L2 Teachers' Efficacy: The Impact Of Professional Development

Nino Jakhaia

University of Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd

Part of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Recommended Citation
https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/495

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.
L2 TEACHERS’ EFFICACY: THE IMPACT OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A Dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Teacher Education
The University of Mississippi

Nino Jakhaia

May 2018
ABSTRACT

This quasi-experimental explanatory sequential mixed-methods study examined the impact of a 25-hour professional development on English as a foreign language (L2) teachers’ sense of efficacy in writing instruction in the country of Georgia. It also explored the links between teachers’ beliefs about teaching writing, self-efficacies in instructional strategies, and the professional development. A convenience sampling technique was used to select teachers for participation in the professional development. The quantitative data was collected through the teacher efficacy scale. The qualitative methods in the form of semi-structured questions about efficacy were used to enhance the data by examining teachers’ perceptions of the influence of the program on their beliefs.

The results of this study indicate that L2 teachers who attended the 25-hour professional development had higher self-efficacy in instructional ability, namely their ability to deal with students’ writing problems, teach writing skills, assess writing assignments’ difficulty level, and an efficacy in the belief that the amount that a student can learn in writing is related to the teacher’s qualification and knowledge. These findings were supported by the qualitative data which further enhanced understanding of the quantitative findings.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Research indicates that teachers are not adequately prepared in writing instruction and find it challenging to employ instructional approaches that foster and nurture students’ composition skills (Gallavan, Bowles, & Young, 2007; McCarthy, 2008; Street & Stang, 2008; Troia & Maddox, 2004). A number of studies demonstrate that teacher preparation programs fail to equip pre-service teachers with the pedagogic knowledge and skills necessary to become effective teachers (Bruinsma, 2006; Gibson, 2007; Hall & Grisham-Brown, 2011; Hochstetler, 2007; Uyar, 2016). The gap in teacher preparation leaves educators with no choice but to embark on their career paths with limited knowledge and experience (Uyar, 2016). The field of foreign/second language teaching (henceforth, EFL/ESL and L2) is saturated with similar problems. For example, according to the National Center for ESL Education (2002), professional development programs for ESL teachers fall below the sufficient level.

In post-Soviet countries, the professional development opportunities for teachers, including language teachers, are similarly underrepresented (Dimova, 2003; Kobakhidze 2013; Silova & Kazimzade, 2010; Steiner-Khamsi, Moldoktamova & Sheriphanova-Mcleod, 2009). In the Republic of Georgia, for example, there is a lack of well developed, systematic professional development programs for English language teachers (Polat, 2009; Jakhaia & Holmes, in press). Additionally, most general ESL and EFL teacher preparation programs do not offer separate courses that address instructional issues as it relates to teaching writing to L2 students; nor do they provide teachers with the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the research development
in the field of composition (de Oliveira & Silva, 2013; Leki, 2001). These pedagogical and professional development shortfalls express themselves differently for teachers and students. On the one hand, there are L2 teachers who have less confidence in implementing writing curriculum and avoid assigning writing tasks. On the other hand, there are the language learners whose writing skills and competencies are suffering (Jakhaia & Holmes, in press).

Besides the above-mentioned factors, facilitating learners’ acquisition of composition skills depends on other contextual variables. For example, researchers agree that introducing a writing curriculum in classrooms on a large part is contingent upon educators’ self-beliefs about their capacity to design and implement writing tasks (Binkley, 1993). Teachers may avoid implementation of regular writing tasks if they do not perceive themselves as effective teachers of writing. If teachers do not feel competent enough to design writing activities and are not adequately trained, it is likely that writing tasks will not be viewed favorably; teachers may consider it challenging and may ultimately circumvent assigning writing tasks to their students (Bratcher & Stroble, 1994; Pajares & Johnson, 1994; Street & Stang, 2008).

It is not surprising that the existence of such circumstances requires the L2 field to investigate the factors that could affect educators’ perceptions of themselves as effective teachers. To achieve the goal, the research on teachers’ behavior has shifted attention to the role the teachers’ thinking patterns play in the education field. As Freeman (1996) highlighted, in order to understand EFL teacher behavior, it is important to investigate the nature of teachers’ beliefs about language teaching. Similarly, Borg (2003), who uses the term teachers’ cognitions to refer to the teachers’ thought patterns, points to the marginal role of research on understanding the relationship between teachers’ thoughts and their actual practices in the EFL writing. The available research reported that one such belief that can impact teachers’ perception of
themselves is related to the sense of efficacy (Henson, 2002; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). A substantial body of literature indicates a positive relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs and variety of teaching practices (Henson, 2002; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Empirical studies have shown that self-efficacy beliefs are positively associated with teachers in terms of their commitment to teaching (Coladarci, 1992), planning and organization (Allinder, 1994; Dibapile, 2012), classroom management (Poulou, 2007; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990; Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990) and job satisfaction (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, & Steca, 2003). The construct of self-efficacy has also been linked to educators’ willingness to implement innovative strategies of teaching (Guskey, 1988).

Researchers have examined the aspects, circumstances, as well as factors that can affect teachers’ efficacy. Research demonstrates that the purposefully designed professional development programs can affect teachers’ efficacy in a positive way. For example, Brownell and Pajares (1999) found that professional development is related to the perceived teacher efficacy of teaching writing. Professional development such as training programs and workshops may have more impact on teachers’ sense of efficacy when they are designed in a way which supports teachers in meeting the needs of the students (Bray-Clarks & Bates, 2003). In relation to this, self-efficacy frequently arises in studies of teacher effectiveness and L2 student attainment. Evidence demonstrates a relationship between teachers' beliefs about their personal ability to affect students’ achievement and the outcomes of both the teachers’ and the students’ efforts (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). In short, the L2 teachers’ beliefs about their self-efficacy to teach are linked to students’ academic persistence and achievement.
Statement of the Problem

Producing written work in English is one of the most challenging skills that foreign and second language learners are expected to acquire. It goes beyond the mastery of grammar, vocabulary or sentence construction and requires the command of the linguistic, cognitive and sociocultural skills among many other things (Barkaoui, 2007; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). L2 learners need to master these competencies to be proficient in writing, to gain access to educational opportunities and to be competitive in the 21st century.

The need for an increased competency in English writing is further boosted by the status the English language holds as a world’s lingua franca. The spread of English as a “global language” led Georgia, as well as other post-Soviet countries, to significantly revise their language policies (Blauvelt, 2013). The need to do so has emerged from the political and economic situation. To meet Georgia’s goals for European and Euro-Atlantic integration, it is pivotal for the country to articulate its political aspirations on a global field in the English language. Furthermore, English has become a vehicle for economic mobility of the country (Blauvelt, 2013). Employers, both international and domestic, demand a proficiency in English which includes the ability to perform written and oral communication successfully.

Thus, writing in English is a critical component of the Georgian society and if L2 teachers are to prepare students to be successful, they must ensure that students get the ample opportunities for mastering these skills first at the K-12 school level and then, at the university level. Unfortunately, the current situation in language teaching curricula in the Republic of Georgia is that performing a written communication in English remains a challenging endeavor for many language learners despite having studied a foreign language for years (Jakhaia &
Holmes, in press). The underperformance in writing illustrates the gap in teacher preparation initiatives and points to the need to teach writing effectively and incorporate writing tasks in all aspects of teaching. However, often L2 teachers are reluctant to design writing tasks or implement innovative writing strategies in their classrooms. The reluctance may stem from several factors: lack of preparation at both pre-service as well as in-service level, and lack of confidence in teaching writing.

Based on a researcher’s background as a language learner, L2 teacher, and later L2 teacher trainer, the writing practices both at in-service and pre-service levels, by and large, remain the same. This, for the most part, is due to the Soviet legacy in education. In the former USSR, teaching writing skills was not considered a priority (Tarnopolsky, 2000). In other words, the Soviet educational system did not emphasize teaching writing in English as a foreign language; even in EFL teacher preparation institutions, writing played a peripheral role (Tarnopolsky, 2000). Nowadays, a little more time is devoted to teaching writing in educational institutions, but in essence, the focus is still on grammar and reading (Polat, 2009). It is very common in Georgian universities that general English curriculum places emphasis on developing reading skills, and a considerable amount of time is devoted to grammar and oral retelling of the texts. There is very limited time dedicated to the development of written communicative skills (Jakhaia & Holmes, in press). Due to the lack of preparation at a pre-service level, many L2 teachers feel less confident teaching writing in L2 settings.

The prospects for professional growth of L2 teachers at an in-service level leaves much room for improvement despite the efforts of the government to increase the overall quality of language teaching and instruction. Georgian government has considerably revised its language teaching policies and launched intensive teacher preparation programs to increase the standards
of education. While the purpose of new reforms and initiatives is entirely plausible, teacher professional development in foreign languages is not sufficient, especially in the area of writing instruction. This gap in composition instruction reveals itself in student performance in writing. Georgian students are required to take university entrance exams in foreign languages, which include English language (National Assessment and Examination Center, 2016). Unfortunately, the students usually score the lowest on the essay part (Jakhaia & Holmes, in press). Moreover, according to the head of the English Language Exams at the National Examination Center, about 60% of Georgian applicants disregard the writing part of the exams in the English language (Mateshvili, 2016). This problem leads to the conclusion that despite the policies and reforms that have been implemented in the educational sector, L2 teachers’ general preparation in teaching English writing has not improved considerably.

Considering the challenges that teacher educators face as well as the profound effect of self-efficacy beliefs resulting in functional teacher performance, it becomes necessary to further expand further the research on teacher efficacy. It is also worth noting that despite the evidence demonstrating the role efficacy plays on teachers’ effectiveness, studies investigating the link between L2 teachers’ instructional practices and their self-beliefs are quite sparse. Furthermore, studies on writing improvement have drawn the attention of researchers but mainly in assisting learners with the difficulties they face in writing, whereas preparation of EFL teachers in writing and composition has mainly remained out of the research scrutiny (Casanave, 2009; Hochstetler, 2007; Reichelt, 2009). Hence, the need to design a professional development program aiming at increasing writing efficacy of teachers emerges. By identifying programs that contribute to L2 teachers’ self-efficacy perceptions in writing, it is possible to provide interventions such as professional development designed to increase an individual's sense of efficacy, which could
then impact their teaching performance, and in turn, ultimately positively affect their students’ writing performance.

The Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this mixed method study is to examine how professional development influences the teaching efficacy of Georgian English as foreign language teachers (Henceforth, L2). Participants of the study are in-service teachers working in schools in a Western region in Georgia. The following research questions are examined:

1. Do L2 teachers who participate in a professional development program tend to have higher teaching efficacy in writing compared to those who do not?

   Null Hypothesis: L2 teachers’ efficacy in writing is unrelated to professional development.

2. How does professional development contribute to teachers’ sense of efficacy?

   Sub-questions:
   a. How did professional development affect teachers’ sense of pedagogic knowledge?
   b. How did participation in the professional development affect teachers’ perceptions about their ability to implement the writing curriculum?
   c. How did professional development influence teachers’ conceptions of teaching L2 writing?

The Significance of the Study

Understanding in-service L2 teachers’ levels of efficacy and exploring their writing beliefs and experiences is significant on many levels. First, the greater the demand for students to
be able to achieve proficiency in the foreign and second language justifies the need for more effective professional development opportunities for teachers who can prepare learners to perform different written communicative functions. Next, understanding L2 teachers’ efficacy would better prepare professional development coaches to support teachers build their pedagogic knowledge and feel more confident about teaching English writing. And finally, the findings of the study can offer L2 writing scholars as well as L2 writing practitioners thoughtful insights into profound L2 writing scholarship as it relates to the EFL teacher education.

The Study Limitations

The limitations that are imposed upon this study include the following.

1. The study seeks to investigate the efficacy levels of L2 teachers and does not differentiate between efficacy levels of novice or experienced teachers.

2. Measure of efficacy are obtained over a relatively short experimental period; therefore, long-term changes in attitude and efficacy resulting from the treatment cannot be predicted.

3. The study is delimited to an investigation of the efficacy of professional development participants toward teaching writing as measured by a score on an efficacy scale and follow up interviews.

4. In terms of the generalizability, the application to the broader population should be done with caution since the research was limited to teachers in a Western region of the Republic of Georgia.
**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are directly related to my research and will be used throughout the study. Therefore, before going into the literature review, I would like to clarify the special terms and offer definitions.

1. **Efficacy**: Efficacy, as a general term, refers to the belief of an individual that he or she can successfully execute the behaviors necessary to produce the desired outcome (Bandura, 1977, 1982).

2. **Self-efficacy**: According to Bandura (1995, p. 2) self-efficacy is “the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations” (Bandura, 1995, p. 2).

3. **Teacher self-efficacy**: Teacher self-efficacy is a teacher's personal conviction regarding his or her individual capability to influence student learning (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

4. **Professional Development**: Professional development is the means by which participants gain knowledge and acquire new skills. According to Speck and Knipe (2005, p. 4), professional development “offers choices, levels of learning; builds on collaborative, shared knowledge; employs effective teaching and assessment strategies; expands teacher knowledge of learning and development, and informs teachers’ daily work.” In this study, professional development describes the writing workshops that L2 educators attended as part of this study. Therefore, for the purposes of the study, the terms the writing workshops and professional development will be used interchangeably.

5. **EFL**: This term, an acronym for English as a Foreign Language, refers to an educational setting in which English is not a dominant language. In EFL settings, usually, students...
share the same culture and language with the teacher. However, in certain contexts, the
teacher may be the native speaker of English.

6. **ESL**: A term for the use or study of the English language by non-native speakers in an
English-speaking environment. That environment may include countries in which English
is a dominant language (e.g., the U.S., Australia) or one in which English has an
established role (e.g., India).

7. **SLA**: Refers to the second language acquisition (SLA). It is generally used to describe the
languages that are being learned after the first language is acquired and examines the
ability of individuals to master the foreign languages (Moeller & Catalano, 2015).

8. **L2**: Refers to the abbreviation for second language, or a language that is not a mother
tongue. Ferris (2009, p. 4.) defines L2 learners as “students whose first language is not
English.” For the purposes of this study, L2 will refer to both second and foreign
languages.

**Organization of the Chapters**

This quasi-experimental study is divided into five chapters. Chapter I relates the rationale
of this paper, including the theoretical orientation to the L2 teacher development, the motivation
for the study, and the purpose of this study. Moreover, this chapter includes definitions of key
terms used throughout this paper in order to avoid potential confusion.

Chapter II presents a review of the related literature. It begins with a review of the
theoretical framework of the efficacy construct and its links to multiple educational variables.
The chapter goes on to draw attention to the major developments of teacher efficacy studies in
the field of foreign and second language learning and teaching. It discusses the writing theories dominant in the L2 field and concludes with an argument for developing a professional development which draws from the insights from the L2 writing research and emphasizes various sources of self-efficacy beliefs proposed by Bandura (1997). In addition, chapter II reviews the changes that have been undergoing over the past few years. It reviews a number of problems that remain unaddressed and looks in more detail at the challenges in foreign language education, specifically the situation in higher educational institutions and schools. This review describes how political and social factors affected the education field and L2 teacher education. The chapter elucidates the adverse consequences of these factors on teacher education in general and subsequently, on writing instruction.

Chapter III describes the research design, the participants in this study, the testing instrument, the pilot study, the data collection procedures, and the details of the scoring procedures applied. The research design includes an overview of the professional development used in the study to develop the intervention.

Chapter IV reports on how the professional development contributes to the teachers’ efficacy levels. The results are based on both quantitative and qualitative data. First, results of the quantitative data which consist of posttests administered to experimental and control groups are presented. Then, results of the qualitative interviews are discussed. Finally, results of both the qualitative and quantitative data comparisons are presented.

Chapter V includes the summary of the study and the major findings, as well as a discussion of the results. The chapter provides educational implications of the study. The chapter concludes with the suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature review is divided into three sections and presents an overview of the theoretical framework, the origins and the sources of the efficacy construct. The research discussed focuses on efficacy and professional development. The review of the studies indicates a relationship between teacher self-efficacy and educational variables that impact both the teacher and the student in a positive way. There is also evidence in the literature that the professional development can increase teachers’ beliefs of themselves as effective teachers. The second part of the chapter presents a review of the relevant writing theories in English as a Second language and Foreign Language (L2), which provide the theoretical basis for the series of the professional development workshops. The third segment of the literature review provides a historical background of the Georgian education system and discusses the social, historical and economic factors which have affected the teaching field and particularly, English as a foreign language context.

The review of the relevant literature reveals the gaps in several areas. Teacher efficacy is a widely researched construct and it has been applied to many educational variables but less attention has been paid to the studies that investigate the L2 educators’ teaching efficacies in writing instruction. There are only a handful of quantitative studies to the best of the researchers’ knowledge that examine the efficacy of L2 teachers. Studies that investigate the effects of
interventions to increase the L2 teacher efficacy in teaching writing have not been identified. The literature reveals that there is a need for more experimental studies that investigate the development of the writing efficacies of the foreign language teachers.

**Theoretical Framework**

The attention to self-efficacy extends well beyond Bandura’s social learning and personality development, cognitive mechanism, and social cognition (Hughey, 2010). According to Gecas (1989), its origins can be linked to the various aspects of the human agency such as determinism, notions of causality, free will as well as libertarian philosophies of voluntarism and intentionality (as cited in Hughey, 2010, p. 8). Despite its links to broader philosophical and theoretical perspectives, the research on self-efficacy is grounded on Rotter’s social learning theory and Bandura’s self-efficacy theory (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Rotter’s (1966) social learning theory defines the difference between external and internal locus of control. The constructs of external and internal locus of control help to understand causal beliefs; If a person’s locus of control is external, she or he will perceive that the outcome of actions is dependent on other people, luck or circumstances. On the other hand, if a person’s locus of control is internal, she or he believes that the outcome is within his or her control and thus, he or she is more inclined to take personal responsibility for outcomes.

Bandura (1977; 1981; 1986) while developing his own theory on self-efficacy, significantly revised the notions of self-evaluation and self-belief. He made a distinction between efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. An efficacy expectation is the belief that one can accomplish a given task successfully and produce a positive outcome. It is related to the notion that one’s sense of usefulness and uselessness may stem from high or low self-efficacy. Outcome
expectation, on the other hand, is a belief about the likelihood of the behavior leading to a specific outcome (Bandura, 1977). According to Bandura “outcome and efficacy expectations are differentiated, because individuals can believe that a particular course of action will produce certain outcomes, but if they have certain serious doubts about whether they can perform the necessary activities, such information does not influence their behavior” (1977, p. 193). Therefore, outcome expectations may be an important determinant of human behaviors.

