JSLTE
Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English
Online ISSN: 2476-7727, Print ISSN: 2251-8541
https://jslte.shiraz.iau.ir/
12(3), 2023, pp. 57-68

Research Article

An Investigation into the Impact of IELTS Teachers' Self-Efficacy Training Workshops on their Learners' Achievement

Maryam Talebi [1], Nacim Shangarffam [2], Behdokht Mall Amiri [3]

1. Ph.D. Department of English, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
2.3. Department of English, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author: Nacim Shangarffam; Email: nshangraf@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Submission History

Received: 2023-06-26
Accepted: 2023-07-08

Keywords

IELTS, Learners' achievement
Teacher self-efficacy
Teacher training workshop

ABSTRACT

An increasing amount of proof indicates that instructors have a notable impact on foreign language education and acquisition procedure. Moreover, the accomplishment of students is among the most crucial matters that can be affected by various factors connected to the teacher, including the teacher's efficacy which is regarded as a critical factor in the field of educational psychology and plays a vital role in the language instruction and acquisition process. This mental attribute can yield significant results and potentially result in academic achievement for both educators and learners. Therefore, this study makes an effort to scrutinize the importance of teachers' efficacy in International English Language Testing System (IELTS) learners' achievement. To this end, 90 learners participated and took the IELTS Mock test as a pretest and they were assigned to the control and experimental group. Those who were in the experimental group were taught by the teachers who were trained through efficacy workshops. At the end of the semester, the IELTS Mock test was used again as a posttest. The data were collected in the quasi-experimental and the findings of this study through running Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) indicated a constructive effect of self-efficacy on IELTS learners' achievement after the workshop training course. In line with these findings, some implications for language stakeholders were presented.

Introduction

In every educational setting, the main concern of policymakers, educational leaders, and teachers is the academic success or achievement of learners, and this is also true for English as Foreign Language (EFL) environments (Kahu & Nelson, 2018). Academic success refers to the product of learning, which is generally assessed through classroom grades, evaluations, and standardized tests (Gajda, Karwowski, & Beghetto, 2017). In the realm of language education, academic success pertains to how effectively learners have attained proficiency in a new language (Xue, 2022). The academic achievement of students refers to the educational outcome, encompassing the knowledge, skills, and concepts acquired and retained during the process of learning both within and beyond the classroom setting (Hwang, Lim, & Ha, 2017).

The achievement of a student can be described as the productive attainment of an academic assignment at a designated level that depends on multiple interconnected aspects and cannot be ascribed solely to one issue (Paat et al., 2020). The IELTS has emerged as a leading measure for achievement and linguistic proficiency, serving as a crucial global achievement for competitiveness that forms an integral part of the socialization process of a learner (Templer, 2004). The IELTS exam has now become an essential aspect of the English language's cultural value. It also reflects the current trend of transforming English language teaching into a marketable, commercialized, and industrialized industry as one of the UK's significant strengths, it serves as evidence of the international dominance of educational policies that have turned knowledge into a tradable commodity (Templer, 2004). Today, given the high demands, some educational institutions have embarked on providing IELTS preparatory classes as an important component of their EFL classes in Iran. The demands for IELTS have grown exponentially because of the growing number of applicants for higher education as many of these students apply for admission at universities located in English-speaking countries. Therefore, IELTS preparation cannot be deemed as a proficiency exam taken by students upon graduation from high school or as part of their university application process. Moreover, they should help learners from various backgrounds in their classrooms. This can result in multiple challenges, especially for older teachers as the latter lack training in "remedial work or special education (Greyling, 2009 as cited in Pather, 2011, p.1106).

According to the literature, the accomplishment of learners is contingent on several factors, one of which is the effectiveness of instructors (Liu, Hsiu-Min Tsai, Wang, Chen, 2019). Considering the pivotal role that teachers play in classroom settings, a significant portion of studies on factors related to educators has focused on examining how teacher-student relationships impact student achievement (Kola & Sunday, 2015; Klusmann, Richter, & Ludtke, 2016; Kheirzadeh & Sistani, 2018; Engels, Spilt, Denies, & Verschueren, 2021). Specifically, IELTS teachers play a very important role in preparing applicants who seek to immigrate to other countries for education or work. Indeed, today, IELTS teaching constitutes an important part of the massive industry of English teaching across the world. Teachers' tasks, such as improving their learners' performance, sustaining influential classroom management, sorting, and organizing lesson plans, need educators' focus on the objectives set by an IELTS institute. The key personal asset that educators possess is self-efficacy, which pertains to an individual's recognition of their own abilities to succeed (Fathi, Derakhshan, & Saharkhiz Arabani, 2020; Han, Yin, Wang, & Bai, 2020). Indeed, the efficacy of teachers in their ability to confront challenges is crucial to their profession and ultimately impacts the academic progress of their students (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). The ability of educators to manage time, physical environment, duties, subject matter, interpersonal connections, and student conduct is considered a factor that affects their self-efficacy (Ahmed & Julius, 2015). Although the impact of self-efficacy of the instructors in their own abilities on the language learners' issues such as engagement and success has been studied in some cases and among different levels of proficiency (Kim & Seo, 2018; Lu & Mustafa, 2021; Usher, Li, Butz, & Rojas, 2019), there is a scarcity of studies that investigate the effect of teacher efficacy after implementing the workshop training sessions on IELTS students' achievement on the one hand and in Iranian context on the other hand.

