

# AFGHANISTAN EFL TEACHER PREPARATION INSTITUTIONS AND EFL TEACHING EFFICACY IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

**Nasim Danesh Tahsildar**

Northeast Normal University (NENU), China  
*tahsildar@hu.edu.af*

**Abstract:** In Afghanistan university context, English Departments focusing on preparing or educating EFL teachers' candidates are of two types; the Education Colleges' English Departments (ECED) and the Literature Colleges' English Departments (LCED). The purpose of this research is to investigate the extent to which the two EFL teacher preparation institutions in Afghanistan universities educate efficacious EFL teachers so as to teach English at public schools. It also aims at comparing the teaching efficacy level of male and female EFL teachers as the graduates of the two different English Departments (ECED and LCED) with different curricula in order to find out how these Departments educate public school EFL teachers. The study applied a survey questionnaire to obtain the data from 105 graduates of two English Departments as novice EFL teachers recruited by 45 public schools in a province in Afghanistan. The findings showed that both Departments educate highly efficacious EFL teachers. However, the level of efficacy between the two Departments is significantly different. The study also has some implications to schools of EFL teachers to comprehend their level of professional efficacy and certain implications to English Departments, Universities, and Afghanistan Ministry of Higher Education to understand how different English Departments' graduates meet the public schools' EFL requirements.

**Keywords:** *teacher preparation institutions; EFL novice teachers; self-efficacy; public schools.*

## INTRODUCTION

Given their shortcomings, teacher preparation institutions prepare and certify teachers with higher teaching efficacy than teachers not having been involved in teacher preparation institutions (Greenberg, 1983; Haberman, 1984; Olsen, 1985 Ashton & Crocker, 1986). More prepared teachers are also tended to be more efficacious and successful in teaching than those who are not or less prepared (Hammond, 2000). Research shows that a direct association between teacher preparation institutions and judgements of teacher self-efficacy; however, only few research has investigated the improvement of teacher self-efficacy established while the teachers' enrolment in teacher preparation institutions (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Wenner, 2001; Pendergast, 2011). This study aims to measure self-efficacy of graduates of English Departments as teacher education institutions, who are already working as EFL novice teachers in Afghanistan public schools.

According to Moran (1998), there is some evidence that preparation programs have variety of effects on teachers' personal as well as general efficacy. As Hoy & Woolfolk (1990) and Spector (1990) assert, general teaching efficacy improves during college programs and drops while teaching, and this suggests that the enthusiasm of younger teachers might be rather lost while they face with the realities and complications of the teaching job. Thus, teacher preparation institutions must take the responsibility of improving teaching efficacy in their graduates so as to meet the learners' needs (Garica, Arias, Murri, & Serna, 2011; Monica, 2016). In addition, Heibert and Morris (2012) and Core (2014) further assert that the focus of teacher preparation institutions must be on quality teaching practices and teaching practices must be shared with teacher candidates by professional teachers to produce efficacious graduates.

Cummins (2005) on the other hand states that the first aspect of assessing professional teachers' knowledge and skills is through the teachers' efficacy. Teacher efficacy was recognized more than two decades ago as a teacher characteristic associated with student

achievement through an analysis by the RAND corporation (Armor et al., 1976). According to Moran and Hoy (2001), teacher efficacy is “a teacher’s efficacy belief is a judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated” (p. 783). Based on Bandura’s (1993) self-efficacy theory, Moran and Hoy (2001) establish a reliable instrument to test teachers’ self-efficacy and it is known as the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). This tool is invented to test three dimensions of teachers’ level of efficacy. The first aspect of the instrument assesses teacher efficacy with regard to student engagement. It tests teachers’ opinions with regards to their capabilities to stimulate students. The next factor measures the teacher efficacy with regard to teaching strategies. This aspect gauges teachers’ beliefs regarding their aptitude to apply various teaching approach while teaching. The third aspect of the instrument is on teacher efficacy regarding classroom management which gauges teachers’ opinions of classrooms management (Moran & Hoy, 2001). The concept of teachers’ efficacy and its relation with different variables like teachers’ job satisfaction, students’ attitude and achievement and teachers’ experience has also been assessed by several research such as by (Moran & Master, 2009; Klassen & Chiu 2010; Alwan & Mahasneh, 2014).

The theoretical framework used as an assessment base in this research is Bandura’s (1977) theory of self-efficacy. The current study utilizes Moran and Hoy’s (2001) Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale, created in accordance with theory of Bandura, as an assessment deviceto gauge the self-efficacy of graduate teachers of English Departments as EFL teacher education institutions in Afghanistan universities.