Bandura’s (1997) self-efficacy explains how individuals overcome challenges and obstacles in their lives. Bandura proposed that self-efficacy beliefs lie at the core of human functioning. For example, having the necessary skills and knowledge to perform a certain action, does not guarantee the correct execution of the task. A person must have a belief that she or he can successfully accomplish the task under pressure or constraints. Moreover, these components of successful human functioning influence one another in what Bandura (1978) calls “reciprocal determinism.” He further argues that the component of self-efficacy is the view that personal, behavioral, and environmental factors create interactions that result in a ‘triadic reciprocity’. As a result, people are capable of being both the product and producers of their own environments as well as of their own social systems (Bandura, 1978).

A significant characteristic of the efficacy belief is its “enabling construct” – the term that Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy (2001) used to describe the teachers’ perceptions about their teaching capabilities. People who have high self-efficacy exert considerable effort in fulfilling their goals despite the obstacles or challenges. High self-efficacy allows them to exercise some control over events in their lives. Due to these factors, efficacy beliefs influence people’s thought patterns and emotions.
According to Bandura (1997), the perceived-self efficacy of teachers is an individual’s belief in his or her ability to produce desired levels of academic performance in their students. Teachers with a high sense of efficacy believe that they can influence students and those with low self-efficacy lack the confidence in their ability to positively influence students’ learning. Zimmerman (2000) concluded that self-efficacy beliefs cannot be defined as the beliefs that exist on their own. He defines them as “multidimensional” and argues that they “vary depending on the area of performance and the domain in which one is performing” (p. 67). For example, self-efficacy beliefs of how one will perform in one domain may differ from one’s self-efficacy of how he or she will perform in another domain.

Sources of self-efficacy.

A body of research has also focused on the sources that develop teachers' sense of self-efficacy. Bandura's (1986; 1997) social cognitive theory asserts that teacher's self-efficacy beliefs are developed from four main sources, namely: mastery experiences (successful teaching experiences), vicarious experiences (observing or hearing of the successful experiences of others), verbal coaxing (encouragement from respected peers), and physiological states (inner personal strength or resilience). Moreover, high efficacy precursors will strengthen ones’ self-efficacy while adverse efficacy precursors will weaken one’s self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Wood & Bandura, 1989). Below each source of efficacy is discussed separately.

Mastery experiences.

Mastery experience also called enactive attainment or performance attainment is the most powerful source of efficacy (Bandura, 1977). The sense of accomplishment and success is
related to the individual’s determination to pursue the goals even under the difficult circumstances (Bandura, 1997; Schunk & Pajares, 2009). Smith (2002) states two reasons for this. First, inactive mastery is based on experiences that are direct and personal. Second, mastery is usually attributed to one’s effort and skill. A plethora of studies suggests that action-oriented treatment in which people practice and apply new behavior or skill can significantly increase the perceptions of efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Bandura & Adams, 1977; Bandura, Adams, & Beyer, 1977). The effect of these performance experiences depends on the cognitive appraisal of people’s performances (Bandura, 1977). The positive judgment of success raises self-efficacy beliefs while the negative judgment of a given task decreases self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1977; 1978).

Although enactive mastery is described as the greatest source of efficacy, little empirical research exists in this realm. A teacher’s sense of efficacy has been shown to increase the most through personal mastery experiences, that is, success in the classroom (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007).

**Vicarious experience.**

Vicarious experience, also known as modeling, affects self-efficacy through social comparison process. The social comparison process is a situation in which people judge their capabilities based on the abilities of others (Bandura, 1997; Wood & Bandura, 1989). In other words, the vicarious experience is most likely to take place when an individual observes other individuals who possess more or less similar capabilities achieve success. Vicarious experience is believed to be the second most effective way to develop self-efficacy (Wise & Tunnel, 2001). “Proficient models build self-beliefs of capability by conveying to observers effective strategies
for managing different situations” (Wood and Bandura, 1989. p. 364). Similarly, self-efficacy of the individuals may decrease if they observe others, who are similar to them, fail in achieving their desired goal despite strong persistence (Brown & Inouye, 1978). Vicarious experience occurs with individuals with little experience as well as the less awareness of one’s performance level (Schunk, 1987). Because individuals’ capability may change over the course of the time, the vicarious experience is considered less stable compared to other sources of efficacy. Hence, vicarious experience allows room for alteration, it can be easily transformed based on other sources of efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

**Verbal persuasion.**

Verbal persuasion, also known as social persuasion, is another way to increase people’s beliefs in their efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Wood & Bandura, 1989). Verbal persuasions are thought to be the third most effective way to develop self-efficacy (Wise & Trunnel, 2001). For example, Wood and Bandura (2001) demonstrate that verbal persuasion is most effective when following a performance accomplishment. They further assert that “if people receive realistic encouragement, they will be more likely to exert greater effort to become successful than if they are troubled by self-doubts (p. 365). Additionally, if the efficacy information received through verbal persuasion comes from a “competent and reliable” person, the value of the efficacy information increases (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007, p. 612). Individuals providing efficacy information offer encouragement and praise as well as opportunities for accomplishing the purpose. Efficacy information received through verbal persuasion is less powerful than other sources of the efficacy mainly because it is not the source of the authentic experience. In addition, negative feedback is likely to diminish the self-efficacy acquired from the verbal
persuasion (Bandura, 1977). In other words, the sense of efficacy acquired from the praise can be not be sustained if followed by negative criticism.

_Phyiological states._

People’s judgments concerning their physiological states are the fourth determinant of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). People attribute a physiological condition to an efficacy perception. Emotional reactions can elevate or undermine one’s confidence. Feelings of stress, tension, and depressed mood have physical and psychological effects that adversely influence performance (Bandura, 1994; Schunk & Pajares, 2009). Physiological states or the way individuals experience high emotional or low emotional arousal determines their sense of knowledgeability in a specific task (Schunk & Meece, 2006). Bandura (1993) further delineates that “Those who are inclined to perceive their arousal as stemming from personal inadequacies are more likely to lower their perceived efficacy than those who regard their arousal as a common transitory reaction…” (p. 133).

These four sources of efficacy do not occur haphazardly, but rather a combination of all judgments about information trigger the development of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1978). These self-perception skills which are often not recognized at full level result in a discrepancy between what an individual actually knows and what he thinks he is capable of doing (Bandura, 1992; Pajares, 2006). In other words, individuals may not fully understand the link between their actual knowledge and the perceived efficacy to carry out the desired action. Refining self-perceptions in regards to the task that must or should be carried out has proven to be beneficial for generating more precise self-efficacy beliefs (Pajares, 2006).
Teachers’ Perceived Self-Efficacy

Perceived teacher efficacy is defined as teachers’ beliefs in their ability to reach the desired level of performance in specific teaching tasks (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). All four sources of efficacy described above influence teachers’ perceptions of themselves as teachers and thus are directly related to their self-efficacy beliefs (Pajares, 2006; see also Bandura, 1977; 1978; 1997). These beliefs start to develop at a pre-service level and are greatly susceptible to change. Gradually, through combinations of the vicarious experiences, modeling, mastery experiences and their own experience of teaching, their self-beliefs start to develop and take shape (Bandura, 1997, 1986; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Judgments of their own teaching abilities usually do not develop in a linear fashion. There is a plethora of factors that directly influence their perceptions of themselves as teachers. These factors may include:

…the students’ abilities and motivation, appropriate instructional strategies, managerial issues, the availability and quality of instructional materials, access to technology, and the physical conditions of the teaching space…[the] leadership of the principal, the climate of the school, and the supportiveness of other teachers (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 232).

Teachers’ efficacy beliefs play a significant role in affecting many important variables in the education field. For example, the efficacy of the teachers has been studied in terms of its relation to student achievement outcomes (Brownell & Pajares, 1999; Good & Brophy, 2003). McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) were the pioneers in identifying the positive links between these constructs. They proposed that teachers’ efficacy can impact students’ behavior and consequently, their academic performance. Since this research, many other researchers have
demonstrated the link between the teacher efficacy and student performance (Allinder, 1995; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Ross, 1992; 1994). For instance, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) investigated the influence of the teacher efficacy on the students’ achievements in reading, language arts, and math. The findings of their study found a strong correlation among these constructs. The higher a teacher’s self-efficacy, the higher are students’ achievement scores in reading.

Research on teachers’ perceived efficacy has investigated teachers’ self-perceptions in relation to teachers’ willingness to implement innovation in their teaching practice. Guskey’s (1988) study found that teachers who held higher personal efficacy had favorable attitudes towards teaching and had a considerably high level of confidence in their teaching abilities. In other words, those who liked teaching and held stronger beliefs about their abilities were highly effective in the classroom. They also seemed, according to Guskey, more enthusiastic to introduce new practices. In comparison, those “assumed to be less effective appeared to be the least receptive to innovation” (p. 67). Further, research also points out that teachers with high self-efficacy demonstrate effective instructional practices as compared to teachers with lower levels of efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

The body of research which examines the relationship between foreign/second language teachers’ efficacy and its implications for educational contexts is extremely limited. Yet, literature is saturated with topics which examine concepts that are closely aligned with the efficacy notions. Specifically, the studies that investigate the relationship between L2 teachers’ beliefs and their effects on various educational issues are rather abundant. Based on the literature review, ‘belief’ seems to be the widely acknowledged term in the literature which investigates the notions closely aligned with it. However, other terms have also emerged in relation to the
beliefs. The number of researchers employ the word ‘teacher beliefs’, ‘teacher perceptions’, ‘pedagogical beliefs’, ‘teacher cognitions’ and ‘teacher thinking’ to describe the same notion (Gabillon, 2013).

Gabillon (2013), in his literature review, identified five major research areas in relation to teacher beliefs. According to the researcher, the literature investigates (a) “the relationship between L2 teacher beliefs and their classroom practices; (b) L2 teachers’ beliefs as a source for teacher awareness and professional growth; (c) L2 teachers’ beliefs about educational innovation; (d) the nature of L2 teachers’ beliefs; (e) discrepancies between teachers and learners’ beliefs” (Gabillon, 2013, p. 6). Teacher efficacy is included under the first major area of research which investigates the interrelationship of teacher beliefs and classroom practice.

**Self-Efficacy and the Teaching of Writing**

Teachers are aware of their deficiencies in the subject matter knowledge and the skills in the area of writing instruction (Troia & Maddox, 2004). According to Bandura (1986) and Pajares (2003) the awareness of the gaps in knowledge together with negative self-beliefs about their own ability to perform as writers adversely impacts teachers’ self-efficacy to teach writing. The beliefs about themselves are significant because self-efficacy was thought by Bandura (1977) to play an influential role in the decisions individuals make, the effort and perseverance they are willing to put forth, and the level of success they can obtain. It is a sense of efficiency and ability (Brophy, 1999) that motivates both teachers and their students to take on the challenging task of writing.

Teachers’ beliefs in their ability to teach writing are influenced by their perception of themselves as writers (Daisey, 2009). Those who are not confident about their own writing
abilities are not comfortable with teaching writing, and the sense of deficiency in teaching ability jeopardizes their willingness to teach, especially when they encounter struggling writers (Bratcher & Stroble, 1994). Conversely, teachers who are aware of their own deficiencies are hesitant to work with students on the tasks that are perceived as challenging or difficult. For instance, Hall and Grisham-Grown found that pre-service teachers who had problems with writing conventions were reluctant to teach about them (2011). Additionally, teachers’ beliefs of writing as an inborn gift diminishes the value they place on the teaching of the writing (Norman & Spencer, 2005). For example, if teachers believe that writing cannot be taught and that they will not be able to impact students’ writing performance, then it is unlikely that teachers will enforce writing assignments or create an environment that encourages students to write on a regular basis.

Besides teachers’ general dispositions about themselves as writers, there is a number of other factors that influence the teachers’ instructional practices as it pertains to teaching writing. A number of researchers contend that the purposefully designed courses which are aimed at influencing teachers’ perceptions of themselves as writers can have a positive impact on teachers’ self-beliefs (Tracy, Scales, & Luke, 2014). For example, in a study conducted by Tracy et al., (2014), researchers designed an online course which was based on principles of the National Writing Project; they emphasized activities that required teachers to seek links between the theory, practice and personal experience. At the end of the course, graduate students who were participants of the study reflected on the impact of the program on their writing instruction and on their self-perceptions. The data from the graduate students’ reflections demonstrate that their “personal experiences with writing during the course affected how they thought about the teaching of writing” (p. 75).
According to Graham, Harris, and Fink (2001) studies related to teacher self-efficacy in respect of themselves as teachers of writing are sparse. The authors devised and tested the reliability of an instrument designed to measure self-efficacy in relation to the teaching of writing, and subsequently found that reported classroom practices varied with teachers’ level of efficacy, as measured by the scale.

**Self-Efficacy and L2 Teachers**

Self-efficacy has been proven to affect many educational variables and therefore, literature is saturated with the studies that explore the efficacy beliefs of the various subject matter teachers. Abundant among the studies are the ones that examine the efficacy of science teachers (Yangin & Sidekly, 2016; Swars & Dooley, 2010). However, research on language teachers’ efficacy dims in contrast (Chacón, 2002; Lee, 2009). The review of the literature reveals only a handful of studies that document a relationship between efficacy and language teachers. The Synopsis of this review and the gaps in the research are presented below.

Lee (2009) studied Korean elementary English teachers’ efficacy and used various instruments for the measurement of the construct. Teachers’ sense of efficacy in teaching English was measured by Teacher’s Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) by Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy (2001) and it was modified to fit the English teaching context in Korea. Personal teaching efficacy was measured by the five-item scale for PTE (Hoy & Woolfolk Hoy, 1993) without modification. Teachers’ attitude towards the English language was measured by an adapted Likert type instrument. Lee found that teachers rated their self-efficacy in teaching English at a moderate level in following aspects: Instructional strategies, classroom management, and student
engagement. They assessed their proficiency levels of receptive skills (i.e., Listening and Reading) higher than productive skills (i.e., Speaking and Writing).

Another noteworthy finding of Lee (2009) that is important for this study pertains to the in-service training and its effects on teacher efficacy. The study found that there was no significant relationship between trainings and teachers’ efficacy. Specifically, teachers who attended basic 120-hour training were found to be less confident in using target language when teaching English. However, according to the study, positive relationships were found between advanced trainings and English teachers’ efficacies.

Unlike Lee’s (2009) study, which has mixed results in terms of the effects of the training on the teacher efficacy, Turkish study conducted by Ortaçtepe and Akyel (2015) reveals the steady growth in teachers’ beliefs as a result of the in-service training. One of the aims of the study was to investigate the impact of an in-service teacher education program on English teachers’ efficacy and self-reported and actual practice of communicative language practice. Fifty middle school EFL teachers completed the pre- and posttests after the in-service training. The results showed significant differences in the dimensions of efficacy for student engagement, for management and for instructional strategies. The increase in efficacy levels of the EFL teachers in these dimensions showcases the positive impact of the training on the teachers’ beliefs.

Similarly, Cabaroglu’s (2014) study indicates to the positive relationship between teacher efficacies and professional development. The researcher reported on the study that investigated the impact of the participation in an action research on the English language teacher candidates in Turkey. The objective of the action research was to support teacher candidates to enhance
their instructional practice and to use an inquiry-based approach to learning. The results showed that the participants demonstrated growth in teaching efficacies, increased self-awareness, improved problem-solving skills and enhanced autonomous learning.

Shim (2001) investigated the middle and high school English teachers’ efficacy in Korea and examined differences in beliefs of the teachers as it relates to the personal and school-related variables. The researcher employed correlational research design and administered a survey instrument which was comprised of four parts. The first part of the questionnaire included questions on teachers’ sense of efficacy. The second part dealt with questions pertaining to ‘teaching satisfaction,’ ‘role preparedness, and ‘classroom management.’ The remaining parts of the instrument addressed school related variables, assessed teachers’ language skills and had questions on teacher demographics.

One of the findings of Shim’s (2001) study is that Korean EFL teachers have two efficacy beliefs: personal and general. It should be noted though that their general efficacy was low. In addition, the results of the study revealed that the classroom management was pivotal in sustaining high teacher efficacy beliefs among Korean teachers of English. Another finding that is important for this study is that good English skills did not contribute to the increase of teacher efficacy beliefs. In other words, proficiency in language skills does not always lead to the teachers’ efficaciousness. The results of the study contradict the findings of Mills and Allen (2008). They investigated teacher efficacy of second language native and non-native graduate teaching assistants of French. The authors found differences in self-reported efficacy beliefs of native and non-native graduate teaching assistants. Native speakers of English had higher scores on average than non-native graduate teaching assistants. Mills and Allen’s study is in line with Chacón’s (2005) findings. The researcher examined teachers’ self-reported English proficiency
and the use of pedagogical strategies to teach English by using the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The findings of the research reveal that teachers with high self-efficacy beliefs were more likely to employ communication and grammar focused pedagogical strategies. The result of these studies suggests that content knowledge can affect language educators’ conceptions of teacher efficacy.

The studies reviewed above indicate that the self-efficacy beliefs of L2 teachers are complex to analyze due to the nature of the contextual variables. For example, what Korean teachers may find useful for increasing their efficacy may be irrelevant for Turkish teachers. This suggests that when studying beliefs of teachers, we have to make sure that the context and the factors are taken into account. Furthermore, the mixed findings from the above studies suggest that the relationship between teacher efficacies and professional development may depend on the nature of professional development, on how it is implemented and whether contextual variables are meticulously examined prior to the implementation process.

**Development of Teacher Efficacy Scale and its Measurement**

Two conceptual strands of theory provide the basis for the development of the construct of teacher efficacy scale. The very first studies of efficacies were conducted by the RAND organization (Tschannen-Moran at al. 1998). The questionnaire they used included efficacy items taken from Rotter’s (1966) theory of action-outcome contingency which entails two opposing beliefs of teachers on their perception of the influence they possess on student learning: the first idea presupposes that teachers who believe they have an influence on students’ learning despite the environmental factors have internal control. Whereas teachers who have a conviction
that environmental factors have more influence than their efforts, have external control (Tschannen-Moran at al., 1998).