Review of the Literature

Academic achievement is correlated with elevated levels of student triumph in various socially coveted results, encompassing job acquisition and job effectiveness (Kanfer, Wolf, Kantrowitz, & Ackerman, 2010; Lamb & McKenzie, 2001). A productive approach to acquiring a comprehension of aspects that obstruct or boost academic achievement is to examine factors that can impact their disposition toward learning and achievement (Clark, 2002; Lackney, 2000). Given the distinctiveness of instructing the English language, it is imperative to conduct a thorough examination of the attributes of proficient foreign language tutors

instead of just implementing the findings of general education in teaching English as a foreign language. The most crucial personal asset that educators possess is self-efficacy, which pertains to an individual's comprehension of their potential for achievement (Fathi et al., 2020).

As per the social cognitive theory, the self-efficacy of educators refers to their assessment of their competence in achieving desired outcomes in terms of learner engagement and learning, even with students who may pose difficulties or lack motivation (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Bandura (2010) explored the source from which self-efficacy arises. He examined how individuals, who are constantly evolving, can adapt and modify their behavior, as opposed to being passive beings who are governed by obscure protective forces or inner workings. Individuals can engage in self-transformation and control occurrences and phenomena through their actions. As stated by Bandura (2010), self-efficacy improves a person's motivation, which is a vital aspect in dealing with particular situations. Buoyancy in an individual's efficacy serves as the groundwork for a drive, a superior quality of life, and distinct contentment in all aspects of life (Simarasl, Fayazi, & Gho, 2010).

As declared by Bandura (2010), four factors influence efficacy. The primary element is that one's perception of self-efficacy develops through experiences or active achievements in specific areas. This is because achievement enhances self-efficacy. Observing others' success in particular activities, known as vicarious modeling, is another factor that contributes to self-efficacy growth. The belief that "if they can do it, I can do it too" has a positive impact on one's efficacy. Boosting effectiveness through verbal influence occurs by motivating individuals so that they can accomplish triumph in carrying out the assigned duty. In due course, biological factors, specifically feeling immensely stressed in demanding situations, can have detrimental effects on effectiveness (Bandura, 2010). Self-efficacy has numerous significant consequences for individuals. When contemplating the ability to complete a task, it can bring about a sense of enjoyment, but reduced effectiveness can result in adverse emotions such as stress and anxiety. These emotions can either positively or negatively impact a person's efficiency (Prilleltensky, Neff, & Bessell, 2016). In addition, individuals with high efficacy are optimistic and more driven when faced with stimulating circumstances, while those with low levels of efficacy are more likely to give up (Robbins & Judge, 2013).

Akbari and Allvar (2010) examined three factors related to teachers, namely their instructional approach, efficacy in their abilities, and tendency to reflect on their teaching, to determine their impact on student achievement gains in an Iranian EFL setting. The study involved 30 EFL teachers who taught in high schools in Iran, with the final exam scores of their students serving as the dependent variable. The findings indicated that the study variables had a significant predictive effect on student achievement. Furthermore, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, and Malone (2006) inspected the correlation between teachers' self-efficacy, the academic success of their students, and job satisfaction. The findings of the analyses conducted through structural equation modeling revealed that the teachers' individual efficacy beliefs had an impact on both the academic performance of their pupils and job satisfaction. Moreover, Saeidi and Kalantarypour (2011) investigated the connection between the self-efficacy of forty-five EFL instructors and the language attainment of their pupils. Upon gathering data via surveys, the findings of the correlation examination demonstrated a noteworthy affirmative correlation between the instructors' self-efficacy and the achievement of the students. Research carried out by Mojavezi and Tamiz (2012) examined how the self-efficacy of eighty senior high school educators impacted the motivation and achievement of one hundred and fifty students. The study findings confirmed that the efficacy of teachers had a constructive effect on the motivation and achievement of students.

So, regarding the above-mentioned points and related studies, the present study aimed to explore the effect of IELTS teachers' self-efficacy on students' performance. Thus, the current study tried to answer the following research question and hypothesis:

Q1: Does IELTS teachers' self-efficacy have any significant effect on their learners' performance?

