1. Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to education level?

1.2. Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to undergraduate program field?

1.3. Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to years of professional experience?

1.1. Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to gender?

2. What kind of teacher identities do the EFL instructors in the university-level English Preparatory Programs in Türkiye have?

2.1. Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to education level?

2.2. Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to undergraduate program field?

2.3. Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to years of professional experience?

2.4. Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to gender?

Professional Identity
Questionnaire (Ölmez
Çağlar, 2016)

Semi-structured
Interview Questions

3. What are the motivations of instructors in the university-level Preparatory Programs in Türkiye to choose teaching as a profession?

3.1. Do the motivations for choosing teaching profession as a career vary according to education level?

3.2. Do the motivations for choosing teaching profession as a career vary according to undergraduate program field?

3.3. Do the motivations for choosing teaching profession as a career vary according to years of professional experience?

3.4. Do the motivations for choosing teaching profession as a career vary according to gender?

EFL Teacher
Motivation
Questionnaire (Karavas,
2010)

Semi-structured
Interview Questions

4. Is there a correlation between self-efficacy beliefs, teacher identities, and career motivations of instructors who teach English as a foreign language in the university-level English Preparatory Programs in Türkiye?	EFL Instructor Self-Efficacy Questionnaire Professional Identity Questionnaire (Ölmez Çağlar, 2016) EFL Teacher Motivation Questionnaire (Karavas, 2010) Semi-structured Interview Questions
---	---

3.4.1. EFL Instructor Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

Although there are many scales or questionnaires related to the self-efficacy beliefs of (foreign language) teachers in the literature, there were almost no questionnaires developed specifically for EFL instructors teaching at the university level when researched in depth. For example, the "Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)" (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) is the most commonly used instrument to measure teacher self-efficacy in the field. However, since it was developed for pre-service teachers teaching at K-12 level, it was not considered appropriate for this study. For example, there was an item like "How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?", that would not be suitable for this study which was particularly conducted with university-level EFL instructors.

Another scale named "Teacher's self-efficacy scale", which was developed by Schmitz and Schwarzer (2000) and adapted by Yılmaz, Köseoğlu, Gerçek, and Soran (2004) was not suitable for this study, either. The scale, which was originally in German, was translated into Turkish, and then reliability and validity studies were completed. However, because it was also developed for K-12 teachers, it was not used. For example, there was an item like "I can communicate well with parents.", which was not suitable for university-level EFL instructors. Therefore, it was also eliminated.

Given the lack of an appropriate data collection instrument to measure the perceived self-efficacy levels of EFL instructors in this study, the researcher developed a questionnaire. If the required instrument is not available in the literature, the researcher might develop one according to the needs (Creswell, 2012). After examining these and many other scales or questionnaires, the researcher decided to develop a questionnaire suitable for the participants and the aims of this study. To this end, the "EFL Instructor Self-Efficacy Questionnaire" (see Appendix B) was developed by the researcher. Developing an instrument entails a number of stages, including deciding on its aim, reviewing relevant literature, writing the questions, and piloting the questions on people who are similar to the participants of your intended research (Creswell, 2012). As the first of these four steps, it was determined that the first step in developing the questionnaire would be to elicit the perceived self-efficacy levels of EFL instructors. Then, when the literature was reviewed in the second step, it was understood that some reliable and valid questionnaires had been developed, but they could be modified to be more suitable for the purpose. In this regard, a new questionnaire was developed by blending two different existing questionnaires developed by the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). In the final stage, a pilot study was conducted with people with similar criteria to the participants of the study.

To be more specific, two different sources were used during the development of the questionnaire. The first of these was the English Teacher Special Field Competencies published by the General Directorate of Teacher Training and Development under the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE). The MoNE is in charge of regulating the educational system in Türkiye. The ministry is divided into a number of departments, including the Departments of Primary Education, Secondary Education, Vocational and Technical Education, and Higher Education. Together, these divisions seek to maintain the quality, accessibility, and comprehensiveness of Türkiye's educational system. With this authority, in order to identify the broad knowledge, abilities, and attitudes that must be had in order to carry out the teaching profession successfully and efficiently, the MoNE has issued some criteria. Within these criteria, five different main requirements were determined: organizing and planning the processes for teaching English, developing language skills, monitoring and evaluating language progress, working in tandem with the community, school, and families, and offering professional development in the field of English. The scope of each title and the competencies required by this scope are clearly

stated. While developing the questionnaire, the expressions within the scope of cooperation with school, family, and society, which are among these competencies, were not included because they were not suitable for the participants in this study. In the light of these competencies, 16 questions of the 27-item questionnaire were prepared from English Teacher Special Field Competencies (MoNE).

Since these qualifications stated by MoNE were originally prepared in Turkish, it became necessary to translate the items in the new questionnaire from Turkish to English. The items translated into English by the researcher were also re-worded to be more understandable and clearer. Afterwards, expert opinions were obtained from three different translators, one of which was a native speaker of English, in order to determine whether the translation was true to the original. After the changes made in the questionnaire in line with expert opinions, expert opinion was elicited from 2 faculty members specialised in the field of English Language Teaching in order to determine whether the survey served the research questions or not. Based on the feedback received from them, necessary adjustments were made to the questionnaire, and the 16 items in the questionnaire were finalised.

Another resource used in the development of the survey was the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS). TALIS is an international survey conducted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that aims to provide comparative information about teaching and learning conditions in schools worldwide. One of the measures used in the survey is self-efficacy, which refers to teachers' beliefs in their ability to perform specific teaching tasks effectively. TALIS self-efficacy measures teachers' confidence in their ability to use different teaching practices, such as engaging students in learning, managing classroom behaviour, and adapting teaching to student diversity. The TALIS self-efficacy measures are based on Bandura's (1997) Self-efficacy Theory, which suggests that people's beliefs in their ability to perform specific tasks influence their behaviour and performance. The measures are designed to capture teachers' beliefs about their ability to use specific teaching practices, rather than their overall self-confidence or personality traits.

In the original TALIS questionnaire, there are 9 sub-domains: (1) Background and qualification, (2) Current work, (3) Professional development, (4) Feedback, (5) Teaching in general, (6) Teaching in the target class, (7) Teaching in diverse environments, (8) School climate and job satisfaction, and (9) Teacher mobility. Under the sub-domain “Teaching in general” there are 13 items consisting of four options (1= Not at all, 2= To some extent, 3=

Quite a bit, and 4= A lot). Two of the items, “I can support student learning through the use of digital technology” and “I can use a variety of assessment strategies” were omitted as they overlapped with the competencies of MoNE. Also, the items used in the questionnaire were re-worded to make them much simpler and clearer. Considering these data, the remaining 11 questions of the 27-item questionnaire were prepared from the TALIS (OECD). As the questionnaire itself is in English, no translation was needed.

When it comes to the content of the newly developed questionnaire, there are 27 items in total, consisting of 6 different subdomains. In the first subdomain, (1) "Efficacy for planning and organising teaching processes", instructors' ability to plan their teaching and their ability to select appropriate materials/resources are questioned through five items. In the second sub-domain, (2) "Efficacy for instructional strategies", there are three items aimed at measuring their teaching skills. Also, in the (3) "Efficacy for classroom management" subdomain which consists of four items, the ability to maintain order in the classroom and control student behaviour is measured. In the fourth sub-domain, (4) "Efficacy for developing language skills", there are seven items aimed to measure the effectiveness of students in determining language education strategies and developing language skills. Another sub-domain, (5) "Efficacy for student engagement", measures how efficacious they are in maintaining students' motivation for learning a foreign language and prompting using critical thinking strategies through four items. Finally, students' self-efficacy beliefs about measuring and evaluating their language development are evaluated with the (6) "Efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development" subdomain with four items in it.

After the 27-item questionnaire was finalised, it was piloted with a group of Turkish EFL instructors (N= 11), who would not be involved in the study later on. In line with the feedback received from the 11 respondents, the unclear items were rearranged, and the questionnaire was finalised. The final version of the questionnaire contains 6 sub-domains: (1) Efficacy for planning and organising teaching processes, (2) Efficacy for instructional strategies, (3) Efficacy for classroom management, (4) Efficacy for developing language skills, (5) Efficacy for student engagement, and (6) Efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development. It is a 5-point Likert-type questionnaire including five options (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Undecided, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree).

The reliability of the questionnaire was examined through SPSS 22. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was obtained for the entire questionnaire as well as its four sub-domains for reliability reasons. The questionnaire's total alpha value was 0.93. The following were the

alpha values determined for each domain: (1) 0.81 for the first domain (efficacy for planning and organizing teaching processes); (2) 0.72 for the second (efficacy for instructional strategies); (3) 0.86 for the third (efficacy for classroom management); (4) 0.83 for the fourth (efficacy for developing language skills); (5) 0.79 for the fifth (efficacy for student engagement); and (6) 0.89 for the sixth (efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development). In light of these results and the overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient for both the entire questionnaire and sub-domains, a high level of internal consistency was assured.

3.4.2. Professional Identity Questionnaire

In order to determine EFL instructors' teacher identities, the "Professional Identity Questionnaire" developed by Ölmez Çağlar (2016) (see Appendix C) was adopted. This questionnaire is a 5-point Likert type including five options (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Undecided, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree). Before the construction of the questionnaire, the theoretical framework for the concept of teachers' professional identities was investigated. According to the three main components put forward by Beijaard, Verloop, and Vermunt (2004) regarding teacher identity; (1) the teacher as a subject matter expert, (2) the teacher as a pedagogical expert, and (3) the teacher as a didactical expert was taken as a starting point for the questionnaire. In addition to these three subdomains, since instructors also need to make efforts to protect and develop their current professional identities, the pursuit of professional growth was judged essential to be included in the construct. Therefore, the questionnaire consists of four sub-domains: (1) Subject Matter Expertise, (2) Didactic Expertise, (3) Pedagogical Expertise, and (4) Continuation of Professional Development. The first sub-domain, namely "Subject Matter Expertise" includes six items (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) which measure the knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, pragmatic failures, and cultural aspects of the English language. The second sub-domain, "Didactic Expertise" consists of twelve items (Items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18) related to modern techniques, methods or specific procedures to teach a foreign language, especially in terms of reading, listening, writing, speaking, grammar, and vocabulary. The third sub-domain, "Pedagogical Expertise" includes seven items (Items 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25) which are about facilitating students' autonomy, knowing students' individual differences and their needs. It also aims to investigate the importance given to students' social, academic, and emotional developments. Lastly, the

final subdomain, “Attitudes towards Professional Development” includes ten items (Items 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35) about the activities regarding teacher training, reflection on teaching experiences. Moreover, it includes items concerning their professional development, such as searching, publishing, and following the latest trends. Apart from these, there is one reverse item (item 33) in the questionnaire, which is worded negatively, unlike the other items.

When it comes to the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated for both the whole questionnaire and the four sub-domains using SPSS 22. The questionnaire's total alpha value was calculated as 0.92. Also, the following alpha values were determined for each sub-domain: 0.84 for the first domain (subject matter expertise); 0.91 for the second domain (didactic expertise); 0.86 for the third domain (pedagogical expertise); and 0.79 for the fourth domain (continuation of professional development). Considering these results and the overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the entire questionnaire and sub-domains, a high level of reliability was found.

3.4.3. EFL Teacher Motivation Questionnaire

To investigate why EFL instructors preferred teaching as a career, the "EFL Teacher Motivation Questionnaire " questionnaire (see Appendix D), developed by Karavas (2010) for Greek EFL teachers, was adopted for this study. Originally, the questionnaire items are in English; therefore, no translation was needed. The original questionnaire consists of four main parts: (1) Biographical information of teachers, (2) satisfaction level of teachers, (3) attitudes of teachers towards school-based factors, and (4) teachers’ reasons for entering teaching as a career. After the questionnaire was developed by Karavas (2010), it was piloted with 400 EFL teachers working in Greece, an EFL context as in Türkiye. Fowler (2009) stated that, questionnaires can be modified unless it remained relevant to the research objectives. Therefore, to meet the aim of this research, only the 4th part of the questionnaire, namely teachers’ reasons for entering teaching as a career, was used.

Before deciding on the questionnaire, it was thoroughly reviewed and the content, structure, and items were questioned. It was evaluated whether the questionnaire was applicable to the Turkish context and also the objectives of the current research. In the meantime, factors such as research questions, variables of interest, and the population of the study were also

considered. The cross-cultural validity of the questionnaire was also evaluated. This evaluation included determining if the questionnaire's items were culturally relevant to Turkish EFL instructors. After considering cultural norms, language and contextual differences, expert opinions were also taken regarding the applicability of the questionnaire in the Turkish context. Based on the feedback, the questionnaire was considered appropriate. The "EFL Teacher Motivation Questionnaire" questionnaire (Karavas, 2010) consists of a total of 13 items, one of which is open-ended. The respondents are asked to evaluate the given items in order of importance from 1 to 5 (1= Not at all important, 2= Slightly important, 3= Important, 4= Fairly important, 5= Very important). In addition to 12 items such as salary, benefits, job security, and working with young adults, there is also an "Other" option that the participants could add themselves.

As for the reliability purposes, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated for the whole questionnaire using SPSS 22. The questionnaire's total alpha value was 0.77, indicating an acceptable level of internal consistency.

3.4.4. Semi-Structured Interviews

To support quantitative data, qualitative data were collected via semi-structured interviews. According to Dörnyei (2007), a semi-structured interview is a qualitative research method that involves conducting an interview with a predetermined set of questions, also allowing for flexibility and follow-up questions based on the interviewee's responses. In a semi-structured interview, the interviewer has a general idea of what they want to ask but is also able to adjust the questions and the interviewee's responses. This approach allows for a more in-depth understanding of the interviewee's perspectives, experiences, and attitudes on a particular topic. They typically start with open-ended questions to encourage interviewees to speak freely about the topic of interest. The interviewer may then follow up with specific questions to clarify or elaborate on the interviewee's responses. The data collected from semi-structured interviews can be analysed qualitatively, with researchers identifying patterns and themes in the interviewee's responses. Overall, semi-structured interviews can provide rich, detailed information that can help researchers gain a deeper understanding of a particular topic (Nunan, 2003). Therefore, a semi-structured interview was administered in order to deeply understand the perspectives of the participants.

In the current study, semi-structured interview questions (see Appendix E) were developed by the researcher. The interview questions are basically grouped under four main questions, each serving a different purpose. In other words, each developed question and sub-questions were developed to address a different research question. That is to say, aims of each interview question is: (1) The reasons behind choosing to be an EFL instructor, (2) their perceptions about their teacher identities, (3) how efficacious they feel in foreign language teaching, and (4) their views on the possible correlation between their self-efficacy, teacher-identity and career motivations. Under each category, there are also sub-categories as follow-up questions.

The interview questions were prepared in Turkish, the respondents' mother tongue, in order to make them feel more comfortable and open. Each question was made available for respondents to express themselves better and provide further explanations. After the questions were prepared, they were sent to two Ph.D. graduate experts working in the ELT field, and feedback was requested. It was supervised both in terms of language clarity and whether they served the research questions. Based on the feedback given, the questions were revised and finalised.

3.5. Data Collection Procedures

Prior to the start of the data collection process, the ethical procedures regarding the data collection process were initiated. In the beginning, the approval of the Sakarya University Ethics Committee was required. First of all, a proposal was prepared, and an application was made to the Sakarya University Ethics Committee. After the approval of the committee (see Appendix F), the "Permit for Survey Application" was applied for the surveys to be applied to the EFL instructors, and the necessary correspondence was made by the Institute of Education with the state and foundation universities in Istanbul where the research would be conducted. After getting the official permissions from the universities, the questionnaires to be used in the quantitative data collection phase were primarily prepared via Google Forms in order to collect the data online. In the first part of this form, which consists of 4 main parts in total, the researcher herself and the purpose of the research were indicated. It was clearly stated to the respondents that the study was on a voluntary basis, and they were informed about the aim and the content of the study in detail. A check box on the form asked for the participants' informed agreement to take part in the study. The

form also included the voluntary consent of the respondents who preferred to take part in the qualitative stage as well. The data were collected in the Spring term of the 2022-2023 academic year when the educational institutions in Türkiye carried out hybrid education (online or face-to-face) in many universities with the decision of CoHE. Therefore, English language instructors at both public and private universities in Istanbul were each sent an email with a link to the Google Forms survey. First, utilizing the university websites, the work email addresses of all the instructors from the universities in İstanbul were obtained and listed. The researcher then addressed each English language instructor on the list in an individual email. Approximately 1650 instructors were contacted via e-mail and kindly requested to participate in the study. The survey collection process continued for approximately one month. In total, 373 participants responded to the questionnaire.

As for the qualitative stage of the study, a total of 7 voluntary respondents were interviewed. In order to choose the interviewees, a stratified sampling method was employed. According to Cochran (1977), using subgroups or strata depending on specific criteria, stratified sampling is a statistical sampling technique that makes sure a representative sample is taken from a population. Independent sampling is used to choose samples from each stratum in proportion to how common each is in the population. The sample is more accurate and representative of the total population thanks to this methodology, which enables researchers to capture the variation found in various subgroups. Therefore, first, the population was identified in terms of categories such as EFL instructors having high, mid, and low-self-efficacy levels. Secondly, the population was divided into mutually exclusive and exhaustive subgroups based on specific characteristics such as having different types of teacher identities. Then the number of participants in each stratum to be sampled was decided and randomly selected. Finally, once samples were collected from each stratum, they were combined to form the final stratified sample. A total of 21 interviewees were invited via e-mail, yet only 7 of them accepted the invitation and participated in interviews.

The interviews with these seven interviewees were performed via Zoom or face-to-face. Interviews were carried out in Turkish, to make respondents feel more comfortable. A meeting time was fixed according to the convenience of the volunteering respondents. At the beginning of the interviews, participants were sent a consent form and kindly asked to volunteer in the qualitative stage of the study. Regarding their consent, interviews were recorded. A clear understanding of the research questions was ensured by asking

predetermined interview questions and, if necessary, follow-up questions to the interviewees.

3.6. Data Analysis Procedures

As the data for this study came from both quantitative and qualitative instruments, namely (a) the EFL instructor self-efficacy questionnaire, (b) the Professional identity questionnaire, (c) the EFL teacher motivation questionnaire, and (d) Semi-structured interviews, qualitative and quantitative data were analysed utilizing a variety of different procedures. To begin with, quantitative data that came from (a) EFL instructor self-efficacy questionnaire, (b) the Professional identity questionnaire, and (c) the EFL teacher motivation questionnaire were transferred into the SPSS 22.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) program for performing statistical analyses. First, data were screened for missing values and normality. Afterwards, frequencies, percentages, means, and minimum and maximum values were determined. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the questionnaires and their sub-dimensions were then calculated in order to determine reliability. Additionally, by calculating means and standard deviations, the participants' self-efficacy beliefs, teacher identities, and why they chose teaching as a profession were examined. After that, the researcher conducted a correlational analysis to discover any potential connections between the variables and the sub-dimensions. One-way ANOVA, Independent Sample T-test, and Fisher's Exact Test were run in order to identify any potential significant relationship between the instructors' self-efficacy beliefs, teacher identities, and choosing teaching as a profession and the following variables: gender, education level, undergraduate program field, and years of professional experience. Fisher's Exact Test was preferred instead of Chi-Square Test because less than 20% of the cells in the crosstabs had values less than 5 (Sauro & Lewis, 2012).

