The Relationship among University Lecturers' Institutional identity, Professional Identity, and Teaching Efficacy

Dlnia Esmaili [1], Adel Dastgoshadeh [2*]

1,2. Department of English, Sanandaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran
*Corresponding author: adastgoshadeh@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among Iranian EFL university lecturers' professional and institutional identity, and their teaching efficacy. To this end, 100 EFL university lecturers from different branches of Islamic Azad Universities, including Kermanshah, Isfahan and Hamedan, took part in the study by completing the Professional Identity Questionnaire, the Institutional Identity Questionnaire, and the Teachers' Efficacy Scale. The sampling strategy for selection of the participants of this study was convenience sampling. To answer the research questions, Pearson product-moment correlation and Multiple-regression analyses were run. The results showed that there exists a statistically significant positive relationship between EFL university lecturers' a) professional identity and teaching efficacy, and b) institutional identity and teaching efficacy.

Introduction

Teachers play a significant role in today's schooling processes. As pointed out by Murphy, Delli, and Edwards (2004), lecturers are entrusted with the accountability to educate and teach the future leaders and are crucial to learners' achievements. Teachers provide various opportunities for their students to discover their own talents and alter them into abilities and skills on the path to self-actualization (Murphy, Delli, & Edwards, 2004).

Moreover, the post-method period in language learning and teaching is mainly characterized by a shift from static methodological packs for language teaching toward a concern with lecturers' professional knowledge, growth, understanding, experience, students' needs, the milieu of teaching, and the administrative situations of the milieu in which instruction takes place (Richards, 2002). Many factors might affect the teaching performance of teachers and lecturers, two specifically important of which are identity and efficacy. A typical definition of instructor efficacy is "the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance" (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977, p. 137).

There are also various recent definitions, with regard to the concept of instructors' efficacy. For instance, instructor efficacy is defined as "the teacher's belief in his or her capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplishing a specific teaching task in a particular context" (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy & Hoy, 1998, p. 22). Moreover, Guskey and Passaro (1994), define instructor efficacy as "teachers' belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated" (p. 4). Several research studies showed that students' motivation, the learners' own levels of efficacy and their academic achievement are positively associated with the teachers' and instructors' sense of efficacy (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Guskey, 1988; Moradkhani, 2009; Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). According to Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, and Hoy (1998), teaching efficacy includes three components: efficacy for student engagement, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for classroom management.

Furthermore, conducting research study is regarded as an essential activity in universities. Having adequate research efficacy significantly assists university instructors in order to critically examine various issues, generate and

investigate different ideas, hypotheses and theories, and also to create and analyze the obtained data. Furthermore, Nordin and Mohammad (2013) define instructors research efficacy as the degree to which instructors have confidence in their capability of conducting different research steps including formulating research hypothesis, gathering data and accomplishing an analysis efficaciously. According to Talafhah (2012), teachers' research self-efficacy and confidence are most important constituents in determining whether teachers' research is a failure or a success. With the purpose of achieving a high level of research efficacy, it is essential for the university instructors to have a high level of research abilities.

Generally speaking, identity is regarded as the type of individuals people are basically perceived in a particular milieu or perceive themselves. Moreover, according to Gohier, Chevrier, and Anadon (2007), identity also is regarded as a self-constructed progression which is typically modified by a large number of issues. Similarly, language teacher identities attempts to mainly capture lecturers' definition of themselves with regard to their own careers (Morita, 2004). Concerning the effects of language teacher's identity on various educational features and issues, such as lecturer's commitment and promise (Day & Gu, 2007), analyses of lecturer identity bring about better considerations of educational and instructional practice and theories.

As pointed out by Hao (2011), the concept of lecturer identity has mainly aroused interest among investigators since the 1990s and has appeared as a distinct research area in the last two decades. Moreover, Akkerman and Meijer (2011) define lecturer identity as a constant process of exchanging and interdepending various "I positions in such a way that a more or less coherent and consistent sense of self is maintained throughout various participations and self-investments in one's (working) life" (p. 315).