H01: IELTS teachers' self-efficacy does not have any significant effect on their learners' performance.

Method

Participants

The population of the present study included 90 male and female Iranian IELTS learners with the age range of 19 to 45 who were randomly selected among those enrolled in IELTS preparation courses at the IELTS Oxford center, Tehran, Iran. To do so, first, the standard deviation of the performance scores for all 90 students was calculated. Then, the cutoff point for standard deviation was determined to place the students in classes. More specifically, those whose performance fell within one standard deviation of the mean were placed in the classes. The results of the mock test were used as a pretest for the learners' performance and a placement test, as well. Then, they were randomly divided into two different groups, one with teachers going through the self-efficacy workshop and the other with teachers not attending the workshops

Instruments

For the aim of the study, the following instruments were utilized.

IELTS Mock Test

A practice IELTS assessment is identical to an official IELTS assessment. The format, complexity, grading, and timing are all identical to the official assessment. The test was adapted from the Cambridge IELTS series and was utilized to standardize students' language proficiency levels and to serve as a pre-and post-test for both groups of learners in this research. In the current study, a comparable Mock test was used as a posttest after the intervention. The Mock test encompasses all four sections of the assessment and features newly created IELTS materials that have been pretested by IELTS partners that is among the valid test. The reliability of the test for the context of the study was ensured through a two-step procedure. For the sections that were tested through multiple-choice questions (i.e., listening and reading), Cronbach's alpha formula was used to estimate the reliability. For the other two sections, which were scored by two raters based on the scoring rubric, the inter-rater consistency was measured to make sure of consistency. The overall estimated reliability for the two sections was .717. The listening section had a reliability index of .623 and the reading section was .610. These numbers indicate acceptable reliability for these parts of the test as all indices were above the cut-off value of 0.6 suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). To make sure of the reliability of the scores in the writing and listening sections, two correlational analyses were run between the scores rated by two raters. The results reported in Tables 1 and 2 showed high and significant consistency between the two raters scoring these sections. Therefore, the researcher was rested assured that the two raters can proceed in rating the subsequent tests.

Table 1

Inter-Rater Consistency for the Writing Section of IELTS

		Wr.Rater1	Wr.Rater2
Wr.Rater1	Pearson Correlation	1	.743**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	90	90
Wr.Rater2	Pearson Correlation	.743**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	90	90

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2

Inter-Rater Consistency for the Speaking Section of IELTS

		Sp.Rater1	Sp.Rater2
Sp.Rater1	Pearson Correlation	1	.713**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	90	90
Sp.Rater2	Pearson Correlation	.713**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	90	90

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Procedure

Ninety IELTS students were carefully selected from Oxford IELTS Center in Tehran, Iran. Forty five IELTS learners with teachers taking part in the workshop and 45 with teachers not participating in the workshop by administering a Mock test, adopted from the Cambridge IELTS series, for the aim of homogeneity. A week-long workshop on self-

efficacy training was held for the teachers of the experimental group that covered the entire process of creative problem-solving, beginning with identifying issues, determining the factors, and generating potential ideas, to presenting solutions related to educators' efficacy. Participants exchanged ideas on the challenges they faced in IELTS centers and institutions and worked together to develop educational improvements in a productive trial session. The workshop was organized by a team of twenty educators. The instructional modules encompassed a wide variety of educational and enlightening materials. Each module began with an introduction and summary, an explanation of its objectives, as well as suggestions for their implementation. The workshops concluded with guidance for individual and group reflection and consideration. At the end of the term, the students took part in another sample IELTS as a posttest the data of which were utilized to check the possible difference between the two groups of students.

Data analysis

The learners' scores' of the pre-test and post-test scores of the students, were scrutinized using MANOVA to compare the gain scores of both groups.

Results

As mentioned above, 90 learners took part in this study. These learners all had enrolled in the IELTS preparation course of the institute. Purposeful sampling was taken to choose 45 learners whose teachers had attended the workshop and 45 who did not. Based on the institute's evaluation, all learners were considered to have a B2 level of proficiency (upper-intermediate based CEFR classification). However, to verify that the assignment does not cause any significant difference, and the participants in the two groups are, indeed, at the same level of language proficiency prior to the treatment, they were asked to sit in a Mock IELTS test, their performances were marked by professional IELTS raters and the results were compared. The test consisted of two sections with 80 questions in a multiple-choice format which aimed to measure the teste's levels of proficiency regarding listening and reading, two writing questions marked out of 9 by two raters, and a speaking test which was held in an interview session and marked out of 9. Table 3 presents the pretest scores of the participants.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics of the Scores on the IELTS Pretest