The first researchers who developed a teacher efficacy scale based on Bandura’s (1977) framework were Gibson and Dembo (1984). The scale they developed became the standard measurement for efficacy. Since then the Teacher Efficacy Scale has gone through numerous modification processes as various researchers altered the Teacher Efficacy Scale to measure different subject-specific efficacies of teachers (Riggs & Enochs, 1990).

General teacher efficacy (GTE) and personal teacher efficacy (PTE).

Researchers of efficacy beliefs propose that the construct of efficacy beliefs consists of two components: General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) and Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

General teaching efficacy refers to the “teachers’ expectations that teaching can influence student learning” (Ashton & Webb, 1986, p. 4). Personal teacher Efficacy, on the other hand, focuses on whether or not teachers believe that they can influence student learning (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

Researchers are agreeing on the significance of the PTE. However, there is a lack of consensus in regards to the GTE. A number of researchers propose that GTE incorporates factors which do not align well with the teachers’ PTE (Guskey & Passaro, 1994) and some see the link between GTE and Bandura’s outcome expectancy (Gibson & Dembo 1984). However, others disregard those notions and propose that GTE dimension describes teachers’ belief in how other educators can act within the analogous circumstances (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990).
The Impact of Professional Development on Teachers’ Efficacy

Professional development activities can affect teachers’ classroom practices and student achievement (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001). An emergent body of work demonstrates that effectively implemented professional development programs have a positive impact on many variables related to teachers. For example, the study conducted by Scribner (1998), evaluated the teachers’ professional development experiences from the personal teaching efficacy and professional learning perspectives. The findings of the research revealed that the level of personal teaching efficacy influences how and in what ways individual teachers experience, perceive and respond to the professional development. As authors contend, their study confirmed the assertions for approaches to professional development that address individual teacher needs.

Tschanen-Moran and McMasters’ (2009) quasi-experimental study examined the effect of professional development on teachers’ efficacy beliefs. They also investigated whether professional development affected implementation of innovative instructional methods. The results of the study revealed that “primary-grade teachers’ sense of efficacy for teaching and efficacy for reading instruction were highly correlated” (p. 240). This view is bolstered by several recent studies on the effects of the professional development on L2 teachers’ efficacy. For example, Karimi’s (2011) study revealed that professional development cannot only significantly affect the teachers’ perceptions of their teaching skills, but it can also alter their previous beliefs about teaching capabilities. The findings of this study are supported by the research which recognizes the changing nature of the self-efficacy beliefs (Cervone & Peake, 1986). Hence, efficacy beliefs are malleable and they are related to positive personal outcomes.
Palmer (2011) investigated the sources of teacher efficacy and the impact of a teaching intervention in science education. The results from quantitative and qualitative data showed that an increase in self-efficacy was influenced by the professional learning. Cognitive mastery was the strongest source of efficacy information while enactive mastery was not as powerful a source of efficacy as the cognitive mastery. Vicarious experience also affected cognitive mastery. Changes in science teachers’ sense of efficacy were correlated with the feedback given after observation of the teacher teaching in her/his class. One of the main findings of the study indicates that the changes in self-efficacy were maintained for two years.

Similar outcomes were found in Ross and Bruce’s (2007) study. They investigated the effects of the professional development on grade six mathematics teachers’ efficacy and used randomized field trial to involve all teachers in a school district in Canada. The results of their study show that mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion and physiological states have the potential to improve the teaching efficacy. Teacher efficacy in the treatment group positively affected student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management when compared to the teachers in control group.

The review of these studies indicates that the professional development can have a positive effect on teachers’ efficacy beliefs in various subject matters. The review of the research also demonstrates that professional development yields positive results when Bandura’s efficacy principles are incorporated in the program.

**Professional Development and Teacher Knowledge**

An increasing number of research studies on professional development has emerged during the past decade. The studies contain research on professional development, teacher
learning and teacher change (Garet, at al., 2001). Despite the size of the body of literature, however, relatively little systematic research has been conducted on the effects of professional development on improvements in language teaching or student outcomes.

Even though the literature on professional development and language teachers is scarce, the research on what constitutes high-quality professional development is abundant. For example, Guskey (2003) conducted an extensive review of the literature which acknowledged the absence of the straightforward characteristics regarding effective professional development. However, he identified four major themes that effective professional development is expected to promote that includes (a) enhancing teachers’ content knowledge, (b) providing sufficient time and resources, (c) promoting collegiality and collaboration, and (d) including procedures for evaluation.

Emphasis on the content of the professional development has been identified by many researchers. For example, as early as the 1980s, Shulman (1986) emphasized the importance of the teachers' knowledge base and argued that “knowledge base of teaching lies at the intersection of content and pedagogy” (p. 72). In other words, teachers’ capacity to transform the content into the pedagogically useful methods that will be understandable for students is the essence of the pedagogical thinking.

Debate on what constitutes teachers’ knowledge has continued to be the subject of much argument. For example, Ellis (2007) argues that the widespread perspective on teachers’ subject knowledge is characterized by three epistemological problems: dualism, objectivism, and individualism. Dualism unveils the complexity of the idea of a ‘teachers’ subject knowledge’ because it is viewed through dichotomous angles – as a fixed construct and on the other hand, it
is as a dynamic construct. Objectivism is associated with the commodification of the idea of knowledge. Ellis’ conceptualization of the teachers’ subject knowledge is problematic hence it considers the knowledge as a material thing, something that can be “grasped, handled and manipulated” (p. 450). The problem of individualism refers to downgrading teachers’ knowledge to ones’ cognitive capacities.

Despite the debates on conceptualizations of the teachers’ knowledge, the consensus exists that there are strong links between teaching and content knowledge. Teachers need to incorporate the greater awareness of subject knowledge in the classrooms, but they should also possess the knowledge that surpasses and extends the knowledge needed for instructional purposes. To put it differently, their pedagogical content knowledge has to be vast (Ball, Lubienski, & Mewborn, 2001). The emphasis on content knowledge is explained by the fact that teaching involves a broad range of processes which require from a teacher an awareness of varied theories, pedagogical practices, as well as research-based practices in their respective fields. Teachers should be equipped with strong theoretical knowledge before they embark on the application of the knowledge. In other words, teacher education entails a process of developing “pedagogical content knowledge” (Johnson, 2009; Lantolf & Johnson, 2007; Shulman, 1987).

These concepts, discussed above, definitely apply to educators working in an English as a foreign and second language field. They, as other subject teachers, face the similar requirements and share the same characteristics regarding maintenance of high instructional standards, content focus, and the learning opportunities. Likewise, the debate on language teachers’ knowledge and what constitutes this content knowledge plagues L2 researchers (Freeman & Johnson, 2004; Tarone & Allwright, 2005). Central to this debate is whether the knowledge base should be grounded on “core disciplinary knowledge about the nature of language and language
acquisition” (Yates & Muchisky, 2003, p. 136) or concentrate more on how L2 teachers learn to teach and how they do their work (Freeman & Johnson, 1998).

Although researchers have pointed out theoretical and empirical answers with respect to teachers’ knowledge, no clear consensus exists on the conceptualization of L2 teachers’ knowledge base. However, researchers contend that it is of utmost importance for L2 teachers to know about theories and methodologies of language teaching (König, at al., 2016). They also agree on the idea that L2 educators should have an overall understanding of how language functions and how it is acquired. This is important because teaching English as a foreign or second language goes beyond merely knowing vocabulary or the grammar. It requires complex knowledge of the theories of human development, language acquisition, and cognition among many other things. Teachers who possess the strong command of vocabulary and grammar do not always make great teachers; teachers should be equipped with not only content knowledge but pedagogic content knowledge as well as general pedagogic knowledge (König, at al., p. 330, 2016).

L2 Composition Theories

As early as the 1980s, language two (L2) composition research started to emerge from language one (L1) rhetoric, composition research, applied linguistics and teaching English as a second language (TESOL) (Leki, 2000; Matsuda, 1998). Several writing theories influenced the development of new theories in L2 writing. However, these theories are not always mutually exclusive; there are commonalities that overlap one another among these theories (Ferris & Hedgecock, 2005). Starting from the 1960s, the conventional method of instruction, known as
“traditional paradigm” was dominant in writing instruction (Clark, 2003; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). The traditional approach holds an assumption which considers students’ written works as the fixed representation of students’ knowledge. It operates on the assumption that teaching writing is possible by instructing learners on what their final essays should look like (Williams, 2014). In a similar line, Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) refer to simplification of the writing process when they describe the approach taken by the traditional approach. Namely, they argue that traditional approach to writing often boils down to a “mechanical task” which involves copying a model test and disregards the goals of the writing, the audience and “expectations of the discourse” (p. 116). In other words, this perspective completely disregards the cognitive aspect of the writing process. In the product approach, writing revolves around the appropriate usage of vocabulary, syntax and cohesive devices (Pincas, 1982). From this perspective, writing is a way to reveal the linguistic knowledge and awareness of the processes involved in composing new texts.

The conventional approach to writing was replaced by an emphasis on process writing starting in the 1980s. Process-oriented writing pedagogies emphasized such aspects as discovering ideas, the emergence of personal voice and empowerment of the individual’s writer (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). Effective methods of teaching composition, according to the process approaches to writing, involves both students and teachers in a symbiotic relationship in which students share their work with one another and teachers lead learners through the steps involved in writing. The focus is shifted to the process of writing rather than on the final product (Hairston, 1982; Murray, 2003; Williams, 2014).

The advantage of the process approach to writing revolves around the idea that writing is a process and that there are multiple ways of composing written works (Susser, 1994). Graham
and Sandmel (2011) provide a number of advantages associated with the process writing. According to the authors, the emphasis on students’ engagement in planning, drafting and revising is one of the reasons why process approach can be beneficial for the learner. Graham and Sandmel further delineate that teaching writing “through mini-lessons, conferences, teachable moments” represent “mechanisms for addressing the instructional needs of individual students” (p.397). Increase in motivation to writing is also attributed to the process approach to writing as it includes providing more personalized attention to the individual writer (Graham & Sandmel, 2011).

Process movement has been viewed from dichotomous perspectives: expressivism and cognitivism. The former philosophy focuses on the importance of nurturing students’ personal voice by shifting focus on the essays which are concerned with “personal experience and self-reflection” (Clark, 2012, p. 15). The influential proponents of the expressive movement, such as Peter Elbow (1986) and Donald Graves (1983) promoted the development of a writer’s voice and acknowledged the importance of attending to voice in the texts. For instance, Peter Elbow (2007) maintains that “the voice formulation is a personal subjective projection—and it implies a subjective guess about how others will react and even about the mind and feelings of the writer” (p. 6). Voice, viewed through this lens, constitutes a powerful aspect of a written discourse. Unlike expressivism, the cognitive approach to writing instruction presupposes embracing “non-linear, recursive strategies” that includes planning, formulation and revision – stages that closely align with steps involved in expressivist approach (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014, p. 66). The second distinctive feature of the cognitivist approach is to attend to “the higher-order and problem solving operations” (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014, p. 66), which leads to the successful production
of the written texts by focusing on the development of the writers’ mental processes, cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

The concept of the process approach to writing did not appear in EFL/ESL literature until the 1980s. The first author who called for the application of process approach to EFL/ESL was Zamel (1976). He called for the shift in the EFL/ESL composition by emphasizing the importance of the “expressive and creative process of writing” (Zamel, 1976, p. 74) in L2 writing and denounced the idea that writing proficiency should be determined by grammar accuracy as well as conventions. Supporters of process writing approach emphasize invention and prewriting tasks, drafting of multiple versions of writing assignments, multiple revisions, collaborative writing and feedback sessions and the postponement of editing until the final stages of the composing cycle (Clark, 2003).

A significant number of studies have been designed to explore the effects of the process-based approaches to writing. However, the effectiveness of this approach is inconclusive – many studies showcase the negative results whereas a considerable amount of research indicates the positive relationships between students’ writing performance and process-based approaches to composition in L2 contexts. For example, Ho (2006) launched a writing program in lower primary and upper primary school level in China. The aim of the program was to teach students strategies needed at each stage of the writing process. The results show that after the implementation of the process approach to writing, students’ writing habits as well as attitudes to composition altered considerably; Students engaged more in planning, revising and editing their drafts. The program also helped the students to improve their writing performance and they were able to learn the stages involved in the writing process too. Similar results were found in Ngo and Trinh’s (2011) study. During the study, researchers implemented process based writing
curriculum with 57 non-English major grade 10 students in Vietnam. After the sixteen weeks’ intervention program students in experimental group improved their writing and developed better attitudes to writing process than students in the control group.

However, in the late 1980s and the 1990s, theoretical interest in writing instruction shifted to a genre approach to writing (Feez, 2002). Theorists started to debate if it was the right time to replace the process approach to writing with the genre approach. The reason for this new shift stemmed from the realization that despite the pedagogical importance of the process movement, it could not contribute to learners’ overall literacy (Oliver, 1999). Researchers started to express concerns about the validity of the process pedagogy by claiming that it “neither provided a magic solution to student writing problems, nor influenced the writing class as drastically as has sometimes been claimed” (Clark, 2012, p. 21). The critics questioned the extent to which process movement affected not only L1 writers’ composition proficiency but the development of L2 learners’ writing skills as well. The researchers in L2 composition field were expressing concerns that the process approach failed to meet the language requirements of L2 learners (Badger & White, 2000). Critics of the process approach argued that many writing conventions did not provide students with the opportunity to engage themselves in the construction of various text types and often it left students with minuscule comprehension of the steps involved in the writing process (Paltridge, 2007). Furthermore, theoreticians conceived the process approaches as being devoid of opportunities for reflection on a number of significant aspects of writing. Process approach, as viewed from this angle, bypassed the reasons as to why such texts types and text structures were constructed and the purpose of the significance of the text itself. Neither did the process approach raise the linguistic awareness of the writers (Badger & White, 2000).
Unlike the process movement, the pedagogic trajectory of genre-based writing models reexamines the cognitive aspect of the teaching language and extends its scope to the reader, context and the audience. The emphasis on teaching strategies of planning, revising and editing are no longer considered to be the primary focus of the teaching of writing. Instead, writing as a *socililoterate* perspective emerges due to its the emphasis on the social and ideological contexts (Johns, 1997; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). Literacy development occurs through and is proved by individuals’ ability to “use texts and produce texts from diverse genres” (Ferris & Hedcock, 2014, p. 79).

Various authors propose their own definition of the genres. The definition offered by a prominent expert in the field, John Swales (1985) offers the following explanation of the genre: “A genre is a recognized communicative event with a shared public purpose and with aims mutually understood by the participants within that event” (p. 384). What forms genres is the “shared set of communicative purpose” – the characteristic which provides the genre with a structural format, and altering the communicative purpose will lead to the formation of the new genre (Bhatia, 2013, p. 13).

Hyon (1996) identifies three branches of socioliterate genre theories and instructional practices: ‘‘The Sydney School” which is based upon Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL); the English for Specific Purposes movement (ESP), and the New Rhetoric School, which is also known as North American Genre Theory, draws on rhetorical rather than linguistic theories. The brief explanation of each genre school and its application to writing curriculum and L2 writing curriculum respectively are provided below.
Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL).

Systemic Functional Linguistic which is often referred to as the Sydney School approach to writing is influenced by three perspectives (Rose, 2008): These perspectives range from Halliday’s (2014) theory of “social semiotic” to the sociological theory of Basil Bernstein (1990; 2000) and literacy education research (Martin, 1999; 2000; Rose, 2008). This pedagogical approach to writing supports explicit teaching of a genre and casts a doubt on the idea that process writing models can benefit learners, especially those from the marginalized groups (Clark, 2012).

The scaffolded writing curriculum has been developed based on the genre pedagogy and it constitutes an important classroom application of the SFL theory. The examples of these developments are writing cycles which include various versions. For example, the most prominent of these cycles is the one proposed by Rothery and Strenglin (1994) and it features three stages: deconstruction, joint construction and independent construction of the texts. The model in a deconstruction phase assumes that teachers “guide students to recognize the cultural context, staging and key linguistic features in model texts”, (Rose, 2008, p. 5). In the joint construction stage, students and teachers work collaboratively to produce the new text in the same genre they analyzed in the previous stage (Rose, 2008). The final stage - independent construction – assumes students write a new text in the same genre independently (Rose, 2008).

English for Specific Purposes (ESP).

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) was born in the 1960s and has been influenced by the world economy, burgeoning use of English as the language of business and scholarship,
economic powers of oil-rich countries and large number of foreign students seeking educational advancements in the USA and Australia (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998, pp. 4-5).

Since the development of the ESP as a specific discipline, various definitions have been offered by the experts in the field. According to Dudley-Evans and St John (1998), for example, ESP teaching is related to specific discipline or profession by adopting a methodology that is distinct from the one used in General Purpose English teaching. Hyland (2013) further delineates that ESP approach to writing involves teaching specific genre types by focusing on the contexts, practices, and multiplicity of the texts types.

Communicative purpose and communicative intention are central tenets through which genres in ESP are operationalized and conceived (Bhatia 1993). This approach to writing brings us closer to the realization that when we write we follow specific linguistic conventions to communicate our ideas effectively. We adopt distinctive text structures, tone, and terms that are easily identifiable and recognizable by the target audience. Hyland (2013, p. 6) further delineates how ESP envisions writing by asserting that genres in ESP “explicate the lexico-grammatical and discursive patterns” to allow us to discern the “structural identity” of the texts.

Procedures and practical results of teaching are the focus of ESP movement (Dudley & St John, 1998). For instance, the material and text analysis that have been promoted by John Swales (1990) have gained a dominant role in the ESP (Dudley-Evans & John, 1998). Swale’s (1990) approach involves moves analysis where moves constitute rhetorical steps that generally are used by individuals to identify the organizational structure and key linguistic features of the texts. The explanation of moves provided by (Bhatia, 2013), for instance, further clarifies the goal and the
stages involved in moves analysis. According to Bhatia, moves are features of genres and awareness of their functions and patterns lets readers understand genres at a deeper level.

**New Rhetoric School.**

By juxtaposition of the theoretical underpinnings of ESP, Sydney schools, and New Rhetoric School (NR), the distinction of the latter from two other camps becomes evident. While ESP and Sydney school favor the lexico-grammatical analysis of texts, the NR theorists call for analysis of the rhetorical situation (Johns, 2002). Understanding rhetorical situation is paramount for ESP as it conceptualizes genre within a rhetorical situation. For example, Devitt (2004) explains that linking rhetorical situation to genres is crucial because through this link individuals learn how to choose an appropriate genre; they also learn why certain genres prevail in some groups.