The current study is a new contribution in the area of teaching efficacy in Afghanistan since research in teaching efficacy in common, and EFL teachers’ efficacy in particular, is an understudied area in this country. In addition, EFL teachers in Afghanistan are mainly the graduates of two different Departments, the aims of which are

somehow different: the English Language Departments at Education Colleges (EC ELD) and English Language Departments at Literature Colleges (LC ELD). The main purpose of EC ELD is to educate professional EFL teachers while the LC ELDs' purpose is to train literary characters (HU Strategy Plan, 2018).

According to Jiménez and Teague (2009) teacher preparation institutions are required to develop particular forms of knowledge and skills in their graduates in order to train efficacious teachers who can work with their students. Jong and Harper (2005) also assert that efficacious language graduate teachers understand "the process of learning a second language, the role of language and culture as a medium in teaching and learning, and the need to set explicit linguistic and cultural goals".

However, research shows that although it is the teacher preparation institutions commonly supporting high criteria of teaching and learning process, numerous teachers cannot facilitate teaching practices based on quality standards (Michael, 2001) and many new graduates confess not to be well prepared to teach, and this is due to lack of enough focus on their efforts on qualifications (Hammond, Chung & Frelow, 2002). In addition, a recent review by Sleeter (2011) on teacher education signifies that there are very limited indications which can notify teacher education policy. Several studies' findings by Hammon (2002), Betts et al (2003), Aaronson, et al (2007), Clotfelter et al (2007), Redmon (2007) and Tschannen-Moran & McMaster(2009) regarding teacher preparation programs and teacher efficacy on the other hand are not consistent.

Thus, lack of research contributions related to teacher efficacy in Afghanistan, noticing the different functions of English Departments as teacher preparation institutions, and the inconsistent conclusions on the associations between teacher preparation programs and teacher efficacy are the main reasons of this research to be conducted. The specific questions of the current study are focused on how English Departments in Afghanistan Universities educate efficacious graduates so as to teach EFL in public schools, which EFL

Department (CE ELD or CL ELD) is educating more efficacious EFL teachers, and a significant difference between male and female EFL teachers as the graduates of the two EFL Departments.

One of the important prophecies of universities is to train graduates in different field to meet the schools' needs in different societies. The significance of training candidate teachers in EFL context is evidenced in a variety of research that demonstrate EFL teachers' academic success. Findings of this study will contribute on forming an idea about the efficacy level of English Departments' graduates as EFL teachers at public schools. It will also help English Departments know what experiences contribute positively for preparing more efficacious graduates to teach English to school students. In addition, the results of this study let Afghan Universities know about the efficacy of the application of what is taught at English Departments through these Departments. Further, findings of the study will provide suggestions for Afghanistan Higher Education for improving English Department curricula so as to meet the schools' needs in a more qualified way.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Ways of better teaching have recently started to emerge in teacher education (Howard & Moss, 2014) and the focus on teachers' education has also included teaching English language to EFL learners (Banks et al, 2005; Sleeter, 2008). Researchers have also started to ask if various types of teacher preparation courses provide teachers with effective teaching knowledge and skills (Hammond, 2000b). One of the ways to investigate the teachers' effectiveness in school context is through the teachers' level of efficacy which is related to different variables like teachers' use of new teaching methods, students' involvement in classrooms and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran and McMaste, 2009). Research demonstrates that teachers who own higher sense of efficacy produce better student achievements (Muijs & Reynolds, 2002; Mascal, 2003 and Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2004). Another way to investigate the

teachers' effectiveness in school context is the teachers' preparation programs (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Wenner, 2001; Pendergast, 2011). However, the empirical research findings are not consistent with regard to teacher preparation program and teacher efficacy.

In fact, it is the teacher preparation institutions which have to provide qualified graduates with essential knowledge and skills so as to teach language in different contexts (Baecher & Ediger, 2013). Hollins and Guzmán (2005) state that preparing candidate teachers to teach students underlies the notion that "teachers' knowledge frames and belief structures are the filters through which their practices, strategies, actions, interpretations, and decisions are made" (p. 482). Shulman (1987) divides teacher knowledge into seven categories, among which three are general pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge and knowledge of classroom management. Brad (2010) also suggests that on the basis of their backgrounds, different graduates require different kinds of involvements to understand different strategies and experiences that work for them as prospect teachers.