In the second step, qualitative data gathered via semi-structured interviews were analysed by administering inductive content analysis. Content analysis is systematically examining and understanding oral, written, or visual information. Finding and examining patterns, themes, and meanings within the data is part of this quantitative and qualitative research technique (Weber, 1990). It is described by Krippendorff (2018) as a research technique for making accurate and reliable inferences from data to their context.

In the final stage of the data collection process, the researcher recorded interviews with 7 volunteer participants and then typed up the transcriptions. To put it another way, inductive content analysis was used, where the researcher theorised the data, then categorised the concepts into meaningful groups, and lastly found the reoccurring meaningful themes to interpret the data. By creating summary themes or categories from the raw data, inductive approaches aim to help people understand the meaning in complex data (Thomas, 2006). In order to build an understanding through the patterns, categories, and themes were allowed to emerge naturally from the data. As the inductive approach is less structured and highly flexible, it allowed for the discovery of new categories and was open to unexpected findings. Therefore, to meet the objectives, the researcher re-listened to the interview recordings at this phase if necessary and then developed a list of themes and its sub-dimensions. In order to minimise bias, the researcher did not intervene with the respondents while collecting the data.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented. Whereas the first section presents the quantitative data findings gathered from questionnaires, the second section addresses the qualitative data analyses obtained through semi-structured interviews.

4.1. Findings of Quantitative Data

As mentioned previously in the methodology chapter (see Chapter 3), to find out the self-efficacy levels, teacher identities, and the reasons for choosing teaching as a career, quantitative data came from three questionnaires focusing basically on self-efficacy, teacher identity, and career motivations. After checking for the missing data, SPSS was used to run frequency and descriptive analyses. The following sections present a detailed portrayal of the findings.

4.1.1. Findings Related to the Self-Efficacy Levels of EFL Instructors

In light of Research Question 1 (RQ1), which sought to investigate the self-efficacy levels of EFL instructors, data elicited via the “EFL Instructor Self-Efficacy Questionnaire” were initially analysed through descriptive statistics, where the means and standard deviations for the questionnaire were calculated. Table 9 shows the findings of descriptive statistics regarding instructors’ self-efficacy levels according to sub-dimensions.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics of Self-efficacy Questionnaire According to Its Sub-dimensions

Sub-dimensions	M	SD
Efficacy for instructional strategies	4.52	.50
Efficacy for planning and organising teaching processes	4.50	.48
Efficacy for classroom management	4.42	.57
Efficacy for student engagement	4.35	.55
Efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development	4.32	.65
Efficacy for developing language skills	4.29	.52

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

As presented in Table 9, instructors considered themselves self-efficacious in instructional strategies (M= 4.52, SD= .50) and planning and organising teaching processes (M= 4.50, SD= .48) than they did in other sub-dimensions. With respect to the area in which the instructors felt the least self-efficacious, developing language skills (M= 4.29, SD= .52) received the lowest mean score. Findings regarding each sub-dimension are presented in detail in the following sections.

4.1.1.1. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Instructional Strategies

Regarding the self-efficacy of EFL instructors in instructional strategies, findings are given in Table 10.

Table 10

Self-efficacy Levels for Instructional Strategies

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly Agree n (%)
7. I can provide an alternative explanation	4.73	.50	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (3.1%)	72 (20.2%)	273 (76.7%)
6. I can craft good questions for students	4.50	.64	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	26 (7.3%)	122 (34.3%)	207 (58.1%)
8. I can vary instructional strategies in the classroom	4.32	.69	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	43 (12.1%)	153 (43%)	159 (44.7%)

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

When instructors were asked to rate their self-efficacy for instructional strategies, providing alternative explanations had the highest mean score (M= 4.73, SD= .50). In other words, the majority found themselves self-efficacious in clarifying certain points when students were confused. As for the other instructional strategies, they also felt self-efficacious in crafting good questions for students (M= 4.50, SD= .64). On the other hand, varying instructional strategies in the classroom had the lowest mean score (M= 4.32, SD= .69), illustrating that this was the sub-dimension in which they felt the least self-efficacious among others.

4.1.1.2. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Planning and Organising Teaching Processes

Findings regarding EFL instructors' self-efficacy beliefs for planning and organising teaching processes are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Levels for Planning and Organising Teaching Processes

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly Agree n (%)
3. I can use materials and resources which are suitable for the process.	4.64	.56	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	12 (3.4%)	99 (27.8%)	244 (68.5%)
1. I can make appropriate planning for English language teaching.	4.56	.61	1 (0,3%)	0 (0%)	18 (5.1%)	115 (32.3%)	222 (62.4%)
4. I can use methods and techniques suitable for the English language teaching process.	4.48	.63	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	25 (7%)	131 (36.8%)	199 (55.9%)
2. I can organise learning	4.45	.67	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	33 (9.3%)	126 (35.4%)	196 (55.1%)

environments
suitable for English
teaching.

5. I can use technological resources in English language teaching.	4.38	.72	0 (0%)	5 (1.4%)	35 (9.8%)	133 (37.4%)	183 (51.4%)
---	------	-----	-----------	-------------	--------------	----------------	----------------

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

As illustrated in Table 11, instructors' self-efficacy levels for planning and organising teaching processes varied. They had the highest level of self-efficacy in using materials and resources suitable for the process (M= 4.64, SD= .56). Whereas the second area they felt the most self-efficacious was making appropriate planning for language teaching (M= 4.56, SD= 0.61), the third one was using methods and techniques suitable for the English language process (M= 4.48, SD= .63). The lowest mean score belonged to the sub-dimension of using technological resources in English language teaching (M= 4.38, SD= .72) amongst others. Overall, while EFL instructors considered themselves most self-efficacious in using materials and resources as well as preparing plans, they did not do so when it came to using technological resources.

4.1.1.3. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Classroom Management

Findings related to the self-efficacy of EFL instructors regarding their classroom management are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Self-efficacy Levels for Classroom Management

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly Agree n (%)
9. I can make my expectations clear about student behaviour.	4.48	.66	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	29 (8.1%)	121 (34%)	204 (57.3%)
10. I can control disruptive behaviour in the classroom.	4.41	.70	0 (0%)	5 (1.4%)	30 (8.4%)	134 (37.6%)	187 (52.5%)
12. I can get students to follow the classroom rules.	4.38	.65	0 (0%)	3 (0.8%)	26 (7.3%)	159 (44.7%)	168 (47.2%)
11. I can calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.	4.34	.72	0 (0%)	6 (1.7%)	35 (9.8%)	144 (40.4%)	171 (48%)

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

According to the mean scores under the sub-dimension efficacy for classroom management, instructors described themselves as the most self-efficacious in making their expectations clear about student behaviour (M= 4.48, SD= .66). In addition to this, in controlling disruptive behaviour in classroom (M= 4.41, SD= .70), getting students to follow the classroom rules (M= 4.38, SD= 0.65), and finally calming disruptive or noisy students (M= 4.34, SD= .72), similar findings were found.

4.1.1.4. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Student Engagement

Findings regarding self-efficacy for student engagement are given in Table 13.

Table 13

Self-efficacy Levels for Student Engagement

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly Agree n (%)
20. I can get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork.	4.48	.60	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	18 (5.1%)	146 (41%)	191 (53.7%)
21. I can help students value learning.	4.40	.70	0 (0%)	4 (1.1%)	34 (9.6%)	131 (36.8%)	187 (52.5%)
23. I can help students think critically.	4.31	.70	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	44 (12.4%)	149 (41.9%)	161 (45.2%)
22. I can motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork.	4.14	.82	1 (0.3%)	8 (2.2%)	68 (19.1%)	141 (39.6%)	138 (38.8%)

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Findings, as presented in Table 13, illustrated that almost all of the instructors (N= 337, 94.7%) found themselves self-efficacious in getting students to believe that they can do well in schoolwork. Similarly, a majority of them (N= 318, 89.3%) indicated that they can help students value learning. On the other hand, the lowest mean score in this sub-dimension was found in item 22 (M= 4.14, SD= .82), where instructors did not feel that self-efficacious in motivating students showing low interest in schoolwork.

4.1.1.5. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Monitoring and Assessing Language Development

Concerning the findings of self-efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development, Table 14 shows the details regarding the descriptive statistics of each item related to their efficacy.

Table 14

Self-efficacy Levels for Monitoring and Assessing Language Development

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly agree n (%)
26. I can interpret the assessment questions to determine the language development of students and provide feedback.	4.35	.74	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.1%)	39 (11.0%)	136 (38.2%)	176 (49.4%)

24. I can determine the purposes of assessment and evaluation practices.	4.29	.78	1 (0.3%)	7 (2%)	46 (12.9%)	133 (37.4%)	169 (47.5%)
25. I can use assessment and evaluation tools and methods in English language teaching.	4.29	.80	2 (0.6%)	9 (2.5%)	39 (11%)	139 (39%)	167 (46.9%)
27. I can organise students' practices in the light of the assessment and evaluation results.	4.29	.72	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.6%)	44 (12.4%)	152 (42.7%)	157 (44.1%)

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Findings demonstrated that instructors overall felt self-efficacious in monitoring and assessing students' language development. When the items were considered, it was noticed that interpreting the assessment questions to determine the language development of students and providing feedback had the highest mean score (M= 4.35, SD= .74). Findings also reported high mean scores for determining the purposes of assessment and evaluation practices (M= 4.29, SD= .78), using assessment and evaluation tools and methods in English language teaching (M= 4.29, SD= .80), and organizing students' practices in the light of the assessment and evaluation results (M= 4.29, SD= .72).

4.1.1.6. Findings Related to the Efficacy for Developing Language Skills

As to the self-efficacy of instructors in developing language skills, findings are tabulated in Table 15.

Table 15

Self-efficacy Levels for Developing Language Skills

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly agree n (%)
17. I can improve students' writing skills.	4.50	.68	0 (0%)	4 (1.1%)	27 (7.6%)	109 (30.6%)	216 (60.7%)
16. I can improve students' reading skills.	4.45	.62	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	25 (7%)	144 (40%)	187 (52.5%)
18. I can improve students' speaking skills.	4.30	.75	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.1%)	45 (12.6%)	142 (39.9%)	164 (46.1%)
13. I can help students develop effective language learning strategies.	4.29	.70	0 (0%)	5 (1.4%)	36 (10.1%)	165 (46.3%)	150 (42.1%)
14. I can ensure that students use English accurately and clearly.	4.22	.73	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.1%)	46 (12.9%)	168 (47.2%)	137 (38.5%)
19. I can adapt my teaching according to the needs of students	4.00	.91	3 (0.8%)	17 (4.8%)	78 (21.9%)	137 (38.5%)	121 (34%)

with special
educational needs.

15. I can improve students' listening skills.	3.31	1.87	1 (0.3%)	5 (1.4%)	46 (12.9%)	158 (44.4%)	146 (41%)
---	------	------	-------------	-------------	---------------	----------------	--------------

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

As also reported in Table 15, improving students' writing skills (M= 4.50, SD= .68) and reading skills (M= 4.45, SD= .62) were the areas where EFL instructors expressed themselves the most self-efficacious. Regarding their efficacy in improving speaking skills (M= 4.30, SD= .75), the analysis yielded similar findings. However, regarding their perceived self-efficacy in improving listening skills, they felt comparatively less self-efficacious (M= 3.31, SD= 1.87), as compared to their perceived self-efficacy levels in improving other language skills. Also, almost one-fourth of EFL instructors showed disagreement (n= 20, 5.6%) or were undecided (n= 78, 21.9%) regarding their self-efficacy in adapting their teaching according to the needs of students with special educational needs.

4.1.2. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Different Variables

In accordance with Research Question 1.1. (RQ1.1), 1.2. (RQ1.2), 1.3. (RQ1.3) and 1.4. (RQ1.4), the self-efficacy levels of EFL instructors were examined in relation to several variables, including their educational level, undergraduate program field, years of professional experience, and gender. Findings are reported in the following sub-sections.

4.1.2.1. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Education Level

Research question 1.1 sought to investigate whether EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels vary according to education level (e.g., BA, MA, Ph.D.). Not only the overall perceived self-efficacy levels, but also the self-efficacy sub-dimensions (i.e., efficacy for planning and

organizing teaching processes, efficacy for instructional strategies, efficacy for classroom management, efficacy for developing language skills, efficacy for student engagement, efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development) were investigated within this scope. The findings of the descriptive statistics are tabulated in Table 16.

Table 16

Self-efficacy Levels According to Education Level

Sub-dimensions	B.A.		M.A.		Ph.D.		Sig. (p)
	(n= 89)		(n= 241)		(n= 26)		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Efficacy for planning and organizing teaching processes	4.46	.52	4.51	.47	4.57	.45	.49
Efficacy for instructional strategies	4.43	.51	4.53	.48	4.65	.47	.81
Efficacy for classroom management	4.36	.59	4.41	.57	4.50	.67	.56
Efficacy for developing language skills	4.26	.52	4.29	.52	4.30	.52	.88
Efficacy for student engagement	4.33	.56	4.32	.57	4.39	.49	.82
Efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development	4.24	.64	4.33	.67	4.32	.61	.57
Overall	4.35	.44	4.40	.43	4.45	.43	.46

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

B.A.= Bachelor of Arts, M.A.= Master of Arts, Ph.D.= Doctor of Philosophy

In order to investigate whether instructors' perceived self-efficacy levels significantly vary according to their education level, a parametric one-way ANOVA was conducted. According to the findings, instructors with a Ph.D. degree had the highest self-efficacy levels in almost all the sub-dimensions, except for self-efficacy in monitoring and assessing

language development. In overall evaluation, too, instructors having a Ph.D. degree were more efficacious compared to the ones having B.A. and M.A. degrees. However, although differences in mean scores were observed in both sub-dimensions and overall, no statistically significant difference was found ($p = .46$).

4.1.2.2. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Undergraduate Program Field

Research question 1.2 (RQ1.2.) aimed to reveal whether EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels differ according to their undergraduate program field. The findings of descriptive statistics are shown in Table 17.

Table 17

Self-efficacy Levels According to Undergraduate Program Field

Sub-dimensions	ELT graduates (n= 173)		Other (Non-ELT graduates) (n= 183)		Sig. (p)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Efficacy for planning and organizing teaching processes	4.55	.46	4.46	.50	.10
Efficacy for instructional strategies	4.52	.49	4.52	.50	.99
Efficacy for classroom management	4.4	.57	4.42	.58	.99
Efficacy for developing language skills	4.31	.49	4.26	.55	.39
Efficacy for student engagement	4.37	.55	4.34	.56	.69
Efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development	4.38	.60	4.25	.70	.04*

Overall	4.41	.41	4.37	.45	.29
---------	------	-----	------	-----	-----

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance, ELT= English Language Teaching

*p<.05

According to the findings shown in Table 17, EFL instructors who graduated from English Language Teaching (ELT) departments had higher self-efficacy levels in efficacy for planning and organising teaching processes, efficacy for developing language skills, efficacy for student engagement as well as efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development. In the overall evaluation, ELT graduates were more self-efficacious compared to those who graduated from other departments (namely, non-ELT departments). In order to investigate whether instructors' self-efficacy varies according to the undergraduate program field they graduated from, an independent samples t-test was conducted. However, no statistically significant difference was found only in efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development ($p = .04$), with ELT graduates demonstrating higher self-efficacy levels ($M = 4.38$, $SD = .60$) as compared to those who graduated from other departments ($M = 4.25$, $SD = .70$).

4.1.2.3. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Years of Professional Experience

Research question 1.3 (RQ1.3.) investigated whether EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels vary according to their years of professional experience. Findings of descriptive statistics are provided in Table 18.

Table 18

Self-efficacy Levels According to Years of Professional Experience

Sub-dimensions	1-5		6-15		16-30		31+		
	years		years		years		years		
	(n= 43)		(n=164)		(n= 125)		(n= 24)		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	Sig. (p)
Efficacy for planning and organising teaching processes	4.42	.45	4.48	.46	4.52	.52	4.66	.43	.22
Efficacy for instructional strategies	4.27	.56	4.45	.47	4.65	.47	4.68	.37	.00*
Efficacy for classroom management	4.02	.73	4.34	.54	4.57	.52	4.64	.39	.00*
Efficacy for developing language skills	4.22	.49	4.20	.53	4.37	.52	4.55	.38	.00*
Efficacy for student engagement	4.39	.54	4.25	.57	4.37	.56	4.57	.37	.04*
Efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development	4.11	.70	4.23	.70	4.42	.60	4.55	.41	.00*
Overall	4.24	.44	4.33	.42	4.48	.44	4.62	.30	.00*

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

*p<.05

As seen in Table 18, as the instructors' experience increased, their perceived self-efficacy levels also appeared to increase. Regarding their overall self-efficacy, instructors having 31+ years of experience were the most self-efficacious (M= 4.62, SD= .30) across all groups. Furthermore, in order to investigate whether these differences in instructors' self-

efficacy are statistically significant or not, a one-way ANOVA was conducted, reporting a statistically significant difference across all groups in terms of self-efficacy ($p = .00$). Likewise, a significant difference was also found in all sub-dimensions except for self-efficacy of planning and organising teaching processes ($p = .22$): self-efficacy for instructional strategies ($p = .00$), classroom management ($p = .00$), developing language skills ($p = .00$), student engagement ($p = .04$) and monitoring and assessing language development ($p = .00$).

4.1.2.4. Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Instructors According to Gender

Research question 1.4 (RQ1.4.) investigated whether EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels vary according to their gender. Findings of descriptive statistics are provided in Table 19.

Table 19

Self-efficacy Levels According to Gender

Sub-dimensions	Females (n= 273)		Males (n= 83)		Sig. (p)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Efficacy for planning and organising teaching processes	4.51	.48	4.48	.49	.66
Efficacy for instructional strategies	4.51	.80	4.55	.79	.55
Efficacy for classroom management	4.42	.56	4.40	.61	.72
Efficacy for developing language skills	4.27	.51	4.33	.57	.38
Efficacy for student engagement	4.36	.53	4.35	.62	.94
Efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development	4.31	.67	4.36	.61	.52

Overall	4.39	.42	4.40	.46	.84
---------	------	-----	------	-----	-----

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

According to the findings shown in Table 19, overall, male instructors (M= 4.40, SD= .46) had slightly higher self-efficacy levels than female instructors (M= 4.39, SD= .42), and this difference was not statistically significant ($p = .49$). Regarding the sub-dimensions, while female EFL instructors had higher self-efficacy levels in efficacy for planning and organising teaching processes, classroom management, student engagement, males had higher self-efficacy levels in instructional strategies, developing language skills, and monitoring and assessing language development. In order to investigate whether instructors' self-efficacy varies according to gender, an independent samples t-test was conducted. However, no statistically significant difference was found.

4.1.3. Findings Related to Teacher Identity

The aim of the second research question (RQ2) was to reveal the type of teacher identity EFL instructors have. There were four sub-dimensions in the questionnaire; (1) subject matter expertise, (2) didactic expertise, (3) pedagogical expertise, and (4) attitudes towards professional development. The descriptives for sub-dimensions are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Teacher Identities According to Its Sub-dimensions

Sub-dimensions	M	SD
Pedagogical expertise	4.45	.51
Didactic expertise	4.43	.49
Subject matter expertise	4.33	.51
Attitudes towards professional development	3.73	.61

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

When the findings in Table 20 are examined, it can be stated that EFL instructors' identities were mostly developed in pedagogical expertise (M= 4.45, SD= .51). Secondly, they were almost equally developed in didactic (M= 4.43, SD= .49) and subject matter (M= 4.33, SD= .51) expertise. When it comes to professional development, nevertheless, they seemed to have lower identities (M= 3.73, SD= .61) than in other sub-dimensions.