							Skewness		
		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Statistic	Std. Error	Ratio
Listening	Raw Score	90	17.00	32.00	23.8333	4.03148	.056	.254	.221
	Total	90	5.00	7.00	5.9333	.53632	.104	.254	.410
Reading	Raw Score	90	17.00	31.00	23.9889	3.96472	.032	.254	.126
	Total	90	5.00	7.00	5.9778	.54521	-.017	.254	-.067
Writing	Rater1	90	5.00	7.00	5.7389	.57195	.217	.254	.854
	Rater2	90	5.00	7.00	5.7111	.56079	.321	.254	1.263
	Total	90	5.00	6.50	5.6056	.52731	.269	.254	1.059
Speaking	Rater1	90	5.00	6.50	5.5556	.52169	.441	.254	1.796
	Rater2	90	5.00	6.50	5.5667	.48110	.481	.254	1.903
	Total	90	5.00	6.50	5.4444	.47667	.484	.254	1.905
Valid N (listwise)		90							

As is evident from Table 3, the highest mean was obtained in the reading section followed by listening and the lowest mean score belonged to the speaking section. Moreover, the inspection of the skewness ratios showed that all distributions of scores enjoyed normalcy as the ratios fell within the legitimate range of ±1.96 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). As mentioned earlier, the selected participants were grouped based on their teachers' attendance/nonattendance to the workshop. Table 4 presents the statistics of the two groups' performance on the IETLS pretest.

The group whose teachers had taken part in the workshop was labeled "experimental" and the one whose teachers did not was labeled "control".

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics of IELTS Pretest Scores by Two Groups

							Skewness		
Group		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Statistic	Std. Error	Ratio
Experimental	Listening	45	5.00	7.00	5.9222	.60260	.231	.354	.53
	Reading	45	5.00	7.00	5.9000	.52872	-.183	.354	-.517
	Writing	45	5.00	6.50	5.5889	.54657	.286	.354	.808
	Speaking	45	5.00	6.50	5.3889	.43809	.687	.354	1.893
Control	Listening	45	5.00	7.00	5.9444	.46737	-.120	.354	-.339
	Reading	45	5.00	7.00	6.0556	.55619	.083	.354	.235
	Writing	45	5.00	6.50	5.6222	.51296	.273	.354	.771
	Speaking	45	5.00	6.50	5.5000	.51124	.534	.354	1.509
Valid N (listwise)		45							

As Table 4 indicates, the two groups' scores in different sections of IETLS were slightly different from one another. To see if these variances were significant, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was run. As the skewness ratios for all distributions fell within the legitimate range of ±1.96, acknowledging the normality, the first assumption for running this parametric test was met. There were a few other assumptions that had to be checked before running the test. In what follows, the results of assumption checking are reported. The next assumption was multivariate normality. This assumption was checked by creating a regression model and computing the Mahalanobis distance. Table 5 demonstrates the results.

Table 5
Residual Statistics: Multivariate Normality for the IELTS Pretest Scores

	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	N
Predicted Value	25.8179	59.7022	45.5000	8.99393	90
Std. Predicted Value	-2.188	1.579	.000	1.000	90
Standard Error of Predicted Value	2.876	9.411	5.735	1.458	90
Adjusted Predicted Value	23.8199	64.3901	45.4055	9.25687	90
Residual	-43.70216	45.65471	.00000	24.52772	90
Std. Residual	-1.741	1.819	.000	.977	90
Stud. Residual	-1.832	1.945	.002	1.006	90
Deleted Residual	-48.39014	52.18007	.09453	25.99945	90
Stud. Deleted Residual	-1.859	1.978	.003	1.011	90
Mahal. Distance	.180	11.523	3.956	2.547	90
Cook's Distance	.000	.108	.012	.017	90
Centered Leverage Value	.002	.129	.044	.029	90

As reported in Table 5, the maximum Mahalanobis (Mahal.) The distance value was 11.523. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), when there are four variables (four sections of IELTS) in the model, the critical value for Mahal. Distance is 18.47. Having all the assumptions in place, running MANOVA was legitimized. Table 6 presents the results of Multivariate Tests.