Another distinction between the New Rhetoric theoreticians and Sydney School/ESP scholars is the approach to the teaching of genres. A sizable number of New Rhetoricians posit that genre knowledge cannot be taught explicitly due to the fluid nature of the genre itself. For example, in *Show and Tell? The Role of Explicit Teaching in the Learning of New Genre*, Freedman (1994) discusses and critiques the explicit teaching of genres. Drawing on the research results and theoretical analysis, she claims that explicit teaching is not only insufficient but also “not possible: and were possible not useful” (p. 226).

Based on the L2 writing literature review we can conclude that it is important to employ a writing model for the professional development which incorporates both the process and genre-based approaches to writing. From the review of the literature, studies that are investigating EFL
teachers’ efficacy are quite scarce. Furthermore, the literature review reveals the gaps in the research which specifically addresses writing efficacies of teachers who are not native speakers of English. Additionally, the positive effect of genre and process based approaches to students’ writing suggests that in order for L2 learners to improve their students’ writing literacies, teachers need the capacity to model effective writing practices to students and also, demonstrate that writing is a creative, generative and non-linear process. The need for such writing models emerges with L2 teachers who may not be confident in their pedagogical practices, especially in a difficult area such as writing. The model which meets such requirements is found in Toni Silva’s (1990) work. He proposes that the combination of two approaches to writing provides more opportunities for learners to develop competency in writing literacies. Tribble, Candlin and Widdowson (1997) in the book the *Writing: Language Teaching (Scheme for Teacher Education)* also propose a combination of process and genre approaches to writing and offer a way of implementation of the approach in the classrooms. Thus, the proposed model for the professional development workshops is guided by recommendation of the researchers who suggest combination of both approaches to the writing instruction.

The Unique Context of Georgia Regarding Language Teaching

**Historical background.**

After the break-up of the Soviet Union in December 1991, the Republic of Georgia gained independence in April 1991 and gradually transitioned from a Soviet republic to a democratic state. Similar to other countries in the Caucasus, the post-Soviet transformation period was characterized by a collapse of the national economy (World Bank, 2012). Public
expenditure on education declined from over 7% of GDP in 1991 to below 1% of GDP in 1994 (Matiashvili & Kutateladze, 2006). However, since 2004, Georgia’s economy has started to grow due to direct foreign investments, powerful government spending, and public administration reforms (Central Intelligence Agency, 2013). Thus, during the transition period of the 1990s, Georgia went through a deep systemic change process that included gradual decentralization of its education management systems.

The “Revolution of Roses” in 2003 brought strong political leaders into power who introduced massive economic, political, and education reforms in Georgia (Kobakhidze, 2014). The anti-corruption policy started to sweep across all governance levels. Transparency International’s Global Corruption Barometer ranked the country first globally for the relative eradication of corruption and second for the effectiveness of government fighting against corruption (World Bank, 2012). In 2001, the World Bank and the Government of Georgia signed an agreement to allocate long-term credit to the education sector amounting to US$60 million (World Bank, 2001). The program Education System Realignment and Enhancement Program was the first comprehensive education plan in Georgia after the collapse of the Soviet Union; this helped shape the Georgian education system through radical transformations between 2004 and 2011 (Kobakhidze, 2014).

Current issues and challenges to L2 teacher efficacy.

In order to fully understand the current language teaching practices in the Republic of Georgia, it is necessary to know what contextual factors shaped the language teaching domain and how these factors have affected modern teaching practices. To achieve this goal, this study
has drawn on the research which demonstrates how the social and political environment has impacted the general education system and created the gaps in many aspects of the teaching process.

The lack of research and professional development opportunities.

To keep up with the recent trends in the language teaching realm, research has taken a prominent role in educational circles in the 21st century. In the past few years, the marked emphasis has been placed on the importance of teachers conducting research. Promoting initiatives that engage teachers in research has widely been recognized as a valuable and important feature of teacher education policies worldwide (Shavelson & Towne, 2002). The sense of urgency for research derives from the fact that making informed decisions in the classrooms and implementing changes in language teaching instruction is closely aligned with teachers’ engagement level in research processes. A major argument in favor of teachers engaging in research is that pedagogical decisions, which are based on research, contribute positively to both teaching and learning process (Hargreaves, 2004). Borg (2009) studied L2 teachers’ engagement in research in 13 counties; his findings reveal that the scale of teachers conducting research is extremely limited and remains largely inhibited by a plethora of contextual factors.

The factors which hinder teachers’ engagement in research are evident in Georgia as well. There is no sustainable policy which mandates or incentivizes teachers to be engaged in research. The absence of institutional support structures for initiating and sustaining research results brings about a climate where teachers do not see the necessity of being involved in the
systematic inquiry into their professions. Furthermore, the absence of such policies creates a void which disconnects them from current trends in the language teaching methods.

Another concern in the language teaching realm in Georgia is the lack of professional development opportunities for L2 teachers. Foreign language teachers, similar to other subject teachers, need to update their knowledge and instructional practice. One way to do so is through professional development activities. However, in Georgia, L2 teachers have the scarce chances for engaging in continuing professional development activities.

Georgian Ministry of Education and Science since 2009 has mandated teacher certification exams. L2 teachers, as well as other subject teachers, are required to take this exam which includes a standardized test in content and teacher standards. The tests for foreign language teachers are administered in a written form except for a listening and speaking module. Although teacher certification is a part of the teacher professional development reform, the former can hardly be characterized as such; most trainings are short term and they are geared towards increasing awareness of an exam format. No systematic professional development activities are in place to support L2 teachers (Jakhaia & Holmes, in press; Polat, 2009). They are largely dependent on their own resources to broaden their pedagogical prowess and instructional methods. The only establishment which offers regular professional development opportunities to teachers of English is the British Council. It is possible to attend a wide range of workshops, trainings and seminars through the membership benefits. The organization invites qualified teachers, professors and experts in the field to conduct professional development events. However, not all seminars and workshops are free of charge. There is a small fee attached to some trainings. Another obstacle which hinders teachers from participating in these activities is that teachers, especially from rural areas, need to travel considerable distances to attend the
trainings and workshops. In addition to above-mentioned factors, these workshops are not provided on a regular basis and are mainly offered once or twice a year.

**Private tutoring and its impact on the education system and L2 teaching and learning.**

Private tutoring is a characteristic feature of the school system in Georgia. It existed during the Soviet period regardless of the official attempts by the government to regulate private tutoring, its various forms and arrangements (Silova, Budiene, & Bray, 2006). In the period that followed Georgia’s newly acquired independence, private tutoring became even more prevalent. The demand for afterschool classes has been driven by the combination of different factors which include but are not limited to economic, social, cultural and political factors. After the collapse of the Soviet Union Georgia’s economic problems caused drastic changes in education spending which decreased by 94% (Micklewright, 2000). The extremely severe decline in the education budget caused other negative changes such as cuts in teachers’ remuneration as well as the decrease of their social status and authority (Silova, et al., 2006). Furthermore, political turmoil further exacerbated the already deteriorating climate in the education system; schools were constantly disrupted due to the internal conflicts in Abkhazia and South Ossetia – these autonomous Republics, backed by Russian government, claimed independence from Georgia. In this situation, the reemergence of a private tutoring seemed a natural development of the processes. Schools, being unable to offer quality education, were unofficially enhanced by private classes. Students, whose parents were dissatisfied with the school curriculum and teaching process, were sent to private classes held either outside school or in school after the classes. Teachers, especially those teaching the core subjects such as math, foreign languages,
and Georgian literature and language, had an opportunity to gain an additional income as their salaries were falling far from the national average. Teachers were earning 118% below the subsistence level (Silova, et al., 2006).

Following the peaceful Rose Revolution in November 2003, Georgia’s newly elected government quickly launched the process of eliminating the country’s Soviet style bureaucracy and corruption. As a result, the reforms that have been introduced, considerably changed the social, political, and educational landscape of the country (Kobakhidze, 2013). Concerning reforms in higher education, the corrupt practices of university admission examinations were replaced by new unified university entrance examination (Kobakhidze, 2013). Students after completion of the secondary schools are securing places at the universities based on the results of the exams on a centralized national examination. These exams are administered by the National Examination and Assessment Center (NAEC). Students need to take exams in Georgian language and literature, Foreign languages (students can choose from 4 foreign languages – Russian, English, French and German), subject specific test (depends on the students’ choice of the field - could be subjects from the humanities or from sciences) and aptitude tests.

It should be noted that the reform in higher education sector eradicated the corrupted practices (Kobakhidze, 2013; Rostiashvili, 2012). However, it did not prevent private tutoring from flourishing even further. The vehement race for securing a place at the universities intensified the need for the individual lessons (Matiashvili & Kutateladze, 2006). More and more parents are sending their children to private teachers in the hope for their children to extend their knowledge and gain competitive advantage on the exams. From one standpoint, tutoring indeed supports children grow their content specific knowledge and it also allows teachers to earn additional income which considerably exceeds their salaries. However, on the other hand,
existence of private education negatively affects education context as a whole. Cramming students for exams is counterproductive of creative thinking and does not provide opportunities for developing their critical thinking skills. Also, it creates unfavorable conditions for teaching and learning in classrooms for both teachers and students. Students, especially in secondary school, are demotivated to attend regular classes. Teachers, on the other hand, preoccupied with teaching in school and after school tutoring do not see it necessary to invest heavily in the classroom preparation. This is true of English teachers as well. They are aware that many students will attempt to hone their writing skills at private tutoring sessions. However, existence of such conditions puts students from low socio-economic families in unfavorable positions; Costs for private education for these students are unaffordable and inadvertently, they are denied opportunities to prepare for national exams in English as well as in other subjects.

What is most important to note is the fact that developing writing skills takes time; students can’t develop efficient writing skills in a year or two. Students should be exposed to writing practices in English from early years of their schooling (Myles, 2002). Moreover, writing has to be regarded as part of the school curriculum. Granted that students lack these opportunities, they do not have enough time to practice writing during the final year of tutoring as the most of them get specialized classes in English mainly during the last year of secondary education. This leaves the majority of students with only a year of practice in writing. It also should be noted here that even those who take one year of private classes before the university entrance exams, do not have much exposure to writing because they have to learn all four skills (reading, grammar, speaking and writing) and one year is not sufficient to practice these skills comprehensively. Therefore, this situation impedes their already limited opportunity to practice writing.
Thus, existence of private education in Georgia creates a climate which exacerbates the learning process in schools and affects many strands of school system in an adverse way. Additionally, it poses challenges for teachers and their students in the field of the language education, and particularly in writing instruction.

Different opportunities in rural and urban settlements.

The question of concern is the equality of opportunities for schools in rural and urban settlements. The research conducted by Tabatadze and Gorgadze (2014) points out that schools in urban settlements have a more diverse source of income than schools in the rural areas. This discrepancy in school income is in direct relation to teachers’ quality and professional growth. Teachers in the countryside have less favorable conditions for teaching and implementing new strategies than teachers in the urban settings. Diminished quality teaching leads to diminished results and performance of students. Chankseliani’s (2013) study further confirms these findings. Her research indicates that urban applicants in Georgia consistently score higher on university entrance exams compared to rural applicants, and their odds of gaining university admission are 3.22 times higher. Among those with the same measured aptitude, rural applicants are 12 times more likely to apply to one of the least prestigious colleges than are applicants from urban areas (Chankseliani, 2013). These facts are further proof of the gap created by an imbalance in school funding. The lack of resources and funding limits the opportunities for growth for all teachers, including the language teachers. Most public schools fail to provide sufficient resources and funding to their teachers and this lack of resources leads to lack of quality professional teaching staff.
Reforms in the teaching profession.

Within the last three decades, many Georgian governments have embarked on reforms to transform the education system. They have also shifted their focus on teacher preparation and set teacher quality high on the national agenda. However, significant teacher-related reforms were postponed because other institutional level reforms, such as school decentralization and voucherization were given priority (Kobakhidze, 2014). The reforms to regulate the teaching profession started in 2010 when the Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) administered the first teacher certification examination (TCE) (Kobakhidze, 2014).

Reforms in teaching profession brought emphasis on foreign language education. English language education began to receive more attention, which led to research developments in both theoretical linguistics and teaching methods. Polat (2009), while examining foreign language teaching methods in Georgia, found out that teaching practices are mainly dominated by traditional methods, and only recently researchers and educators have started to introduce modern teaching methods.

Summary

The aim of this chapter was to emphasize the significant role of teachers’ self-beliefs in educational settings. The theoretical framework and important factors which facilitate the development of such beliefs have been identified. The literature review has drawn on the empirical evidence from various disciplines in which a clear consensus emerges, namely that the purposeful professional development design can have a positive impact on educators’ beliefs and perceptions about themselves as teachers. Also, the writing theories that are dominant in L2
settings have been identified in order to show the positive effects of the process and genre approach implementation on students’ outcomes. Given the positive results of such approaches, it is deemed important to implement the professional development which incorporates these writing theories. The aim of the professional development is to increase the pedagogic and content knowledge of L2 teachers which can further improve students’ writing habits. The chapter provided the educational context of the country of Georgia in order to shed light on the existing challenges and provide the necessity of implementing the series of writing workshops for the language teachers.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Overview

The intent of this mixed method study was to examine the impact of a 25-hour in-service professional development (PD) course on English teachers’ (henceforth, L2) sense of efficacy in writing instruction and explore the links between teachers’ beliefs about teaching writing, the self-efficacies in instructional strategies, and professional development.

This chapter discusses the research design, research questions, hypotheses, variables, sample, population, instrumentation, pilot study, data gathering methods, and data analysis procedures for the study.

The Statement of Research Questions

This study addressed two central research questions:

1. Do L2 teachers who participate in a professional development tend to have higher teaching efficacy in teaching writing compared to those who do not participate in professional development?

   Null Hypothesis: L2 teachers’ efficacy in teaching writing is unrelated to the professional development.

2. How does the professional development contribute to teachers’ sense of efficacy?
The second central question explored teachers’ efficacy through the following sub-questions:

a. How did professional development affect teachers’ sense of pedagogic knowledge?

b. How did participation in the professional development affect teachers’ perceptions about their ability to implement the writing curriculum?

c. How did professional development influence teachers’ conceptions of teaching L2 writing?

Research Design

This mixed methods study examined the impact of the professional development on L2 teachers’ efficacy. This design is an explanatory sequential mixed methods design. By definition, it is an approach to research methods which consists of first collecting quantitative data and then collecting qualitative data to help explain or elaborate on the quantitative results (Creswell, 2011). The following benefits have been attributed to the sequential mixed method design: First, its straightforwardness gives researchers opportunity to write a research report in two specific phases which include quantitative and qualitative phases (Creswell & Clark, 2006). Second, this model allows the researcher to identify specific quantitative findings that need further exploration which could include “statistical differences among groups, individuals who scored at extreme levels or unexpected results” (Creswell & Clark, 2006, p. 72). The purpose of this mixed method design is complimentary (Greene, Caracelli & Graham, 1989). The Complimentary mixed method study aims to assess “overlapping but also different facets of a phenomenon, yielding an enriched, elaborated understanding of that phenomenon” (Greene at al., 1989, p. 258). Characteristics of the mixed-method design should also be taken into account.
The present study has the *status* characteristic which is defined as the “degree to which a study’s qualitative and quantitative method have equally important or central roles” (Green et al., 1989, p. 264). In the present project, qualitative and quantitative methods play an equally important role in determining the teachers’ efficacy. There additional methodological aspects that need to be taken into account when conducting a mixed-method study are: “priority given to the quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis in the study, the sequence of data collection and analysis, and the stages in the research process at which the quantitative and qualitative phrases are connected” (Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006, p. 5). In the present study, quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis have equal weight. In terms of the sequence, quantitative data is collected and analyzed first. Regarding implementation, it starts with collecting and analyzing quantitative data and it moves on to qualitative data collection and analysis. The integration of the quantitative and qualitative data occurs at the interpretation stage of the study.

The study used the results of the quantitative data to test the hypothesis that predicts that professional development positively influences the teachers’ efficacy. The qualitative data obtained through the interviews explored how the professional development has or has not contributed to their efficacy beliefs. The application of this design is most appropriate when the “quantitative data” provides “a general picture of the research problem,” and when “more analysis through qualitative data collection, is needed to refine, extend or explain the general picture” (Creswell 2011, p. 542).

From these research considerations discussed above, it was deemed important to employ a mixed method research methodology. Namely, the sequential mixed method design gave the
researcher an opportunity to address the limitations of the quantitative analysis and provide a broader insight into the construct of teacher efficacy.

The Population and Sample

The target population of this research was private and public school teachers of English in the Western region of Georgia. The quantitative data were collected in late July of 2017. The qualitative data were gathered between September and the end of October 2017.

Two procedures were involved in finding subjects. First, the researcher emailed the head of the English Teachers Association of Georgia (ETAG) and arranged a meeting with her. At a later date, the researcher met with her and explained the purpose of the study as well as provided her with the written description of the study (Appendix A). The head of ETAG disseminated the information about the study via email and also, provided phone conversations to those who wanted to find out more about the study. Forty teachers who responded to her email were recruited for the study. The researcher sent the consent forms (Appendix A) to teachers. To equate the groups’ means (Creswell, 2003) from the pool of teachers, participants were randomly assigned to the control and experimental groups.

Participant Demographic Data

All 38 participants for the study were female teachers employed either in private or public schools. Teachers aged in range from 22 to 44 ($M=8.78; SD=4.85$). And all teachers reported a minimum of 2 years and a maximum of 22 years of experience in teaching.

Demographic data was included in the questionnaire and it was collected together with TES. The aim of adding demographic questions was to find a connection between the academic
degrees held by teachers, employment within private and public school settings, and the number of years of teaching experience. This background information was collected to obtain characteristics of the participants of the study which aided in interpreting the findings.

Participant demographic information is displayed in Table 1. Participants reporting the age of 22 and 30-years old each comprised 37% of participants. The age group, 31-44, comprised 62.4% percent of the participants. In the 31-44-year age group, 50% (68.5% of the total of teachers in both age groups) reported having fewer than 10 years’ experience of teaching English. Twelve participants, 50% of the teachers in the 31-44 age group, (31.5% of the teachers in both age groups) reported having more than 10 years of professional teaching experience. 13 Teachers held Master’s degrees and 15 teachers held Bachelor’s degrees.