4.1.3.1. Findings Related to Pedagogical Expertise

EFL instructors were also asked to rate seven items based on their pedagogical expertise. The details of the findings are shown in Table 21.

Table 21

Teacher Identities for Pedagogical Expertise

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly agree n (%)
24. I am knowledgeable about how individual learner differences can affect the learning outcomes	4.58	.61	0 (0%)	4 (1.1%)	12 (3.4%)	113 (31.7%)	227 (63.8%)
25. I pay attention to student psychology during	4.57	.59	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (5.3%)	114 (32%)	223 (62.6%)

my teaching
practices

23. I am able to support students' academic development	4.55	.59	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	13 (3.7%)	128 (36%)	213 (59.8%)
19. I am able to adopt different teacher roles according to student needs	4.52	.63	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	21 (5.9%)	122 (34.3%)	211 (59.3%)
20. I am able to facilitate learner autonomy	4.41	.68	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	34 (9.6%)	135 (37.9%)	185 (52%)
21. I am able to support students' social development	4.33	.77	0 (0%)	7 (2%)	47 (13.2%)	123 (34.6%)	179 (50.3%)
22. I am able to support students' emotional development	4.22	.85	1 (0.3%)	13 (3.7%)	53 (14.9%)	127 (35.7%)	162 (45.5%)

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

As can be seen in Table 21, most participants agreed that they were knowledgeable about learner differences (M= 4.58, SD= .61), they were able to adopt different teacher roles according to students' needs (M= 4.52, SD= .63) and facilitate learner autonomy (M= 4.41, SD= .68). They also self-reported being supportive in students' social (M= 4.33, SD= .77), emotional (M= 4.22, SD= .85), and academic development (M= 4.55, SD= .59). At the same

time, they seemed to be equally knowledgeable about learner differences and pay attention to student psychology during their practices ($M= 4.57$, $SD= .59$).

4.1.3.2. Findings Related to Didactic Expertise

Findings delving into instructors' teacher identities related to didactic expertise are shown in Table 22.

Table 22

Teacher Identities for Didactic Expertise

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly Disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly Agree n (%)
16. I know how to use different language teaching resources	4.64	.53	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	7 (2%)	110 (30.9%)	238 (66.9%)
12. I am able to use specific procedures to teach writing	4.55	.64	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	28 (7.9%)	98 (27.5%)	229 (64.3%)
9. I am able to use specific procedures to support the learning of grammar	4.55	.61	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	18 (5.1%)	116 (32.6%)	220 (61.8%)

8. I am able to prepare lessons according to my students' needs	4.52	.66	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.8%)	18 (5.1%)	119 (33.4%)	215 (60.4%)
10. I am able to use specific procedures to support the learning of vocabulary	4.51	.63	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	21 (5.9%)	123 (34.6%)	210 (59%)
14. I am able to use specific procedures to teach reading	4.51	.64	0 (0%)	3 (0.8%)	21 (5.9%)	122 (34.3)	210 (59%)
15. I am able to raise students' awareness of other cultures in multilingual classes	4.37	.76	0 (0%)	4 (1.1%)	51 (14.3%)	107 (30.1%)	194 (54.5%)
11. I am able to use specific procedures to teach speaking	4.36	.73	0 (0%)	5 (1.4%)	39 (11%)	133 (37.4%)	179 (50.3%)
13. I am able to use specific procedures to teach listening	4.35	.72	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.6%)	42 (11.8%)	137 (38.5%)	174 (48.9%)
7. I apply the current foreign language teaching methods and techniques	4.31	.70	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	40 (11.2%)	158 (44.4%)	156 (43.8%)

17. I am able to design different assessment tools	4.19	.86	1 (0.3%)	10 (2.8%)	68 (19.1%)	117 (32.9%)	160 (44.9%)
18. I am able to implement different kinds of assessment procedures in order to evaluate the learning outcomes	4.18	.82	1 (0.3%)	10 (2.8%)	59 (16.6%)	138 (38.8%)	148 (41.6%)

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Table 22 demonstrates that instructors agreed on having teacher identities related to didactic expertise. More specifically, knowing how to use different resources in teaching was the highest among instructors (M= 4.64, SD= .53). Furthermore, most of them (N= 334, 93.8%) were able to prepare lessons according to their students' needs (M= 4.52, SD= .66). When it comes to teaching certain skills such as grammar (M= 4.55, SD= .61), vocabulary (M= 4.51, SD= .63), speaking (M= 4.36, SD= .73), writing (M= 4.55, SD= .64), listening (M= 4.35, SD= .72) and reading (M= 4.51, SD= .64), most instructors seemed to use specific procedures to teach English. On the whole, the highest mean score was for using different language teaching resources (M= 4.64, SD= .53) and the lowest mean score was for items 17 (M= 4.19, SD= .86) and 18 (M= 4.18, SD= .82) which are related to designing assessment tools and implementing them in order to evaluate the learning outcomes.

4.1.3.3. Findings Related to Subject Matter Expertise

EFL instructors' identities related to subject matter expertise were investigated through six items, whose findings are presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Teacher Identities for Subject Matter Expertise

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly agree n (%)
2. I am well-informed about English grammar	4.74	.49	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	6 (1.7%)	76 (21.3%)	273 (76.7%)
1. I have a good command of English vocabulary	4.51	.56	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (3.7%)	148 (41.6%)	195 (54.8%)
6. I am well-informed about cultural aspects of English-speaking countries whose native language is English	4.30	.72	0 (0%)	6 (1.7%)	39 (11%)	153 (43%)	158 (44%)
5. I am well-informed about the types of pragmatic failures in English	4.26	.72	0 (0%)	3 (0.8%)	50 (14.0%)	154 (43.3%)	149 (41.9%)
3. I am competent in English pronunciation almost native-like	4.14	.75	1 (0.3%)	8 (2.2%)	48 (13.5%)	181 (50.8%)	118 (33.1%)

4. I am competent in intonation of English words almost native-like	4.03	.78	1 (0.3%)	11 (3.1%)	63 (17.7%)	179 (50.3%)	102 (28.7%)
---	------	-----	-------------	--------------	---------------	----------------	----------------

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

As illustrated in Table 23, findings revealed that a vast majority of the participants (N= 349, 98%) agreed that they were well informed about English grammar. Also, instructors seemed to have a good command of English vocabulary (M= 4.51, SD= .56), too. Furthermore, competency in pronunciation (M= 4.14, SD= .75) and the intonation of the English words almost native-like (M= 4.03, SD= .78) were the areas that instructors had less-developed teacher identities compared to others.

4.1.3.4. Findings Related to Attitudes Towards Professional Development

Regarding instructors' views towards professional development, ten items were used in order to reveal their teacher identity. Findings are tabulated in Table 24.

Table 24

Teacher Identities for Attitudes Towards Professional Development

Items	M	SD	1= Strongly disagree n (%)	2= Disagree n (%)	3= Undecided n (%)	4= Agree n (%)	5= Strongly agree n (%)
28. I reflect on my teaching experiences,	4.50	.71	1 (0.3%)	6 (1.7%)	22 (6.2%)	112 (31.5%)	215 (60.4%)

strengths and
weaknesses as a
teacher

27. I exchange ideas about teaching English with my colleagues	4.46	.75	2 (0.6%)	5 (1.4%)	30 (8.4%)	106 (29.8%)	213 (59.8%)
29. I research in order to improve my teaching”	4.19	.93	5 (1.4%)	17 (4.8%)	46 (12.9%)	125 (35.1%)	163 (45.8%)
31. I update my lecture notes	4.00	1.08	13 (3.7%)	25 (7%)	54 (15.2%)	120 (33.7%)	144 (40.4%)
35. I update my knowledge about the foreign language teaching approaches, methods, and techniques	3.98	.95	8 (2.2%)	19 (5.3%)	59 (16.6%)	153 (43%)	117 (32.9%)
26. I attend different kinds of teacher training events for my professional development	3.95	1.03	8 (2.2%)	25 (7%)	76 (21.3%)	113 (31.7%)	134 (37.6%)
32. I follow the current developments in the field of English language teaching	3.95	.92	5 (1.4%)	18 (5.1%)	75 (21.1%)	147 (41.3%)	111 (31.2%)

34. I follow the current trends in curriculum development	3.51	1.17	23 (6.5%)	46 (12.9%)	95 (26.7%)	107 (30.1%)	85 (23.9%)
33. I am in a period of professional burnout	2.58	1.30	88 (24.7%)	98 (27.5%)	85 (23.9%)	43 (12.1%)	42 (11.8%)
30. I publish research articles	2.19	1.34	159 (44.7%)	70 (19.7%)	55 (15.4%)	42 (11.8%)	30 (8.4%)

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Findings, as seen in Table 24, illustrated that the highest mean score was in instructors' self-efficacy to reflect on teaching experiences, strengths, and weaknesses (M= 4.50, SD= .71). Also, most instructors (n= 319, 89.6%) agreed that they exchange ideas about teaching with their colleagues (M= 4.46, SD= .75). However, with respect to following the current trends in curriculum development, the mean score was comparatively lower (M= 3.51, SD= 1.17). What is more, while some of the instructors disagreed (n= 186, 52.2%) that they were in a period of professional burnout, some (n= 85, 23.9%) were undecided about this issue, and only some of them (23.9%) agreed. Finally, the majority of the instructors (n= 229, 64.4%) disagreed that they publish research articles, which is a striking finding in the present study.

4.1.4. Teacher Identity of Instructors According to Different Variables

In light of Research Questions 2.1. (RQ2.1), 2.2 (RQ2.2.), 2.3. (RQ2.3) and 2.4. (RQ2.4), EFL instructors' teacher identities were investigated according to different variables, namely, their education level, undergraduate program field, professional years of experience, and gender. Findings are presented in the following subsections.

4.1.4.1. Teacher Identities of Instructors According to Education Level

Research Question 2.1. investigated whether EFL instructors' teacher identities vary according to their education level (i.e., whether they hold a B.A., M.A., or Ph.D. degree). Findings of descriptive statistics are tabulated in Table 25.

Table 25

Teacher Identities According to Education Level

Professional identity questionnaire sub-dimensions	B.A. (n= 89)		M.A. (n= 241)		Ph.D. (n= 26)		Sig. (p)
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Subject matter expertise	4.35	.50	4.31	.53	4.45	.34	.34
Didactic expertise	4.36	.53	4.44	.49	4.43	.40	.42
Pedagogical expertise	4.40	.57	4.46	.49	4.50	.45	.53
Attitudes towards professional development	3.64	.56	3.74	.61	3.97	.69	.05
Overall	4.19	.45	4.24	.41	4.34	.38	.28

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

B.A.= Bachelor of Arts, M.A.= Master of Arts, Ph.D.= Doctor of Philosophy

According to the findings reported in Table 25, instructors holding a Ph.D. degree had the highest mean scores regarding their identities in all sub-dimensions, except for didactic expertise. Regarding their overall professional identity, instructors having a Ph.D. degree developed all types of identities compared to the ones having B.A. and M.A. degrees. In order to investigate whether instructors' teacher identities significantly vary according to education level, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted. However, although differences were observed in both sub-dimensions and total, no statistically significant difference was found ($p = .28$).

4.1.4.2. Teacher Identities of Instructors According to Undergraduate Program Field

Research question 2.2 (RQ2.2.) aimed to reveal whether EFL instructors' teacher identities differ according to their undergraduate program field. The findings of descriptive statistics are shown in Table 26.

Table 26

Teacher Identities According to Undergraduate Program Field

Sub-dimensions	ELT graduates (n= 173)		Other (Non-ELT graduates) (n= 183)		Sig. (p)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Subject matter expertise	4.29	.52	4.36	.51	.19
Didactic expertise	4.47	.46	4.39	.52	.13
Pedagogical expertise	4.47	.52	4.44	.51	.54
Attitudes towards professional development	3.85	.53	3.62	.66	.00*
Overall	4.27	.40	4.20	.43	.12

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance, ELT= English Language Teaching

*p<.05

According to the findings shown in Table 26, EFL instructors who graduated from English Language Teaching (ELT) departments had more developed identities in didactic expertise (M= 4.47, SD= .46), pedagogical expertise (M= 4.47, SD= .52), and attitudes towards professional development (M= 3.85, SD= .53). Non-ELT graduates, on the other hand, had more developed identities in only subject matter expertise sub-dimension (M= 4.36, SD= .51). When it comes to the overall evaluation, ELT graduates had more developed identities

compared to non-ELT graduates. In order to investigate whether instructors' teacher identities vary according to the undergraduate program field they graduated from, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. According to the results, a significant difference was found only in sub dimension attitudes towards professional development ($p = .00$), with ELT-graduates ($M = 3.85$, $SD = .53$) reporting higher mean scores than non-ELT graduates ($M = 3.62$, $.66$).

4.1.4.3. Teacher Identities of Instructors According to Years of Professional Experience

Research question 2.3. (R.Q.2.3) aimed to find out whether EFL instructors' teacher identities differ according to their years of professional experience. Descriptive statistics are demonstrated in Table 27.

Table 27

Teacher Identities According to Years of Professional Experience

Sub-dimensions	1-5 years (n= 43)		6-15 years (n=164)		16-30 years (n= 125)		31+ years (n= 24)		Sig. (p)
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Subject matter expertise	4.33	.49	4.26	.50	4.36	.52	4.60	.42	.02*
Didactic expertise	4.38	.49	4.37	.49	4.48	.49	4.62	.42	.05
Pedagogical expertise	4.39	.52	4.42	.53	4.49	.50	4.62	.48	.21
Attitudes towards professional development	3.61	.63	3.69	.62	3.79	.60	3.95	.48	.92

Overall	4.18	.42	4.18	.41	4.28	.43	4.45	.37	.01*
---------	------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

*p<.05

As seen in Table 27, as the instructors' experience increased, their development of teacher identities also increased. Regarding their identities overall, instructors having 31+ years of experience appeared to have developed all types of teacher identities across all other groups. In order to investigate whether these differences in instructors' teacher identities significantly vary according to years of professional experience, a one-way ANOVA was conducted, which reported a statistically significant difference between groups in terms of teacher identity ($p = .01$). EFL instructors having 31+ years of professional experience had the most developed identities among all groups ($M = 4.45$, $SD = .37$). Similarly, a significant difference was also found in subject matter expertise ($p = .02$). On the other hand, no statistical difference was found in pedagogical expertise ($p = .21$), didactic expertise ($p = .05$) or attitudes towards professional development ($p = .92$).

4.1.4.4. Teacher Identities of Instructors According to Gender

Research Question 2.4 (RQ2.4.) investigated whether EFL instructors' teacher identities vary according to their gender. Findings of descriptive statistics are provided in Table 28.

Table 28

Teacher Identities According to Gender

Sub-dimensions	Females (n= 273)		Males (n= 83)		Sig. (p)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Subject matter expertise	4.32	.50	4.34	.56	.72

Didactic expertise	4.41	.49	4.47	.50	.30
Pedagogical expertise	4.47	.51	4.41	.53	.33
Attitudes towards professional development	3.75	.61	3.66	.59	.24
Overall	4.24	.42	4.22	.41	.79

*M= Mean, **SD= Standard Deviation, ***Sig= Significance ($p < 0.05$)

According to the findings shown in Table 28, while male instructors had more developed teacher identities in subject-matter expertise and didactic expertise, females were found to have more developed teacher identities in in overall evaluation and other sub-dimensions. In order to investigate whether instructors' teacher identities significantly vary between male and female instructors, an Independent samples t-test was conducted. However, although differences in mean scores were observed in both sub-dimensions and overall, these differences were not statistically significant ($p = .79$).

4.1.5. Findings Related to Career Motivations

In the last part of the questionnaire, there were twelve items delving into instructors' motivation for choosing teaching as a career. Findings are tabulated twofold: Firstly, in Table 29, findings of the sub-dimensions of the EFL teacher motivation questionnaire are shown. Secondly, findings related to each item are demonstrated in Table 30.

Table 29

Career Motivation According to Its Sub-dimensions

Sub-dimensions	M	SD
Intrinsic motivations	4.41	.63
Altruistic motivations	4.39	.62

Extrinsic motivations	3.98	.80
Socialisation influences	3.67	.99

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

When Table 29 is examined, it is seen that the instructors primarily considered the intrinsic (M= 4.41, SD= .63) and altruistic (M= 4.39, SD= .62) motivations when choosing the teaching profession, whereas they did not appear to attach importance to the extrinsic (M= 3.98, SD= .80) or socialisation (M= 3.67, SD= .99) motivations as much as the others.

Regarding the items in the questionnaire, mean scores and standard deviations are given below in Table 30 with the frequencies.

Table 30

Career Motivation According to the Items

Items	M	SD	1= Not at all important n (%)	2= Slightly important n (%)	3= Important n (%)	4= Fairly Important n (%)	5= Very Important n (%)
7. Love of the subject	4.58	.69	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.1%)	25 (7.0%)	80 (22.5%)	246 (69.1%)
6. Mentally stimulating work	4.41	.77	1 (0.3%)	6 (1.7%)	40 (11.2%)	108 (30.3%)	201 (56.5%)
3. Job security	4.40	.86	1 (0.3%)	12 (3.4%)	48 (13.5%)	75 (21.1%)	220 (61.8%)

11. Potential of changing students' lives/attitudes	4.40	.80	0 (0%)	9 (2.5%)	46 (12.9%)	92 (25.8%)	209 (58.7%)
1. Working with young adults	4.39	.90	6 (1.7%)	11 (3.1%)	34 (9.6%)	91 (25.6%)	214 (60.1%)
9. Contributing the society	4.39	.87	3 (0.8%)	11 (3.1%)	41 (11.5%)	90 (25.3%)	211 (59.3%)
4. Teaching fitted with my lifestyle/family situation	4.31	1.00	13 (3.7%)	10 (2.8%)	31 (8.7%)	99 (27.8%)	203 (57%)
5. Variety in teaching	4.23	.90	2 (0.6%)	14 (3.9%)	59 (16.6%)	106 (29.8%)	175 (49.2%)
2. Salary and benefits	4.07	1.04	8 (2.2%)	18 (5.1%)	78 (21.9%)	87 (24.4%)	165 (46.3%)
10. Status of the profession	4.03	.98	7 (2%)	16 (4.5%)	77 (21.6%)	113 (31.7%)	143 (40.2%)
8. Promotion prospects	3.32	1.36	44 (12.4%)	57 (16%)	95 (26.7%)	59 (16.6%)	101 (28.4%)
12. Family approval	3.04	1.44	76 (21.3%)	56 (15.7%)	79 (22.2%)	67 (18.8%)	78 (21.9%)

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

As shown in Table 30, findings indicated that the factors love of the subject (M= 4.58, SD= .69), the job being mentally stimulating work (M= 4.41, SD= .77), job security (M= 4.40,

SD= .86), the potential of changing students' lives/attitudes (M= 4.40, SD= 0.80), and contributing to the society (M= 4.39, SD= .87) were the most powerful motivators to choose teaching as a profession. On the contrary, instructors were least motivated by promotion prospects (M= 3.32, SD= 1.36) and family approval (M= 3.04, SD= 1.44) while choosing teaching as a career.