Table 6

Multivariate Tests: The Difference in IELTS Pretest Scores

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.997	6860.142[b]	4.000	85.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.003	6860.142[b]	4.000	85.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	322.830	6860.142[b]	4.000	85.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	322.830	6860.142[b]	4.000	85.000	.000
Group	Pillai's Trace	.048	1.062[b]	4.000	85.000	.380
	Wilks' Lambda	.952	1.062[b]	4.000	85.000	.380
	Hotelling's Trace	.050	1.062[b]	4.000	85.000	.380
	Roy's Largest Root	.050	1.062[b]	4.000	85.000	.380

a. Design: Intercept + Group

b. Exact statistic

The results reported in Table 6 (Wilk's Lambda = .50, F = 1.062, p = .38) indicate that the two groups' scores in four sections of the IELTS pretest were not significantly different from one another. Therefore, the two groups could be considered homogenous in terms of language proficiency at the outset. After the treatment was over, another Mock IELTS was given to the learners of both groups whose results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics of IELTS Posttest Scores by Two Groups

							Skewness		
Group		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Statistic	Std. Error	Ratio
Experimental	Listening	45	5.50	7.00	6.4111	.41682	-.141	.354	-0.398
	Reading	45	5.50	7.00	6.3333	.38435	-.279	.354	-0.788
	Writing	45	5.00	7.00	5.8667	.44467	.564	.354	1.593
	Speaking	45	5.00	6.50	5.6444	.37873	.440	.354	1.2429
Control	Listening	45	5.00	7.00	6.0556	.50252	-.231	.354	-0.653
	Reading	45	5.00	7.00	6.1111	.55277	-.041	.354	-0.116
	Writing	45	5.00	6.50	5.6778	.50176	.205	.354	0.579
	Speaking	45	5.00	6.50	5.5333	.49313	.457	.354	1.291
Valid N (listwise)		45							

As reported in Table 7, the mean scores of the participants in the experimental group were higher than those in the control group. The inspection of the skewness ratio values suggested the normality of distributions for all sets of data as the values fell within the legitimate range of ±1.96 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Answering the research question required running a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on learners' IELTS post-test scores. As reported earlier, there was no significant difference in their language performance at the outset. Therefore, any possible significant difference at the post-test stage can be attributed to the role of the treatment.

Before running the test, some assumptions had to be checked. All assumptions were met but the results of Box's test (F = 3.18, p = .000) indicated that the covariance matrices for both groups were expressively diverse from one another. Therefore, this assumption was *violated*. The final assumption was equality of error variances (Table 8).

Table 8

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances: IELTS Posttest Scores

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Listening	Based on Median	.691	1	88	.408
Reading	Based on Median	11.731	1	88	.001
Writing	Based on Median	.117	1	88	.733
Speaking	Based on Median	3.244	1	88	.075

The results of Levene's test showed that the error variances between the two groups were not meaningfully diverse (p > 0.5) for listening,

writing, and speaking post-test scores while a significant difference in the variance was found between the two groups reading post-test scores. As a result, this assumption was partially met. As the results of assumption checking showed that the assumptions of equality of covariance matrices and equality of error variances were violated, the researcher decided to opt for using a more conservative post hoc test, i.e., Sidak (see Table 11, below) to compare the results of the two groups. Table 9 presents the outcomes of Multivariate Tests.

Table 9

Multivariate Tests: The Difference in IELTS Posttest Scores

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.997	7299.987[b]	4.000	85.000	.000	.997
	Wilks' Lambda	.003	7299.987[b]	4.000	85.000	.000	.997
	Hotelling's Trace	343.529	7299.987[b]	4.000	85.000	.000	.997
	Roy's Largest Root	343.529	7299.987[b]	4.000	85.000	.000	.997
Group	Pillai's Trace	.135	3.322[b]	4.000	85.000	.014	.135
	Wilks' Lambda	.865	3.322[b]	4.000	85.000	.014	.135
	Hotelling's Trace	.156	3.322[b]	4.000	85.000	.014	.135
	Roy's Largest Root	.156	3.322[b]	4.000	85.000	.014	.135

a. Design: Intercept + Group

b. Exact statistic

The results reported in Table 9 (Wilk's Lambda = .865, F = 3.32, p = .014 < 0.05) indicate that the two groups' scores in four sections of the IELTS posttest were significantly different from one another. To locate the place of the difference(s), the results for between-subjects effects were checked out (Table 9). As reported, the differences between the two groups were significant for listening (F = 13.34, p = .000 < .05, partial eta square = .132, signifying a large effect size) and reading (F = 4.90, p = .029 < .05, partial eta square = .053, demonstrating a medium effect size).