Besides, as pointed out by Beijaard, Meijer, and Verloop (2004), the concept of identity denotes various meanings, leaving addressees with imprecise and distant notions with regard to this growing issue in education. Furthermore, according to Beijaard, Meijer, and Verloop (2004), the formation of lecturer identity is typically (a) constant, (b) comprises of both individual and setting, (c) involves sub-identities which is essential to be harmonious, and finally (d) necessitates a level of agency by lecturers. Lecturer identity,

likewise, attempts to capture lecturers' definition of themselves with regard to their careers (Morita, 2004).

Additionally, Brown (2006) believes that lecturer identity arises best as a growing transformation. That is to say that the lecturer self surfaces as pre-service lecturers gain notional and practical expertise and knowledge, bringing about progressively greater potential sense of agency and efficacy beliefs in order to make lecturer decisions and choices.

As stated earlier, identity is an outcome of rehearsal, thinking on that rehearsal, and constant professional development (Epstein, 1978). According to Wenger (1998, p. 149), identity in particular has five main dimensions which are discussed in turn briefly.

The first dimension of identity is 'identity as negotiated experiences'. Concerning the first dimension of identity we basically define who we really are by the methods that we generally experience ourselves over along with the way in which we and others typically reify ourselves (Wenger, 1998). The second dimension of identity is 'identity as community membership' wherein we describe who we really are by the acquainted and the unacquainted (Wenger, 1998). The third dimension of identity ,according to Wenger (1998), is 'identity as learning trajectory' in which we basically outline who we actually are by locating where exactly we have been as well as where we are actually going.

The fourth dimension of identity, as stated by Wenger (1998), is 'identity as nexus of multi membership'. Concerning this dimension of identity, we mainly describe who we actually are by the methods we actually reconcile our different sorts of identity into one unique identity. Finally, the fifth dimension of identity is 'identity as a relation between the global and the local'. In the fifth dimension of identity, we basically delineate who we actually are by transferring local methods of belonging to wide-ranging groups and establishing comprehensive discourses and styles (Wenger, 1998, p. 149).

In sum, the concept of identity has mainly recognized as a notion that particularly reflects the insights of people which is mainly relative to their own social settings. Moreover, from the above stated definitions, it can be concluded that the concept of identity is mainly considered by negotiating meaning as a person within particular social milieus and elucidations of associations with other people in particular social groups.

The effect of efficacy beliefs and identity on teacher development has been emphasized by many researchers and scholars in these fields (e.g., Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Freese, 2006; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). On the one hand, the success in teacher education depends on how academicians perceive themselves and their practice and what efficacy beliefs they hold about themselves, which affect the quality of the education delivery (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). However, generally speaking, instructors' efficacy in general and their research and teaching efficacy in specific have not been much concentrated on in the realm of teaching and instructors' education including Iranian context. Just a few research studies (e.g., Ghanizadeh & Moafian, 2009; Ghasemboland & Hashim, 2013) have mainly focused on instructors' efficacy. On the other hand, the literature on language teaching emphasizes the important role of identity in teacher development (e.g., Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Freese, 2006; Hoban, 2007; Olsen, 2008). However, even a brief examination of the literature in this regard shows if one is to appreciate the importance of identity in teacher development, there is much to understand.

Furthermore, the recent literature argues that identity needs more attention on the part of scholars and researchers due to several reasons. It can be used as an analytic frame through which it is possible to examine different aspects of teaching, for example, the ways in which students integrate a range of influences, and the necessary confronting of tensions and contradictions in their careers (Olsen, 2008). As MacLure (1993) states, it can be viewed as an consolidating constituent in teachers' professional lives, even a "resource that people use to explain, justify and make sense of themselves in relation to others, and to the world at large" (p. 311).

Ghafar Samar, Kiany, Akbari, and Azimi (2011) conducted a study in order to comprehend the possibility of a direct association between institutional identity and teacher's efficacy of EFL lecturers. To this end, 37 EFL lecturers participated in the study by completing efficacy scale.