Table 1 displays the age of the participants, the number of years each participant taught English at her current institution, and a school affiliation.

Table 1

Demographic Data of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>School of Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT01</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT03</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT04</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT05</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT06</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT07</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT08</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT09</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>Teaching Experience&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>School of Affiliation&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data presented in Table 1 were reported based on the demographic questions added to the instrument. ID = Identification of participants; <sup>1</sup> = Years of teaching experience in the current position; <sup>2</sup> = Type of school affiliation where the participants are employed.

**Setting**

The study was conducted at the Center for Civic Engagement in the Western region of Georgia. The mission of the Center is to provide meeting rooms, halls and lab resources for public use, free of charge. The researcher contacted the head of the Center for Civic Engagement, explained the purpose of the study and enquired if they would be willing to host the training. The head of the Center readily agreed to provide the researcher with a conference room.
The researcher chose the dates for the trainings and booked the conference room via online booking system. Trainings for both the experimental and the control groups were conducted in the Center for Civic Engagement for two consecutive weeks over the span of ten days.

**Overall Rationale for the Professional Development**

The overall goal of the professional development was to improve Georgian L2 teachers’ efficacy in teaching writing. As the literature indicates, professional development and teacher self-efficacy can positively affect one another and can contribute to the overall empowerment of the teacher in multiple educational contexts (Brownell & Pajares, 1999; Good & Brophy, 2003). In line with this research, there is a need to examine professional development in writing instruction that could positively impact and contribute to the overall professional competence of the L2 teachers. By examining the relationship between teacher efficacy and professional development, we can better understand in which areas of writing instruction teachers need help and what kind of professional development activities should be designed in the future for helping teachers and ultimately, their students.

**Professional Development Description**

The professional development included several formats: small group work, pair work, individual work, teacher-led discussions, and mini-lectures. These workshops incorporated the strategies of contemporary composition pedagogies by paying attention to the writing segments such as writing for the real audience, purposes, context, macrostructure, idea development,
paragraph construction, assessment and feedback. The professional development covered the following areas:

- Purpose and audience.
- Pre-writing.
- Drafting and revising.
- Feedback and assessment.

**Purpose and audience.**

Clark (2012) presents a view of audience based on “understanding the role of the audience in the production of discourse” where individuals should pick a “discourse role that is appropriate for the intended audience” (p. 116). Understanding audience and purpose of writing are determinants of successful writing. To communicate the ideas effectively, not only should writers be aware of who their audience is, but they should also consider how the concept of an audience can affect and shape the written texts. The awareness of the writer-audience relationship also helps writers construct unambiguous texts by paying attention to the fact as to why the audience may be interested in the opinions expressed in the texts. These are just a few but basic considerations of the concept of the audience in the classrooms.

Teachers can address the concept of the audience in a writing class by teaching students classical rhetorical elements, namely Aristotle’s persuasive appeals: *pathos, logos* and *ethos* (Clark, 2012). Heeding the rhetorical elements and demonstrating how they can be embedded in the texts will help students understand what affects the reader (Clark, 2012). Furthermore, analyzing texts for audience-based terms is another strategy that will be utilized in the
professional development course. For example, the strategy proposed by Vander Lei and Roen (1999) advocates for “naming moves” – identifying and naming the groups that the audience belongs to and thus, enabling readers to see whether texts were intended for them or not.

**Prewriting.**

The prewriting phase represents a significant step in the composing process because, at this stage, writers have an opportunity to wrestle with ideas, experiment with meanings, forms and intentions. Quality time spent during the initial phase produces insight; the initial stage is the point at which the writer develops an attachment to the work by connecting it with life events and experiences. Prewriting activities help the writers to realize what might be included in the paper and assist them to organize thoughts and vocabulary. For example, teachers can brainstorm a list of possible ideas, perhaps in small groups or individually. In the professional development course, both unstructured prewriting and structured prewriting techniques were addressed. For unstructured writing, teachers had an opportunity to practice activities such as freewriting, brainstorming, and listing. For example, when teachers use informal activities to assist students in developing ideas, these strategies can serve as hallmarks of better writing. These activities will release students from the stress of writing correctly and will stimulate generating new ideas. Like unstructured prewriting, structured prewriting activities help students generate ideas, thoughts and gather information. Tasks such as loop-writing, clustering, cubing are part of structured activities. These techniques are more organized and “heuristic” (Ferris & Hedcock, 2005). They also lend themselves well to procedures leading to drafting.
Drafting and revising.

For the majority of students drafting and revising are the most challenging areas (Graham, 2001), and usually, they are reluctant to think about their mistakes and identify the errors. Teachers can facilitate students’ engagement in the drafting process by organizing the drafting process into the manageable stages. Teachers should encourage students to write their first drafts without giving much attention to mistakes. The focus should be on content rather than mechanics. Students should be allowed to write several drafts of the paper and should be given ample time to reflect on the outline and content of their writing.

To encourage teachers to sharpen their students’ revising skills, the professional development workshop employed the approach to revising proposed by McAndrew and Reigstad (2001). The researchers’ view of the revision includes two separate stages: (a) attending to higher order concerns and, (b) focusing on lower order concerns. Thesis, development, structure and organization and voice pertain to higher order concerns whereas grammatical, mechanical formatting features are part of the lower order concerns. The range of activities that promote the development of the above-described aspects of writing was employed in the professional development. Since the matters of thesis, focus, organization and voice are vital elements of the paper, the professional development initially focused on these aspects and later introduced activities that address the grammatical and mechanical errors and mistakes in the texts.

Feedback and assessment.

Feedback and assessment constitute an important aspect of the composition process. Feedback and assessment provide teachers with valuable information regarding the lesson
effectiveness. At all levels of instruction, teacher feedback both, oral or written, play a significant role. Providing useful feedback is a challenging task. It is a skill that needs development and refinement. Teachers’ written responses often depend on the needs of the students, abilities and personalities of the teachers themselves and the students. Because of these differences in context and characters, it is imperative to understand the context and issues that may prevent the teacher from providing effective feedback. Many questions and topics have been examined in L2 studies of the written feedback. These studies reveal elements of feedback which can improve the efficiency of teacher commentary (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005).

Based on these findings, the professional development focused on gauging teachers’ understanding of the importance and variation of the feedback. Feedback aspects such as the principles of providing written feedback, guidelines for written teacher commentary, and teacher-student writing conferences were extensively discussed in the training. Moreover, the professional development addressed the mechanics of feedback, when and how to give feedback on drafts, and whether to write endnotes or marginal comments. Educators had an opportunity to practice on topics such as the balance between praise and criticism and how to reexamine questioning techniques by focusing more on statements.

The professional development focused on two forms of evaluation: the formative and summative assessment. On-going, formative assessment is the feedback that teachers give the students to clarify misconceptions, affirm new understandings, and challenge the students to think more deeply about key content concepts (Herrera & Murry, 2005). The feedback that teachers provide to students on their writings are examples of formative assessment. Andrade and Heritage are against conceptualizing formative assessment as “an orthodoxy” (2017, p. 26).
Authors ascribe the great flexibility to the formative assessment and argue that it is “likely that it will look different in different teachers’ classrooms” (p. 26).

A portfolio which is comprised of a collection of students’ writing is a real source of formative assessment. A portfolio system does not usually require any scoring procedure. Some portfolio assessment does not need any scoring at all as it emphasizes ongoing reflection and evaluation (Casanave, 2004). Portfolio assessment, recognized as an “alternative” way of assessing learner performance of all kinds, revolves around the idea of “production rather than recognition, projects rather than items, and teacher judgment rather than mechanical scoring” (Calfee & Perfumo, 1966, p. 63).

As part of the summative assessment, in the professional development course, three general approaches to scoring were introduced: holistic, analytic and trait-based scoring. These summative methods are also used in large-scale testing models informed by psychometric theory (Kunnan, 2000). The central focus of the workshop was on ways in which teachers can apply these methods to their educational setting and writer populations.

**The Professional Development Design**

The professional development workshops were guided by the principles of efficacy proposed by Bandura (1997). The importance of applying efficacy principles to the workshop arises from the research which points out that self-efficacy can be an indicator of teacher success when incorporated into the in-service training (Bray-Clarks & Bates, 2003; Palmer, 2011). The following four principles, proposed by Bandura (1997), served as a framework for the
professional development program: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasions and physiological states.

Enactive mastery experience is the most important source of efficacy beliefs because it is exploratory by nature and is rooted in past performance (Bray-Clark & Bates, 2003). The mastery experiences were promoted with the following activities: the professional development workshop was designed in a way that ensures that teachers had sufficient opportunities to master the content before they implement them in their classrooms. Efficacy theory and research suggest that one way to achieve this is to involve teachers in an effective way of practice that is challenging (Bray-Clarks & Bates, 2003). Research confirms that engaging teachers in challenging activities has a potential to affect their self-beliefs in a positive way. According to the researchers, Jacobs and Damsey (1993), simulations are used in a variety of training programs to ensure teachers master the content covered in the training.

Another component pertains to the inclusion of the vicarious experiences in the writing workshop. Embedding vicarious experience in the professional development is supported by the organizational training research which shows positive findings (Grossman & Salas, 2011). Embedding vicarious experience in the professional development capitalizes on the notion of increasing efficacy beliefs through observation. To put it simply, social persuasions made with other individuals have a strong influence on the development of one’s sense of competency (Shunk, 1983). Taylor, Russ-Eft and Chan’s (2005) review of 117 studies found that training interventions which embedded vicarious experiences positively affected training outcomes and self-efficacy. In the present study, the inclusion of this component in the professional development was carried out by the peer interaction activities to increase learning through collaboration. The use of such activities is supported by research conducted by Shebilkse,
Gawlick and Gluck (1998) whose training design was modeled on collaborative training tools which included dyads and triads. They found that these activities considerably improved participants’ learning through peer interaction.

The third source of efficacy, the verbal persuasion, carries less importance compared to the previous components discussed above. However, researchers have found that verbal persuasion can also influence the efficacy in a positive way if it is provided by “respected or influential others” (Bray-Clarks & Bates, 2003, p. 18; Bandura, 1977). Research has also produced mixed findings of the impact of the verbal persuasion on the efficacy beliefs.

The fourth element is the physiological states and it represents a substantial source of efficacy. For example, the emotional state of the individuals may determine how they perceive or evaluate their self-efficacy. According to Pajares (1999), emotional reactions to certain tasks can provide a tool for understanding how the outcome will be anticipated. In other words, if one reacts negatively to the work, it is more likely that he/she will have an anticipation of the failure. And, on the other hands, if the attitude to the task is positive, the expectation of the outcome will be related to success. Bray-Clarks & Bates (2003) further posit that the fear-free environment of the training augments the self-efficacy. In other words, the environment may affect the dispositions of teachers and these dispositions, in turn, may impact their beliefs either in a positive or negative way.

Majority of the activities and the material for the PowerPoint presentations for the professional development were either directly taken or adapted from the following books: *Teaching L2 Composition: Purpose, Process and Practice* by Ferris and Hedgcock (2014),

The table below describes a step by step implementation procedures of the professional development program for the experimental group.

**Table 2**

*Description of the Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Day 1: Session 1; (5 hours)** | 1. **Introductions** (ice breaker) - 30 minutes  
**Discussion**: Reflection on the meaning of good writing/What do we need to be effective writers? (30 Minutes).  
2. **Mini lecture**: Composition pedagogies (30 minutes)  
   The lecture in a form of a power point will cover product-oriented and process based instructional traditions, as well as genre approaches in writing instruction.  
3. **Application activities**:  
   *Three-by-five Card Exercise (1 hour)*  
   *(Lunch Break 1 hour)*  
   *Titles and Repeating a Keyword (90 minutes)*  
   *Free Writing (1 hour)*  
   *Closure* (25 minutes)  
   Reflection on the activities and strategies covered in the session. | |
Day 2: Session 2; (5 hours)

1. Review of the previous material (15 minutes)

   Teachers reflect on the writing pedagogies covered in a mini lecture in a previous session as well as on the prewriting activities.

2. Discussion: Reflection on topics pertaining to revising and drafting; higher order concerns vs lower order concerns (30 minutes).

   Teachers discuss first in small groups and later as a whole group how they perceive drafting and revising processes. They also talk about the strategies they use to help students first draft and later revise their papers.

3. Mini lecture: Drafting and revising (30 minutes)

   Mini lecture in a form of a power point covers topics pertaining to drafting and editing. Namely, distinction between the drafting and editing will be discussed. Matters pertaining to thesis and focus of the paper are also covered in a power point.

4. Application Activities:

   One-sentence Summary and Make a Promise (1 hour)

   Nutshelling and Teaching (1.50 minutes).

   Lunch Break (1 hour)

   a. Attending to lower order concerns

      Teachers work on lower order concerns such as sentence construction and attending to grammatical choices in writing, teaching stylistic elements.

      Following application activities are used to achieve this goal:

      Essay Error Analysis and Examine Sentence Arrangement (1.20 minutes)

5. Closure (15 minutes)

   Reviewing what worked and what did not work in the session and how they would modify and apply these strategies to their own classrooms.
| Day 3: Session 3; (5 hours) | 1. **Review of the previous session** (15 minutes)  
Teachers review the material covered in a previous session. Namely, they talk about drafting and revising, and the application activities they completed during the previous session.  
2. **Discussion: Reflections on feedback** (30 minutes)  
Teachers will be handed out questions for a discussion. They review these questions first in pairs and then, as a group.  
3. **Mini lecture: Principles of teacher feedback** (30 minutes).  
The mini lecture in a form of a power point covers the following topics: Options for a written commentary, avoiding “appropriating” student writing, providing encouragement and a constructive criticism through the feedback.  
*Lunch Break* (1 hour)  
4. **Teachers work on various application activities.**  
*Providing Feedback to the Student Paper* (1 hour).  
*Designing a Peer Response Task* (1 hour)  
*The Guided Approach Peer Response Task* (1 hour)  
5. **Closure** (15 minutes)  
Reviewing the activities that would work in teachers’ classrooms and how they would change/adapt it to their classrooms. |
| --- | --- |
| Day 4: Session 4; (5 hours) | 1. **Review of the previous session** (15 minutes)  
Teachers will review topics covered during the previous session. They will be asked to recollect aspects of feedback covered in a previous session.  
2. **Discussion**: Reflection on assessment (30 minutes)  
Teachers will be handed out questions for a discussion. They review these questions first in pairs and then, as a group. |
### Day 5: Session 5; (5 hours)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Review of the previous session</strong> (15 minutes)</td>
<td>Teachers review the assessment types covered in a mini lecture and the activities they completed in the previous session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Mini lecture: Reading and writing as parallel processes and genre based approaches to teaching writing</strong> (30 minutes)</td>
<td>The power point presentation in a form of a mini-lecture covers the topic of the genre analysis which is the fundamental source of the genre pedagogies. The PowerPoint addressed how the models of genre analysis differ with respects to genre tradition embraced (i.e., SFL, ESP and NR) and their core focal areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Application activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Understanding genre analysis</em> (40 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Writing a narrative story</em> (1.5 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Writing a cover letter</em> (1.5 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Closure</strong> (20 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers discuss the topics covered in the session as well as in previous sessions and reflect on overall quality and usefulness of the professional development.

5. **Teachers complete the instrument** (15 minutes)
6. **Teachers are awarded with certificates and books** (10 minutes).

Teachers in an experimental group complete the instrument at the end of the session (Posttest)

The professional development procedure in the above Table 2 shows the step by step implementation process for the experimental group. As demonstrated in the table, the instrument for assessing teachers’ efficacy was provided to the teachers on the last day of the professional development. Thus, the results of the instrument served as a posttest for the study.

The control group completed the instrument without receiving the treatment. The results of the instrument from the control group served as a posttest. The scores on the posttest were compared to see if the professional development had an impact on the efficacy levels of the teachers who attended the training. For ethical considerations, the control received the treatment after completion of the instrument.

**Quantitative and Qualitative Procedures**

Data for this study was collected using the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and qualitative interviews. The sections that follow explain the Teacher Efficacy Scale, interviews and the procedures for these two groups of participants.

Prior to conducting the research study, the researcher obtained a permission from the Institutional Review Board of the University of Mississippi. After obtaining the approval for
conducting the study, the researcher contacted the head of the resource center via email, describing the purpose of the study and sending an official letter. The researcher was informed that she needed to gain the permission from the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia before she could contact the school principals about the study. After waiting for more than a month for an approval from the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia, the researcher decided to follow an alternate route to recruit the participants for the study. She contacted the regional head of the English Teachers Association of Georgia (ETAG) who willingly accepted the proposal and served as an informant who disseminated the information about the professional development. With the help of the head of the ETAG, 40 participants were identified, two of which withdrew from the study citing reasons for unavailability. A total of 38 teachers participated in the study.

The sub-sections below will explain in greater detail the quantitative procedure followed by the qualitative procedures used in this study.

**Quantitative procedure.**

The study involved a posttest comparison of teacher efficacy. The instrument used for this study and data analysis is described in further detail.

**Instrumentation.**

Regarding instrumentation procedures, one instrument was used in this study: The Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

Gibson and Dembo (1984) were the first to develop an instrument specifically to measure teacher self-efficacy. Their instrument, the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES), has been used in many
studies (Emmer & Hickman, 1991; Gordon & Debus, 2002; Hoy & Spero, 2005; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Saklofske, Michayluk, & Randhawa, 1988; Soodak & Podell, 1997; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990), and is the most common tool for measuring the teacher self-efficacy construct. The instrument includes 30 items and uses a 6-point Likert scale to determine agreement with teacher efficacy statements. There are two dimensions to this scale: personal teaching efficacy and general teacher efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). The latter was originally named simply teaching efficacy, but because it was frequently confused with the first component, it was later renamed general teaching efficacy. Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) represents a teacher’s belief that he/she possesses the skills and abilities to facilitate student learning, that is, it is the teacher’s overall sense of his/her teaching effectiveness. General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) represents the belief that teachers can make a positive difference in student’s learning, even when external factors or conditions such as low motivation or poor home environment are in place. In previous studies, the score reliability fell within the 0.75 to 0.81 for the personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and 0.64 to 0.77 for the general teaching efficacy (GTE) range when administering the original Gibson and Dembo (1984) measure (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

In the present study, the instrument was used to assess the impact of the professional development course on L2 teachers’ sense of efficacy. It is an adaptation of Gibson and Dembo’s (1984) Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES), which was originally designed to measure the teachers’ beliefs of their capability to teach in general.