Table 10

MANOVA: Tests of Between Subjects on IELTS Posttest Scores

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	Listening	2.844	1	2.844	13.346	.000	.132
	Reading	1.111	1	1.111	4.903	.029	.053
	Writing	.803	1	.803	3.572	.062	.039
	Speaking	.278	1	.278	1.437	.234	.016
Intercept	Listening	3496.900	1	3496.900	16407.256	.000	.995
	Reading	3484.444	1	3484.444	15374.262	.000	.994
	Writing	2998.669	1	2998.669	13342.394	.000	.993
	Speaking	2811.211	1	2811.211	14542.647	.000	.994
Group	Listening	2.844	1	2.844	13.346	.000	.132
	Reading	1.111	1	1.111	4.903	.029	.053
	Writing	.803	1	.803	3.572	.062	.039
	Speaking	.278	1	.278	1.437	.234	.016
Error	Listening	18.756	88	.213			
	Reading	19.944	88	.227			
	Writing	19.778	88	.225			
	Speaking	17.011	88	.193			
Total	Listening	3518.500	90				
	Reading	3505.500	90				
	Writing	3019.250	90				
	Speaking	2828.500	90				

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Total	Listening	21.600	89				
	Reading	21.056	89				
	Writing	20.581	89				
	Speaking	17.289	89				

Finally, to compensate for the violations of the assumptions, a pairwise comparison based on Sidak post hoc was run (Table 11).

Table 11

MANOVA: Sidak Post Hoc on IELTS Posttest Scores

Dependent Variable	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Listening	Experimental	Control	.356	.097	.000	.162	.549
	Control	Experimental	-.356	.097	.000	-.549	-.162
Reading	Experimental	Control	.222	.100	.029	.023	.422
	Control	Experimental	-.222	.100	.029	-.422	-.023
Writing	Experimental	Control	.189	.100	.062	-.010	.388
	Control	Experimental	-.189	.100	.062	-.388	.010
Speaking	Experimental	Control	.111	.093	.234	-.073	.295
	Control	Experimental	-.111	.093	.234	-.295	.073

The upshots reported in Table 11 acknowledged the former results obtained from tests of between subjects' effect showing significant difference between the experimental and control groups' listening and reading scores after the treatment, with the experimental group significantly outperforming the control one. Therefore, it can be concluded that the treatment was effective and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Discussion

The result of the study indicated that teachers' efficacy had a significant effect on IELTS learners' achievement. Educators who possess a robust belief in their efficacy are more receptive to fresh concepts and are more inclined to trial novel techniques while simultaneously presenting pupils with innovative and diverse educational prospects (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Correspondingly, the self-efficacy of instructors is closely associated with elevated levels of academic achievement among students and directly impacts their teaching styles, zeal, dedication, and methods that cater to both the cognitive and emotional aspects of learning (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). In addition, the result is in line with prior studies (Penrose, Perry, & Ball,2007; Wossenie, 2014; Zee & Koomen, 2016) which proved that the efficacy of educators impacts the achievement of the students, teachers, and the psychological development of pupils, and is associated with the well-being of the teachers, ambiance in the educational setting and the self-efficacy of learners.

The result of this research is consistent with previous studies (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012; Saeidi & Kalantarypour, 2011), indicating that educators who possess robust efficacy exhibit elevated levels of preparation and arrangement, willingly embrace novel concepts, and are inclined to experiment with innovative approaches to effectively cater to their students' requirements. Such educators also manifest more passion for teaching, demonstrate greater involvement in their profession, and are highly likely to have a constructive effect on learners' educational achievement (Wolters & Daugherty, 2007). The efficacy of a teacher can impact a student's success through various means: educators who possess strong self-efficacy are more inclined to introduce innovative teaching techniques, utilize effective classroom management strategies and teaching methodologies, promote student

autonomy, take charge of students with unique learning requirements, handle classroom issues and ensure students remain focused, in comparison with those with a weak sense of efficacy (Chacon, 2005; Choi & Lee, 2016).

Educators who retain a high sense of self-efficacy tend to offer chances for student interaction through diverse approaches that cater to the requirements of every student, including individual work, pair work, and group work. Studies have additionally confirmed that teachers who have a high degree of efficacy are inclined towards segregating the students into smaller clusters instead of instructing the entire class, thus providing the chance for more personalized instruction (Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the research, teacher efficacy has been established as a significant factor that is linked to academic outcomes, particularly in terms of achievement of the learners. It can be concluded that a teacher with a high sense of efficacy and expertise is deemed to have high levels of efficacy. Such an educator is accountable for the academic progress of their students and perceives any setbacks encountered by the learners as an opportunity to strive harder towards improving their performance. These instructors devote additional time to supervising and collaborating with students and providing opportunities for enhancing learners' participation. Effective instructors are more likely to not only teach the curriculum but also utilize instructional methods that enhance students' learning (Sharma & George, 2016). They take more risks and hold higher anticipations for themselves and their pupils, leading to increased academic advantages for students. Instructors lacking in efficacy have been shown to exhibit a weaker commitment to teaching, allocate less time to topics in which they perceive inefficacy, and allocate less time to academic affairs (Xue, 2022).