Having collected the data, the top five EFL lecturers in the efficacy list were frequently observed throughout an academic semester and conversed with in order to pinpoint their institutional identities. In the meantime, a parallel procedure was done regarding the last five EFL lecturers in the efficacy list.

The results of observation notes and qualitative analyses showed that the two groups were different with respect to their institutional identities. It was revealed that there existed a statistically significant association between the EFL lecturers' teaching efficacy and their institutional identity.

Moreover, Wang (2014) in an empirical study investigated the professional identity of senior high school English lecturers in China. To this end, 108 lecturers from five senior high schools took part in the study. The study mainly aimed at scrutinizing obstacles and difficulties of the professional development of senior high school English lecturers. The results of the qualitative and quantitative analyses revealed that the general level of professional identity of English lecturers in China was average. Additionally, the findings of the study regarding the obstacles and difficulties in the process of professional development English lecturers encounter in China demonstrated primarily in the subsequent three features: (1) Heavy instruction burden bring about robust pressure on the lecturers; (2) the lack of investigation ability has a negative impact on the English lecturers' professional development; and (3), the unproductive working situations, social welfares and low salary level.

Moreover, Ahmadi, Abd Samad, and Noordin (2013) conducted a study in order to investigate the discourse socialization of EFL lecturers in a TEFL program in the context of Iran mainly using practices of oral discourse. They examined how the professional identity of EFL lecturers is influenced by the process of socialization, their circumstantial aspects and preceding histories. Ahmadi, et al. argued that dialogical interactions were expected to give rise to reexamination of their past professional identity.

However, as stated by Beijjard, Meijer, and Verloop (2004), the concept of identity and its subsections have not been investigated sufficiently in the field of instructor education and teaching and therefore, called for a further specific investigation to be conducted on instructors' identity in general and their professional and institutional identity in particular. Due to the fact that instructors' identity and efficacy are context-specific in nature (Bandura, 1995; Brown, 2006), and pertaining to the dearth of investigation in these important areas in the context of Iran, the researcher was adequately motivated to conduct the present study in order to fill the research gap felt.

Therefore, this study, attempts to identify the possible association between Iranian EFL university instructors' a) professional identity, and teaching

efficacy, and b) institutional identity and teaching efficacy in different branches of Islamic Azad University in Isfahan, Kermanshah and Hamadan provinces. Furthermore, this study tried to identify which identity type was regarded as a better predictor of university instructors' teaching.

Given this background, the present research attempts to explore the relationship between Iranian EFL university lecturers' professional and institutional identity, to their teaching efficacy. The questions posed in the present research were as follows:

1) Is there any significant relationship between EFL university lecturers' professional identity and their teaching efficacy?
2) Is there any significant relationship between EFL university lecturers' institutional identity and their teaching efficacy?

Method

Participants

The participants of this study were 100 (67 male and 33 female) EFL university lecturers within the age range of 30-50 and with 5 to 25 years of teaching experiences from Islamic Azad University in Kermanshah, Hamadan and Isfahan provinces.

Instrumentation

In the present study, the participants were requested to answer the following questionnaires:

Professional Identity Questionnaire. In order to assess the EFL university lecturers' professional identity, the Professional Identity Questionnaire developed by Liou (2008) was administered (Appendix A). This instrument has two main sections. Section A comprises of eight 5-point Likert scaled items which focus on English lecturers' professional identity, their perceptions of the social status of their careers, their evaluation and commitment to their profession, and their perceptions of their students' attitudes towards their instruction. Hence, the respondents had to answer the questions by specifying the degree of their agreement or disagreement with the items of the questionnaire on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (= strongly disagree) to 5 (=strongly agree). It took about 10 minutes to complete this instrument. The

reliability and validity of this instrument were strongly confirmed by Liou (2008). According to Lian (2013), running the Cronbach Alpha analysis, the reliability of this instrument was found to be $\alpha = 0.78$, which indicated that this instrument enjoys sufficient internal consistency.

Section B has 18 items about respondents' attitude towards language proficiency of different users in different contexts, in the aspects of grammar and pronunciation (items 1-8), their preference in their teaching content (items 9-14), and whether the purpose of learning English is to achieve intelligibility in communication or to achieve language proficiency and accuracy (items 15-18). In conducting the present study, only Section A was employed as it deals with the professional identity of EFL instructors.