4.1.6. Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Different Variables

In light of Research Questions 3.1. (RQ3.1.) and 3.2. (RQ3.2.), 3.3. (R.Q.3.3.) and 3.4. (RQ3.4.), EFL instructors' reasons for choosing teaching as a profession were sought according to different variables, namely their education level, undergraduate program field, years of professional experience, and gender. Findings are given in the following subsections.

4.1.6.1. Reasons for Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Education Level

Research Question 3.1. investigated whether EFL instructors' motivations for choosing teaching as a career vary according to their education level (i.e., B.A., M.A., Ph.D.). Findings of descriptive statistics are tabulated in Table 31 and Table 32.

Table 31

Career Motivation According to Education Level

Sub-dimensions	B.A. (n= 89)		M.A. (n= 241)		Ph.D. (n= 26)		Sig. (p)
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Altruistic motivations	4.39	.56	4.41	.64	4.21	.71	.28
Extrinsic motivations	4.06	.83	3.94	.79	4.01	.69	.47

Intrinsic motivations	4.46	.57	4.39	.65	4.41	.60	.69
Socialisation influences	3.61	1.04	3.68	.99	3.86	0.87	.53

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

B.A.= Bachelor of Arts, M.A.= Master of Arts, Ph.D.= Doctor of Philosophy

According to the results of ANOVA, instructors holding an M.A. degree were altruistically motivated while starting the teaching career, whereas they were not extrinsically motivated. On the other hand, those with a B.A. degree were the most intrinsically motivated group amongst all. When it comes to socialization influences, Ph.D. degree holders were more motivated than the other two groups. However, although differences were observed within groups, no statistically significant difference was found among instructors according to the educational degree they hold.

Table 32

Career Motivation According to Education Level

Sub-dimensions	Items	B.A. (n= 89)		M.A. (n= 241)		Ph.D. (n= 26)		Sig. (p)
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Altruistic motivations	Working with young adults	4.33	.87	4.46	.86	3.96	1.21	.02*
	Contributing the society	4.43	.76	4.36	.90	4.46	.85	.72
	Potential of changing students' lives/attitudes	4.40	.79	4.42	.81	4.23	.81	.50
Extrinsic motivations	Salary and benefits	4.23	.92	4.02	1.09	4.03	.87	.24

	Job security	4.42	.87	4.39	.87	4.46	.70	.90
	Promotion prospects	3.49	1.32	3.26	1.37	3.34	1.35	.38
	Status of the profession	4.02	.99	4.03	.99	4.11	.90	.91
Intrinsic motivations	Variety in teaching	4.33	.82	4.21	.94	4.03	.77	.28
	Mentally stimulating work	4.46	.70	4.38	.80	4.50	.70	.59
	Love of the subject	4.58	.70	4.58	.69	4.69	.67	.73
Socialisation Influences	Family approval	2.93	1.40	3.04	1.47	3.34	1.23	.43
	Teaching fitted in with my lifestyle/family	4.30	1.04	4.31	1.01	4.38	.69	.93

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

B.A.= Bachelor of Arts, M.A.= Master of Arts, Ph.D.= Doctor of Philosophy

*(p<0.05)

According to the findings reported in Table 32, instructors holding a B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. degree mostly chose teaching as a career as they love the subject. Family approval was the least motivating factor for B.A. and Ph.D. graduates while promotion prospects was the least motivating factor for M.A. and Ph.D. holders. In order to investigate whether instructors' career motivations significantly vary according to education level, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted. However, although differences were observed in both sub-dimensions and overall, a statistically significant difference was found only in working with young adults (p= .02).

4.1.6.2. Reasons for Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Undergraduate Program Field

In light of Research Question 3.2. (RQ3.2.), whether instructors' reasons for choosing teaching as a career vary according to their undergraduate program field was investigated. Descriptive statistics are tabulated in Table 33 and Table 34.

Table 33

Career Motivation According to Undergraduate Program Field

Sub-dimensions	ELT (n= 43)		Non-ELT (n= 24)		Sig. (p)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Altruistic motivations	4.38	.63	4.41	.62	.64
Extrinsic motivations	3.99	.82	3.96	.77	.76
Intrinsic motivations	4.43	.61	4.39	.64	.55
Socialisation influences	3.69	.94	3.66	1.05	.79

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance, ELT= English Language Teaching

According to the findings given in Table 33, while ELT graduates prioritised extrinsic, intrinsic, and socialisation influences, non-ELT graduates seemed to set altruistic motivations as their priority while choosing teaching as a career. However, no statistically differences were found between these two groups, as illustrated by the results of Independent sample T-test.

Table 34

Career Motivation According to Undergraduate Program Field

Items	ELT (n= 173)		Non-ELT (n= 183)		Sig.(p)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Working with young adults	4.35	.94	4.43	.86	.41
Salary and benefits	4.07	1.05	4.07	1.03	.99
Job security	4.32	.91	4.48	.81	.07
Teaching fitted in with my lifestyle/family situation	4.35	.91	4.28	1.07	.51
Variety in teaching	4.28	.85	4.18	.94	.28
Mentally stimulating work	4.39	.77	4.42	.77	.79
Love of the subject	4.61	.66	4.56	.72	.54
Promotion prospects	3.39	1.31	3.26	1.40	.36
Contributing to society	4.35	.86	4.42	.87	.50
Status of the profession	4.10	.96	3.96	1.00	.17
Potential of changing students' lives/attitudes	4.42	.76	4.38	.84	.64
Family approval	3.03	1.38	3.04	1.49	.92

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance, ELT= English Language Teaching

As presented in Table 34, instructors who graduated from English Language Teaching (ELT) departments chose teaching as a profession mostly for intrinsic (e.g., love of the subject, mentally stimulating work) and altruistic (e.g., potential of changing students' lives/attitudes, working with young adults, contributing to society) motivations. For those

who graduated from non-ELT departments, on the other hand, different types of motivations were observed. To illustrate, intrinsic and altruistic motivation as well as extrinsic motivations (e.g., status of the profession) stood out. However, when it comes to socialisation influences such as family approval, both groups showed less priority while choosing teaching as a career. In order to investigate whether instructors' reasons for choosing teaching as a profession vary according to the undergraduate program field, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. Nonetheless, although differences in mean scores were observed in all items, they did not yield significant differences.

4.1.6.3. Reasons for Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Years of Professional Experience

Research question 3.3. (R.Q.3.3) aimed to find out whether EFL instructors' career motivations differ according to their years of professional experience. Descriptive statistics are demonstrated in Table 35 and Table 36.

Table 35

Career Motivation According to Years of Professional Experience

Sub-dimensions	1-5 years		6-15 years		16-30 years		31+ years		Sig.(p)
	(n= 43)		(n=164)		(n= 125)		(n= 24)		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Altruistic motivations	4.48	.58	4.37	.66	4.36	.60	4.59	.54	.30
Extrinsic motivations	4.20	.83	4.03	.77	3.85	.79	3.85	.82	.04*
Intrinsic motivations	4.43	.74	4.38	.58	4.42	.64	4.48	.68	.86

Socialisation influences	3.59	1.02	3.61	.98	3.77	1.00	3.79	1.02	.47
--------------------------	------	------	------	-----	------	------	------	------	-----

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

*(p<0.05)

As seen in Table 35, experienced and novice EFL instructors' motivations were mostly altruistic and intrinsic. When it comes to intrinsic motivations, they were prioritised by all groups. On the other hand, EFL instructors having 1-15 years of experience were mostly motivated by extrinsic motivations compared to those having more experience. In order to investigate whether instructors' career motivations differ according to years of professional experience, a one-way ANOVA was conducted, which reported a statistically significant difference in extrinsic motivation sub-dimension.

Table 36

Career Motivation According to Years of Professional Experience

Sub-dimensions	Items	1-5 years (n= 43)		6-15 years (n=164)		16-30 years (n= 125)		31+ years (n= 24)		Sig (p)
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Altruistic motivations	Working with young adults	4.44	.82	4.39	.95	4.32	.85	4.66	.91	.39
	Contributing the society	4.41	.98	4.39	.88	4.33	.85	4.58	.65	.63
	Potential of	4.58	.73	4.32	.83	4.43	.79	4.50	.78	.26

	changing students' lives/ attitudes									
Extrinsic motivations	Salary and benefits	4.37	.92	4.1 7	1.0 1	3.8 7	1.0 9	3.91	.97	.01 *
	Job security	4.34	.99	4.4 6	.82	4.3 7	.87	4.29	.85	.68
	Promotion prospects	3.79	1.2 8	3.3 1	1.3 9	3.1 6	1.3 1	3.45	1.38	.06
	Status of the profession	4.23	.99	4.1 2	.98	3.9 2	.91	3.66	1.23	.05
Intrinsic Motivations	Variety in teaching	4.20	1.0 5	4.1 4	.90	4.3 0	.82	4.45	.93	.28
	Mentally stimulating work	4.44	.88	4.3 8	.76	4.4 2	.73	4.45	.93	.94
	Love of the subject	4.65	.61	4.6 1	.65	4.5 4	.71	4.54	.97	.75
Socialisation Influences	Family approval	2.86	1.4 8	2.8 9	1.4 5	3.2 7	1.3 8	3.20	1.47	.11
	Teaching fitted in with my lifestyle/ family situation	4.32	.94	4.3 3	.96	4.2 8	1.0 2	4.37	1.20	.95

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

*p<.05

As seen in Table 36, all groups of EFL instructors' had an interest in English subject while deciding on this career. In addition, potential of changing students' lives was also a motivation for novice ($M= 4.58$ $SD= .73$) and experienced ($M= 4.50$, $SD= .78$) EFL instructors. Similarly, in terms of contributing the society, novice ($M= 4.41$, $SD= .98$) and experienced ($M= 4.58$, $SD= .95$) EFL instructors both have this motivation. In terms of salary and benefits, while novice teachers ($M= 4.37$, $SD= .92$) regarded them as a source of motivation, for experienced teachers ($M= 3.91$, $SD= .97$) it's not a complete motivation at all. In order to investigate whether instructors' career motivations differ according to years of professional experience, a one-way ANOVA was conducted, which reported a statistically significant difference between all groups in terms of salary and benefits ($p=.01$).

4.1.6.4. Reasons for Choosing Teaching as a Profession According to Gender

Research Question 3.4 (RQ3.4.) aimed to reveal whether EFL instructors' motivations for choosing teaching as a profession differ according to their gender (i.e., male, female). As for each sub-dimension, the Independent samples t-test results are shown in Table 37.

Table 37

Career Motivation According to Gender

Sub-dimensions	Females (n= 273)		Males (n= 83)		Sig.(p)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Altruistic motivations	4.45	0.58	4.22	0.59	.00*
Extrinsic motivations	3.98	0.80	3.96	0.79	0.78
Intrinsic motivations	4.41	0.63	4.39	0.61	0.79
Socialisation influences	3.69	1.00	3.62	0.98	0.53

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

*p<.05

When Table 37 is examined, it is seen that females had higher mean scores than males did in all sub-dimensions. When the sub-dimensions are further examined individually, it can be seen that altruistic motivation and intrinsic motivation had higher mean values than other sub-dimensions for both females and males. However, although there were slight differences in each sub-dimension, when the Independent samples t-test results were considered, the difference between females and males was considered statistically significant ($p= 0.00$) only in the sub-dimension of altruistic motivation, with female instructors ($M= 4.45$, $SD= .58$) having higher mean scores than male instructors ($M= 4.22$, $SD= .59$).

Table 38

Career Motivation According to Gender

Sub-dimensions	Motivators for Teaching	Females		Males		Sig. (p)
		(n= 273)		(n= 83)		
		M	SD	M	SD	
Altruistic motivations	Working with young adults	4.44	.84	4.22	1.06	.05
	Contributing to society	4.45	.78	4.18	1.07	.01*
	Potential of changing students' lives/attitudes	4.45	.77	4.26	.91	.06
Extrinsic Motivations	Salary and benefits	4.07	1.04	4.08	1.02	.93
	Job security	4.40	.88	4.42	.81	.86
	Promotion prospects	3.31	1.37	3.37	1.34	.71
	Status of the profession	4.08	.95	3.87	1.07	.09

Intrinsic Motivations	Variety in teaching	4.21	.90	4.26	.91	.69
	Mentally stimulating work	4.41	.79	4.39	.71	.86
	Love of the subject	4.61	.67	4.51	.77	.28
Socialisation Influences	Family approval	3.04	1.41	3.03	1.53	.96
	Teaching fitted in with my lifestyle/family situation	4.35	.97	4.20	1.07	.24
	Overall	4.13	.52	4.04	.59	.19

M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, Sig= Significance

*p<.05

According to the findings shown in Table 38, female instructors chose teaching as a profession mostly for intrinsic (e.g., love of the subject), altruistic (potential of changing students' lives/attitudes, working with young adults, contributing to society), and extrinsic (e.g., job security) motivations respectively. Similarly, for male instructors, intrinsic and altruistic motivations as well as extrinsic motivations stood out. However, when it comes to socialisation influences such as family approval, both genders showed less priority while choosing teaching as a career accordingly. Also, considering contributing to society, female instructors (M= 4.45, SD= .78) prioritised it more than male instructors (M= 4.18, SD= 1.07) did. Moreover, female instructors were more motivated by the status of the profession. Apart from these, in order to investigate whether instructors' reasons for choosing teaching as a profession significantly vary between male and female instructors, an Independent samples t-test was conducted. However, although differences were observed in the mean scores in all items, a statistically significant difference was found only in choosing teaching for contributing the society purposes ($p = .012$), with females reporting higher mean scores than males did. .

4.1.7. Potential Relationship Between Self-Efficacy, Teacher Identity, and Career Motivations

The aim of the fourth research question (RQ4) was to find out if there was any potential statistically significant relationship among the self-efficacy levels, teacher identities, and the reasons for choosing teaching as a profession for Turkish EFL instructors working at English preparatory schools. In order to discover any potential relationship between these three constructs, a Fisher's Exact Test was run. The findings of the Fisher's Exact Test are tabulated in Table 39.

Table 39

Relationship between Self-efficacy, Teacher Identity and Career Motivation

The relationship analysed via Fisher's Exact Test	Value	Sig. (p)
Self-Efficacy and Teacher Identity	32.80	.00*
Teacher Identity and Career Motivation	28.81	.00*
Career Motivation and Self-Efficacy	14.67	.59

Sig= Significance

* $p < .05$

As shown in Table 39, there was a significant relationship between the instructors' self-efficacy levels and teacher identities ($p = .00$). In a similar vein, the relationship between their teacher identity and career motivation was also significant ($p = .00$). However, regarding the potential relationship between career motivation and self-efficacy levels, no significant relationship was found ($p = .59$). Crosstabulations related to each pair of constructs are provided in Table 40.

Table 40

Crosstabulation between Self-efficacy and Teacher Identity

Types of teacher identities	Self-efficacy levels		
	Mid (n= 70) %	Mid-high (n= 114) %	High (n= 172) %
Subject matter expertise (n= 92)	25 (27.2%)	38 (41.3%)	29 (31.5%)
Didactic expertise (n= 99)	16 (16.2%)	20 (20.2%)	63 (63.6%)
Pedagogical expertise (n= 155)	23 (14.8%)	56 (36.1%)	76 (49%)
Attitudes towards professional development (n= 7)	4 (57.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.9%)
Equal identities (n= 3)	2 (66.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (33.0%)

The analysis of the crosstabulation between self-efficacy levels and teacher identities of the instructors revealed that instructors with highest self-efficacy levels mostly tended to have teacher identities related to pedagogical expertise (n= 63, 63.6%). Similarly, EFL instructors having mid-high levels (n= 56, 36.1%) of self-efficacy also found to have more developed identities in terms of subject matter expertise and pedagogical expertise. There was also a significant number of instructors with the highest self-efficacy levels possessing teacher identities related to didactic expertise (n= 63, 47.8%).

In terms of teacher identity and career motivations of EFL instructors, the crosstabulation is presented in Table 41.

Table 41

Crosstabulation between Teacher Identity and Career Motivation

Types of teacher identities	Types of career motivations				
	Altruistic motivations	Extrinsic motivations	Intrinsic motivations	Socialisation influences	Equal motivations
	(n= 128) %	(n= 45) %	(n= 109) %	(n= 50) %	(n=24) %
Subject matter expertise (n= 92)	25 (19.5%)	14 (31.1%)	37 (33.9%)	13 (26%)	3 (12.5%)
Didactic expertise (n= 99)	35 (27.3%)	9 (20.0%)	36 (33%)	12 (24%)	7 (29.2%)
Pedagogical expertise (n= 155)	67 (52.3%)	19 (42.2%)	35 (32.1%)	22 (44%)	12 (50%)
Attitudes towards professional development (n= 7)	1 (0.8%)	1 (2.2%)	1 (0.9%)	2 (4%)	2 (8.3%)
Equal identities (n= 3)	0 (0%)	2 (4.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0%)

When examining the relationship between types of teacher identities and career motivations of the instructors, it is seen that more than half of those who have altruistic motivations tended to have identities related to pedagogical expertise (n= 67, 52.3%). Also, there was almost an equal distribution of instructors with intrinsic career motivations within identities related to subject matter (n=37, 33.9%), didactic matter (n= 36, 33%) and pedagogical matter

(n= 35, 32.1%) expertise respectively. Finally, instructors having didactic matter expertise identities had both altruistic (n= 35, 27.3%) and intrinsic (n= 36, 33%) career motivations. In terms of self-efficacy and career motivations of EFL instructors, the crosstabulation is presented in Table 42.

Table 42

Crosstabulation between Self-efficacy and Career Motivation

Types of career motivations	Self-efficacy levels		
	Mid (n= 70) %	Mid-high (n= 114) %	High (n= 172) %
Altruistic Motivations (n= 128)	22 (17.2%)	41 (32%)	65 (50.8%)
Extrinsic Motivations (n= 45)	15 (33.3%)	16 (35.6%)	14 (31.1%)
Intrinsic Motivations (n= 109)	20 (18.3%)	40 (36.7%)	49 (45%)
Social Influences (n= 50)	11 (22%)	12 (24%)	27 (54%)
Equal (n= 24)	2 (8.3%)	5 (20.8%)	17 (70.8%)

In the crosstabulation of self-efficacy levels and career motivations, it becomes apparent that instructors who had the highest self-efficacy levels tended to choose this profession mostly for altruistic (n= 65, 50.8%) and intrinsic (n= 49, 45%) reasons. Also, it can be seen that the majority of instructors (n=17, 70.8%) who had equal teacher identities in all sub-dimensions had considerably high self-efficacy levels.

4.2. Findings of the Qualitative Data

4.2.1. Findings Related to the Self-Efficacy Levels of Instructors

According to the findings of the qualitative data analysed via content analysis, the themes of the participants' responses are illustrated in Table 43.