The idea that language teachers should be trained so as to teach different language students is also reinforced by a great deal of evidence (Nancy, 2014). Brisk and Harrington (2000) suggest certain implications in order to foster teacher qualification of teaching EFL students. They assert that efficacious teachers learn about EFL students' personal linguistic histories as well as their cultural experiences not only at school but also out of school and at home. Coady (2011) and Jong (2013) further emphasize that EFL graduates must know how to facilitate teaching writing and speaking functions of the English language. However, USDOE report (2012) states that a lack of professionals among English teachers and sufficient liability with regard to teaching English in assessing teacher shows major challenges for them. Nancy (2014) also asserts that careful considerations of learning process in teacher preparation institutions whereby the candidates' backgrounds as well as prior experiences are formed affect this procedure. Thus, several studies discuss what

works best in preparing graduates for EFL/ESL instruction, focusing on the skills required to be effective EFL/ESL teachers (Coady, Harper & Jong, 2011; Jong, 2013).

Research also shows a direct association between teacher education institutions and judgements of teacher self-efficacy; however, only few research has investigated the increase in teacher self-efficacy established as pre-service teachers in teacher preparation institutions (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Wenner, 2001; Pendergast, 2011). According to Avery and Meyer (2012), developing self-efficacy with the pre-service teachers requires a challenging and appropriately nurturing environment in teacher preparation institutions. Such a challenging and nurturing environment can be facilitated by methodology courses which can provide the pre-service teachers with opportunities to improve their level of efficacy (McLaughlin, 2015). Teachers with higher efficacy level provide better academic attention in their classes (Gibson & Dembo, 1985), apply novel teaching approaches, do more with struggling learners (Haney, Lumpe, Czerniak & Egan, 2002) and build better relationship among their students (Nurlu, 2015). According to Bloomfield (2010), teachers' background knowledge, experiences and belief significantly affect the efficacy of their teaching at schools.

Several empirical studies on the other hand show that professional development can influence teachers' sense of efficacy. Hammon (2002) in a study assesses data from 3000 beginning teachers investigating their opinions of their readiness, beliefs and exercises for teaching. The results show that teachers having graduated from teacher education institutions were much better ready to teach than teachers who were involved in teaching with little or without preparation. Clotfelter, et al. (2007) also investigate the impact of undergraduate institution programs on high school teachers' productivity. They find a positive as well as a significant association between the teacher preparation programs and high school teachers' productivity. In addition, Redmon (2007) conducts a study on a cohort of students in a program of teacher preparation,

measuring how they feel regarding teaching self-efficacy. Findings show that feelings self-efficacy of pre-service teachers increase due their involvement in such in teacher preparation programs. On the other hand, Moran and McMaster (2009) assess the effect of four specialized developing layouts on teacher self-efficacy and the application of new teaching approaches. They use self-efficacy theory of Bandura and find the four program layouts helping to increase teachers' level of efficacy.

However, some studies find not relationship between teaching preparation programs and teachers' performance. For example, Betts (2003) and Aaronson, et al. (2007) study the impact of teacher preparation institution programs on teacher productivity, while they cannot find a strong connection between the programs and the effect of teachers on their learners' achievement. Further, Kane et al. (2006) and Clotfelter et al.(2007) investigate general tools of the quality of the teacher preparation institutions and could not find any relations to teacher productivity either at elementary schools or middle schools. Kane et al. (2006) on the other hand examine the correlation between the school teachers' grade point average (GPA) as college students and their teaching productivity at school, they could also find no association between their grade point average and their teaching performance.

Thus, it can be implied that findings on teacher preparation programs and school teachers' performance look to be inconsistent. According to Harris (2008), one reason for such inconsistency might be lack of the previous studies' ability to overcome the methodological challenges which could estimate the impact of teacher preparation programs on teaching quality. Harris (2008) adds that the pre-service undergraduate programs for teachers have not obtained enough attention recently. In addition, not enough attention has also been given to the basic principles, competence as well as the skills that EFL teachers are required to have so as to provide effective instruction to their classes (Samson and Collins, 2012). Critics of teacher preparation programs on the other hand claim a

disconnection between what is trained in teacher preparation institutions in universities and what teachers need in their real classes (Cochran-Smith, 2004; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2010; Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012).