Institutional Identity Questionnaire. In order to evaluate the EFL university lecturers' institutional identity, the Institutional Identity Questionnaire primarily developed by Azimi (2012) was administered (Appendix B). This instrument comprises of 34 five-point Likert scale items. Conducting a pilot study, Azimi (2012) reported that this instrument enjoyed a high validity and reliability rate and it confirmed its appropriateness for being used in the context of Iran. It is worth mentioning that the Farsi version of this questionnaire was used in this study as it was recognized by the supervisor to be a better instrument in order to achieve the goals of this project.

The items of the instrument were in Persian and in likert scale format. That is, the participants had to answer the questions by indicating the degree of their agreement or disagreement with the items of the questionnaire on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (= strongly disagree) to 5 (=strongly agree). It took approximately 20 minutes to complete this instrument.

Teachers' Efficacy Scale. In order to measure the participants' teaching efficacy, the Teachers' Efficacy Scale primarily developed by Tschannen-Moran, Hoy and Hoy (1998) was administered (Appendix C). This instrument comprises to two versions, namely, a long form which includes 24 items, and a short form that includes 12 items. It is worth noting that in the present study the long form was used because it seems to be more sophisticated and relevant to this area. The items of this instrument were in a nine-point Likert-scale format, therefore, the respondents had to answer the questions by indicating the degree

of their agreement or disagreement with the items of the questionnaire on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (= nothing) to 9 (=a great deal). It took approximately 20 minutes to complete this instrument.

Procedure

This study was conducted at three branches of Islamic Azad University in Isfahan, Kermanshah and Hamedan provinces. The researcher travelled to the mentioned cities, arranged meetings at the located classes and then in a session asked the EFL university lecturers to identify whether they agreed to participate in this research study. Being certain of their inclination to participate, the researcher in an introductory briefing gave details on the purpose of the study and also the instructions on how to answer the instruments of the study.

Moreover, the researcher assured the participant of the study that their information and responses would be kept confidential. It is worth mentioning that the scope of this study included only those EFL university lecturers with at least five years of teaching experience and 30 years of age into account. Hence, before distributing any research instruments, at the start of the meeting, the researcher asked about their age and teaching experience.

Before administering any questionnaire, the instruments of the study were expert-viewed and their suitability for being used in the context of the present study was confirmed. Afterwards, all the instruments of the study, namely, the Professional Identity Questionnaire, the Institutional Identity Questionnaire, and the Teachers' Efficacy Scale, were administered at a single session. However, since answering all of the research instruments at universities were not feasible for most of the EFL University lecturers, the participants were allowed to take them home and within a time limit of three days send them back to the researcher. It is worth noting that the data collection procedure took about one month. Having collected the required data, SPSS software was used for statistical analyses.

Results

Being a fundamental assumption in parametric testing, the normality of the data is a precondition for numerous statistical procedures. Below are the results

of normality tests of Professional Identity, Institutional Identity and Teaching Efficacy.

Normality of Professional Identity

To determine whether the *professional identity* scores were normally distributed, a one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run the result of which is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Professional Identity

		Professional Identity
N		100
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	29.510
	Std. Deviation	4.527
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.119
	Positive	.105
	Negative	-.119
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.194
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.116

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

As it can be seen in Table 1, the results of One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test showed that the scores related to *professional identity* were normally distributed (K-S $Z = 1.194$ and $p > 0.05$).

Normality of Institutional Identity

In order to identify whether the *institutional identity* scores were normally distributed, another One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was run, the result of which is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Institutional Identity

		Institutional Identity
N		100
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	141.060
	Std. Deviation	16.949
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.122
	Positive	.083
	Negative	-.122
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.219
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.102

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

As is evident from Table 2, the results of One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test revealed that the *institutional identity* scores were normally distributed (K-S $Z = 1.219$ and $p > 0.05$).