Table 43

Themes Related to Self-efficacy

Themes	Frequency (f)
English language competence	6
Subject knowledge	6
Non-ELT graduates	5
Grammatical competence	4
Incompetence in teaching speaking	4
Vocabulary competence	3
Competency in motivating students	3
Open to professional developments	3
Follow new trends	2
Incompetence in vocabulary	2
Professional experience	2
Incompetency in motivating students	2
Incompetency in theoretical knowledge	2
Classroom management competence	1
Incompetency in teaching writing	1

Considering the responses given to the questions about the self-efficacy of the interviewees, it can be stated that the vast majority (f= 6) considered themselves to be professionally self-efficacious. Some interviewees (f= 2) stated that although they did not consider themselves theoretically self-efficacious since they were not ELT graduates, they filled this gap with the competence brought by their professional experience and in-class teaching experience. At the same time, some of them (f= 3) implied that they were open to recent developments in the professional sense, although they considered themselves as self-efficacious. In addition, some (f= 2) stated that they always followed new trends in language teaching.

In terms of language proficiency, almost half of the interviewees (f= 4) stated that they regarded themselves as having high self-efficacy, especially in the field of grammar. One of the interviewees (Int2) stated that the most important reason for him to see himself as efficacious in terms of grammar was that he had a good command of grammar in his native language. The interviewees expressed their proficiency in grammar with the following excerpts:

“First of all, of course, my self-confidence in this subject comes from my knowledge of grammar and my command of the subject. As someone who has been dealing with language for years and especially as a translator, knowing the subtleties of the language gives me self-confidence in this regard.” (Int1)

“An English teacher needs to know their own language well at first. I think I know Turkish and Turkish grammar well. this naturally reflects in the second language, the language we teach, in English as well.” (Int2)

“I mean, for example, I feel more efficacious because of teaching grammar with a more communicative approach.” (Int4)

Although the interviewees were generally observed as having high self-efficacy levels, there were also some areas where they indicated low self-efficacy levels. For example, as stated above, the majority of the interviewees (n= 5) were not ELT graduates, so they expressed themselves as theoretically inadequate. However, they stated that despite feeling insufficient in the theoretical sense, for example they did not know the methods in language teaching by their names, they applied these methods unconsciously as a result of their professional experience (f= 2).

Another area where instructors had low self-efficacy levels was teaching speaking skills (f= 4). The interviewees stated that they felt inadequate in teaching speaking skills to their students, with the disadvantage of not being a native, as well as the lack of self-confidence

brought about by the fact that they had never lived abroad in an English-spoken country. The interviewees expressed their inadequacies in this area with the following words:

“I would like to spend at least 1-2 years abroad, especially in a country where English is spoken as a mother tongue, such as England, America, Canada, Australia, and then I would like to do this job. I think this is a shortcoming for me.” (Int2)

“I think the areas that I need to improve the most and most continuously are vocabulary and stress/pronunciation. I pay attention to the correct pronunciation of the words, and I encourage my students on this subject.” (Int6)

“Since we are not exposed to the environments where the English language is used, I have difficulties in transferring those speech patterns to the students.” (Int7)

In addition, there were interviewees (f=2) who stated that they had low self-efficacy in motivating students in productive skills such as speaking and writing.

“There are students who try to be active but for grammar. When it comes to speaking and writing, you have to develop different strategies to motivate students. Speaking somehow, but when it comes to writing, it becomes even more difficult at the point of skill that our students have difficulty with. I lose my patience there, especially when some students refuse to write or come up with ideas. At that point, I think I need to develop myself more. I think we should actually break the prejudices of the students by motivating students more, getting their feedback, and allocating more time to brainstorming. At this point, I think I need to improve myself more.” (Ins5)

In summary, although EFL instructors generally considered themselves as self-efficacious in teaching English, there were areas where they felt inadequate, in which they strived to improve themselves.

4.2.2. Findings Related to the Teacher Identity of EFL Instructors

When the responses given by the interviewees to reveal the teacher identities and the factors affecting their teacher identities positively or negatively were examined, the following results were found. Table 44 tabulates themes related to teacher identity.

Table 44

Themes Related to Teacher Identity

	Themes	Frequency (f)
How teachers define their teacher identities?	Open-minded	3
	Equipped	3
	Creative	2
	Patient	2
	Helpful	2
	Caring	1
	Fair	1
	Problem-solver	1
	Good listener	1
What factors affect their teacher identities?	Motivated students	6
	Perspectives of institutions	2
	Demotivated colleagues	2
	Student profile	2
	Discrediting teaching profession	2
	External factors	1
	Working with young colleagues	1
	To be appreciated	2

First of all, EFL instructors often described their teacher identities as open-minded (f= 3), equipped (f= 3), creative (f= 2), patient (f= 2), and helpful (f= 2). At the same time, they stated that they tried to create a friendly environment in the classroom and did not compromise on discipline while doing this. To mention the factors that affect their teacher identities, the most prominent factor was a motivated student or vice versa (f= 6). EFL instructors conveyed the importance of student motivation with these words:

“Even if it is the last day of the semester, I make an effort for the student who makes an effort, and I am happy about it. So, working with a highly motivated group of students affects my satisfaction as well.” (Int1)

“Of course, teaching is a social event, and the unwillingness of the student naturally affects the teacher as well.” (Int2)

“The willingness and determination of the students is a factor that affects me positively. The more they want to receive, the more I can be a giver. Indifference and indifference cause me to have attention problems, especially during the lesson, I often warn my students about this.” (Int6)

In addition, the perspectives and attitudes of the institutions towards the EFL instructors was another factor affecting their teacher identities (f= 2). For example, one interviewee (Ins4) stated that when she saw an environment that supports the things she wanted to do or that she was appreciated, this had a positive effect on her teacher identity, while another interviewee (Ins6) stated that her teacher identity was negatively affected when she felt that she was not appreciated by her administrators. Apart from these, discrediting the teaching profession (f= 2), working with demotivated colleagues (f= 2), and external factors such as earthquake and pandemic (f= 1) were also stated among the factors that negatively affected the teacher identities of the interviewees.

4.2.3. Findings Related to the Career Motivations of EFL Instructors

Table 45 shows the frequencies of the responses related to EFL instructors' career motivations.

Table 45

Themes Related to Career Motivation

Themes	Frequency (f)
Interest in English	6
Working with young adults	5
Teaching as a second career/last resort	4
Touching students' lives	4
Informed career choice	3
Conveying their knowledge	2
Started as a translator	2
Opportunity to research	2
Learning from students	1
Appeals to my lifestyle	1

When the interviewees' stories of entering the teaching profession were examined in detail, it was found out that 4 of them started their career journey as an EFL instructor. The other 2 EFL instructors started to work in a translation office in parallel with their undergraduate education, and the other 1 EFL instructor started to work in a private teaching institution. When the interviewees were asked how they chose teaching profession, some (n= 3) stated that they chose the teaching profession willingly, even dreaming of this profession since they were young, while others (n=4) stated that they chose it because they had to or as a second option. Those who started their career as a translator (n= 2) also stated that they preferred teaching as it is a profession which requires direct communication compared to translation, which is a desk-job.

Considering the reasons why the interviewees preferred the teaching profession, altruistic reasons stood out. For example, spending time with young adults (f= 5), touching their lives (f= 4), and conveying what they know to people who need them in the society (f=2) were among the most stated reasons. In addition, a majority of interviewees (f= 6) stated that they

chose this profession as they were interested in English, that is, a result of their intrinsic motivation.

Moreover, the fact that the foreign language teaching profession at university is a field in which both research, production, and teaching activities can be carried out together played a role in choosing this profession ($f= 2$). In addition to these, the interviewees stated the following while expressing the contributions of teaching to them.

“I felt that I enjoyed this job and gradually I realised that I could do it. My self-confidence also increased.” (Int1)

“Of course, besides teaching English, I saw that I enjoyed creating a tolerant and respectful environment in the classroom, not only limited to English, but I also enjoyed raising the awareness of the students on this issue and I made this my mission.” (Int1)

“I realized that language teaching is an area where I can observe myself and my own progress a little more, and I think I enjoy it. In other words, teaching in a classroom environment is a very enjoyable experience for me. I think I learned a lot from my students as well.” (Int4)

“I decided to learn English because I heard different languages and had different experiences, and I actually set out thinking that my perspective would change more as an English teacher.” (Int5)

As can be seen, instructors who choose the teaching profession continue this profession because they both add something to the students and add something to themselves, as well as the pleasure they get from doing this job. However, besides so many positive perspectives, there were also negative views towards the profession. For example, the opinions of teachers in Türkiye that they do not get paid for their efforts (Ins1) or that working teachers are inadequate in terms of profession (Ins3) also emerged from the analysis.

4.2.3. Findings Related to the Relationship between Self-Efficacy Levels, Teacher Identities, and Career Motivations of EFL Instructors

When the interviewees were asked whether there was a relationship between their self-efficacy, teacher identities, and career motivations, all instructors agreed on a relationship. If the reasons behind their thinking are examined specifically, the answers were as follows:

“Of course, I wouldn't have started this profession if I didn't believe in my own knowledge of English.” (Int3)

“I considered myself as sufficient in this regard, and I think doing it with love is the most important thing. I think that I really enjoy doing this job and as I said it was a very early decision. In the sixth grade, while I was learning the language, I had decided that I really liked learning languages and that I wanted to do this profession and to teach. So yes, part of my identity is the desire to tell something, to convey what I have learned, so I think it is related and as I said, when I ask if I could do another profession that I love to do, I think I want to do this profession again.” (Int4)

“I definitely think. If you are making a conscious professional choice, I think you have taken these into consideration. Each individual chooses a profession and choosing a profession is actually one of the turning points of our lives. If you are choosing a profession consciously, your values that you believe in are actually in front of you, and in parallel with that, you actually need to choose a profession that is suitable for you, suitable for your personality, and you need to choose a profession that you can find happiness.” (Int5)

“I definitely think so. I would not want to perform a profession that I find myself inadequate. One of the main reasons I started this profession is that I find myself generally sufficient and successful. It is very important not only to know English, but also to teach it with effective and correct communication. My feeling of self-sufficiency in this sense progressed in direct proportion to my career choice.” (Int6)

As seen above, the interviewees stated that there is a relationship between their choice of profession, teacher identities, and self-efficacy. While choosing this profession, the fact that they have teaching identities and the competencies required by teaching played a big role in their preferences.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS

This final chapter presents an overview of the study, including the discussion and conclusions of the quantitative and qualitative data. On the basis of the study, the chapter ends with implications for stakeholders and recommendations for potential future research.

5.1. Conclusion and Discussion

This correlational descriptive study, which employed a sequential explanatory mixed-method design, aimed to identify the teaching self-efficacy levels, teacher identities, teaching motivations of Turkish EFL instructors teaching at English Preparatory units of state and foundation universities in Istanbul, Türkiye. Also, it aimed to identify a potential relationship among teaching self-efficacy, teacher identity and career motivations. A total of 356 participants (273 females and 83 males) who taught English as a foreign language in different universities in Istanbul voluntarily took part in this study. For the purposes of the study, data came from questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The questionnaires comprised 1) the EFL Instructor Self-efficacy Questionnaire, 2) Professional Identity Questionnaire (Ölmez Çağlar, 2016), and 3) the EFL Teacher Motivation Questionnaire (Karavas, 2010). For the analysis of quantitative data that came from the questionnaires, SPSS 22.0 software was employed for running descriptive and inferential statistics. To analyse qualitative data elicited via semi-structured interviews, inductive content analysis was administered. Overall, instructors' self-efficacy levels, teacher identities, and reasons for choosing teaching as a profession were investigated with both qualitative and quantitative data. Findings are discussed in accordance with each research question that guided this study.

RQ1: What are the self-efficacy levels of instructors who teach English as a foreign language in the university-level English Preparatory Programs in Türkiye?

To investigate the self-efficacy levels of EFL instructors, quantitative and qualitative data were obtained and analysed respectively. First, the participants rated the items in order of

agreement relating to their self-efficacy beliefs on the questionnaire ranging from 1 (= strongly disagree) to 5 (= strongly agree) (see Appendix B). Second, participants responded to semi-structured interview questions that the researcher had devised based on expert opinions.

Both quantitative and qualitative findings illustrated that the participants had high self-efficacy levels overall in teaching English as a foreign language. They mostly regarded themselves as self-efficacious in instructional strategies, planning and organising teaching processes, and classroom management, respectively (see Table 9). In terms of instructional strategies and classroom management, Can (2019), Doğan (2014), and Taşçı (2019) similarly concluded that EFL instructors teaching at universities had high levels of efficacy in these sub-dimensions. Similarly, in the international context, Chacon (2005) found out that teachers felt themselves the most efficacious in instructional strategies. The findings of the study also revealed that they felt the least self-efficacious in developing students' language skills. The interviews yielded similar findings, where some instructors regarded themselves as less self-efficacious in motivating students while teaching writing and speaking skills particularly.

When considering these sub-dimensions in detail, instructors regarded themselves as the most self-efficacious in instructional strategies and classroom management, whereas they felt least self-efficacious in developing language skills. This might be because of the factor that classroom management and instructional strategies are mostly related to teachers' efforts and behaviors, but developing language skills must involve students' efforts. In support of this, although the interviewees described their self-efficacy levels in classroom management and teaching strategies as high, they stated that the most important factor affecting their teaching was student motivation and effort. As Interviewee 1 asserted that working with a more motivated group of students is something that affects him the most. Also, among the efficacy of developing language skills, instructors regarded themselves as least efficacious in improving listening skills. According to Goh and Vandergrift (2012), teaching listening skills is one of the most difficult things that a teacher can face and it takes too much time. One of the reasons is that listening requires students' attention, and there is too much stimulation around them. It is difficult for students to stay focused while practicing listening; therefore, it might be challenging to keep them on task. Furthermore, decoding sounds, recognizing words, comprehending grammatical structures, and processing meaning instantly are all aspects of listening comprehension (Field, 2010),

presenting difficulties for teachers to meet the unique needs of each student because different learners may have differing levels of competency in these areas. Accordingly, it is likely that the instructors consider themselves less self-efficacious in developing listening skills.

RQ1.1: Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to education level?

Research Question 1.1 (RQ1.1) investigated whether EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels vary according to their education level, namely according to whether they hold a B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degree. Although instructors with a Ph.D. had the highest mean scores in all sub-dimensions and overall, findings did not reveal any statistically significant difference according to the education level of instructors (see Table 16). In addition, no differences were observed in terms of self-efficacy among participants with B.A. and M.A. degrees in the interviews. These findings concur with those of some earlier studies (e.g., Yılmaz, 2020). For example, the findings of Yılmaz's (2020) study also revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between participants' self-efficacy according to education levels; nevertheless, graduates of Ph.D. showed a higher mean score when compared to B.A. or M.A. graduates which is in line with the current study. Put it differently, whether instructors' having a B.A., M.A., or Ph.D. degree did not show any difference regarding their self-efficacy levels, or in its sub dimensions (i.e., efficacy for planning and organising teaching processes, instructional strategies, classroom management, developing language skills, student engagement and monitoring and assessing language development). As a result of their increased skill and knowledge, teachers could feel more confident in their ability to teach difficult ideas and manage a variety of classroom settings (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Additionally, advanced degrees may require extensive study and research in the field of education or a particular subject. During their postgraduate studies, instructors typically get more knowledge and experience, leading to a sense of confidence in their ability to teach, which might increase their self-efficacy views (Bandura, 1997). Additionally, due to their advanced degrees, teachers with greater education levels may believe they are more qualified experts. They may feel more self-confident and more effective in their educational methods as a result of this feeling of competence (Woolfolk Hoy, Hoy, & Davis, 2009). Additionally, education is the process of acquiring and mastering new knowledge and abilities. Graduating from a higher education program denotes a level of expertise in the field of study that was chosen, and this sense of mastery can transfer to the classroom, generating higher levels of self-efficacy in teaching. Finally,

educators who pursue graduate and postgraduate studies frequently participate in ongoing professional development and attend programs for additional training. As a result of these experiences, teachers may feel more self-sufficient as they learn new strategies and approaches for overcoming difficulties in the classroom. Therefore, the self-efficacy levels of instructors were expected to vary depending on their education levels. However, although there was no statistically significant difference (see Table 16), M.A. graduates reported themselves as higher self-efficacious than B.A. graduates and Ph.D. graduates reported themselves higher than MA graduates. Similarly, in Doğan's (2014) study, M.A. graduates had higher self-efficacy than B.A. graduates, and Ph.D. graduates had higher self-efficacy than M.A. graduates. However, it is also worth noting the low number of instructors holding a Ph.D. degree (n= 26) for interpreting these findings, for these findings may not be generalisable.

RQ1.2: Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to undergraduate program field?

Research Question 1.2. aimed to find out whether EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels differ according to their undergraduate program field, namely according to whether or not they graduated from the English Language Teaching (ELT) Department or other departments. Findings revealed that instructors who graduated from the ELT department were overall more self-efficacious compared to the ones who graduated from English Language and Literature or other departments (see Table 17). Likewise, in the semi-structured interviews, ELT graduate instructors expressed themselves as more self-efficacious in terms of educational strategies and theoretical knowledge, while instructors who graduated from other departments such as English Language and Literature or Translation and Interpretation expressed themselves as having theoretically low self-efficacy. Yet, although differences were observed in both sub-dimensions and total, no statistically significant difference was found only in self-efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development. In Yılmaz's (2020) study, there was no statistically difference between instructors' self-efficacy levels according to their undergraduate program field. In other words, ELT graduates didn't reveal more self-efficacy than non-ELT graduates in all sub-dimensions and overall. Essentially, ELT program graduates were expected to be more self-efficacious as Bandura (1994) stated that mastery experiences have a positive correlation with self-efficacy level. As instructors who graduated from other departments did not have enough teaching experience during their undergraduate studies, it is expected that ELT program graduates developed higher levels

of self-efficacy. In other words, it is important to keep in mind, though, that teachers who graduate from ELT programs may have undergone specialised training in linguistics, second language acquisition, and language teaching approaches, all of which may have boosted their self-efficacy in the classroom. On the other hand, teachers from other departments, such as English Language Literature or English Language and Interpreting, might be experts in their particular subjects (e.g., English Literature) but may not have had the same in-depth training in the teaching of foreign languages. However, in the current study, only a statistical difference was found in terms of efficacy for monitoring and assessing language development. It can be because of that ELT graduates generally receive specialised training during their studies regarding language teaching and assessment. Also, they are more likely to have a deep understanding of a language and therefore this gives them confidence in monitoring and assessing students' language development. Moreover, their exposure to assessment tools also increases their familiarity with these assessment techniques. However, regarding the fact that there was no difference in other sub-dimensions and overall, it can be stated that the variance in self-efficacy levels across undergraduate program fields and self-efficacy is not straightforward and might also be influenced by different factors, such as specialised training, professional experience, and personal characteristics (Bandura, 1994).

RQ1.3: Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to years of professional experience?