Further, there is no study conducted on the perceptions of school EFL teachers towards teacher training programs in Afghanistan universities although several studies have investigated this issue in other countries. For instance, Way and Holden (2009) in their investigation on 1200 K12 teachers, discovered that the teachers need more training to develop their abilities to teach financial education since their students had problems dealing with financial management. In addition, in US, Thompson (2010) conducts a qualitative study on perception of master teachers' preparations to teach. Thompson suggests that there is a need to bring changes in teacher preparation programs in America's universities. Croom (2009) further asserts that teacher preparation programs are essential parts of a quality education. Thus, it is worth exploring their impacts on the whole education system.

Moran and Hoy (2001) defines teacher self-efficacy as "a judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated" (p. 783). According to Moran and Hoy (1998), a solid sense of efficacy "can pay dividends of higher motivation, greater effort, persistence and resilience" (p. 238). Sense of self-efficacy in teaching has also a direct association with the learners' performance (Dembo & Gibson, 1985; Chang, 2012).

According to Bandura (1997) Teacher self-efficacy is affected by four different causes as "mastery experiences, verbal persuasion, vicarious experiences, and emotional arousal". Each of the four causes undertakes kind of cognitive treating which regulates how the cause of information is weighted and affects the required instructional activities. Mastery experiences are regarded as the most dominant effect since they postulate real indications of teachers' functioning in an instructional situation (Bandura, 1997; Mulholland & Wallace,

Tahsildar, N.D. (2019). Afghanistan EFL Teacher Preparation Institutions and EFL Teaching Efficacy in Public Schools.

2001). Wealthy performance teachers lead to improved self-efficacy whereas any interruption can bring about a decline in self-efficacy while teachers increase mastery experience leading to accumulation increases in their self-efficacy, they depend upon these as explanations of teaching experiences (Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, 1998).

The current study uses Moran and Hoy (2001) self-efficacy tool to investigate the efficacy level of Afghanistan English Departments' graduates as public-school teachers. Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute courses of actions required to produce given attainments" (p. 3). Bandura (1997) considers efficacy beliefs as an essential factor of human behavior and adds that the concept of self-efficacy is established in accordance with the social cognitive theory. Gibson and Dembo (1984) states that teachers with higher level of efficacy focus more on instructional practices rather than non-educational practices.

## **METHOD**

The subjects in the current quantitative study were 105 EFL teachers who had already graduated from two English Departments of the same university (Herat University). Herat University is the only public university in Southwest of Afghanistan and the second largest university throughout the country. 70 participants were the graduates of English Department at College of Education (CEELD) and 35 participants had graduated from English Department at College of Literature (CL ELD). The participants were the formal novice EFL teachers at 45 different public schools in Herat province of Afghanistan and their age ranged from 23 to 34. Table 1 depicts the demographic information about the subjects of this study.

The current study used the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) made by Moran and Hoy (2001) in order to gather data from 105 graduates of English Language and Literature Departments as EFL teachers in public schools. This scale is to measure three aspects of teachers' sense of self-efficacy: efficacy in engaging students; efficacy in teaching strategies; and efficacy in managing the

classroom. The TSES is in two forms, long and short. This study used the long form which comprises 24 items base on a 9-point Likert scale in which, 1 signifies (nothing), 3 signifies (very little), 5 signifies (some degree), 7 signifies (quite a bit), and 9 indicates (a great deal). The score for teacher efficacy was calculated in accordance with the 24 elements on the questionnaire.

Table 1 EFL Teachers’ Demographic Data (N=105)

Gender		Age		Teaching experience		Degree	Eng. Departments		Schools
M	F	23-28	85	1-3	105	Bachel	CE ELD	70	45
47	58	29-34	20			or	CL ELD	35	

The TSES short form contains 12 items, within three factors. Each factor comprises four items as follow: 4 items on instructional strategies;4 items on student engagement and 4 items on classroom management. The same as long form, the TSES short form also includes a 9-point answering scale to rank the participants’ self-efficacy associated with teaching, which ranges from 1 (nothing) to 9 (a great deal).

The validity of TSES has been certified in different settings. For example, Klassen, Usher, Chong, Huan, Wong, and Georgiou (2009) and Fives and Buehl (2010) tried to apply the same instrument in assessing teachers’ sense of self efficacy in five different regions of Canada, Korea, Cyprus, United states and Singapore. It is concluded that the instrument owns a solid internal consistency. The reliability of the instrument in the current study is shown in the following Table 2.