Normality of Teaching Efficacy

With the purpose of determining whether the *teaching efficacy* scores were normally distributed, a One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was run, the result of which is summerized in Table 3.

Table 3
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Teaching Efficacy

		Teaching Efficacy
N		100
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	81.490
	Std. Deviation	15.154
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.116
	Positive	.116
	Negative	-.112
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.158
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.137

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

As can be seen in Table 3, the results of One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test exhibited that the *teaching efficacy* scores were normally distributed (K-S $Z = 1.158$ and $p > 0.05$).

Addressing the First Research Question

The first research question addressed whether there was any significant relationship between EFL university lecturers' professional identity and their

teaching efficacy. In order to test the first hypothesis, a Pearson correlation coefficient was run. Table 4 displays the results of the descriptive statistics for EFL university lecturers' professional identity and their teaching efficacy.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for EFL University Lecturers' Professional Identity and Teaching Efficacy

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Professional Identity	29.51	4.52	100
Teaching Efficacy	81.49	15.15	100

As is evident from Table 4, the mean and standard deviation of Iranian EFL lecturers' professional identity are 29.51 and 4.52, respectively; whereas, the mean and standard deviation of their teaching efficacy are 81.49 and 15.15, respectively.

Moreover, Table 5 shows the result of Pearson correlation coefficient between EFL university lecturers' professional identity and teaching efficacy.

Table 5
The Relationship Between EFL University Lecturers' Professional Identity and Teaching Efficacy

		Teaching Efficacy
Professional Identity	Pearson Correlation	.350[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	100

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

As is evident from Table 5, there is a statistically significant positive correlation between EFL university lecturers' professional identity and teaching efficacy, r = 0.350, p<0.05. Thus, the first null hypothesis which states that "there is no significant relationship between EFL university lecturers' professional identities and their teaching efficacy", was rejected.

Addressing the Second Research Question

The second research question whether there was any significant relationship between EFL university lecturers' institutional identity and their teaching efficacy. In order to test the second research hypothesis, a Pearson correlation coefficient was run. The related descriptive statistics are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for EFL University Lecturers' Institutional Identity and Teaching Efficacy

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Institutional Identity	141.06	16.94	100
Teaching Efficacy	81.49	15.15	100

As indicated in Table 6, the mean and standard deviation of Iranian EFL lecturers' institutional identity are 141.06 and 16.94, respectively; whereas, the mean and standard deviation of their teaching efficacy are 81.49 and 15.15, respectively.

Furthermore, Table 7 displays the result of Pearson correlation analysis which investigated the relationship between EFL university lecturers' institutional identity and their teaching efficacy.

Table 7

The Relationship Between EFL University Lecturers' Institutional Identity and Teaching Efficacy

		Teaching Efficacy
Institutional Identity	Pearson Correlation	.245[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014
	N	100

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

As indicated in Table 7, there is a statistically significant positive association between EFL university lecturers' institutional identity and teaching efficacy, r = 0.245, p<0.05. Therefore, the second null hypothesis which states that "there is no significant relationship between EFL university lecturers' institutional identity and their teaching efficacy", was rejected.

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to scrutinize the possible associations among Iranian EFL university lecturers' institutional identity, professional identity, and teaching efficacy. In what follows, a laconic discussion is provided for the obtained outcomes for each research question by using research questions as a framework. Then, the findings of each research question are compared with those found in the previous research studies. The first

research question asked whether there was any statistically significant association between Iranian EFL university lecturers' professional identity and their teaching efficacy. The results of a Pearson correlation showed that there was a statistically significant positive correlation between Iranian EFL university lecturers' professional identity and their teaching efficacy. That is, as the findings showed the higher the level of the university lecturers' professional identity, the higher their teaching efficacy.

Therefore, not paying enough attention to EFL university lecturers' professional identity in foreign language contexts, in turn, may lead to EFL university lecturers' ineffectiveness in teaching which is essential for performing well in various circumstances. Based on the findings of this study it can be assumed that the knowledge and awareness of the university lecturers' professional identities is crucial for having efficacious teaching.