Furthermore, teachers who have a high level of efficacy tend to display a greater degree of organization and control. Additionally, they are more open-minded to novel ideas and are willing to experiment with new methods and approaches to cater to the needs of their students more effectively. Efficacy impacts the perseverance of teachers during challenging times and enhances their resilience in the face of difficulties and problems (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). The result of this study holds significance for educators, English language instructors, and governing bodies who oversee the professional growth of EFL teachers. It is important that both practicing EFL instructors at different levels and those enrolled in EFL teacher training programs become acquainted with the concept of efficacy and its impact on the academic success of IELTS students. Educational professionals, teacher trainers, and language policymakers ought to recognize the value of teachers' constructive role, including their self-efficacy in delivering impactful instruction that ultimately leads to students' achievements.

Moreover, Supervisors and instructors who train educators should promote the use of self-efficacy approaches to overcome the various challenges associated with their profession. To achieve this, it is recommended that workshops be organized where educators can collaborate positively, as this has been shown to be an effective means of enhancing their efficacy and ultimately leading to the success of their students. Educator preparation courses aid both pre-service and in-service educators in recognizing effective educator characteristics such as efficacy, intending to produce competent educators who can ultimately enhance the achievement of their students. Therefore, by enhancing teachers' self-efficacy, educational institutions can ensure the success of their students. Educational administrators, in collaboration with various education officials, have the potential to assume significant roles in fostering effective educators through the provision of explicit chances for triumph, positive examples from accomplished colleagues, introspective teaching, and verbal motivation. This is due to the fact that the beliefs of teachers concerning their own efficacy have a profound effect on the broader context of teaching and learning, as well as the academic achievement of English language learners.

References

Ahmed, Z., & Julius, S. H. (2015). Academic performance, resilience, depression, anxiety and

stress among women college students. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, *6*(4), 367-370.

Akbari, R., & Allvar, N.K. (2010). L2 teacher characteristics as predictors of students' academic achievement. *English as a Second Language,13*(4), 1-22.

Bandura, A. (2010). Self-efficacy. In. B. Weiner, & W. E. Craighead (Eds.), *The crostini encyclopedia of psychology* (pp.1534-1536). New York,NY: Wiley. doi:10, 97804704 792 16.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(6), 473-490. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001.

Chacon, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teacher in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(3), 257-272. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.001.

Choi, E., & Lee, J. (2016). Investigating the relationship of target language proficiency and self-efficacy among non-native EFL teachers. *System, 58*(2), 49-63. doi:10.1016/j. system.2016.02.010.

Clark, D. A. (2002). *Visions of development: A study of human values*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Engels, M. C., Spilt, J., Denies, K., & Verschueren, K. (2021). The role of affective teacher-student relationships in adolescents' school engagement and achievement trajectories. *Learning and Instruction*, *75*(2), 101485. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc. 2021.101485

Fathi, J., Derakhshan, A., & Saharkhiz Arabani, A. (2020). Investigating a structural model of self-efficacy, collective efficacy, and psychological well-being among Iranian EFL teachers. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, 12*(1), 61-80. doi: 10. 22111/ IJALS.2020. 5725.

Fathi, J., Derakhshan, A., & Saharkhiz Arabani, A. (2020). Investigating a structural model of self-efficacy, collective efficacy, and psychological well-being among Iranian EFL teachers. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, 12*(1), 61-80. doi: 10. 22111/ IJALS.2020.5725.

Gajda, A., Karwowski, M., & Beghetto, R. A. (2017). Creativity and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 109*(2), 1-32. .doi.org/10.1037/edu0000 133.

Han, J., Yin, H., Wang, J., & Bai, Y. (2020). Challenge job demands and job resources to university teacher well-being: the mediation of teacher efficacy. *Studies in Higher Education*, *45*(8), 1771-1785. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2019.1594180

Hwang, M. H., Lim, H. J., & Ha, H. S. (2017). Effects of grit on the academic success of adult female students at Korean open university. *Psychological Reports, 121(4), 705-725.* doi:10.1177/0033294117734834.

Kahu, E. R., & Nelson, K. (2018). Student engagement in the educational interface: Understanding the mechanisms of student success. *Higher Education Research & Development, 37*(1), 58-71.doi:10.1080/07294360.2017.1344197.

Kanfer, R., Wolf, M. B., Kantrowitz, T. M., & Ackerman, P. L. (2010). Ability and trait complex predictors of academic and job performance: A person-situation approach. *Applied psychology, 59*(1), 40-69. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00415.x.

Kheirzadeh, S., & Sistani, N. (2018). The effect of reflective teaching on Iranian EFL students' achievement: The case of teaching experience and level of education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(2), 143-156. doi:10.14221/ajte.2018v43n2.8.

Kim, K. R., & Seo, E. H. (2018). The relationship between teacher efficacy and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Social Behavior and Personality, 46*(4), 529-540. doi:10.2224/sbp.6554.