Table 2 Reliability of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

	Alpha
TSES	.913
Engagement	.798
Strategy	.747
Management	.812

The data in the current study was collected based on convenient sampling online. The researcher used Survey Monkey tool provide the questionnaire and distribute it through Gmail and Facebook among the participants. 121 in-service teachers from 45 public schools participated in this study. After the data was checked and cleaned, 16 participants did not fully respond to all items. Therefore, they were removed and the rest 105 participants' data was analyzed using SPSS.

The teachers' efficacy level in the scale was analyzed based three sub-scales of efficacy in teaching strategies, efficacy in classroom management and efficacy in engaging student. Every subscale was analyzed as a separate factor. Thus, to answer the first research question in this study, the teacher's level of self-efficacy was calculated based on three categories of low, medium and high. Low sense of efficacy belonged to teachers whose mean scores ranged from 1 to 3. Medium sense of efficacy belonged to ones whose mean scores ranged from 4 to 6, and high sense of efficacy belonged teachers that their mean scores ranged from 7 to 9. The frequency and percentage of low, medium and high teacher's level of self-efficacy is shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Frequency and Percentage of Teachers' 3 Levels of Self-Efficacy

Levels	Frequency	Percent	Valid %	Cumulative %
Low	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mid	47	44.8	44.8	45.7
High	57	54.3	54.3	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

As shown in Table 3, most of the participants (57/54.3 %) reported to have a high level of self-efficacy. As for the rest of the participants, almost all them (47, out of 48) reported to possess a moderate level of self-efficacy. There is only 1 participant with a low self-efficacy among all. Thus, it can be stated that the overall self-efficacy level of the graduates in both Departments (CEELD and CL ELD) in this study is rather high.

In addition, to answer the second research question, a T-test was accomplished in order to compare the mean scores between the two different Departments graduates' self-efficacy. The mean and frequency of self-efficacy level of both Departments' graduates are shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Frequency and Mean of the Self-Efficacy of the Two Departments' Graduates

College	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error M
EC ELD	70	6.2266	1.16470	.13921
LC ELD	35	5.3357	1.14109	.19288

As shown in Table 4, the mean of EC ELD (6.2266) is higher than the mean of LCELD which is (5.3357). In order to determine whether there is a significant difference in the means of EC ELD and LC ELD, an Independent Sample T-test was applied and the result is shown in Table 5 below.

As demonstrated in Table 5, a significant difference in the efficacy mean of EC ELD graduates was found at (M=6.4, SD=1.2) and LC ELD participants' (M=5.3, SD=1.1 conditions;  $t(103) = 3.72, p < 0.001$ ). Thus, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between self-efficacy mean scores of EC ELD and LCELD's graduates as public school EFL teachers. The EC ELD graduates showed to have a significant higher level of self-efficacy in teaching English as Foreign Language.

Table 5 Independent Sample T-test

Total Mean Equal variance	Lev equality variance test	t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-taild)	M difference	Std. Error difference	95% Confidence Lower
Assumed		.129	.720	3.720	103	.000	.89090	.23951	.41588
Not assumed				3.745	69.372	.000	.89090	.23787	.41641

As already mentioned, the scale (TSES) applied in this study includes three aspects: Engagement, strategies and management. A descriptive statistics analysis was also carried out to show in which aspect of the scale, the graduates of each Department has a higher/lower efficacy. See Table 6.

Table 6 The Three Aspects of the TSES

Faculty Name		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
EC	Engagement	70	3.00	8.38	6.0500	1.33809
ELD	Strategies	70	2.00	8.13	6.4102	1.29714
	Management	70	3.13	8.13	6.2196	1.22686
	Valid N (listwise)	70				
LC	Engagement	35	2.88	7.50	5.1821	1.16803
ELD	Strategies	35	2.63	8.00	5.3893	1.26817
	Management	35	3.00	8.13	5.4357	1.26730
	Valid N (listwise)	35				

As seen in Table 6, the EC ELD graduates' efficacy in the area of Student Engagement is 6.05, efficacy in using Strategies is 6.41, and efficacy in Classroom Management is 6.22, while the ECELD graduates' efficacy in Student Engagement is 5.18, efficacy for using Strategies is 5.38, and efficacy in Classroom Management is 5.43. EC ELD graduates' highest mean score is in using Strategies and their lowest mean score is in Engagement area. On the other hand, LC ELD graduates' highest mean is in Classroom Management and their lowest mean is in Student Engagement area. However, among the three aspects, both Departments' graduates score the lowest in the area of Engagement.