Because this study focuses on teachers’ sense of efficacy in writing instruction, the original TES was used with some variations. Gibson and Dembo’s reference of general pedagogical-related tasks (i.e., in both Personal and General Teaching Efficacy dimensions) in the TES was
adapted specifically by adding “writing” and “writing assignments” terms. As for the sentence clarity, the “home environment” in the original TES was changed to “out-of-class environment.”

One of the risks associated with using a pretest is concerned with validity. Namely, pretests “can raise the participants’ expectations about the outcome” (Creswell 2011, p. 297). This, in turn, can impede the process of drawing correct inferences from the data and can negatively influence the statistical conclusion validity. To eliminate the danger described above, the researcher administered the instrument (Appendix C) to the experimental group after completion of the professional development. Thus, the assessment served as a posttest. Unlike the experimental group, the teachers in the control group completed the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson and Dembo, 1984) without intervention, prior to attending the professional development. The researcher followed the same procedures: The participants received the hard copies of the instruments and completed them at the beginning of the professional development. The Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) obtained from the treatment group was measured after the training and served as the post-test of the study.

**Quantitative data analysis procedure.**

By administering the measurements in this order and manner, the researcher was able to reduce the threats to validity and draw the valid inferences from the posttest comparison.

Data collected from The Teacher Efficacy Scale questionnaire was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program. To answer the quantitative part of the research question, One-Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) was used. There are assumptions that must be met when using ANOVA, including, having a single independent variable and
single dependent variable (interval), that are normally distributed, and each group must be independent of the other (Cronk, 2017). This data meets all of these assumptions and a one-way ANOVA was used to test for this hypothesis. Significance level was taken as .05, 0.002, 0.001.

The instrument contains 30 questions with the six-point Likert scale answers ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree that assesses an individual’s efficacy beliefs. Prior to placing the data in the SPSS spreadsheet, each item on the questionnaire was coded. Six possible responses to the statements received 1-6 points based on the Likert scale response; 1 for strongly disagree, 2 for moderately disagree, 3 for disagree slightly, more than agree, 4 for agree slightly more than disagree, 5 for moderately agree, and 6 for strongly agree. The statements that were left blank by the participants were treated as the missing data in the SPSS. At a subsequent stage of the data analysis, the questions pertaining to teacher efficacy in writing were rescaled due to the low response number per individual category and to remedy the collinearity problem (Creswell, 2003) that could arise due to the low response number per individual category. Each variable was rescaled into three levels:

1. Level one and two equals to disagree.
2. Level three and four equal to neutral.
3. The level five and six equals to agree.

The following variables showing personal and general teaching efficacy with regards to writing in the TES were analyzed:

Question 1: When a student does better than usual in a writing assignment, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort.

Question 2: Hours in my class have little influence on students’ writing compared to the influence of their out-of-class environment.
Question 4: The amount that a student can learn in writing is primarily related to teachers’ qualifications.

Question 7: I have enough training to deal with any writing problem.

Question 17: Teachers are not a very powerful influence on students’ writing achievement when all factors are considered.

Question 21: If a student masters a new writing skill quickly, this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching that skill.

Question 29: If one of my students couldn't complete a writing assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty.

**Qualitative procedure.**

The interviews (Appendix D) served as the secondary data source for this exploration. Because teacher efficacy is complex, researchers have suggested the use of qualitative data collection methods to clarify the process of efficacy development and to provide context to quantitative findings related to teacher efficacy (Labone, 2004; Lee, 2009; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In the study, one-on-one interviews were utilized as secondary data sources to help explain findings of teachers’ beliefs about teaching writing, their efficacy and the professional development.

Teachers were asked at the end of each professional development session if they would participate in a brief Skype interview during the months of September and October. A follow-up email was administered to teachers to arrange for a time and delivery method of the interview. The researcher conducted each interview (n=7) ranging from 20 to 35 minutes. Two participants indicated their preference for an email interview. The scripted interview protocol was adjusted
by removing scripts and emailed to participants. Interviews consisted of four open-ended questions to add the depth to the quantitative data and gather information that was not captured by the questionnaire. The first question asked teachers to describe how professional development contributed to their sense of efficacy. It was an overarching question that was explored by the number of sub-questions that directly and indirectly assessed the views on the effects of the professional training on their efficacy perceptions. An interview protocol that ensured that all participants received the same questions in the same order were consistently followed (Patton, 2002). Interviews were conducted in Georgian – native language of the teachers. The reason for this decision stemmed from the fact that the researcher was aware that teachers would feel more comfortable in their native language. Moreover, research suggests that interviewees tend to open up about their experiences with a person who speaks the same language (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). The same authors also suggest that a rapport with the participants and putting them at ease are an integral part of the interviewing process. Thus, due to the above-mentioned reasons, the interviews were conducted in the Georgian language.

Since the participants of the study were Georgian teachers and the interviews were conducted in Georgian language, it was important to use a Georgian word that would describe the concept of the self-efficacy accurately. The self-efficacy is a technical term and there is no direct translation for the concept. According to Bandura’s (2006) suggestion, the term “efficacy” should be replaced with “confidence” during the interviews with the respondents who most likely are not familiar with the concept of the efficacy. Therefore, to enhance the validity, it was decided to use the term “confidence to teach composition.” This term assumes the expected capability level and personal control over the action and they are integral concepts associated with self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). A measure of internal consistency was maintained by
triangulating the interview responses with the results from the scale. The researcher and her colleague from Georgia carried out the interrater reliability of the coding and agreement was found in 85% of instances.

**Ethical Considerations.**

Even though teachers had signed the consent form prior to the interview, during and after the training, it was deemed important to highlight the nature of the study by orally reading the informed consent that they had signed earlier. The researcher informed the participants about the study and explained how the interviews would contribute to the findings. The summarized interview data was emailed to the teachers for member checking. Member checking is a validation technique which involves returning results to participants to examine data for accuracy (Patton, 2002). Teachers were asked to confirm the accuracy of the information in terms of the content and the intention. They were also asked to edit, change or remove the information that did not convey their ideas and thoughts accurately or if the summary did not resonate with their experiences. Other triangulation methods involved in the study were peer debriefing and disconfirming evidence (Creswell, 2011). A colleague who is knowledgeable about the topic reviewed analysis and data selection method before the final version of the qualitative analysis was written. Lastly, it was deemed important to attend to the trustworthiness of the qualitative findings and it was achieved by disconfirming the evidence. Disconfirming the evidence is a means to find the ways of refuting the investigator’s inclination to seek confirmation of her or his preliminary or emerging findings (Murrow, p. 256). In the study, the potential disconfirming data were identified and compared with confirming instances. Analysis showed that confirming instances outnumbered disconfirming evidence.
A digital voice recorder was used to record the interviews. After the end of each interview, the recording was transferred to the file on the researcher’s private computer and it was immediately deleted from the recorder. After completing transcription of the interviews, the researcher stored all recorded data in a separate folder in the USB flash drive specially designated for this study. After completion of the study, all voice recordings were erased permanently. The interview and survey data will be stored on that USB flash drive in a secure location known only to the researcher for approximately seven years as per the dissertation requirements. As a backup method, the data will also be stored on a CD specially designated for the data storage. The saved data will be destroyed for good after the time period for keeping the data expires.

The Pilot Study

Baker (1994) notes that a sample size of 10-20% of the sample size of the actual study is a reasonable number of participants to include in the pilot. Considering this recommendation on the number of participants for the pilot study, 8 teachers, which amounts to 20% of the present sample size for the current study, were recruited. Teachers were former colleagues of the researcher who voluntarily agreed to participate in the piloting of the training.

There were the four main goals of this pilot study:

1. Measure the length of time the workshops took to complete per day in general.

2. Identify any changes that were necessary to make and determine the general feasibility of professional development workshop series.
3. Determine the amount of time needed to complete the instrument.

4. Determine whether instructions and statements of the measure (Teacher Efficacy Scale) were clear.

After completion of the pilot study, the researcher made few changes to the way the activities were held. Activities for day four and day five were reduced because the time frame did not allow the researcher to complete all of them within the five-hour time. The time needed for the completion of the instrument was determined. When designing the training program, the researcher allocated approximately seven to eight minutes to the instrument completion. However, it took teachers about 10-15 minutes to complete the instrument. So, time for instrument completion was increased. No other changes were added to the training program.

**Independent Variable**

The independent variable was defined as the specific type of instruction which is a professional development aimed at helping teachers increase the efficacy beliefs in writing instruction. The PD series included several formats: small group work, pair work, individual work, teacher-led discussion, and mini-lectures. These workshops incorporated the strategies of contemporary composition pedagogy by paying particular attention to the writing segments such as responding to student writing, assessing L2 writing, teaching the process approaches to writing, and the role which genre-based approaches play in the writing instruction.
Dependent variable

The dependent variable was defined as participants’ sense of efficacy in writing as determined by the instrument – Teacher Efficacy Scale – developed by Gembo and Gembo (1984). Few modifications were added to the instrument for the purposes of the study.

Summary

This chapter provided a detailed description of the research design, study participants, instrument, and data collection procedures for both the quantitative and qualitative part of the study. The detailed description of the professional development design and activities were also described. The next chapter presents the results gathered from the analyses of quantitative data and qualitative data.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

Overview

This chapter presents the result of a study designed to examine the impact of a 25-hour in-service professional development (PD) course on English as a Foreign Language (henceforth, L2) teachers’ sense of efficacy in writing instruction and explore the links between teachers’ beliefs about teaching writing, the self-efficacies in instructional strategies, and professional development. The data used in the study were gathered from the modified Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES), a self-report instrument that measures teachers’ efficacy beliefs in teaching and qualitative interviews. The results of the quantitative and qualitative findings are also reported in this chapter. The overall descriptive statistics are presented, and specific results are discussed within the sections labeled by the appropriate hypothesis and questions.

Organization of Data Analysis

This chapter will first provide the demographic information of the participants in the form of a narrative description followed by a table. Then it will show the quantitative analysis followed by the qualitative analysis. Quantitative analysis includes descriptive statistics and analysis of the instrument through a One-Way ANOVA. Qualitative analysis is presented in the form of themes and sub-themes.
As this study is a mixed-method design, the data from the quantitative analysis is presented first, followed by data from the qualitative analysis. The following sections present the results of the study that emerged from participants’ responses in accordance with the research questions.

**Research Questions**

1. Do teachers who participate in a professional development tend to have higher efficacy in teaching writing than teachers who do not?

The qualitative part is operationalized through the following question:

2. How does professional development contribute to teachers’ sense of efficacy?

   Sub-questions:

   a. How did professional development affect teachers’ sense of pedagogic knowledge?

   b. How did participation in the professional development affect teachers’ perceptions about their ability to implement the writing curriculum?

   c. How did professional development influence teachers’ conceptions of teaching L2 writing?

**Hypothesis**

The quantitative portion of this study is guided by the following hypothesis in a null form.

1. L2 teachers’ efficacy is unrelated to the professional development.
Quantitative Analysis

The first research question of this study is: Do teachers who participate in a professional development tend to have higher efficacy in teaching writing than teachers who do not? The related hypothesis states: L2 teachers’ efficacy is unrelated to the professional development. This research question is analyzed by using a One-Way ANOVA. Prior to the one-way ANOVA analysis, a descriptive analysis regarding the TES is presented in mean and standard deviation in Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Self-efficacy for Both the Treatment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TES Scale</th>
<th>Treatment M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Control M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The belief that they have enough training and experience to deal with students’ writing problems</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief in the ability to teach writing skills</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief in the ability to assess writing assignment’ difficulty level</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that the amount a student can learn in writing is related to the teacher’s qualifications</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that hours in the classroom have little influence on students’ writing compared to an out-of-class environment</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Significant One-way ANOVA, Degrees of Freedom and F Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief that they enough training and experience to deal with students’ writing problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>11.273</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in the ability to teach writing skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in the ability to assess writing assignment’ difficulty level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>4.132</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.011</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that the amount a student can learn in writing is related to the teacher’s qualifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.137</td>
<td>4.137</td>
<td>12.769</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.044</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantitative data were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) at .05, 0.002, 0.001 significance levels. As it is shown in Table 3, the null hypothesis which assumes that teachers’ efficacy is unrelated to the professional development is rejected.

The analysis indicates that there were significant differences in the belief that the training gives teachers the ability to deal with students’ writing problems: (question 7): \( F(1.31) = \)
11.273, \( p < .002 \). There was significant difference found between the groups in terms of their efficacy in teaching writing skills (question 21): \( (F(1.31) = 4.026, \ p < .05) \). Significant difference in general teaching efficacy was found in the following: Efficacy in assessing a writing assignment’ difficulty level: \( (F(1.31) = 4.132, \ p < .05) \) (question 29); Efficacy in the belief that the amount a student can learn in writing is related to the teacher’s qualifications (question 4): \( (F(1.31) = 12.769, \ p < .001) \).

No significant difference was found between the following scales: Efficacy in attributing students’ improved performance in writing to an extra effort the teacher shows to the student (question 1): \( (F(1.31) = 0.017, \ p > .893) \), and the efficacy in the belief that teachers are not very powerful influence on students’ writing achievement when all factors are considered (question, 17): \( (F(1.41) = 0.029, \ p > .673) \).

**Qualitative Analysis**

The second research question of this study, which is the central question for this qualitative part of this study is: How does professional development contribute to teachers’ sense of efficacy? Three sub-questions that guided this part of the qualitative study were:

a. How did professional development affect L2 teachers’ sense of pedagogic knowledge?

b. How did participation in the professional development affect teachers’ perceptions about their ability to implement a writing curriculum?

c. How did professional development influence teachers’ conceptions of teaching L2 writing?

The results of qualitative data are organized into two levels: themes and sub-themes. Based on the participants’ responses, the researcher identified three themes and three sub-themes that
answered the research questions listed above (see Table 5 below). These categories of themes and sub-themes are discussed in detail in the remaining section in this Chapter 4.

**Table 5.**

*Themes and Sub-themes by Qualitative Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Qualitative Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Competence</td>
<td>Realization of gaps in the writing pedagogy</td>
<td>Qualitative central research question &amp; Sub-question 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Perceptions</td>
<td>Teaching writing as a feasible process</td>
<td>Qualitative central research question &amp; Sub-question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shift in teaching methods</td>
<td>Qualitative central research question &amp; Sub-question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in instructional skills</td>
<td>Assessing students’ written work</td>
<td>Qualitative central research question &amp; Sub-question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching genres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Findings**

Four participants from the treatment group and three participants from the control group were interviewed about their attitude and opinion on the impact of the professional development.
Specifically, the interview included one main question on understanding how professional development affected their sense of efficacy. This question was operationalized by four sub-questions. The sub-questions were concerned with various aspects of the writing efficacy. This section is organized according to themes and subthemes found in the responses from both the treatment and control group. Participants’ real names are not disclosed.

**Emerging themes.**

An inductive analysis of each interview revealed three major themes relevant to the research question: perceived competence, changed perceptions, and confidence in instructional skills. The result indicated two subthemes related to the first theme. For the perceived competence, the subtheme included the realization of gaps in writing pedagogy. Regarding the theme of the changed perceptions, the two subthemes including teaching writing as a feasible process and a shift in teaching methods emerged. For the third theme, subthemes assessing students’ written works and teaching genres emerged. Each of the themes and sub-themes is presented in the following section.

**Theme 1: Perceived Competence.**

Teachers’ interviews were dominated by the themes that unveiled their perceptions about their competence to teach writing. All participants held a perspective that professional development was an opportunity to grow as professionals and to further enrich their knowledge.

If there were more opportunities for similar trainings, I would have gladly attended….as the saying goes “practice makes perfect.” After the certification exam, I have not written any essay and I took the test in 2011. I have been evaluating my students’ works but not
my own work (PT32).

Teachers seemed to equate the pedagogic knowledge with their instructional ability to apply theoretical knowledge to practical situations. However, some participants were not sure there was enough time to internalize the pedagogic knowledge. PT24 described this process as follows:

I need time to internalize what I have learned. Only after that I can incorporate what I learned in the classroom.

Sub-theme 1: Realizations of the gaps in writing pedagogy

Teachers reflected on the fact that during the training they realized for the first time that they lacked the pedagogic knowledge to teach writing. PT12 even used a word “shock” to describe her reaction when she realized that her knowledge of essay organization and thesis development was not consistent with the current composition theory in writing. Teachers’ conceptualization of the writing in terms of pedagogic knowledge was that they managed to reevaluate their instructional methods in writing and reassess their instructional skills. PT12 reflected:

Maybe you have an awareness of the concepts…maybe you know something. But after the training, it funneled into a vast knowledge and now you can pay attention to many things. I have an experience of teaching writing but for the first time I realized what I was lacking. Now I know what constitutes a good writing practice. I got 14 out of 16 in my exam (She refers to the certification exam where teachers take a composition test) and now I know why they (examination committee) gave me two points less.
Despite realization of the deficiencies in instructional knowledge, most participants viewed professional development as their “turning point” towards the improvement of their skills. PT15 also considered this writing training as a source of the knowledge development.

As a novice teacher, I have not had an opportunity to attend many professional development programs. This was my first training on teaching writing and I have gained a lot from it. I took certification exams this year and this training was only a week late. If only I had an opportunity to attend the training prior to the certification exam, I would have had better results. I would have applied the skills learned in the training to the exam requirements. I have already used some of the techniques you taught us with my students. It is very useful. Prior to the training, my experience in teaching composition was limited to what I was taught at the university and it sure was not sufficient.

**Theme 2: changed perceptions.**

Teachers’ responses clearly allude to that fact that their perceptions of teaching writing changed due to the training. Teachers reported readiness to implement the strategies learned in the training into their classrooms. Many of the interviewees (PT32, PT19, PT15 and PT3) indicated that they would pursue teaching writing more methodically with their students. The response of this teacher reflects the thoughts expressed by other teachers in this regard.