One possible rationalization for the result of the current study in this respect may be attributable to the fact that lecturers' teaching efficacy and their professional identity work hand-in-hand to form lecturers' beliefs concerning competence to teach learners from socially and linguistically different backgrounds, including ethnically and/or culturally diverse learners, English language learners, and learners living in poverty (Tournaki & Podell, 2005).

Moreover, this rationalization can be supported by Day and Kington' (2006) claim that lecturers' professional identities are typically constructed not only from sentimental and practical facets of instruction and lecturers' personal lives, but also from interactions between personal involvements and the cultural, social, and educational settings which are significant elements that build up lecturers' teaching efficacy.

Furthermore, Beijaard, Verloop and Vermunt (2000) highlight the association between professional identity and professional development and its implications in issues of teaching. Additionally, Beijaard et al. confirm the accountability of the individual as a lecturer, and argue that the importance of professional development and teaching efficacy is best viewed through its association with professional identity. Moreover, the results of this study are also in line with those of Settlage, Southerland, Smith, and Ceglie (2009) who found that professional identity are positively associated with teachers' sense of efficacy.

The second research question of this study aimed at investigating the association between Iranian EFL university lecturers' institutional identity and their teaching efficacy. The results of the Pearson correlation analysis showed that there was a statistically significant positive association between Iranian EFL university lecturers' institutional identity and their teaching efficacy. This finding would signify that a focus on the development of EFL university lecturers' institutional identity would be beneficial to their teaching efficacy. Consequently, not paying adequate attention to enhancing institutional identity in foreign language education and teacher training programs, in turn, might result in university lecturers' inability in achieving excellence in teaching efficacy which is required of them in order to be capable of acting well enough in different academic and non-academic milieus.

One possible rationalization for the result of the current study in this respect may be attributable to the fact that both lecturers' efficacy and their institutional identity depend greatly on the subject matter and context (Brilhart, 2007). Moreover, as stated by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), subject matter and contextual features impact the lecturers' beliefs in their capabilities and judgments which in turn can affect learners' performances. The results in this respect are consistent with those of Ghafar Samar, Kiany, Akbari, and Azimi (2011) who investigated the relationship between EFL teachers' institutional identity, and their efficacy.

The findings of their study revealed that EFL teachers' institutional identity was positively correlated with their teaching efficacy. Moreover, Krogan (2000) believed that lecturers' institutional identity and professional identity go along hand in hand and are reinforced and developed by the lecturers' experiencing the processes of professional involvement and teaching. Therefore, to sum up this part, the results of the present study as scrutinized by the second research question provides the empirical support for the prediction that EFL university lecturers' institutional identity and their teaching efficacy are positively related.

In conclusion, the present study takes a great step in our understanding of the relationship between EFL university lecturers' institutional identity, professional identity, and teaching efficacy. The present study indicated that there exists a significant relationship (1) between EFL university lecturers'

professional identity and their teaching efficacy, and (2) between EFL university lecturers' institutional identity and their teaching efficacy.

We can conclude that the higher the level of the university lecturers' professional identity, the higher their teaching efficacy is. Also, we understand that not paying enough attention to EFL university lecturers' professional identity in foreign language contexts can lead to EFL university lecturers' ineffectiveness in teaching efficacy which is essential for performing well in various circumstances. The knowledge and awareness of the university lecturers' professional identity are crucial for more influential and successful teaching. As supported by Day and Kington' (2006) some significant elements that build up lecturers' teaching efficacy are based on the lecturers' professional identities. These elements are typically constructed not only from sentimental and practical facets of instruction and lecturers' personal lives, but also from interactions between personal involvements and the cultural, social, and educational settings.

References

Ahmadi, Abd Samad, A, & Noordin, N. (2013). Identity formation of TEFL graduate students through oral discourse socialization. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *3, 10*, 1764-1769.

Akkerman, S. F. , & Meijer, P. C. (2011). A dialogical approach to conceptualizing teacher identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*, 308-3019.

Azimi, H. (2012). *An ethnographic study of English teachers' institutional identity in high schools, language institutes, and universities*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Beijaard, D., Meijer, P., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*, 107-128.