Finally, to answer the third question, a T-test was calculated to compare the mean scores between the self-efficacy of male and female EFL teachers, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7 Male and Female Level Self-Efficacy

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total Mean	Male	47	6.2181	1.22620	.17886
	Female	58	5.6959	1.18579	.15570
P<0.05					

As shown in Table 7, the mean of male EFL teachers (6.2181) is higher than the mean of their female counterparts, which is (5.6959). In order to conclude if there is a significant difference in the means of male and female EFL teachers' level of self-efficacy in EFL teaching, another Independent Sample T-test was conducted and the result showed a significant difference in the efficacy mean of male EFL teachers (M=6.2, SD=1.2) and female EFL teachers (M=5.6, SD=1.1 conditions;  $t(103) = 2.2, p < 0.05$ ).

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The current study investigated if English Departments in Afghanistan Universities educate efficacious graduates. It measured the self-efficacy level of two English Departments' (EC ELD and LC ELD) graduates who were teaching English as novice teachers in public schools. Additionally, the study examined the difference between self-efficacy mean scores of EC ELD and LC ELD's graduates as public school EFL teachers in order to see which Department educates more efficacious EFL teachers.

In the first analysis, results with regard to the first research question in this study disclosed that the overall mean (M=5.9) and standard deviation (SD=1.2) for teacher self-efficacy was rather high. Then the three dimensions of teacher efficacy (Engagement, Strategies and Management) were analysed and the result showed that rather than half (54.3%) of the participants indicated to have a high level of

Table 8 Frequency and Percentage of Teachers' 3 Levels of Self-Efficacy

Levels	Frequency	Percent	Valid (%)	Cumulative (%)
Low	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mid	47	44.8	44.8	45.7
High	57	54.3	54.3	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

self-efficacy in each area. In addition, except one participant, other participants (44.8%) also showed to have a mediate level of self-

efficacy with regard to teaching English as foreign language. Thus, it implies that both English Departments as teacher preparation institutions in the same University educate efficacious EFL teachers so that they are enough efficacious to teach English at public schools.

However, comparing the sense of self-efficacy between the EFL teachers as the graduates of the two Departments, the result revealed a significant difference between the level of self-efficacy of EC ELD's graduates and LC ELD's graduates as EFL teachers. The EC ELD's graduates' level of self-efficacy in teaching English was significantly higher than the LC graduates. Further, the male and female EFL teachers' level of efficacy was also compared. The result showed that male EFL teachers with a significantly higher level of teaching efficacy than their female colleagues.

Table 9 Frequency and Mean of the Self-Efficacy of the Two Departments' Graduates

College	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error M
EC ELD	70	6.2266	1.16470	.13921
LC ELD	35	5.3357	1.14109	.19288

Thus, it seems logical to assume that the difference between self-efficacy level of the two Departments' graduates might be a result of different curricular contents taught to the two Departments' students as prospect teachers.

Table 10 Male and Female Level of Self-Efficacy

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total Mean	Male	47	6.2181	1.22620	.17886
	Female	58	5.6959	1.18579	.15570
P<0.05					

On the other hand, in order to find if there is a significant difference in the means of male and female EFL teachers' level of self-efficacy in EFL teaching, the results of Independent Sample T-test

showed that male teachers significantly scored higher than their female colleagues as shown in Table 10.

The distinction between the male and female teaching efficacy level might also be the result of certain social restrictions for the female teachers to improve their English language abilities as well as their professional skills as EFL teachers. Further studies are required to investigate such factors.

Findings of the current study are in line with different studies conducted in the areas of teacher preparation programs and teacher self-efficacy level. For example, Hammond (2002) investigates teachers' preparations through their self-efficacy and finds that teachers involved in teacher education institutions feel higher efficacy in different dimensions of teaching than those without preparation. Hummon concludes that the degree in which teachers feel prepared is notably associated with their level of teaching efficacy. Woolfolk Hoy and Spero (2005) in another study also report that during the first year, level of teachers' efficacy is associated with the level of support they receive from their teaching preparation institutions. In addition, Eslami (2008) examines the self-efficacy level of Iranian EFL teachers to teach English as a Foreign Language and finds that more efficacious are more motivated to use communicative-based strategies. Moreover, Redmon's (2007) study on a group of learners in a teacher preparation program shows that pre-service teachers' feelings of self-efficacy significantly improve due to their participation in teacher preparation programs. Rahman, Jumani, Akhter, Chishti and Ajmal (2011) further investigate the way teacher preparation programs are related to effective teaching. Their findings indicate that there is a significant relationship between teacher preparation programs teacher effectiveness. Similarly, Giles, Byrd and Bendolph (2016), Aydoğdu, Peker and Duban (2017), Abang (2018) and Peker (2018) investigations of the extent to which teachers apply methods, theory, and training received during training in the teacher training program into their classroom teaching show that there is a

direct association between the teacher preparation programs and teacher efficacy.