I will pay more attention to teaching writing in the future. Now I consider teaching writing an integral part of being a professional teacher. In other words, to me the matter of teaching writing equals professionalism. I view it through this lens now, indeed (PT24).
In addition to a new insight, a number of participants reported how their understanding of teaching changed as a result of the professional development. PT12, for instance, cited a realization that she started to appreciate the theory of writing. Several of the participants credited the theories covered in the training with their understanding of how theories of writing could inform the teaching of writing (i.e., PT24, PT15, PT32 and PT3). The quote which belongs to PT12 clearly describes her new-found realization and the need for understanding more theory of composition.

My understanding of composition instruction has changed. It has sparked more interest in me about learning the theoretical part. At first, I thought it [she refers to theories covered in mini lectures at the training] was not relevant to us but later realized how they were connected to what we were doing later in the training.

*Sub-theme 1: Teaching writing as a feasible process*

Across most interviewees, the majority of the responses were dominated by the terms “not so difficult”, “more manageable” and other words synonymous to these terms when referring to their perceptions of teaching writing after the professional development. Teachers’ responses indicate that the perceptions of teaching writing altered from that of writing as a burdensome endeavor to that of writing as a manageable enterprise. The following is a representative description of the sub-theme.

I realized it is easy…Well, it is easier than I have always thought the teaching of writing was. It made me feel that writing process can be broken down into parts and presented to the students in this form, in an easy form (PT19).

PT3 expressed the similar sentiments.
Before, I thought it was hard to teach writing. Knowing how to approach a writing assignment, makes the teaching process smooth. For example, paying attention to the thesis and the ways of formulating it. To be honest, I was not paying much attention to that before. Prior to the training, when I had my students write an essay, it was more challenging. Now it seems the writing process is manageable.

Sub-theme 2: Shifts in teaching methods

A few participants (PT32, PT3) admitted how their previous teaching method largely neglected writing assignments and how they have altered their approach to teaching English writing.

As I mentioned earlier, my focus was not on teaching writing. It occupied the least amount of my instructional time. Now I pay more attention.

Responses in this category were dominated by the words such as “multiple drafts”, “pre-writing”, and “giving feedback before grading.” These responses reflect an understanding of the process writing pedagogy that was one of the focuses of the training program. Teachers showed their grasp on the process writing steps and the appreciation of the writing multiple versions of the papers before submitting the final drafts and thus, demonstrated a shift in teaching methods.

I can see how asking students to write at least one draft before the submission of a final essay would boost their confidence (PT24).
Theme 3: confidence in instructional skills.

The majority of the teachers indicated that their confidence in various domains of writing pedagogy increased. Some of them elaborated on their existing knowledge and how attending training had added to their instructional skills.

Sub-theme 1: Assessing students’ written work.

Teachers across the data sources (PT24, PT3, PT19, PT3) reported on their increased confidence in assessing students’ written works. For example, PT15 believed that despite her inexperience in teaching, she felt comfortable providing an assessment to her students’ written works after the professional development.

The training gave me the sense of confidence in providing assessments. I am now more confident in assessment. I know how I can approach writing assignments and what I need to pay attention to when I am evaluating their work...I am more confident now.

Knowledge breeds confidence, more we know, more confident we feel. I am not very confident yet because I am a novice teacher and I always try to gain more knowledge. I had three students (private students) this summer who were applying to Polish universities and they had to write an essay in English. I used the approaches you taught us in the training and my students did well on the exam. Now they are waiting for a final decision. I think if I have not attended this training, I would not be able to achieve it.

Another teacher (PT32) elaborated on her gained awareness of an essay structure and organization. She shared a specific example from her recent experience:
Currently, I am giving a private lesson to a student and I give him a writing assignment almost on each session. I am sure that this will have a great result in the end. I teach him how to organize ideas, how to pay attention to a word order and how to construct sentences. Eventually he will be a good writer…He will write good essays I believe. If more writing trainings are offered, I will attend. This was a turning point for me, and for my students as well.

Sub-theme 2: Teaching genres

Another recurrent sub-category is teaching genres. Teachers seemed to have acquired a confidence in the genre instruction. They pointed out that they felt more confident in assigning genres to their students. PT3 explained her opinion regarding the genre instruction:

After writing a narrative story I realized it would be nice to introduce more genres to the students. By understanding various genres and their social purposes they will be able to incorporate it into their own writing.

Teachers also revealed their understanding of the facilitating the genre-based writing tasks. They (PT19 and PT24) elaborated on how they can support their students gain awareness of the various genres. The next example shows their confidence in being able to scaffold genre-based writing assignment (PT24):

I think we need to teach students that writing is a communicative tool. We use writing to communicate with different audiences. We should show students that author’s purpose, the topic and the context influence the writing in different ways. Understanding these relationships will help students become aware of various genre types. It is likely that they will start writing by attending to these aspects.
Overview of the Conceptual Themes and Sub-themes

Based on the qualitative data as presented above, all the themes and sub-themes are represented in Figure 1. It represents a conceptual ideation of the themes and shows the association of three themes and five sub-themes as they relate to the central research question of qualitative part of the study: How does professional development contribute to the teachers’ self-efficacy in writing?

Figure 1

*The Themes and Sub-themes from the Qualitative Data Analysis*
Summary

In conclusion, chapter IV began with a review of the study and the research question and a hypothesis that guided this study. It proceeded with a demographic profile of the participants of the study, quantitative analysis of the instrument as well as qualitative analysis of the interviews. Chapter V contains the interpretation of the data analysis and the implications for further research.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Overview of the Study

This chapter provides a discussion of the findings from the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data obtained from the Teacher Efficacy Scale and the interviews. Bandura’s 1977 Social Cognitive Theory is used in the study as its theoretical framework. Social cognitive theory, as proposed by Bandura, can be enhanced by four sources: mastery experience, vicarious experience, affective states and by verbal persuasion. The professional development program in this study was explicitly designed to enhance teachers’ self-efficacy by embedding these efficacy sources.

The purpose of this quasi-experimental, explanatory sequential mixed methods study was to examine an impact of a 25-hour professional development on teachers’ perceptions and their responses on the thoughts of the teachers’ efficacy concerning preparation and their ability to teach composition. The quantitative data was collected through a self-report measure – The Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES). The TES with few modifications was administered to the treatment group (n=18) after the training and therefore, served as a posttest for the study. The instrument was administered to the control group (n=20) without intervention, and the result served as a posttest as well. Conducting training with a control was not necessary as the posttest
had to be obtained without an intervention. However, because of the ethical considerations and because teachers signed up for the professional development, they attended the training after completion of the instrument. One hypothesis guided the statistical analysis and was stated in a null form: L2 teachers’ efficacy is unrelated to the professional development.

One-way ANOVA showed significant differences between groups for teachers’ beliefs in their ability to deal with a writing problem, to teach writing, to assess writing assignment’s difficulty level, and in the belief that the amount a student can learn in writing is related to the teacher’s qualifications.

The qualitative part of this study was guided by the following research question: How does professional development contribute to L2 teachers’ sense of efficacy? This question was guided by the following sub-questions: how does professional development affect teachers’ sense of pedagogic knowledge? How does professional development affect teachers’ perceptions about their ability to implement writing curriculum? How does professional development influence teachers’ conceptions about teaching writing?

Teachers responded to these questions through Skype and email interviews which were guided by a structured interview question protocol. Each response was analyzed inductively.
Discussion of the Research Findings

Discussion of the hypothesis and interview questions are merged to provide the overall findings of the study.

The hypothesis of the study stated that no significant difference would emerge from the posttest scores that would indicate that teachers who attended the professional development had higher self-efficacy than those who did not. Based on the results of the analysis of the variance, this hypothesis was rejected. The quantitative analysis indicated that teachers who attended the professional development had higher self-efficacy in instructional ability, namely their ability to deal with students’ writing problems, in teaching writing concepts, in assessing writing assignment’s difficulty level and efficacy in the belief that the amount that a student can learn in writing is related to the teacher’s qualification and knowledge.

Qualitative findings offered support for teachers’ belief that the training gave them an ability to deal with students’ ‘‘writing problems. One of the major theme – confidence in instructional skills – that emerged through the qualitative interview data clearly indicates this link. For example, a majority of the teachers reported in an interview that they had more confidence in their instructional abilities in writing. This is evident in the narratives of the teachers when they attributed their self-assuredness to the altered perception of teaching writing. “I can help students overcome problems with writing by providing more opportunities to engage in pre-writing,” was a response of a teacher who expressed the sentiment described by other interviewees. Quantitative finding pertaining to teachers’ beliefs that the training gave them an ability to deal with students’ writing problems is further supported by another sub-theme that
emerged from the qualitative data. For example, the sub-theme *teaching writing as a feasible process* indicates that because teachers found teaching writing more manageable and easy to implement they could respond positively to this quantitative question. The quote belonging to an interviewee who referred to the concept “manageable process” when attempting to describe stages involved in the writing process further clarifies how findings from the interview data complement findings from the quantitative data; Her realization that it is not problematic to teach writing is explained by her increased awareness of the steps involved in writing process. “Teaching writing does not seem as difficult as I thought it was before,” reported one of the participants. The realizations and awareness of these participants boil down to the idea that teachers felt confident to address challenges inherent in composition instruction. In other words, it can be translated as their ability to provide help to students in any situation in terms of writing and thus, be more proficient in making instructional decisions.

These findings echo results of Bruning and Horn (2000) and more recent research conducted by Dismunke (2015). In the latter study, teachers were immersed in a professional development writing course which lasted for a semester and the findings indicate that teachers’ perceptions about their efficacy changed after the course. Teachers reported being more confident in teaching writing and their beliefs about themselves as writers were altered.

Quantitative analysis of the instrument revealed that teachers attending training scored higher in efficacy in teaching writing. This was a very significant finding for the study and it was supported by the qualitative data analysis. The sub-theme *shift in teaching trajectory* backs this quantitative finding. Judgments of the majority of the teachers of their self-beliefs were favorable.
and self-affirming in various domains of writing. Teachers explained how their vision for teaching writing changed and how they envisioned implementing composition curriculum. For example, domination of the words that characterize process and genre approaches to writing in the interviews indicates that teachers felt comfortable to adopt new methods.

A significant difference in general teaching efficacy was found in the efficacy in assessing writing assignment’s difficulty level. This is supported by the qualitative interview data. The theme – confidence in instructional abilities – revealed that teachers responding to the question about how professional development affected their self-efficacy, answered that they felt more confident about their instructional ability in terms of student evaluation, assessment and teaching genres.

Both quantitative and qualitative findings of the study in terms of teachers’ increased efficacy in teaching writing and assessing writing assignment’s difficulty level can be attributed to the content of the training. Due to the emphasis on content which introduced teachers to the writing theories and its practical application, teachers’ beliefs about their instructional abilities were affected. There is a research consensus to support the claim that the content focus of the professional development is the most effective feature (Chacón, 2005; Desimone, 2009; Garet at al., 2001; Johnson, Kahle, & Fargo, 2007). For example, a plethora of research on the effects of the professional development shows that the focus on the content affects teachers’ instructional practice, and knowledge (Wayne, Yoon, Zhu, Cronen, & Garet, 2016; Thomas-Brown, Shaffer & Werner, 2016). Teachers’ reflections, as well as data in a quantitative form, from this study align
with the findings described above. Participants revealed that their overall experiences with the training program had an impact on their content knowledge as it relates to the composition instruction, and it affected their self-beliefs.

Quantitative data also revealed that the efficacy in the belief that the amount a student can learn in writing is related to the teachers’ beliefs in their qualifications. The quantitative finding is supported by the qualitative interview data. Namely, the theme of perceived competence provides a support for this finding. When asked about how professional development influenced their pedagogic knowledge, interviewees reflected that they gained competencies to teach writing and expressed the belief which emphasizes the idea that teachers who are qualified to teach writing can impact students’ writing performance. The sub-theme realization of the gaps in writing pedagogy which is associated with the major theme of the perceived competence can also be linked to the quantitative finding in terms of their beliefs about teachers’ qualification. The data from the transcript shows how teachers’ understanding of their deficiency in writing pedagogy helped them gain a sense of efficacy by contrasting their knowledge before and after the training program. Research on professional development’s influence on teachers’ dispositions provides support for teachers forming the confidence due to the training. Most recent research shows that professional development enhances beliefs about teaching and learning (De Vries, van de Grift, & Jansen, 2014).

It is worth noting that even though this study did not attempt to describe which source of efficacy was the most influential factor on teachers’ self-conceptions, the qualitative analysis revealed that the feedback and the atmosphere of the training were very important components of
the training. Teachers reported that positive encouragement they received and the way they felt at the training made a huge difference in their dispositions and attitude to the training. The feedback and atmosphere mentioned by the study participants equal to verbal persuasion and physiological states proposed by Bandura (1997). This finding is supported by the recent research (Ross & Bruce, 2007; Palmer 2011) which indicates that professional developments designed in a way that incorporates the sources of efficacy are effective and can positively be correlated with teachers’ self-beliefs.

**Limitations**

There are a few limitations to this study.

The first limitation concerns the sample size and randomized controlled assignment. Only thirty-eight teachers participated in the study. Furthermore, the sampling technique was not based on a random selection but rather on a convenience sampling method. These limitations were imposed on the study due to the limited nature of the research. Future studies on the professional development of L2 teachers should include true experiments and larger and more comprehensive sample of participants.

Second, the study investigated the efficacy levels of L2 teachers and did not differentiate between efficacy levels of novice and experienced teachers. Teachers with significant years of teaching experience tend to be more confident in their instructional abilities. These factors may account for the absence of strongly perceived differences in self-perceptions in some areas,
which would have established a direct link to the literature addressing efficacy issues in the practice of teachers who have various experience levels.

The third limitation is timing that could affect the study results. The instrument in the treatment group was administered right after the completion of the training. A longer time frame would allow for mapping a more accurate picture of the teacher efficacies. Thus, the different time interval for the treatment group could limit the interpretability of the study. More studies are needed that examine the long-term impact of in-service teacher professional development program such as this one.

The Implications and Recommendations for the Future Studies

As reported in the study, there were differences observed between the groups in terms of teacher efficacy. However, the survey and the interviews captured teachers’ beliefs soon after the completion of the professional development program. For future consideration, more studies are needed that will attempt to gather efficacy beliefs after a significant time lapse. It is worthwhile to know if teachers’ efficacy levels are sustained over a longer timeframe. Conducting a longitudinal study of teachers to investigate the impact of time on efficacy levels would add to the growing literature which indicates that the impact of the training programs is likely to remain stable even when considerable time has elapsed after the training (Karimi, 2011).

The ultimate purpose of the professional development programs is to positively affect the students’ academic achievement. As a natural extension of the present study would be to investigate how students’ outcome in writing may be affected as the results of the gains in
teacher efficacy. This task was not the goal of this study. Future studies should take this factor into consideration so that the cause-effect relationship between teachers’ beliefs and students writing performance can be established.

Summary

Professional development programs in L2 fields could use the findings of this study as a rationale to begin, strengthen and continue designing training programs that embed the efficacy beliefs in the training. The results of the professional training program show that professional development when designed in a way that tends to teachers’ cognitive needs, can result in an increased sense of efficacy. This is a significant finding that adds to the literature that proves there are the benefits of such a design. Furthermore, considering that no such trainings with L2 teachers were designed, this finding adds another layer of the importance to the new and emerging field in the L2 teacher preparation fields.

The findings of this study shed light on possible considerations for policymakers to take into account when planning and designing meaningful teacher learning programs for L2 teachers. To begin with, L2 in-service teachers should be provided with opportunities to attend professional development programs that are narrowly focused and are tailored toward teachers’ specific needs. Particular emphasis should be paid to strengthening writing skill development because as this study reveals L2 teachers are in need of programs that emphasize enhancement of the composition skills. Teachers should be trained to familiarize themselves with the recent composition theory and practice so that they can make informed decisions in their own
classrooms. Findings indicated that teachers felt more confident and competent in teaching writing and expressed willingness to use provided resources to enhance and extend instruction. These outcomes, adding to the literature on effective models of professional development, support the need for an ongoing research in the area of an intensive, and content-specific professional development in L2 field.

Research regarding the influence of the professional development program on teachers’ efficacy beliefs in writing instruction is a significant contribution to an area widely accepted as scarcely researched in the teacher education field in second and foreign language settings. Findings are relevant for multiple audiences, educational researchers and a variety of leaders in the L2 teacher preparation field. The discussions of the study findings and the implications of the future research included in this chapter may aid researchers and educators in their efforts to implement professional development programs that lead teachers toward improved instructional practices and ultimately, to increased beliefs in themselves as teachers who can bring about change and impact student learning.
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APPENDIX A: LETTER TO THE HEAD OF THE ENGLISH TEACHERS ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA (ENGLISH VERSION)
Letter to the Head of the English Teachers Association of Georgia (ETAG, regional branch)

Dear Colleague,

My name is Nino Jakhaia, a doctoral candidate for Teacher Education at the University of Mississippi. I am writing my dissertation entitled *The L2 Teachers’ Efficacy: The Impact of Professional Development*. The purpose of my study is to examine the effect of a 25-hour in-service professional development course on the English as a Foreign Language teachers’ sense of efficacy in writing instruction and explore the links between teachers’ beliefs about teaching writing, the self-efficacies in instructional strategies, and professional development.

I would like to first provide the summary of my project and explain how English teachers will benefit from participation. If teachers agree to participate, they will be asked to attend a 25-hour professional development workshops which will span over a full week period in the month of July 2017. The professional development will cover the main aspects of contemporary composition theory, different pedagogical models used in current composition teaching by introducing general themes and addressing specific pedagogic concerns that teachers may encounter in the language classrooms. Teachers will also be asked to complete a survey which asks questions related to their sense of teaching efficacy. Additionally, after the completion of the professional development, selected teachers will be asked to participate in Skype interview which will ask questions about their beliefs on the impact of the professional development on their senses of pedagogic knowledge and teaching efficacy. Interviews will be conducted from September through October 2017 at a time/day convenient to the participant.

I would also like to describe what exactly is involved in participation. There are no risks associated with the study, it is free, and teachers are going to benefit from the project by learning new methods and strategies necessary for effective teaching of writing. Additionally, teachers will receive the certificate of completion as well as the books as a sign of my appreciation.