Klusmann, U., Richter, D., & Ludtke, O. (2016). Teachers' emotional exhaustion is negatively related to students' achievement: Evidence from a large-scale assessment study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 108*(8), 1193-1203. doi:10.1037/edu0000125.

Kola, A. J., & Sunday, O. S. (2015). A review of teachers' qualifications and its implication on students' academic achievement in Nigerian schools. *International Journal of Educational Research and Information Science, 2*(2), 10-15.

Lackney, J.A.(2000). Thirty-three educational design principles for schools & community learning centers. *ERIC Clearinghouse, 1*(2), 1-33.

Lamb, S., & McKenzie, P. (2001). *Patterns of success and failure in the transition from school to work in Australia*. Research Report.

Liu, H. Y., Tsai, H. M., Wang, I. T., & Chen, N. H. (2020). Predictors of self-perceived levels of creative teaching behaviors among nursing school faculty in Taiwan: A preliminary study. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, *36*(3), 171-176. doi:10.1016/j.profnurs.2019.09.004

Lu, Q., & Mustafa, Z. (2021). Toward the impact of EFL teachers' self-efficacy and collective efficacy on students' engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*(2),1-10. doi:10.3389/ fpsyg.2021.744586.

Mojavezi, A., & Tamiz, M. P. (2012). The impact of teacher self-efficacy on students' motivation and achievement. *Theory & Practice in Language*

Studies, 2(3),483-491. doi:10.4304/tpls.2.3.483-491.

Paat, F. M. G., Tamayao, A. I., Vecaldo, R. T., Mamba, M. T., Asuncion, J. E. L., & Pagulayan, E. S. (2020). Does being gritty mean being college-ready? Investigating the link between grit and college readiness among Filipino K-12 graduates. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 19*(9), 160-174. doi:10.26803/ ijlter.19.9.9.

Pather, S. (2011). Evidence on inclusion and support for learners with disabilities in mainstream schools in South Africa: off the policy radar? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 15*(10), 1103-1117.

Penrose, A., Perry, C., & Ball, I. (2007). Emotional intelligence and teacher self-efficacy: the contribution of teacher status and length of experience. *Issues in Educational Research, 17*(1), 107-126.

Prilleltensky, I., Neff, M., & Bessell, A. (2016). Teacher stress: What it is, why it's important, how it can be alleviated. *Theory into Practice, 55*(2), 104-111.doi:10.1080/00405 841.2016.1148986.

Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2013). *Organizational behavior* (15th ed.). Pearson Education Inc. Nobel Academic Publishing.

Saeidi, M., & Kalantarypour, M. (2011). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' self-efficacy and students' language achievement. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 15*(11), 1562-156

Shahzad, K., & Naureen, S. (2017). Impact of teacher self-efficacy on secondary school students' academic achievement. *Journal of Education and Educational Development, 4*(1), 48-72.

Sharma, U., & George, S. (2016). Understanding teacher self-efficacy to teach in inclusive classrooms. In S. Garvin, & D. Pendergast (Eds.), *Asia-pacific perspectives on teacher self-efficacy* (pp. 37-51). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Simarasl, N., Fayazi, M., & Gholipour, A. (2010). Explanation of the consequences of positive organizational behavior among Iranian librarians. *Fashnameye Oil Moderate Iran, 5*(17), 23-45.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivated for teaching? Associations with school goal structure, teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*(2), 152-160. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.006.

Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed). Boston: Pearson Education.

Templer, B. (2004). High-stakes testing at high fees: Notes and queries on the international English proficiency assessment market. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 2*(1), 1-8.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(6), 944-956. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, AW. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2006). Sources of academic and self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of entering middle school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 31*(2), 125-141. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2005.03.002.

Usher, E. L., Li, C. R., Butz, A. R., & Rojas, J. P. (2019). Perseverant grit and self-efficacy: Are both essential for children's academic success?. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 111*(5), 877-902. doi: 10.1037/edu0000324.

Wolters, C. A., & Daugherty, S. G. (2007). Goal structures and teachers' sense of efficacy: Their relation and association to teaching experience and academic level. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(1), 181-193. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.1.181.

Wossenie, G. (2014). EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, pedagogical success, and students' English achievement: A study on public preparatory schools in Bahir Dar Town, Ethiopia. *Science, Technology, and Arts Research Journal, 3*(2), 221-228

Xue, Y. (2022). The Role of EFL Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Emotional Resilience in Appraisal of Learners' Success. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12(2)*, 1-10.

Zarei, A. A., & Naghdi, F. (2017). Sources of self-efficacy as predictors of EFL learners' course performance. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 6*(1), 56-68.

Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: *A synthesis of 40 years of research. Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 981-1015. doi:10.3102/0034654315 6 6801.