However, there is a limitation in this research. It firstly deals with the application of a convenience sample conducted online. So, the generalizability of the study findings is limited. In addition, since the study was on novice teachers, the demographics of the participants specially their age and teaching experience in this study might limit generalizability this study. As found by Putman (2012), more experienced teachers have the higher level of teaching efficacy than novice teachers. Moreover, only the graduates of two English Departments in a single public university were the participants of this study. The result might be different if the same study includes private universities' graduates of English Departments as EFL teachers in private and public schools.

## CONCLUSION

As a new contribution in the area of EFL teacher efficacy, this study aimed at investigating the extent to which English Departments as EFL teacher preparation institutions in Afghanistan Universities educate efficacious EFL teachers so as to teach English at public schools. In addition, the study also compared the efficacy levels of the male and female EFL teachers who had already graduated from two different English Departments at the same University, to know which Department was educating more efficacious public school EFL teachers. Findings of this study showed that both English Departments at Herat University educate efficacious male and female EFL teachers.

However, a significant difference was explored between the EFL teachers as the graduates of the two Departments. EFL teachers as the graduates of EC ELD showed to have a significantly higher self-efficacy than EFL teachers as the graduates of LC ELD. Moreover, a significant difference was also discovered between the male and female EFL teachers' level of self-efficacy. Male EFL teachers reported a significantly higher level of efficacy than their female colleagues.

Finally, the study ended with certain recommendations to teacher preparation institutions in Afghanistan.

The findings of this study suggest teacher preparation institutions to create opportunities for their students as prospect teachers to obviously assess their teaching efficacy levels while involved in their programs. This suggestion is also supported by Woolfolk Hoy & Spero (2005) who state that students as prospect teachers need opportunities to enhance their efficacy in teaching before their teaching practices through their college programs and again while teaching practices as teachers.

Moreover, since contribution of academic research in Afghanistan in general and in teacher efficacy in particular is a new experience, prospect studies are also recommended to conduct more inclusive studies in the area of teacher preparation programs and teacher efficacy not only in EFL context but also in different contexts and include both public and private institutions. Future studies are also suggested to elaborate on the difference between the level of efficacy of EFL teachers as the graduates of different Departments such as EC ELD and LC ELD.

## REFERENCES

- Aaronson, D., Lisa, B., and William, S. (2007). Teachers and Student Achievement in the Chicago Public High Schools. *Journal of Labor Economics*. 25, 95-135.
- Abang, F., Aisyah N., Fatima, S., Sueb, I. (2018). The effectiveness of teacher education program: identifying the difficulties and challenges faced by the pre-service English teachers. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*.6(1), 1-17
- Aydogdu, B., Peker, M., &Duban, N. (2017, October). *An Investigation on pre-service teachers' levels of self-efficacy*. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Best Practices and Innovations in Education, Izmir, Turkey.

- Tahsildar, N.D. (2019). Afghanistan EFL Teacher Preparation Institutions and EFL Teaching Efficacy in Public Schools.
- Al-Alwan, A. F. and Mahasneh, M. (2014). Teachers' self-Efficacy as determinant of students' attitudes toward school: A study at the school level. *Review of European Studies*, 6(1).
- Ashton, P. and Crocker, L. (1986). Does teacher certification make a difference? *Florida Journal of Teacher Education*, 3, 73-83.
- Avery, L. and Meyer, D. (2012). Teaching science as science is practiced: Opportunities and limits for enhancing preservice elementary teachers' self-efficacy for science and science teaching. *School Science and Mathematics*. 112, 395-409
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.
- Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., Darling-Hammond, L., & Duffy, H. (2005). *Teaching diverse learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Betts, J.R., Andrew C.Z., and Lorien, A.R. (2003). *Determinants of Student Achievement: New Evidence from San Diego*. San Diego: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Chang, Y. L. (2012). A study of fifth graders' mathematics self-efficacy and mathematical achievement. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*. 21, 519-525.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Helen, F. L., & Jacob, L. V. (2007a). *How and Why Do Teacher Credentials Matter for Student Achievement? Working Paper #2*. Washington, DC: CALDER.
- Ester J. de Jong, Candace A. Harper & Maria R. Coady (2013). Enhanced Knowledge and Skills for Elementary Mainstream Teachers of English Language Learners, *Theory Into Practice*, 52(2), 89-97
- DeJong, E., and Harper, C. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*. 32(2), 101-124.