Research question 1.3 (RQ1.3.) investigated if EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels vary according to their years of professional experience. According to the findings, as the instructors' years of experience increased, their self-efficacy levels parallelly increased (see Table 18). Overall, instructors with 31+ years of experience were the most self-efficacious among all groups. Regarding the statistical differences, a significant difference was found between all groups in terms of self-efficacy ($p = .000$). Likewise, a significant difference was also found in efficacy for instructional strategies ($p = .000$), classroom management ($p = .000$), developing language skills ($p = .003$), student engagement ($p = .041$), and monitoring and assessing language development ($p = .006$). In terms of the qualitative data, as the variation between interviewees ranged from 10 to 21 years of teaching experience, it was not possible to observe the differences. However, some of the interviewees emphasised that although they graduated from non-teaching departments, they considered themselves self-efficacious thanks to their teaching experience. One of the interviewees pointed out "Maybe

if you had asked me in the early years of my career, my answer to this question might have been different depending on the department I studied, but now I can speak more comfortably with the self-confidence gained from 10 years of effort and experiences I have gained.” (Int1). Similarly, this was raised by another interviewee: “The only thing that worries me is that I don't know much about the theoretical part of teaching, but at this point I don't get too hard on myself because I know that the theoretical part cannot be adapted to the classroom very easily anyway. The biggest reason why I feel this way is, of course, that I did not study English teaching. But when I talk to my friends, I see that what I do in the course is not very different, it amounts to the same thing, I just don't know the theoretical names of these. At the same time, one of the things that helped me the most at this point is the training and experience you received. In fact, I think they help me close the points where I feel inadequate.” (Int2).

Regarding the findings of this study, instructors having more than 30 years of experience had the highest self-efficacy levels, which support Bandura's (1994) theory of self-efficacy. He states that experiences have an influence on increased self-efficacy levels. Therefore, the findings of this study are in line with this statement for all five sub-dimensions and overall evaluation. There have been numerous studies in the literature which found that instructors' self-efficacy levels varied depending on their years of professional experience (e.g., Solar Şekerci, 2011; Yılmaz, 2020). In this study, experienced instructors considered themselves as more self-efficacious particularly in instructional strategies and classroom management. People who believe in their own abilities are predicted to have higher expectations for effectively accomplishing impending tasks (Bandura, 1982). Low self-efficacy beliefs are predicted to increase the likelihood of giving up when faced with challenges (Schunk & Pajares, 2002). Thus, experienced teachers are expected to have higher levels of self-efficacy and attempt to use various teaching methods because a teacher's level of self-efficacy influences their instructional strategies in the classroom. When trying to reach students, those with higher self-efficacy levels put in more effort, do not give up when they come across difficulties, and strive to reach the students using various strategies (Schunk & Pajares, 2002). That is because experienced instructors felt more efficacious in the classroom management sub-dimension. When it comes to the student engagement sub-dimension, a significant difference was also found, similar to the findings of Klassen and Chiu (2010) and Ülkümen (2013). Klassen and Chiu (2010) likewise found that EFL teachers' years of experience was linked to their self-efficacy in student

engagement. In this study, teachers with 23 years of professional experience showed more self-efficacy in instructional strategies sub-dimension compared to inexperienced ones. Similarly, Ülkümen (2013) concluded that EFL instructors' years of professional experience were significant predictors of their self-efficacy beliefs in terms of student engagement. However, in Yılmaz's (2020) study, it was surprising that EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels in student engagement sub-dimension did not vary depending on their years of professional experience. That can be a result of student characteristics or teaching styles.

RQ1.4.: Do the self-efficacy levels of instructors vary according to gender?

Research question 1.4 (RQ1.4) investigated whether EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels vary according to their gender. According to the findings, in overall evaluation, male EFL instructors had slightly more self-efficacy than female instructors (See Table 19.) Also, female EFL instructors were more self-efficacious in efficacy for planning and organising teaching processes, efficacy for classroom management, and efficacy for student engagement. In contrast, male EFL instructors had more self-efficacy in instructional strategies, developing language skills, monitoring and assessing language development. Despite this, no statistical difference was found between groups in overall evaluation and sub-dimensions.

This finding concurs with those of some earlier studies (e.g., Doğan, 2014; Taşçı, 2019; Yavuz, 2007) which similarly reported that females had higher self-efficacy levels in terms of some sub-dimensions. Although she found a contrary result in overall evaluation, Doğan (2014) stated that self-efficacy levels of female EFL instructors teaching at preparatory schools of universities were higher than males in terms of student engagement and classroom management. In another study, Taşçı (2019) also found that female EFL instructors had more self-efficacy in terms of classroom management. She predicated this finding on Bandura, who stated that females consider themselves highly sufficient for careers traditionally held by women. When it comes to instructional strategies male EFL instructors were found to be more self-efficacious which was in line with the current study. However, she found a significant difference in student engagement and classroom management sub-dimension contrary to the current study. Yavuz (2007) also stated that female EFL instructors had higher self-efficacy in terms of classroom management compared to males which is a similar finding in the current study. Therefore, female EFL teachers in this study showed less self-efficacy than males in overall and most sub-dimensions contrary to the common belief that teaching is largely a feminine task (Yavuz,

2007). However, although some differences in the mean scores can be seen in this study, there is no significant difference in terms of overall evaluation and sub-dimensions.

RQ2: What kind of teacher identities do the instructors who teach English as a foreign language in the university-level English Preparatory Programs in Türkiye have?

To investigate the teacher identities of EFL instructors, quantitative and qualitative data were obtained and analysed respectively. First, the participants rated the items in order of agreement relating to their teacher identities on the questionnaire ranging from 1 (= strongly disagree) to 5 (= strongly agree) (See Appendix C). Second, participants responded to semi-structured interview questions (See Appendix E) that the researcher had devised based on expert opinions.

According to the findings, EFL instructors highly developed identities in terms of pedagogical expertise, didactic expertise and subject-matter expertise. However, they had the lowest mean score in terms of attitudes towards professional development (See Table 20). Specifically, although instructors' identities had closer mean scores, they were mostly developed in pedagogical expertise and least developed in professional development. This result was not surprising when compared with the qualitative results as the interviewees mostly stated that they empathised with students while teaching and encouraged them to facilitate learner autonomy. Secondly, they were equally developed in didactic and subject matter expertise. Similarly, when qualitative results were examined, although the instructors found their teacher identities to be improved in some respects such as teaching grammar and vocabulary, they found it low in some respects such as implementing specific procedures to teach listening, writing, or speaking skills. Surprisingly, when it comes to professional development, they seemed to have lower identities than other sub-dimensions. This finding is also in line with the findings of Kazımlar's (2019) and Ölmez Çağlar's (2016) studies. In their studies, the most developed identity sub-dimension was pedagogical expertise, even if other sub-dimensions were close to each other. Thus, it can be stated that pedagogy is the main focus for instructors while teaching English. In Kazımlar's study (2019), she stated that instructors tried to balance each sub-dimension and attach similar amounts of importance to improve them. Therefore, it can be said that their professional identities have a combination of two or more sub-dimensions. Similarly, in Ölmez Çağlar's (2016) study, participants revealed that they had highly developed professional identities. In her study, the dimension of professional identity that was reported to be least developed was the continuation of professional development, which was in line with the findings of Kazımlar's

(2019) and the present study. These findings could be interpreted with instructors' perceptions of the relevance of such professional development activities. As Daloğlu (2004) stated earlier, Turkish EFL teachers often find professional development opportunities irrelevant and, therefore, these activities are often seen as an imperative rather than an opportunity for professional development. In addition, in their study, Çelik, Bayraktar-Çepni, and İlyas (2013) concluded that although Turkish EFL instructors considered professional development activities as important, they did not find them applicable on their teaching practices, in line with Daloğlu's (2004) results.

When it comes to the details in continuation of the professional development sub-dimension, an interesting detail stood out. A considerable majority of the participants (n= 229) disagreed that they publish research articles. That might be one of the weaknesses of the instructors in this profession because especially in preparatory schools, they do not have the responsibility of researching and publishing.

RQ2.1: Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to education level?

Research question 2.1 (RQ2.1.) investigated if EFL instructors' teacher identities vary according to their education level. Based on the findings, instructors who have a Ph.D. degree possessed all types of teacher identities in almost all sub-dimensions, except for didactic expertise. This result is surprising because it is expected that an instructor holding a higher degree of education is better at using teaching procedures or applying different methods. However, instructors holding a Ph.D. degree may feel low self-efficacy in these areas, as their focus is on academic studies rather than teaching. In overall evaluation, instructors having a Ph.D. degree also had developed all types of identities compared to the ones having B.A. and M.A. degrees. However, although differences were observed in both sub-dimensions and total, no statistically significant difference was found (see Table 24). Similarly, no differences were found in qualitative data analysis. These findings are in line with Ölmez Çağlar's (2016) findings, who also stated that EFL instructors' identities did not vary according to education level. Nevertheless, since studies on teacher identity in Türkiye are mostly conducted with pre-service teachers, no other comparable research on the education level variable has been found in the few studies conducted with EFL instructors, posing a challenge for comparability of these findings with other studies in the literature.

RQ2.2: Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to undergraduate program field?

Research question 2.2. (RQ2.2.) aimed to reveal whether EFL instructors' teacher identities differ according to their undergraduate program field. According to the findings, EFL instructors who graduated from English Language and Teaching (ELT) departments had more developed identities in didactic expertise and attitudes towards professional development. Similarly, in overall evaluation, they had higher mean scores than non-ELT graduate EFL instructors. Also, there was a significant difference within groups in attitudes towards professional development with a higher mean score for ELT graduates ($M= 3.85$, $SD= .53$) than non-ELT graduates ($M= 3.62$, $SD= .66$). In Ölmez Çağlar's (2016) study, she couldn't find a significant difference between EFL instructors' teacher identities according to the undergraduate program field. However, Kazımlar (2019) concluded that studying ELT resulted in more developed identity overall. She also found that ELT graduates had more developed identities in terms of didactic expertise and attitudes towards professional development, which is in line with the current study. She attributed this to their teaching skills they gained during their education or practicum. Pennington (2014) also stated that language teaching education contributes to teachers' expertise related to teaching and supports teachers with necessary qualifications. So, EFL instructors' teacher identities might have been developed as a result of their early practices.

RQ2.3: Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to years of professional experience?

Regarding research Question 2.3. (RQ2.3.), which delved into finding out whether EFL instructors' teacher identities differ according to their years professional experience, quantitative findings illustrated that as the instructors' years of experience increased, their development of teacher identities also increased. Specifically, in terms of all sub-dimensions and overall evaluation, EFL instructors having more than 31 years of experience had the highest mean scores. Similarly, interviewees stated that they improved their classroom practices and teaching skills as their years of professional experience increased. As one of the interviewees voiced: "That's why I can say that with this experience over the years, I have assumed a more confident identity." (Int1). They also indicated that their class dominance and field knowledge increased especially with the self-confidence brought by experience. As one of the interviewees stated "I think I am strong in terms of classroom management and field knowledge. I attribute this mostly to my experience." (Ins6).

According to Schön (1987), with more experience, educators more frequently participate in reflective practice, which entails a critical review of their classroom interactions and experiences. They can improve their instructional strategies, comprehend the effects of their instruction on students, and connect their practices with their fundamental educational principles and beliefs through this reflective process. As they obtain a deeper awareness of themselves and their pedagogy through reflection, their teacher identities become more refined and developed. Similarly, Korthagen and Vasalos (2005) stated that teachers gain more pedagogical knowledge, instructional expertise, and classroom management skills as they accumulate more classroom experience. They grow more skilled in dealing with varied teaching difficulties, customizing their approaches to fit various learner types, and putting into practice powerful techniques to support student learning. Their teacher identities are favourably impacted by this rise in knowledge because they feel more competent and confident in their roles as teachers. Therefore, findings in this study are in line with the literature. From an overall perspective, instructors having more than 30 years of experience have developed all types of teacher identities within all groups. Moreover, a statistically significant difference was found between all groups in terms of teacher-identity. Similarly, a significant difference was also found in subject matter expertise (see Table 27). These findings, however, do not corroborate those of with Kazımlar's (2019) and Ölmez Çağlar's (2016) studies which yielded no significant differences in terms of teaching experience. Although the participant groups in each study were EFL instructors, this result may have arisen considering individual differences and external factors affecting teacher identity. Yet, as the identity of a teacher is formed by the lived experiences of a person (Keller, 2021), it is expected that instructors having more experience showed higher identity development. Similarly, as Beauchamp and Thomas (2009) and Beijaard et al. (2004) stated, teacher identity is not a stable, but a dynamic process. Therefore, its evolution and development over the years is a finding in line with expectations.

RQ2.4: Do the teacher identities of instructors vary according to gender?

Research Question 2.4. (RQ2.4.) aimed to reveal whether EFL instructors' teacher identities differ according to their gender. Findings showed that whereas male EFL instructors had more developed identities in subject matter expertise and didactic expertise, female EFL instructors had more developed identities in pedagogical expertise and attitudes towards professional development (see Table 28). In overall evaluation, female EFL instructors were slightly higher than males but none of the findings indicated a statistically significant

difference (see Table 28). When the literature was reviewed, no studies were found investigating any potential variance in EFL instructors or teacher identity according to gender. However, regarding the previous studies conducted with EFL teachers (e.g., Keskin & Zaimoğlu, 2021; Rezai, 2018) while a few of them found that female EFL teachers developed a stronger professional identity, some of them (e.g., Kao & Lin, 2015; Xiong & Xiong, 2017) found no significant difference in terms of gender.

RQ3: What are the motivations for instructors who teach English as a foreign language in the university-level Preparatory Programs in Türkiye to choose teaching as a career?

Findings of Research Question 3 (RQ3) illustrated that EFL instructors mostly considered intrinsic and altruistic reasons when choosing the teaching profession and they didn't seem to attach importance to extrinsic and socialisation factors as much as the others (see Table 29). Whereas the most common reason was the love of the subject, which is an intrinsic motivational factor, family approval was the least popular reason for choosing the teaching career (see Table 30). Also, altruistic reasons such as potential of changing students' lives/attitudes, working with young adults and contributing to society were prevalent among instructors as well as job security, which is an extrinsic motivational factor. Intrinsic motives are known to originate from the individual and are linked to happiness and fulfillment on a personal level. Intrinsically driven EFL teachers could actually like their work and feel fulfillment in assisting others in learning a new language (Kyriacou, Hultgren, & Stephens, 1999). However, altruistic motivations involve a selfless concern for the well-being of others. Many EFL instructors are drawn to the profession because they want to contribute to the educational development and cross-cultural understanding of their students (Chong & Low, 2009). They also stated that altruistic motivations often coexist with intrinsic motivations, as teachers find fulfillment in making a positive difference in their students' lives and helping them become effective communicators in English. Therefore, teachers who have altruistic motivations are expected to have higher levels of intrinsic motivation in their language teaching endeavors. In conclusion, EFL instructors with intrinsic and altruistic motivations benefit the educational system by creating a supportive and stimulating learning environment, encouraging student success, and acting as role models and lifelong learners. Both the individual learners and the larger community may be significantly and permanently impacted by these motives.

RQ3.1: Do the motivations of instructors for choosing teaching as a profession vary according to education level?

Research Question 3.4 (RQ3.4.) aimed to reveal whether EFL instructors' motivations for choosing teaching as a profession differ according to their education level. Findings indicated that, B.A and M.A. graduates were mostly driven by altruistic motivations, whereas Ph.D. graduates were driven by intrinsic motivations (see Table 31). Additionally, while working with young adults was at the forefront for MA graduates, for Ph.D. graduates, teaching English was a mentally stimulating career (see Table 32). Both groups indicated their interest in the subject while deciding on a career. When it comes to B.A. graduates, similar findings were seen. They regarded teaching as a mentally stimulating work, and they had an interest in teaching English. Also, the potential of changing students' lives was also a motivation for all groups. However, family approval had the least mean scores within all groups. According to the findings, EFL instructors with different education levels chose a teaching career driven by altruistic and intrinsic motivations. Although there wasn't a significant difference in terms of sub-dimensions, when it comes to items, working with young adults had a significant difference between groups with the highest mean score ($M=4.46$, $SD=.86$) for M.A. graduates and lowest mean score ($M=3.96$, $SD=1.21$) for Ph.D. graduates. However, no comparable research was found on EFL instructors in terms of their career motivations and education level.

RQ3.2: Do the motivations of instructors for choosing teaching as a profession vary according to undergraduate program field?

In light of research question 3.2. (RQ3.2.), whether instructors' motivations for choosing teaching as a career vary according to their undergraduate program field was investigated. Findings indicated that although some differences are observed in mean scores, no statistical difference was found in terms of sub-dimensions (See Table 33). Specifically speaking, whereas non-ELT graduates considered altruistic motivations more than ELT graduates, when it comes to extrinsic motivations, intrinsic motivations and socialisation motivations ELT graduates had higher mean scores. Findings also indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in terms of the items (see Table 34). More precisely, while ELT graduates mostly chose teaching for their interest in English and potential of changing students' lives or attitudes, non-ELT graduates mostly considered job security as well as their interest in English. In contrast, while choosing the teaching profession, the interviewees did not consider teaching as a secure job. However, a different detail that came to the fore in the qualitative data was that respondents, especially those who graduated from other language-related departments than ELT, emphasised they did not have a career

alternative other than teaching. As one of the interviewees stated: “Once you choose a language department in high school, you don't have many alternatives anyway. You have to either turn to teaching or translating. I chose teaching.” (Int2). Although there is no specific study regarding this topic, considering the factors such as having to have a pedagogical certificate, entering the Public Personnel Selection Examination (KPSS) exam or the anxiety of being appointed as a teacher, it could be normal for English Language and Literature graduate students to head to the teaching profession by putting job security to the fore.

RQ3.3: Do the motivations of instructors for choosing teaching as a profession vary according to years of professional experience?

Regarding research question 3.3. (RQ3.3.), which delved into finding out whether EFL instructors' career motivations differ according to their years of professional experience, findings illustrated that while novice (1-5 years) teachers and experienced (31+ years) EFL instructors prioritised altruistic and intrinsic motivations, extrinsic motivations were prioritised by mostly novice (1-5 years) instructors (see Table 35). When it comes to socialisation influences, although all groups of EFL instructors had low mean scores, it can be seen that when the experience increases, mean scores also increases. Regarding the significance of the sub-dimensions, there is a significant difference in altruistic motivations. While 1-5 years of experienced EFL instructors had the highest mean score ($M= 4.20$, $SD= .83$), other groups didn't seem to consider altruistic motivations as much as them. When it comes to the items, love of the subject was the most popular motivation for all groups of EFL instructors (see Table 36). For more experienced teachers, working with young adults was the most important motivation. A significant difference was found between groups in terms of salary and benefits as a motivation. While novice EFL instructors (1-5 years) gave more importance on salary and benefits while choosing this career ($M= 4.37$, $SD= .92$), for experienced EFL instructors it was a subordinate motivation ($M= 3.91$, $SD= .97$). No comparable studies were found in the literature investigating teaching motivations in terms of professional experience. However, as EFL instructors gain experience and expertise, their motivation might change, shifting from an early career concentration on pay and perks to a more inner and altruistic desire. A complex interaction of variables, including career advancement, internal happiness, institutional support, individual values, and outside opportunities, might have an impact on this progression.

RQ3.4: Do the motivations of instructors for choosing teaching as a profession vary according to gender?