Beijaard, D., Verloop, N., & Vermunt, J. D. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of professional identity: an exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 16, 749-764.

Brilhart, D. L. (2007). *Teacher conceptualization of teaching: integrating the personal and the professional*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Ohio State University.

Brown, T. (2006). Negotiating psychological disturbance in pre-service teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 675–689.

Gohier, C., Chevrier, J., & Andanon, M. (2007) Future Teacher's Identity: Between an Idealistic Vision and a Realistic View. Mcgill Journal of Education,*42*(1).

Day, C., & Kington, A. (2006). The personal and professional selves of teachers: stable and   unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal, 32* (4), 601-616.

Ghafar Samar, R., Kiany, G.R., Akbari, R. & Azimi, H. (2011). Institutional identity of teachers: A determinant of teacher efficacy. *TELL*, 5, 2, 1-29.

Hao, C. (2011). Changes and Characteristics of EFL Teachers' Professional Identity: The Cases of Nine University Teachers. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Quarterly), 1*, 3-21.

Kroger, J. (2000). *Identity development: Adolescence through adulthood*. California: Sage Publications.

Liou, I. Y. (2008). *English as an international language and teachers' professional identity.* Ph.D. thesis, School of Education, Deakin University.

Morita, N (2004). Negotiating Participation and Identity in Second Language Academic

  Communities. *TESOL Quarterly* ,38(4),573-603.

Murphy, P. K., Delli, L. A., & Edwards, M. N. (2004), The good teacher and good teaching. *The

  Journal of Experimental Education*,72(20), 69-92.

Q Gu, Q., & Day, C. (2007) [Teachers resilience: A necessary condition for effectiveness](). *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23* (8), 1302-1316

Settlage, J., Southerland, S. A. Smith, L. K. & Ceglie, R. (2009). Constructing a doubt-free teaching self: self-efficacy, teacher identity, and science instruction within diverse settings. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching,* 46, 1, 102–125.

Tournaki, N., & Podell, D. M. (2005). The impact of student characteristics and teacher efficacy on teachers' predictions of student success. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 299-314.

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

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk- Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202-248.

Wang, X. (2014). Investigation on the professional identity of senior high school English teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5, 4,769-774.

Appendices
Appendix A:
1. Professional Identity Questionnaire

1. Teaching is a respectable profession.
2. I like the job of being an English language teacher.
3. I prefer to be an ELT teacher than any other profession.
4. The sense of accomplishment from my work can compensate for the frustration.
5. I like to participate in conferences or professional development sessions.
6. My students appear to like to attend my class.
7. I like to participate in the public affairs of my institute.
8. My institute appreciates my teaching performances.

Appendix B:
2. Institutional Identity Questionnaire

۱.   "این دانشگاه" (نمونه ای از) همان جایی است که همیشه می خواستم عضوی از ان باشم.

۲.   یکی از دلایلی که (می) توانست مرا در انتخاب "این دانشگاه" قانع کند, امکانات عمومی ان بود.

۳.   از همان روز اول خودم را در موفقیت ها و شکست های "این دانشگاه" شریک می دانستم.

۴.   این که استاد "این دانشگاه" هستم , انتخاب خودم بود.

۵.   این همان رشته ای است که همیشه دوست داشتم تدریس کنم.

۶.   اگر به من پیشنهاد شود در دانشگاهی تدریس کنم که موقعیت اجتماعی پایینی دارد, قبول نخواهم کرد.

۷.   به نظرم بعدها به این که عضو "این دانشگاه" بودم, افتخار خواهم کرد.

۸.   دوست دارم, علاوه بر تدریس, به هر روش دیگری که بتوانم به "این دانشگاه" کمک کنم.

۹.   اگر دانشگاه های نسبتا مشابه دیگری به من پیشنهاد شوند, ترجیح میدهم در "همین دانشگاه" بمانم.

۱۰. به نظر من, موقعیت اجتماعی یک دانشگاه می تواند به تنهایی عوامل دیگر ان را تحت تاثیر قرار دهد.