- Eslami, Z.R., & Fatahi, A. (2008). Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy, English Proficiency, and Instructional Strategies: *A Study of Nonnative EFL Teachers in Iran*, 11(4).
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.
- Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 51(3): 166-173.
- Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education*. 53, 286-302.
- Fives, H. & Buehl, M. (2010). Examining the factor structure of the teachers' sense of efficacy scale. *The Journal of Experimental Education*. 78, 118-134.
- Gibson, S. & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.
- Giles, R., Byrd, K. and Bendolph, A. (2016). An investigation of elementary pre-service teachers' self-efficacy for teaching mathematics. *Cogent Education*. 3,
- Greenberg, J. D. (1983). The case for teacher education: Open and shut. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 34(4): 2-5.
- Haberman, M. (1984). *An evaluation of the rationale for required teacher education: Beginning teachers with or without teacher preparation*. Paper prepared for the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 51(3): 166-173.
- Haney, J., Lumpe, A., Czerniak, C. M., and Egan, V. (2002). From beliefs to actions: The beliefs and actions of teachers

Tahsildar, N.D. (2019). Afghanistan EFL Teacher Preparation Institutions and EFL Teaching Efficacy in Public Schools.

implementing change. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*. 13, 171-187.

Hiebert, J and Morris, K. (2012). Teaching, rather than teachers, As a Path Toward Improving Classroom Instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(2): 92-102

Hollins, E., and Torres-Guzmán, M. (2005). *Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations*. The report of the AERA Panel on research and teacher education (pp. 477-548). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hoy, W. K. and Woolfolk, A. E. (1990). Socialization of student teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*.27, 279-300.

Kane, T. J., Jonah, E. R. & Douglas, O. S. (2006). *What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? Evidence from New York City.* Working Paper. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Klassen, R. M., Bong, M., Usher, E. L., Chong, W. H., Huan, V. S., Wong, I. Y., & Georgiou, T. (2009). Exploring the validity of a teachers' self-efficacy scale in five countries. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 34, 67-76.

Klassen, R. M., Tze, V. M. C., Betts, S. M. and Gordon, K. (2010). Teacher efficacy research 1998-2009: Signs of Progress or Unfulfilled Promise? *Educational Psychology Review*.23(1): 21-43.

McLaughlin, D. (2015). Investigating preservice teachers' self-efficacy through Saturday Science. *Journal of College Science Teaching*.45: 77-83.

Muijs, D. and Reynolds, D. (2002). Being or doing: the role of teacher behaviours and beliefs in school and teacher effectiveness in mathematics, a SEM analysis. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*. 37(2), 3-15.

- Mulholland, J., & Wallace, J. (2001). Teacher induction and elementary science teaching: Enhancing self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.17, 243- 261.
- Nurlu, O. (2015). Investigation of teachers' mathematics teaching self-efficacy. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*. 8, 489-508.
- Peker, M., Gultekin, M. & Erol, R. (2018). Investigation of the teacher self-efficacy beliefs of math teachers. *Malaysian online journal of educational sciences*. 6(4).
- Pendergast, Donna; Garvis, Susanne; and Keogh, Jayne (2011) Pre-service student-teacher self-efficacy beliefs: An insight into the making of teachers," *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*.36(12).
- Putman, S. M. (2012). Investigating teacher efficacy: Comparing preservice and in-service teachers with different levels of experience. *Action in Teacher Education*. 34, 26-40.
- Redmon, R. (2007). *Impact of teacher preparation upon teacher self-efficacy*. Unpublished. Midwestern State University.
- Sleeter, C. (2008). An invitation to support diverse students through Teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 59(3), 212-219.
- Sleeter, C. E., &Owuor, J. (2011). Research on the impact of teacher preparation to teach diverse students: The research we have and the research we need. *Action in Teacher Education*. 33, 524-536.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy "Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*. 68(2), 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. and Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive concept. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 17, 783-805.

Tahsildar, N.D. (2019). Afghanistan EFL Teacher Preparation Institutions and EFL Teaching Efficacy in Public Schools.

Tschannen-Moran, M. and McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy: Four professional development formats and their relationship to self-efficacy and implementation of a new teaching strategy. *Elementary School Journal*. 110, 228–245.

Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 21, 343-356.