Research question 3.4 (RQ3.4.) aimed to reveal whether EFL instructors' motivations for choosing teaching as a profession differ according to their gender. Findings indicated that, in all sub-dimensions, females had higher mean scores than males (see Table 37). Among these sub-dimensions, a statistical difference was found only in altruistic motivations with higher means for females ($M= 4.45$, $SD= .58$) than males ($M= 4.22$, $SD= .59$). Considering the items specifically, both males and females chose the teaching profession as they loved the subject, revealing that they were intrinsically motivated (see Table 38). Moreover, in motivations such as salary and benefits, job security, promotion prospects and variety in teaching, females showed less interest. There was a statistically difference in terms of contributing the society. Regarding this item, female EFL instructors had a higher mean score ($M= 4.45$, $SD= .78$) compared to males ($M= 4.18$, $SD= 1.07$) Moreover, both groups of EFL instructors stated that they choose this profession as they wanted to work with young adults, which is an altruistic motivation. Altruistic motivations deal with seeing teaching as a socially worthwhile profession (Kyriacou, Hultgren, & Stephens, 1999). In other words, instructors who have altruistic motives have a desire to help the society improve. For instance, a significant difference was found in the item "contributing the society", which is an altruistic reason. It was a more powerful motive for females than males (see Table 38). Kılınç, Watt, and Richardson (2012) stated that teaching is mostly common among females in Türkiye as a result of gender roles. As women generally undertake the responsibility to inspire children and are considered as role models, it might be natural for them to feel as if they are forerunners of change. Therefore, they adopt the roles of contributing the society more than males. These findings are also in line with Saban's (2003) study. Although his study was conducted with pre-service EFL teachers, findings similarly revealed that females had more altruistic and intrinsic motivations compared to males. In contrast, males were interested in teaching due to "job security". As teaching is regarded as one of the most secure professions and men have the responsibility to earn a living in some societies, they might feel safer in the teaching profession. That is why male EFL teachers prioritise "job security" purposes when choosing teaching as a career. This finding is also in line with those in other studies (e.g., Richardson & Watt, 2006; Saban, 2003; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012).

RQ4: Is there a correlation between self-efficacy beliefs, teacher identities, and the motivations for choosing teaching as a profession of instructors who teach English as a foreign language in the university-level English Preparatory Programs in Türkiye?

Research question 4 (RQ4) aimed to reveal if there is a correlation among EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels, teacher identities, and career motivations. As the findings of the Fisher's exact test illustrated, there was a significant correlation among the instructors' self-efficacy levels and teacher identities ($p = .00$) (see Table 39). Also, interviewees confirmed that these two variables were connected to each other. Instructors mostly stated that they would not enter this profession if they had not realised their self-efficacy in language skills and language teaching abilities. They stated that if a career was chosen consciously, the person would not want to perform a profession that he finds himself inadequate. These results concur with those of Bandura (1998), Volkmann and Anderson (1998), and Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). According to Bandura (1998), an individual's choice as a profession gives a vital reference point for their personal identity, and self-efficacy beliefs are crucial for career advancement. According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), teacher efficacy is connected to a number of important educational concerns, such as the persistence, determination, and instructional behavior of teachers as well as student issues including accomplishment, motivation, and self-efficacy beliefs. According to Volkmann and Anderson (1998), professional identity is a complicated and active balance in which teachers' own self-image is evaluated in light of a range of societal responsibilities they feel compelled to fill.

Considering their role in education, one of the biggest shares in student success is teachers. By actively and critically focusing on their personal identities throughout the teaching process, EFL instructors can enhance their own teaching. Instructors' personal qualities, such as their self-efficacy, might be influenced by their professional identity as a component of their identity as educators. It can be beneficial to consider how instructors' perceptions, beliefs, identities, and self-efficacy play a part in the success of EFL education as well as how to improve their performance to benefit students' learning. Research on teachers' professional identities, according to Beijaard, Meijer, and Verloop (2004), focuses on how teachers relate to others, their knowledge, as well as the duties, attitudes, and behaviors they adopt. Crucial components, such as, teachers' awareness on their identities and self-efficacy can also be beneficial to their overall well-being. EFL instructors' teacher identities might evolve within time as they gain more experience and engage in professional development. Experienced EFL instructors who continuously seek opportunities for professional development might develop a stronger identity, leading to high self-efficacy. In conclusion, there's a fact that teachers' self-efficacy was a major part of their professional identity. A

strong teacher identity that aligns with professional development, experience and the belief in the value of EFL education, might lead to higher teacher self-efficacy.

Similarly, the relationship between EFL instructors' teacher identity and career motivations was also significant ($p = .00$) (see Table 39). One of the EFL instructors also stated in the interviews that teaching was a part of her identity, that is why she chose this profession. The beliefs, values, and attitudes that EFL instructors hold in relation to teaching English to non-native students are a part of their professional identities. A career dedicated to teaching English as a foreign language is more likely to be chosen by EFL instructors who developed a strong professional identity in the field of English language teaching. Individuals choosing teaching as a career generally have a strong identity that includes a deep passion for exploring and sharing. They see language education not only as a powerful tool for personal growth, but also a means of impacting their students positively. As teaching requires continuous learning and adaptation to current teaching strategies, teachers with an identity that values lifelong learning prefers to have a career in teaching. Moreover, an individual's past experiences which shape their identities have also an influence on their career choices. Similarly, positive experiences with their teachers who serve as a role model during their education might shape their teacher identity and encourage a career devoted to teaching. In conclusion, EFL instructors who are passionate about dealing with students, deeply interested in language learning and professional development, and dedicated to assisting students in improving their English language skills develop stronger identities, have higher self-efficacies and become satisfied in their careers.

5.2. Implications

The present study investigated EFL instructors' self-efficacy beliefs, teacher identities, and reasons for choosing teaching as a profession in the Turkish higher education context. Within the framework of findings, instructors had high self-efficacy levels overall, yet there were some areas in which they felt comparatively less self-efficacious. It might, therefore, be suggested that universities must put greater emphasis on professional development (PD) activities and start and/or improve Teacher Development (TD) units. Regarding the first research question and its sub-questions, EFL instructors considered themselves as low-efficacious in terms of developing students' language skills, especially listening skills. From this point of view, universities can hold PD activities or seminars for EFL instructors on

how they can better develop the knowledge and practice of teaching these skills. At the same time, administrators can encourage instructors to maintain reflective journals in order to document their teaching journeys and set goals for their professional development. Furthermore, high levels of self-efficacy are more frequent in instructors who have a strong sense of self and teaching-related beliefs. To support teachers' long-term success in the profession, it is crucial for teacher education programs and professional development opportunities to put a major emphasis on assisting instructors in developing a strong sense of their teaching beliefs.

As for the second research question and its sub-questions, although EFL instructors regarded themselves as having developed teacher identities overall, it was also apparent that they could not develop their identities in terms of professional development. Moreover, they stated that they did not publish research papers or take part in academic events. To develop their identities, institutions should encourage EFL instructors. They ought to communicate the benefits of professional development to EFL instructors and emphasise how these activities improve their teaching skills and lead to career upgrades. Also, they might support them financially such as covering their registration fees or travel expenses for conferences and courses. Also, they can offer incentives for instructors who actively participate in PD activities and apply what they have mastered in their teaching process. Finally, they ought to provide them with enough time during the academic year to research and publish articles.

As for the third research question, EFL instructors had intrinsic and altruistic motives when they entered the profession. Since intrinsic motivation is frequently characterized by greater levels of accomplishment and excitement for the practice of teaching (Erten, 2014), this is encouraging for the ELT field and could be a useful asset for the education of future generations. This is crucial because, even in the absence of specific external rewards, intrinsic motivation can last longer than extrinsic motivation (Erten, 2014). However, steps must be done to maintain this long-lasting intrinsic drive for further professional growth and the maintenance of quality-focused teacher behaviors. Administrators should, for instance, permit instructors to have a say in curriculum design, instructional strategies, and material choice. Teachers' intrinsic motivation is increased when they feel ownership over their work.

5.3. Limitations

There are some limitations on the current study that need to be taken into account in interpreting the findings. First of all, only 356 EFL teachers teaching in foundation and state universities in Istanbul made up the sample for this study. Therefore, it stands to reason that if a similar study is carried out with larger groups, the findings will likely be more generalizable. Second, the study's scope is too narrow because it only focuses on English teachers working in English Preparatory Programs of universities. Teachers who instruct at other educational levels, such as pre-primary, primary, and secondary education, could be included in future research to be replicated. To put it another way, future researchers could delve into whether English teachers' levels of self-efficacy vary depending on the educational level they teach at, as well as their teacher identities and any potential connections between those factors and their career motivations. Additionally, only seven EFL instructors participated in the in-depth interviews. More instructors might be interviewed in upcoming studies, and quantitative data could be more meaningful this way. In addition, data weren't obtained on EFL instructors graduated from non-ELT departments whether the participants had a pedagogical formation certificate. Additionally, data collection tools can be developed specifically for EFL instructors working in Türkiye to be used in future studies. Finally, a pilot study could only be conducted with 11 people for the EFL Instructor Self-Efficacy questionnaire used in the current study. Although the internal consistency of the questionnaire was high, the piloting phase could have been conducted with a higher number of participants.

5.4. Suggestions for Future Studies

In this study, several suggestions could be made for future research studies. First, the present study investigated only EFL instructors' self-efficacy levels, teacher identities, and reasons for choosing teaching as a profession. It may be suggested that similar studies focusing on the relationship between different variables should be carried out in the same context. Furthermore, this study was restricted to 356 EFL instructors employed by Istanbul-based universities. A more in-depth study should be done involving a larger group of instructors from other universities in other cities to get more generalisable results.

REFERENCES

- Açıkgöz, K. Ü. (2016). *Etkili öğrenme ve öğretme*. Biliş.
- Alloush, I., Chaleila, W., & Watted, A. (2020). Close to the heart or close to the home? motivational factors influencing EFL teaching as a career choice among female Arab-Israeli students. *English Language Teaching*, 14(1), 48-57. doi:10.5539/elt.v14n1p48
- Almuhammadi, K. H., Assalahi, H. M., & Madini, A. A. (2020). Saudi female EFL instructors' perceptions of the effects of professional development on their self-efficacy. *English Language Teaching*, 13(10), 74-85. doi:10.5539/elt.v13n10p74
- Anthony, T. D., & Kritsonis, W. A. (2006). *A mixed methods assessment of the effectiveness of strategic e-mentoring in improving the self-efficacy and persistence (or retention) of alternatively certified novice teachers within an Inner City School District*. Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.
- Arpacı, D. (2015). *An investigation on the relationship between prospective teachers' early teacher identity and their need for cognition* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 439147).
- Artino Jr., A. R. (2012). Academic self-efficacy: From educational theory to instructional practice. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 1(2), 76–85. doi:10.1007/s40037-012-0012-5
- Balban, S. (2015). *Reflections on teacher identity: A case study of novice language teachers* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 440551).
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. doi:10.1037/0033-295x.84.2.191
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.37.2.122
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117–148. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Social Foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of Control. *Choice Reviews Online*, 35(03). doi:10.5860/choice.35-1826
- Bandura, A. (1999a). Social cognitive theory of personality. *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*, 154–196. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-24612-3_300244
- Barni, D., Danioni, F., & Benevene, P. (2019). Teachers' self-efficacy: The role of personal values and motivations for teaching. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(1), 1-7. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01645
- Baş, T. (2010). *Anket*. Ankara, Çankaya: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Batson, C. D. (1987). Prosocial motivation: Is it ever truly altruistic? *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 20(2), 65–122. doi:10.1016/s0065-2601(08)60412-8
- Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39(2), 175–189. doi:10.1080/03057640902902252
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(2), 107–128. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001
- Bolinger, R. R. (1988). The effects of instruction in the Hunter Instructional Model on teachers' sense of efficacy. <https://scholarworks.montana.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1/6604/31762100518453.pdf;sequence=1>
- Borchert, M. (2002). Career choice factors of high school students. <http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/lib/thesis/2002/2002borchertm.pdf>
- Bosnyák, J., & Gáncs, N. (2012). The motivational disposition of English language teacher trainees. *WoPaLP*, 6, 64–78.
- Brookhart, S. M., & Freeman, D. J. (1992). Characteristics of entering teacher candidates. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(1), 37–60. doi:10.3102/00346543062001037
- Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2003). A test of the factorial validity of the teacher efficacy scale. *Research in Education*, 69(1), 67–79. doi:10.7227/rie.69.6
- Bullough, R. V. (1997). Practicing theory and theorizing practice in teacher education. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), *Teaching about teaching* (pp. 13–31). London: Falmer Press.
- Can, S. (2019). *University preparatory school instructors' self-efficacy beliefs* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 567521).

- Chacón, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(3), 257–272. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.001
- Chan, S., Maneewan, S., & Koul, R. (2021). Cooperative learning in teacher education: Its effects on EFL pre-service teachers' content knowledge and teaching self-efficacy. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 47(5), 654–667. doi:10.1080/02607476.2021.1931060
- Cheng, L. (2021). The implications of EFL/ESL teachers' emotions in their professional identity development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(1), 1-7. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.755592
- Cheung, H. Y. (2008). Teacher efficacy: A comparative study of Hong Kong and Shanghai Primary in-service teachers. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 35(1), 103–123. doi:10.1007/bf03216877
- Cheung, Y. L., Said, S. B., & Park, K. (2016). *Advances and current trends in Language Teacher Identity Research*. London: Routledge.
- Chong, S., & Low, E.L. (2009). Why I want to teach and how I feel about teaching—formation of teacher identity from pre-service to the beginning teacher phase. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 8(1), 59–72. doi:10.1007/s10671-008-9056-z
- Chwalisz, K., Altmaier, E. M., & Russell, D. W. (1992). Causal attributions, self-efficacy cognitions, and coping with stress. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 11(4), 377–400. doi:10.1521/jscp.1992.11.4.377
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques*. New York: Wiley.
- Coşkuner, M. (1970, January 1). *Turkish provincial state university teachers' perceptions of English language teaching as a career*. BUIR. <https://repository.bilkent.edu.tr/handle/11693/14952>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). In *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 209–240). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Çapa Aydın, Y., Uzuntiryaki Kondakçı, E., Temli, Y., & Tarkın, A. (2013). Adaptation of sources of self-efficacy inventory into Turkish . *İlköğretim Online*, 12(3), 749–758. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ilkonline/issue/8617/107438#article_cite
- Çelebi, H., & Aktekin, N. (2017). Teacher identity formation in teacher education. In *Teacher-researchers in action* (pp. 77–90). IATEFL.
- Çelik, S., Bayraktar-Çepni, S., & İlyas, H. (2013). The need for ongoing professional development: Perspectives of Turkish university-level EFL instructors. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1860–1871. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.264
- Daloğlu, A. (2004). A professional development program for primary school English language teachers in Turkey: Designing a materials bank. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24(6), 677–690. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2004.04.001
- Damar, E. A. (2018). Identifying motivational factors of pre-service EFL teachers. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 7(1), 147–151. doi:10.2478/ajis-2018-0015
- Day, C., Kington, A., Stobart, G., & Sammons, P. (2006). The personal and professional selves of teachers: Stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(4), 601–616. doi:10.1080/01411920600775316
- Dibapile, W. T. (2012). A review of literature on teacher efficacy and classroom management. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 9(2), 79–92. doi:10.19030/tlc.v9i2.6902
- Doğan, D. (2014). *A comparative study of English language instructors regarding teacher self-efficacy and teacher stress* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 370213).
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in Second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation*. New York: Routledge.
- Ekin, S., Yetkin, R., & Öztürk, S. Y. (2021). A comparative study of career motivations and perceptions of student teachers. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED611796.pdf>
- Emmer, E. T., & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51(3), 755–765. doi:10.1177/0013164491513027

- Eren, G. (2020). *Foreign language teaching anxiety and self-efficacy perceptions of native and non-native EFL instructors at tertiary level institutions* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 627914).
- Erten, İ. H. (2014). Understanding the reasons behind choosing to teach English as a foreign language. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167271.pdf>
- Eslami, Z. R., & Fatahi, A. (2008). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies: A study of nonnative EFL teachers in Iran. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255635441_Teachers'_Sense_of_Self-Efficacy_English_Proficiency_and_Instructional_Strategies_A_Study_of_Nonnative_EFL_Teachers_in_Iran
- Field, J. (2010). *Listening in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2011). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Friedman, I. A., & Kass, E. (2002). Teacher self-efficacy: A classroom-organization conceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(6), 675–686. doi:10.1016/s0742-051x(02)00027-6
- Gavora, P. (2010). Slovak Pre-Service Teacher Self-Efficacy: Theoretical and Research Considerations. *The New Educational Review*, 21(2), 17–30. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287424468_Slovak_Pre-Service_Teacher_Self-Efficacy_Theoretical_and_Research_Considerations
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25(1), 99-125. doi:10.2307/1167322
- Ghaemi, H., & Damirchiloo, S. (2015). The relationship among perfectionism, motivation and self-efficacy of EFL learners. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(8), 230-242. <http://www.jallr.com/~jallrir/index.php/JALLR/article/view/214/pdf214>
- Giallo, R., & Little, E. (2003). Classroom behaviour problems: The relationship between preparedness, classroom experiences, and self-efficacy in graduate and student teachers . https://www.newcastle.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0017/100484/v3-giallo-little.pdf
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 569–582. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.76.4.569

- Goh, C. C. M., & Vandergrift, L. (2011). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. Routledge.
- Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles*. Pittsburgh: Alliance Publishers.
- Güven, S., & Çakır, Ö. (2012). A study on primary school English teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. *Ted Eğitim ve Bilim*, 37(163), 43–52. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289058072_A_Study_on_Primary_School_English_Teachers'_Self-Efficacy_Beliefs
- Hayes, D. (2008). Becoming a teacher of English in Thailand. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(4), 471–494. doi:10.1177/1362168808097160
- Henson, R. K. (2001). Relationships between preservice teachers' self-efficacy, task analysis and classroom management beliefs. *Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association*, 2(3), 1–41. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED450084>
- Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(4), 343–356. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.007
- Hsieh, B. (2010). *Exploring the complexity of teacher professional identity*. Berkeley: University of California.
- İlgör, B. (2019). *The relationship between English teachers' professional identity perceptions and self-efficacy beliefs*. (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 581870).
- İpek, H., Akçay, A., Bayındır Atay, S., Berber, G., Karalık, T., & Yılmaz, T. S. (2018). The relationship between occupational stress and teacher self-efficacy: A study with EFL instructors. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 8(1), 126–150. doi:10.18039/ajesi.393945
- İşsever, F. (2020). *Teacher research self-efficacy beliefs of instructors at an English preparatory school* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 627847).
- Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). Learning to become a second language teacher: Identities-in-practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(2), 236–252. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01178.x
- Karakaş, M. (2016). *An examination of pre-service elt teachers' sense of self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and teacher knowledge as constituents of teacher identity*

- construction (Doctoral Dissertation). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 443536).
- Karavas, E. (2010). How satisfied are Greek EFL teachers with their work? Investigating the motivation and job satisfaction levels of Greek EFL teachers. *Porta Linguarum Revista Interuniversitaria de Didáctica de Las Lenguas Extranjeras*, 8(2), 59–78. <https://doi.org/10.30827/digibug.31944>
- Kao, Y. R., & Lin, S. (2015). Constructing a Structural Model of Teachers' Professional Identity. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education*, 4(1), 69–81. [http://www.ajmse.leena-luna.co.jp/AJMSEPDFs/Vol.4\(1\)/AJMSE2015\(4.1-08\).pdf](http://www.ajmse.leena-luna.co.jp/AJMSEPDFs/Vol.4(1)/AJMSE2015(4.1-08).pdf)
- Kartopu, S. (2016). Öz yeterlilik algısında dindarlık eğiliminin rolü. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 9(50), 73–73. doi:10.9761/jasss3550
- Kazımlar, N. (2019). *Exploring EFL instructors' perceptions of professional identity: The Turkish context* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 538745).
- Keller, T. M. (2021). “The world is so much bigger.” *Research Anthology on Religious Impacts on Society*, 2(1), 211–230. doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-3435-9.ch010
- Keskin, A., & Zaimoğlu, S. (2021). An investigation of Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of professional identity. *Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 18(1), 82–95. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/cagsbd/issue/63182/959756>
- Kılınç, A., Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2012). Factors influencing teaching choice in Turkey. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 199–226. doi:10.1080/1359866x.2012.700048
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741–756. doi:10.1037/a0019237
- Korthagen, F., & Vasalos, A. (2005). Levels in reflection: Core reflection as a means to enhance professional growth. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1354060042000337093>
- Kotaman, H. (2008). Self-efficacy belief and enhancement of learning performance. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(1), 111–133.
- Köroğlu, N. (2018). *Psikoloji öğrencilerinde depresyonun yordayıcısı olarak öz yeterlik ve beden algısı* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 527962).

- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Kuş, E. (2007). *Nicel-nitel araştırma teknikleri: Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma teknikleri: Nicel Mi Nitel Mi?* Ankara: Anı.
- Kyriacou, C., Hultgren, A., & Stephens, P. (1999). Student teachers' motivation to become a secondary school teacher in England and Norway. *Teacher Development*, 3(3), 373-381. doi:10.1080/13664539900200087
- Lasky, S. (2005). A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(8), 899–916. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.06.003
- Lawrence, B. S., Arthur, M. B., & Hall, D. T. (1989). *Handbook of career theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levin, K. A. (2006). Study design III: Cross-sectional studies. *Evidence-Based Dentistry*, 7(1), 24–25. doi:10.1038/sj.ebd.6400375
- Liebig, B., & Sansonetti, S. (2004). Career Paths. *Current Sociology*, 52(3), 371–406. doi:10.1177/0011392104043084
- London, M. (1983). Toward a theory of career motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(4), 620–630. doi:10.5465/amr.1983.4284664
- Lutovac, S. (2020). How failure shapes teacher identities: Pre-service elementary school and Mathematics teachers' narrated possible selves. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 94, 103-120. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2020.103120
- Marschall, G. (2021). The role of teacher identity in teacher self-efficacy development: The case of Katie. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 25(6), 725–747. doi:10.1007/s10857-021-09515-2
- Matheny, E. B. (2016). *Becoming a mathematics teacher: Identity, narratives, and resources*. TRACE. https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/4150/
- Merç, A. (2015). *Foreign Language Teaching Anxiety and Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Turkish Pre-Service EFL Teachers*, 6(3), 40–58. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ijrte/issue/8572/106264>
- Moeketsane, P. (2014). *Exploring the career barriers faced by women managers in municipal authorities in South Africa*. (Master's Thesis). <https://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/items/2adf9c96-0bb1-47a4-8fea-d9caa300825a>
- Morgan, D. L. (2007). Paradigms lost and Pragmatism regained. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48–76. doi:10.1177/2345678906292462

- Moslemi, N., & Habibi, P. (2019). The relationship among Iranian EFL teachers' professional identity, self-efficacy and Critical Thinking Skills. *HOW*, 26(1), 107-128. doi:10.19183/how.26.1.483
- Nikitina, L., & Furuoka, F. (2008). "A language teacher is like...": Examining Malaysian students' perceptions of language teachers through metaphor analysis. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(2), 192-205. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED509070>
- Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613. doi:10.2307/3588214
- Olan, E.L., & Belló, P. (2016). Understanding teachers' career choices: Narratives from international in-service teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL). *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 23-42. https://scholar.google.com.tr/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=tr&user=z3R6GzwAAAAJ&citation_for_view=z3R6GzwAAAAJ:NMxIlDI6LWMC
- Ölçü, Z. (2014). *An Investigation of career plans (career, professional and workplace intentions) and career choice satisfaction of senior year pre-service English teachers in Turkey* (Doctoral Dissertation). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 377866).
- Ölmez Çağlar, F. (2016). An insight into professional identities of Turkish EFL instructors. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, 2(4), 1226–1235. doi:10.24289/ijsser.278998
- Özdemir, M. (2020). *The relationship between efl instructors' self-efficacy beliefs and their teaching styles* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 630204).
- Pajares, F. (2002). Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy. <http://people.wku.edu/richard.miller/banduratheory.pdf>
- Patton, W., & McMahon, M. (2006). *Career Development and systems theory: Connecting Theory and Practice*. Rotterdam Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Pennington, M. C. (2014). *Teacher identity in TESOL: A frames perspective* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Pennington, M. C., & Richards, J. C. (2016). Teacher identity in language teaching: Integrating personal, contextual, and professional factors. *RELC Journal*, 47(1), 5–23. doi:10.1177/0033688216631219

- Ramaswami, A., Dreher, G. F., Bretz, R., & Wiethoff, C. (2010). Gender, mentoring, and career success: The Importance of Organizational Context. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(2), 385–405. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01174.x
- Rezaei, V. (2018). The relationship between English learning and professional identity changes among Iranian phd teachers. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(1), 169. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0801.21>
- Richardson, P. W., & Watt†, H. M. (2006). Who chooses teaching and why? profiling characteristics and motivations across three Australian universities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(1), 27–56. doi:10.1080/13598660500480290
- Ross, J. A. (1998). The antecedents and consequences of teacher efficacy. In *Advances in research on teaching* (Vol. 7, pp. 49–73). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2022). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Saban, A. (2003). A Turkish profile of prospective elementary school teachers and their views of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(8), 829–846. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2003.03.004
- Sachs, J. (2005). In M. Kompf & P. Denicolo (Eds.), *Connecting policy and practice: Challenges for teaching and learning in schools and universities* (pp. 5–21). London, Oxford: Routledge.
- Safari, I., Davaribina, M., & Khoshnevis, I. (2020). The influence of EFL teachers' self-efficacy, job satisfaction and reflective thinking on their professional development: A structural equation modeling. *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, 13(1), 27–40. doi:10.7160/eriesj.2020.130103
- Sakız, G. (2013). Başarıda anahtar kelime: Öz-yeterlik. *Uludağ University Faculty of Education*, 26(1), 185-209. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/uefad/issue/16697/173576>
- Sauro, J., & Lewis, J. R. (2012). *Quantifying the user experience: Practical statistics for user research*. Elsevier/Morgan Kaufmann.
- Sayar, E. (2014). *Investigating EFL teachers' and their students' conceptions of professional teacher identity through metaphor analysis* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 370217).
- Schiefele, U., & Schaffner, E. (2015). Teacher interests, mastery goals, and self-efficacy as predictors of instructional practices and student motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 42, 159–171. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.06.005

- Schmitz, G. S., & Schwarzer, R. (2000). Selbstwirksamkeitserwartung von Lehrern: Längsschnittbefunde mit einem Neuen Instrument. *Zeitschrift Für Pädagogische Psychologie*, 14(1), 12–25. doi:10.1024//1010-0652.14.1.12
- Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. *Development of Achievement Motivation*, 10(1), 15–31. doi:10.1016/b978-012750053-9/50003-6
- Senemoğlu, N. (2012). *Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim: Kuramdan uygulamaya*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Shih, D. C.-M. (2016). Why do they want to become English teachers: A case study of Taiwanese EFL teachers. *Perspectives in Education*, 34(3), 43–44. doi:10.18820/2519593x/pie.v34i3.4
- Singh, G., & Richards, J. C. (2006). Teaching and learning in the language teacher education course room. *RELC Journal*, 37(2), 149–175. doi:10.1177/0033688206067426
- Solar Şekerci, A. (2021). *Self-efficacy levels of prep-school instructors and its predictors* (Doctoral Dissertation). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 660489).
- Spector, P. E. (2019). Do not cross me: Optimizing the use of cross-sectional designs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(2), 125–137. doi:10.1007/s10869-018-09613-8
- Suri, H. (2001). Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 11(2), 63–75. doi:10.3316/qrij1102063
- Taşçı, Ç. (2019). *A multivariable examination of the relationships between efl instructors' self-efficacy beliefs and motivation in higher education* (Doctoral Dissertation). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 548274).
- Taşdemir, H. (2021). *A narrative inquiry into early career English language teacher identities* (Doctoral Dissertation). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 664172).
- Taşer, D. (2015). *Predictors of university EFL instructors' self-efficacy beliefs in Turkey* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 399819).
- Tathioğlu, S. S. (2021). Öğrenmeye sosyal-bilişsel bir bakış: Albert Bandura. *Sosyoloji Notları*, 5(1), 15–30. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/sosnot/issue/63416/892420>

- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2), 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>
- Thompson, G. (2016). *Japanese high school English teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about teaching English* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/78103194.pdf>
- Topkaya, E. Z., & Uztosun, M. S. (2012). Choosing teaching as a career: Motivations of pre-service English teachers in Turkey. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 126–134. doi:10.4304/jltr.3.1.126-134
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783–805. doi:10.1016/s0742-051x(01)00036-1
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944–956. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202–248. doi:10.3102/00346543068002202
- Ülkümen, H. A. (2013). *The predictors of English language preparatory school instructors' self-efficacy beliefs* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 345155).
- Ünver, M. M. (2004). *An exploration of perceived self-determination and self-efficacy of EFL instructors in a Turkish state university* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 145570).
- Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 4(1), 21–44. doi:10.1207/s15327701jlie0401_2
- Volkman, M. J., & Anderson, M. A. (1998). Creating professional identity: Dilemmas and metaphors of a first-year chemistry teacher. *Science Education*, 82(3), 293–310.
- Watt, H. M., & Richardson, P. W. (2007). Motivational factors influencing teaching as a career choice: Development and validation of the fit-choice scale. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 75(3), 167–202. doi:10.3200/jexe.75.3.167-202
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Wazir, N. M. (2019). Factors impacting EFL teachers' self-efficacy: A theoretical perspective. *English Language Teaching*, 12(4), 39. doi:10.5539/elt.v12n4p39
- Wilensky, H. L. (1968). *Organizational careers: A sourcebook for theory* (pp. 50–53). London: Routledge.
- Wongruvitch, N., & Yitzhak, G. (2018). Teachers' position in the Israeli society today. *Dapim*, 68, 11–27. <https://www.workrights.co.il/%D7%9E%D7%A2%D7%9E%D7%93-%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%94>
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 81–91. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.81
- Xiong, T., & Xiong, X. (2017). The EFL teachers' perceptions of teacher identity: A survey of Zhuangang and non-zhuangang primary school teachers in China. *English Language Teaching*, 10(4), 100-110. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n4p100>
- Yavuz, C. (2010). *Teacher identity: An investigation of personal and professional experiences of Turkish EFL teachers* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 278028).
- Yavuz, Ş. (2007). Socio-demographic predictors of EFL teacher efficacy. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 3(2), 304-324.
- Yeşilyurt, E. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen öz-yeterlik algıları. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(45), 89–104. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/70461>
- Yentür, M. M. (2023). The effect of geography teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and attitudes toward teaching on their motivation. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 8(2), 360–367. doi:10.24331/ijere.1255100
- Yılmaz, A. (2020). *An investigation into the relationship between English preparatory teachers' mindsets and their self-efficacy beliefs* (Master's Thesis). Accessed from CoHE Thesis Center database (Thesis No: 640496).
- Yılmaz, M., Köseoğlu, P., Gerçek, C., & Soran, H. (2004). Yabancı dilde hazırlanan bir öğretmen öz-yeterlik ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uygulanması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 27(27), 260-267. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/hunefd/issue/7811/102525>

- Yong, B. C. (1995). Teacher trainees' motives for entering into a teaching career in Brunei darussalam. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(3), 275–280. doi:10.1016/0742-051x(94)00023-y
- Yök. (2021). Retrieved from <https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Yayinlar/Yayinlarimiz/2021/turkiye-de-yuksekokretim-sistemi-2021.pdf>
- Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(3), 663–676. doi:10.3102/00028312029003663
- Živković, P., Ristanović, D., & Stajonavić, B. (2018). The dimensionality of student teacher professional identity. *The New Educational Review*, 51(1), 221–231. <https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2018.51.1.18>



APPENDICES

Appendix A

Demographic Information

Please read the statements below carefully and write your responses in the spaces provided.

With questions consisting of choices, please mark the most appropriate choice with a tick (✓).

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐
 Prefer not to say ☐
3. What is your undergraduate field degree?
English Language Teaching ☐
English Language and Literature ☐
Translation and Interpreting ☐
Linguistics ☐
Other ☐ _____
4. What is your highest qualification?
BA ☐ MA ☐ Ph.D. ☐
5. How many years of teaching experience do you have overall?
_____ years
6. Where do you teach now?
Preparatory School of a state university ☐
Preparatory School of a foundation university ☐
7. How long have you been teaching at university?
_____ years

Appendix B

Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

Dear respondent, in this section you will find statements about EFL self-efficacy questionnaire. Each of the following items asks you about your opinions on your self-efficacy beliefs about your teaching. There is no right or wrong answer. Please give the response that best reflects your opinions.

While you are teaching English, how efficient do you feel yourself in doing the following?

I can

Strongly disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly agree	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Undecided (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1. make appropriate planning for English language teaching.					
2. organize learning environments suitable for English teaching.					
3. use materials and resources which are suitable for English language teaching process.					
4. use methods and techniques suitable for English language teaching process.					
5. use technological resources in English language teaching.					
6. craft good questions for students.					
7. provide an alternative explanation (for example,					

when students are confused).					
8. vary instructional strategies in my classroom.					
9. make my expectations clear about student behaviour.					
10. control disruptive behaviour in the classroom.					
11. calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.					
12. get students to follow the classroom rules.					
13. help students develop effective language learning strategies.					
14. ensure that students use English accurately and clearly.					
15. improve students' listening skills.					
16. improve students' reading skills.					
17. improve students' writing skills.					
18. improve students' speaking skills.					
19. adopt my teaching according to the needs of the students with special educational needs.					

20. get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork.					
21. help students value learning.					
22. motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork.					
23. help students think critically.					
24. determine the purposes of assessment and evaluation practices.					
25. use assessment and evaluation tools and methods in English language teaching.					
26. interpret the assessment questions to determine the language development of students and provide feedback.					
27. organize students' practices in the light of the assessment and evaluation results.					

Appendix C

Professional Identity Questionnaire for English Instructors (Ölmez Çağlar, F., 2016)

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Strongly <u>disagree</u> Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly agree	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Undecided (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1. I have a good command of English vocabulary.					
2. I am well-informed about English grammar.					
3. I am competent in English pronunciation almost native-like level.					
4. I am competent in intonation of English words and sentences almost native-like level.					
5. I am well-informed about the types of pragmatic failures in English.					
6. I am well-informed about cultural aspects of English-speaking countries whose native language is English.					
7. I apply the current foreign language teaching methods and techniques.					

8. I am able to prepare lessons according to my students' needs.					
9. I am able to use specific procedures to support the learning of grammar.					
10. I am able to use specific procedures to support the learning of vocabulary.					
11. I am able to use specific procedures to teach speaking.					
12. I am able to use specific procedures to teach writing.					
13. I am able to use specific procedures to teach listening.					
14. I am able to use specific procedures to teach reading.					
15. I am able to raise students' awareness of other cultures in multilingual classes.					
16. I know how to use different language teaching resources (e.g. different materials, internet, computer literacy, etc.).					
17. I am able to design different assessment tools.					
18. I am able to implement different kinds of assessment					

procedures in order to evaluate the learning outcomes.					
19. I am able to adopt different teacher roles (mediator, supervisor, etc.) according to student needs.					
20. I am able to facilitate learner autonomy.					
21. I am able to support students' social development.					
22. I am able to support students' emotional development.					
23. I am able to support students' academic development.					
24. I am knowledgeable about how individual learner differences can affect the learning outcomes.					
25. I pay attention to student psychology during my teaching practices.					
26. I attend different kinds of teacher training events for my professional development.					
27. I exchange ideas about teaching English with my colleagues.					
28. I reflect on my teaching experiences, strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.					

29. I research in order to improve my teaching.					
30. I publish research articles.					
31. I update my lecture notes.					
32. I follow the current developments in the field of English language teaching.					
33. I am in a period of professional burnout.					
34. I follow the current trends in curriculum development.					
35. I update my knowledge about the foreign language teaching approaches, methods, and techniques.					



Appendix D

EFL Teacher Motivation Questionnaire (Karavas, E., 2010)

Please indicate how important each of the following statements is in your decision about choosing English teaching.

	1 (Not at all important)	2	3	4	5 (Very important)
1. Working with young people					
2. Salary and benefits					
3. Job security					
4. Teaching fitted in with my lifestyle/family situation					
5. Variety in teaching					
6. Mentally stimulating work					
7. Love of the subject					
8. Promotion prospects					
9. Contributing to society					
10. Status of the profession					
11. Potential of changing students' lives/attitudes					
12. Family approval					
13. Other (Please state)					

Appendix E

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. Could you introduce yourself briefly?

1.1. Could you briefly tell me about your professional life?

1.2. How did you decide to become an English language teacher? Can you tell me about your decision-making process?

1.3. For what reasons did you choose English language teaching as a profession?

1.4. Can you tell me about specific examples or experiences that led you to choose the profession of English language teaching?

1.5. Did you have any other career options in mind? If there was, could you tell me about the reasons that led you to choose the profession of English language teacher?

2. How would you describe yourself professionally as an English language teacher?

2.1. Are there any factors that have a positive or negative impact on your professional identity that you currently have? If there are, can you tell us about them?

3. Do you think that you are professionally qualified to teach English as a foreign language? Can you explain the reasons for this?

3.1. Are there areas where your self-efficacy as an English teacher is low? If so, can you specify? Why do you think this way?

3.2. Are there areas where your self-efficacy as an English teacher is high? If so, can you specify? Why do you think this way?

4. Do you think there is any relationship between your teaching self-efficacy beliefs, professional teacher identity, and the reasons why you chose teaching as a career? If so, what kind of relationship do you think it is? If not, why?

Appendix F

Sakarya University Ethics Committee Permission



T.C.
SAKARYA ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Etik Kurulu



Sayı : E-61923333-050.99-231164
Konu : 17/24 Berfu DUYGUN

16.03.2023

Sayın Berfu DUYGUN

İlgi : 07.03.2023 tarihli ve E--000-0 sayılı yazınız.

Üniversitemiz Eğitim Araştırmaları ve Yayın Etik Kurulu'nun 15.03.2023 tarihli ve 17 sayılı toplantısında alınan "24" nolu karar ile Berfu DUYGUN'un başvurusu uygun görülmüş ve karar örneği ekte sunulmuştur.

Bilgilerinizi rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Murat İSKENDER
Eğitim Araştırmaları ve Yayın Etik
Kurulu Başkanı

Ek: Karar Yazısı (1 Sayfa)

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Doğrulama Kodu: BSFKZR9MYE Pin Kodu: 04103
Adres: Esentepe Kampüsü 54187 Söğütözü SAKARYA / KEP Adresi:
sakaryamiversitesi@is01.kep.tr
Telefon No: 0264 295 50 00 Faks No: 0264 295 50 31
e-Posta: ozalikalem@sakarya.edu.tr Elektronik Ağ: www.sakarya.edu.tr

Belge Takip Adresi : <https://turkiye.gov.tr/ehd/teK=3783&eD=BSFKZR9MYE&eS=231164>

Bilgi için: Hanife Bobacan
Uzman: Birim Evrak Sorumlusu