۱۱. سعی می کنم تدریسم را با روش مطلوب "این دانشگاه" هماهنگ کنم, حتی اگر اجباری در کار نباشد.

۱۲. اگر فرصت مناسبی پیدا کنم, "این دانشگاه" را ترک خواهم کرد.

۱۳. فکر میکنم رشته ای که تدریس می کنم به عشقم نسبت به معلمی می افزاید.

۱۴. موقعیت اجتماعی یک دانشگاه را به توانایی های اموزشی ان ترجیح می دهم.

۱۵. ساختمان (ها) , کلاس ها و ظاهر یک دانشگاه در جدب من به ان تاثیرگذار هستند.

۱۶. حتی بیرون از دانشگاه هم خود را یک "استاد دانشگاه " می دانم.

۱۷. با وجود برخی مشکلات, فکر می کنم به این دانشگاه متعهد خواهم ماند.

۱۸. در مقایسه با روزهای اول, علاقه من نسبت به این رشته بیشتر شده است.

۱۹. مدیر گروه رشته مربوطه در "این دانشگاه" تاثیر مثبتی در افزایش علاقه من نسبت به این جا دارند.

۲۰. باید به اساتیدی که تمایل دارند/ ویا سعی می کنند به دانشگاه کمک کنند, احترام بیشتری گذاشت.

۲۱. اگرچه در ابتدا چندان اصراری به امدن به "این دانشگاه , الان از این که این جا هستم خوشحالم.

۲۲. دوست دارم بعدها نیز با "همین اساتید" همکار باشم.

۲۳. حتی اگر ظاهر دانشگاهی چندان جذاب نباشد, محیط گرم و صمیمی اش ادم را جذب می کند.

۲۴. با وجود برخی مشکلات, فکر می کنم به تدریس در "همین دانشگاه" ادامه خواهم داد.

۲۵. تدریس در "این دانشگاه" به علاقه من نسبت به رشته ام افزوده است.

۲۶. اگر دانشگاهی دارای موقعیت اجتماعی بالایی باشد, اساتید تمایل بیشتری به جذب در ان جا دارند.

۲۷. دلم می خواهد تا دوره ی بازنشستگی در "همین دانشگاه" تدریس کنم.

۲۸. از این که "این دانشگاه" چنین کادر اداری – منشی, ابدارچی, دفتردار و غیره – دارد, خوشحالم.

۲۹. حتی اگر مشکلاتی وجود داشته باشد, علاقه من نسبت به "این دانشگاه" متزلزل نخواهد شد.

۳۰. با اسن که در دانشگاه های دیگر نیز تدریس می کنم, خودم را استاد "این دانشگاه" معرفی می کنم.

۳۱. کار کردن با اساتید دیگر در "این دانشگاه" با ارامش همراه است.

۳۲. مسافت طولانی بین خانه و دانشگاه از علاقه من به ان می کاهد.

۳۳. حتی هنگام مریضی نیز سعی می کنم سر کارم در "این دانشگاه" حاضر شوم.

۳۴. خودم را استاد "این دانشگاه" می دانم تا جاهای دیگر.

Appendix C:
3. Teachers' Efficacy Scale

1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?
2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?
4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?
6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?

7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?
8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?
9. How much can you do to help your student's value learning?
10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?
11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?
12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?
13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?
14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?
15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?
16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?
17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?
18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?
19. How well can you keep a few problem students form ruining an entire lesson?
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation for example when students are confused?
21. How well can you respond to defiant students?
22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?
23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

Biodata

Dlnia Smaili is an MA holder in TEFL from Islamic Azad University (Sanandaj branch, Iran).studied B.A English Literature at University of Kurdistan (2010-2014). She has been teaching English at different Institutes of Sanandaj since 2010, currently teaching at Safir Language Academy (2015 – now) Sanandaj branch. She is interested in doing research in ELT.

Adel Dastgoshadeh is an assistant professor of English language teaching at Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj Branch. He has published several articles on teaching methodology, and teacher education nationally and internationally. His areas of research include methodology, skills teaching and teacher education.