My request for your assistance is to disseminate this information with teachers. Please contact me at njakhaia@go.olemiss.edu for more information with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Nino Jakhaia, Ph.D. candidate
Department of Education
The University of Mississippi
APPENDIX B: CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Consent to Participate in Research

**Study Title:** L2 teachers’ efficacy: The impact of professional development

**Researcher:** Nino Jakhaia, doctoral candidate

**Purpose:** The goal of the proposed study is to deepen understanding of the relationship between L2 teachers’ self-efficacy and professional development. To this end, this study will examine the impact of the professional development on English as a foreign language teachers’ (henceforth, L2) efficacy in writing instruction. The study will also explore the links between teachers’ beliefs about teaching writing, the self-efficacies in instructional strategies, and professional development.

**Procedures/Tasks:** Signing this consent form means you agree to attend a 25-hour professional development program which will take place on July 17-21 and on July 24-28, 2017. The professional development will cover the main aspects of contemporary composition theory, different pedagogical models used in current composition teaching by introducing general themes and addressing specific pedagogic concerns that teachers may encounter in the language classrooms. Signing this consent form also involves agreeing to complete a survey and to participate in Skye interview, and its estimated time per participant is 1 hour. The survey will ask questions related to participants’ sense of teaching efficacy. At interviews participants will be provided an opportunity to talk with the researcher about related topics including their beliefs on the impact of the professional development on their sense of pedagogic knowledge and teaching efficacy. Interviews will be audio recorded.

**Risks and Benefits:** Participating in the study will pose no more than the level of stress or discomfort that the participant would feel in their everyday lives. This is because the topics being discussed in the professional development are not psychologically, physically, and socially sensitive. Having said this, anticipated benefits are greater than anticipated risks. First, the results of the study will generate very important and useful information for considering future direction(s) of teacher development for teaching English writing in the foreign language context. Second, through participating in the study, the individual teachers will be provided an opportunity to enrich their pedagogic knowledge in composition theory and apply the strategies gained in the professional development to their own classrooms.

**Confidentiality:** The results of the survey will be kept confidential. The interview will be audio recorded; however, your name will not be recorded on the audio device. Your name and identifying information will not be associated with any part of the written report of the research. All of your information and interview responses will be kept confidential. The researcher will not share your name, individual responses with anyone other than the research advisor.
If you have questions about the study, please contact:

**Principal Investigator**
Nino Jakhaia M. Ed., Ph.D. candidate
Department of Teacher Education
117 Hill Hall
The University of Mississippi
Email: njakhaia@go.olemiss.edu
Tel: (662) 380 1565

**Research Advisor**
Rosemary Oliphant-Ingham, Ph.D.
Department of Teacher Education
331 Guyton Hall
The University of Mississippi
Email: ringham@olemiss.edu
Tel: (662) 915-7589

**IRB Approval**
This study has been reviewed by The University of Mississippi’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a participant of research, please contact the IRB at (662) 915-7482 or irb@olemiss.edu.

Please ask the researcher if there is anything that is not clear or if you need more information. When all your questions have been answered, then decide if you want to be in the study or not.

**Statement of Consent**
I have read the above information. I have been given a copy of this form. I have had an opportunity to ask questions, and I have received answers. I consent to participate in the study. Furthermore, I also affirm that the experimenter explained the study to me and told me about the study’s risks as well as my right to refuse to participate and to withdraw.

___________________________________  ______________________
Signature of Participant                      Dat
წერილი
ინგლისური ენის მასწავლებლების გაერთიანების ხელმძღვანელი (ჩრდილოეთი ფილიალი)

მეოთხეთ კოლეგა,
ჩემი სახელია ნინო ჯახაია. მე ასპირანტ და ვსწავლობ მასწავლებელთა განათლების ფაკულტეტზე, მისისიპის უნივერსიტეტში.
ჩემი დისერტაციის სახელწოდება უცხო ენის მასწავლებელთა ეფექტია: პროფესიული განვითარების ზეგავლენა.
ჩემი კვლევის მიზანია გაარკვიოს თუ რა ზეგავლენა ექნება 25 საათიან პროფესიულ განვითარების პროგრამაში ინგლისური მასწავლებლთა წერის სწავლების ეფექტიამ.

პირველი რიგში,
ჩემი მინდა აღვწერო ჩემი კვლევა და აგიხსნათ თუ როგორ დაეხმარება კვლევა მასწავლებლებს. იმ შემთხვევაში, სადაც მათი მოსაზრება მარტო ეშვება, მათ გადაგრძელება თოვლის, რომ თანდათან შეარჩენენ 25 საათით პროფესიული განვითარების პროგრამა. ეს პროგრამა შეიცავს თეორიას თემა და გადამტკიცებულ კონკრეტულ პედაგოგიურ პრობლემებს.

მიჩნეულად, კვლევაში მონაწილეობა არ არის რისკსთან დაკავშირებული. პირიქით, მასწავლებლთა შეუძლია მათი უფლება და ცხოვრება. მეოთხეთ თანდათან შეგვარდით, რომ დისერტაცია უფლება და შამთაშუალობა მოითხოვო სერტიფიკატს. ჩემი თხოვნა იქნება, რომ გაავრცელოთ ეს ინფორმაცია ინგლისური პედაგოგებთან.

გთხოვთ კითხვების შემთხვევაში დამიკავშირდეთ შემოთავაზებით მისამართზე: njakhaia@go.olemiss.edu.
პატივისცემით,

ნოთი ოჯახი, განათლების მეცნიერებათა მეცნიერის დოქტორის კანდიდატი
მასწავლებლთა თანხმობის ფორმა

მოთხოვნა: ქვეყნის მოთხოვნა დახვდა თუ რა ხელშეკრულება უნდა 25 საათით პროფესიულ განვითარების პროცესში ინგლისური მასწავლებელთა წერის სწავლების ეფექტიანობის კვლევას შესრულოს. ქვეყანას აქვს შეფასებითი თუ რა ფაქტორს მასწავლებელთა წერის სწავლების ეფექტიანობაზე პროფესიულ განვითარებას.

პროცედურა: თქვენი ხელშროება ამ თანხმობის ფურცელზე ნიშნავს, რომ თქვენ თანახმა ხართ დაესწროთ 25 საათიან პროფესიული ტრენინგს, რომელიც ჩატარდება 5 დღის განმავლობაში ივლისის თვეში. ტრენინგი მოიცავს თანამადროვე წერის სწავლების თეორიას, სხვადასხვა ჟილმაგებით მოდელებს, რომლებიც გამოიყენება სწავლების დროს. ამ თანხმობას ხელშროება ასევე ნიშნავს, რომ თქვენ თანახმა ხართ მისცეთ ინტერვიუ, თქვენთვის მოსახერხებელ დროს. ინტერვიუს ხანგრძლივობა არ იქნება ერთ საათზე მეტი. ინტერვიუს ხანგრძლივობა ექნებათ შესაძლებლობა ისაუბრონ იმაზე, თუ რას ფიქრობენ ისინი ამ ტრენინგზე, როგორი ზეგავლენა მოახდინა ტრენინგმა ტენას პედაგოგიურ ცოდნაზე და სწავლების ეფექტიანობაზე.

ყველა ინტერვიუ ჩაიწერება აუდიო მოწყობილობის საშუალებით.

რისკი და სარგებელი: ქვეყნის მინისტრის მიერ არ არის არანაირი რისკი და სარგებელი. თემები, რომლებიც ტრენინგზე განიხილება არ მოიცავს ფსიქოლოგიურად, ფიზიკურად და სოციალურად სათუთ საკითხებს. აქვს განსხვავება, თუნდაც დასწრება არ არის არანაირი რისკი. ქვეყნის შეყოლება მოიცავს სამუშაოდ შეფასებით საშუალო ადგილს, რომელიც ფაქტობრივად მასწავლებელთა არასწორი უფლებადი უარი ცოდნაზე კვალიფიციურ სწავლებაზე. ასევე, ამ კვლევაში მონაწილეობით მასწავლებელთა გამოთვალება საჭირო ყველა ზეგავლენას ჰქონდათ პედაგოგიურ ცოდნას და მეთოდოლოგიურ თეორიას პედაგოგიაში.

კონფიდენციალურობა: ქონების შედეგი ინტერვიუ არ ნიშნავს თქვენი ინტერესები თუ არ შემდეგ იმასზე, რას თქვენ თანახმა ხართ. ინტერვიუ არ წარმოადგენს არასამუშაო ინფორმაციას, თუმცა თქვენი ხელმოწერა ინტერვიუ არ შეიცავს იმ ამოცანას, რომელიც გამოიყენება სამომავლო გეგმაში შეუსრულნილი. თქვენი სახელი და გვარი არ იქნება ინტერვიუ შეიცავს აგრეთვე თქვენი მოთხოვნის ქვეყანაში გამოყენებაში. თქვენი სახელი და გვარი არ იქნება შეუსრულობული ქვეყანას აგრეთვე კვებით დაკავშირებით.
გარდა მქვლევარის ხელმძღვანელის, თქვენი ინტერვიუს პასუხები არ იქნება გაზიარებული მესამე პირთან.

ბონუსები: ტრენინგზე დასწრება უფასოა. მასწავლებლები მიიღებენ მისისიპის უნივერსიტეტის სერთიფიკატს.

კვლევის ხელმძღვანელის თქვენი ინტერვიუს პასუხები არ იქნება გაზიარებული მესამე პირთან.

გარდა მქვლევარის ხელმძღვანელის, თქვენი ინტერვიუს პასუხები არ იქნება გაზიარებული მესამე პირთან.

შეკითხვების შემთხვევაში გთხოვთ მოგვმართოთ შემდეგ მისამართზე:

მთავარი მქვლევარი
ნინო ჯახაია, ასპირანტ
განათლების დეპარტამენტი
117 ჰილ ჰოლ
მისისიპის უნივერსიტეტი
საფოსტო მისამართი: njakhaia@go.olemiss.edu
ტელ: (662) 380 1565

ელი როზმარი ოლიფანტ
როზმარი ინგამი, განათლების მეცნიერებათა დოქტორი
განათლების დეპარტამენტი
331 გაიტონის ჰოლ
მისისიპის უნივერსიტეტი
საფოსტო მისამართი: ringham@olemiss.edu
ტელ: (662) 915-7589

ინსტიტუციური საბჭოს თანხმობა

ეს კვლევა გამოიყენება იქნა მისისიპის უნივერსიტეტის ინსტიტუციური საბჭოს მიერ. თუ გექნებათ შეკითხვები თქვენი როლით ელვანება თქვენი ინტერესების უფლებთან, ყოველთვიუთან ინსტიტუციური საბჭო შემდეგ ინსტიტუციური საბჭოს თანხმობა იძლევა 662 915-7482 ან საფოსტო მისამართზე irb@olemiss.edu.
გთხოვთ კითხვებთან მიმართოთ მეკვლევარს თუ გარკვეული საკითხები არ არის გახდებოდა ან თუ გჭირდება დამატებითი ინფორმაციის მოპოვება. თუმცა, თუმცა ეს კითხვებს გაგზავნეთ საჭირო, მიღწევად ამის შემდეგ დამატებითი ინფორმაციის მოპოვება თუ არა აქ ელეგირდა მონაწილეობა.

თანხმობის ფორმა
მე გავეცა ზემოთხსენებულ ინფორმაციას. თანხმობის ფორმას ასეთი ჩაწერის უფლება მე მიწოდებული არის. შესაძლოა, იმის გამო, რომ მაქვს უფლება ამ კვლევაში მონაწილობა და მოსახუთეთ საჭირო. თანხმობის ფორმას ჩაწერის შემთხვევაში, იმის გამო, რომ თანხმობა მთელი უფლებები ეძებება თუ არ მე შეიძლება ამ კვლევაში ელეგირდა მონაწილეობა.

________________________________________                    ______________________
მონაწილის ხელმოწერა                                       თარიღი
APPENDIX D: INSTRUMENT
Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984)

The items below make up the Teacher Efficacy Scale. It is an adaptation of Gibson and Dembo’s (1984) Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES).

Please, respond using the scale choices below by circling your agreement level to each of the statements below.

1. When a student does better than usual in writing assignment, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort.

   | Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

2. The hours in my class have little influence on students’ writing compared to the influence of their out-of-class environment.

   | Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

3. If parents comment to me that their child behaves much better at school than he/she does at home, it would probably be because I have some specific techniques of managing his/her behavior which they may lack.

   | Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

4. The amount that a student can learn in writing is primarily related to teachers’ qualifications.
5. If a teacher has adequate skills and motivation, she/he can get to the most difficult students.

6. If students aren't disciplined at home, they aren't likely to accept any discipline.

7. I have enough training to deal with almost any writing problem.

8. My teacher training program and/or experiences has given me the necessary skills to be an effective teacher.
9. Many teachers are stymied in their attempts to help students by lack of support from the community.

Strongly disagree *** Moderately disagree *** Disagree slightly, more than agree*** Agree slightly, more than disagree*** Moderately agree *** Strongly agree

10. Some students need to be placed in slower groups so they are not subjected to unrealistic expectations.

Strongly disagree *** Moderately disagree *** Disagree slightly, more than agree*** Agree slightly, more than disagree*** Moderately agree *** Strongly agree

11. Individual differences among teachers account for the wide variations in student achievement.

Strongly disagree *** Moderately disagree *** Disagree slightly, more than agree*** Agree slightly, more than disagree*** Moderately agree *** Strongly agree

12. When a student is having difficulty with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it to his/her level.

Strongly disagree *** Moderately disagree *** Disagree slightly, more than agree*** Agree slightly, more than disagree*** Moderately agree *** Strongly agree

13. If one of my new students cannot remain on task for a particular assignment, there is little that I could do to increase his/her attention until he/she is ready.
14. When a student gets a better grade than he usually gets, it is usually because I found better ways of teaching that student.

15. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.

16. A teacher is very limited in what he/she can achieve because a student's home environment is a large influence on his/her achievement.

17. Teachers are not a very powerful influence on students’ writing achievement when all factors are considered.
18. If students are particularly disruptive one day, I ask myself what I have been doing differently.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

19. When the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I found more effective teaching approaches.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

20. If my principal suggested that I change some of my class curriculum by adding more curriculum activities, I would feel confident that I have the necessary skills to implement the unfamiliar curriculum.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

21. If a student masters a new writing skill quickly, this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching that skill.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |
22. Parent conferences can help a teacher judge how much to expect from a student by giving the teacher an idea of the parents' values toward education, discipline, etc.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

23. If parents would do more with their children, I could do more.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

24. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

25. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him quickly.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

26. School rules and policies hinder me doing the job I was hired to do.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |
27. The influences of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

28. When a child progresses after being placed in a slower group, it is usually because the teacher has had a chance to give him/her extra attention.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

29. If one of my students couldn't do a writing assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |

30. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.

| Strongly disagree *** | Moderately disagree *** | Disagree slightly, more than agree*** | Agree slightly, more than disagree*** | Moderately agree *** | Strongly agree |
APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS IN ENGLISH
1. How does the professional development contribute to teachers’ sense of self-efficacy in writing?

d. How did professional development affect teachers’ sense of pedagogic knowledge?

e. How did participation in the professional development affect teachers’ perceptions about their ability to implement the writing curriculum?

f. How did professional development influence teachers’ conceptions of teaching L2 writing?
APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS IN GEORGIAN
1. როგორი წვლილი შეიტანა პროფესიულმა ტრენინგებმა მასწავლებლების ეფექტიანობის შეგრძებაზე?

დამატებითი კითხვები:

ა. როგორი გავლენა ჰქონდა ამ ტრენინგი მასწავლებლების პედაგოგიურ ცოდნაზე?

ბ. როგორ იმოქმედა ტრენინგზე დასწრებამ მასწავლებელთა უნარზე, რომ დანერგოთ ახალი წერილი სტრატეგიები?

გ. როგორ იმოქმედა პროფესიულმა ტრენინგმა მასწავლებლების წარმოდგენებზე წერის სწავლებასთა დაკავშირებით?
APPENDIX G: TEACHER CERTIFICATE
This certificate is awarded to

COURSE PARTICIPANT’S NAME

For completion of a 25-hour English professional development course

“Composition Pedagogies: Tools for Teachers”

Delivered on July 2017

__________________________________________
Signature

______________________________
Date

__________________________________________
Signature

______________________________
Date
VITA

NINO JAKHAIA
101 Creekmore Blvd., Apt.# 3321 B, Oxford, Mississippi, U.S.A.
Cell: 662-380-1565
E-mail: njakhaia@go.olemiss.edu

EDUCATION AND ACADEMIC HONOURS

Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction, Secondary Education – English; The University of Mississippi, Expected – May 2018

Master’s in Curriculum and Instruction, The University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS, USA, 2009-2010

Master’s in English Philology; Javakhishvili State University (Sokhumi Branch), 1997-2002

Summer Research Scholarship, The University of Mississippi, 2017

Edmund Muskie Graduate Fellowship, 2009-2010.

Gamma Beta Phi Society, University of Mississippi, 2009-2010.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

The University of Mississippi
Graduate Instructor Jan. 2013-present
Graduate Assistant
Aug. 2016-May 2017
Supplemental Instruction Program
Caucasus International University, Tbilisi, Georgia
Assistant Professor
Ministry of Education and Science, Teacher Professional Development Center,
Tbilisi, Georgia
EFL Teacher Trainer (part-time)
Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
Research Assistant (part-time)
NGO “ATINATI”, Language Center, Zugdidi, Georgia
EFL Teacher
Teacher Professional Development Centre, Georgia
Feb. 2008 - May 2009
Co-trainer for EFL Teachers
Tbilisi University of Economic Relations, Zugdidi Branch
Aug. 2003-June 2007
Lecturer of English
Javakhishvili State University, Zugdidi Branch
Sept. 2003-June 2007
Lecturer
Publications


**Professional Memberships**

Mississippi Foreign Languages Association (MFLA)
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

**Scholarly Presentations and Competitions**

Jakhaia, N. (2018). Teaching Composition in Schools: Challenges of EFL Teachers in Post-Soviet Georgia. TESOL International Convention & English Language Expo, Chicago, IL, US.


**Professional Education**

eLearning Training Course. The Six-week course for faculty offered by the University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS, 2017

*Mississippi Foreign Languages Association Annual Conference*. Tupelo, US, 2009


**Languages**
Georgia (native); English (fluent); Russian (fluent); French (basic)

**Technologies**

SPSS
Adobe (Acrobat, Photoshop, Connect)
Microsoft (Office, Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Publisher, Outlook)
Learning Management System (Blackboard)
Google Applications (Drive, Gmail, Hangout, Picasa)
Survey Monkey
Web 2.0 Technologies