

**Unveiling the Gaps: Teacher Self-Efficacy in English Language Learner
Professional Development**

by

Jennifer Boswell Quillope

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
In partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 8, 2026

Keywords: self-efficacy, English language learners,
professional development

Copyright 2026 by Jennifer Boswell Quillope

Approved by

Dr. Victoria Cardullo, Chair, Professor of Reading Education
Dr. Chih-hsuan Wang, Professor of Educational Research, Measurement, and
Assessment

Dr. Jamie Harrison, Associate Professor of ESOL
Dr. Lucrecia Tripp, Professor of Elementary Education

Abstract

This is a quantitative survey study that investigates teacher self-efficacy in collaboration with English Language Learner (ELL) professional development. The study uses quantitative data from 90 K-6 public school teachers in Alabama using survey questions. The survey gathered numerical data on teacher self-reported confidence with teaching students who are English Language Learners (ELLs) along with demographic data. By analyzing data sources, this study identified elements of professional development and other factors that impact teacher self-efficacy. Teacher self-efficacy was measured using the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), and data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The diverse nature of participants in this study included educators from varied cultural and educational backgrounds. Results revealed that teachers reported the highest levels of self-efficacy in classroom management, followed by instructional strategies, and the lowest in student engagement. Most demographic variables, including years of experience, gender, and ELL-specific training, were not significantly related to self-efficacy. However, degree level had a significant effect, specifically in classroom management. In addition, the frequency of professional development, school support, and the availability of resources were not significant predictors of teacher self-efficacy.

Overall, the findings suggest that teacher self-efficacy for working with ELLs is generally consistent across most variables, with degree level being the only factor showing a meaningful difference.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use Disclosure Statement

In the preparation of this dissertation, Grammarly and ChatGPT (OpenAI) were used to assist with grammar and spelling corrections and formatting tables in accordance with APA guidelines. The author acknowledges full responsibility for the intellectual content of this work and has ensured that all AI-assisted sections were carefully reviewed, revised, and verified for accuracy, originality, and appropriate academic style. All AI-generated content was evaluated for relevance, appropriateness, and accuracy before being incorporated into the final document to maintain the scholarly integrity of this research.

Digital Accessibility Use Disclosure Statement

In the preparation of this dissertation, the following digital accessibility tools were used to ensure this document complies with federal requirements: Microsoft Word Accessibility Checker and Adobe Acrobat Pro Accessibility Checker. The author acknowledges full responsibility for the intellectual content of this work and has made a good faith effort to comply with digital accessibility requirements in publishing, wherein the nature of the content does not significantly change in order to do so. Furthermore, all content has been reviewed and revised to meet these requirements prior to final publication.

Acknowledgments

I would like to sincerely acknowledge and thank my advisor and chair, Dr. Vicky Cardullo, who pushed me and believed in me even when I didn't believe in myself. She answered countless calls and text messages at any time of day or night, and for that, I am forever grateful. I truly could not have done this without her.

I would also like to acknowledge my methodologist, Dr. Chih-hsuan Wang, for helping me work through my data and better understand charts, graphs, and data points-oh my! I am also grateful to her graduate student, Mrs. Kailea Manning, who played an essential role in my results portion and patiently answered all my questions.

I would like to thank Dr. Harrison for sharing her expertise in the field of English as a Second Language. I remember sitting with her over coffee, asking a million questions that sparked my interest in this area of research. She is truly an inspiration to me.

I also want to thank Dr. Tripp for her support throughout this program. I enjoyed taking her classes and was given opportunities to think deeply about my practice. I will never forget her words: "you can achieve your dreams, but you must work hard." And now, here we are-we did it!

I would like to thank Dr. Lisa Kensler for serving as my outside reader. She spent countless hours reviewing my work and providing thoughtful feedback so I could make the necessary revisions. I truly appreciate her time, dedication, and commitment to her students.

A special thank you to Dr. Okunola (Ola) Odeniyi, my graduate writing partner. I am so thankful for our friendship and for that summer we treated writing like it was our full-time job. Thank you for holding me accountable and checking in with me every week. You inspired me to keep going. I loved our “letter to self” activity where we both cried our eyes out and realized our “why” in this process.

I want to thank my dear friends and coworkers, Dr. Phil Wilson and Dr. Bianca Florence, for providing encouragement. I am incredibly thankful for my fifth-grade family: Amy Wall, Brian Wynn, Ashley Reed, Tina Burton, Kelsey Clark, Heather Campbell, and Maria Gilleland. I appreciate their unwavering support and filling even the busiest of days with laughter. I would also like to thank all the teachers, staff, and administration at Ogletree Elementary School (Caroline Raville and Tiffani Croley) for their support, uplifting words, and encouragement on my journey. If I could name every one of you, I would. The impact you have had on my life is immeasurable. Teaching here is truly a dream. I am honored to work beside you.

Finally, I would like to thank Auburn University. As a 2004 graduate from the College of Human Sciences (Human Development and Family Studies), it means so much to return and complete this journey here. As a second-generation Auburn graduate, I now pass the torch to my daughter, who will start her educational journey in the fall. There is no other place I would want to earn my doctoral degree. Thank you for the strong sense of community. I will always bleed orange and blue -War Eagle!

Most importantly, all glory and honor belong to my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. I stand in awe and amazement at how He has called me to do this and guided me through every obstacle. Over the past three years, *Good Plans* by Red Rocks Worship

and *Goodness of God* by CeCe Winans have been sources of encouragement, strength, and hope.

I'd like to dedicate my dissertation to my precious family. First and foremost, I want to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my husband, Christopher Paul Quillope. You have been my rock and my encourager in the darkest moments of doubt. You have loved me for over twenty years, and I look forward to growing older with you and creating more memories together. To my children, Mackenzie, Katie, and Tucker, thank you for your patience, love, and understanding. I have tried to be the best mom I can by showing you unconditional love, and that you can do hard things even when there are challenges. I want you to always believe in yourself and to never give up on your dreams. Dream big!

To my mom, Deborah Eason Boswell, thank you for being my biggest cheerleader. You have believed in me from the very beginning, and I am forever grateful. And to my late father, Thomas Fletcher Boswell Jr., I am grateful for the strong work ethic and integrity he instilled in me from birth.

To my brother, Dr. John Andrew Boswell, you are no longer the only family member with a doctoral degree. Our dad would be so proud of us both. I know he is looking down on this momentous occasion with the biggest smile. To my sister-in-law, Kimberly, and my nephews Caleb, Joshua, and Isaac, and my niece Hannah-Grace—your love has meant more to me than words can express. And to all my family members and friends not mentioned, I could not have accomplished this without your prayers and belief in me.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use Disclosure Statement.....	3
Digital Accessibility Statement.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	5
List of Tables.....	12
List of Appendices.....	13
List of Abbreviations.....	14
Definitions of Key Terms.....	15
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	16
Statement of the Problem.....	17
Purpose of the Study.....	18
Supporting Evidence and Rationale.....	19
Research Questions.....	19
Significance of the Study.....	20
Positionality.....	21
Limitations.....	22
Assumptions.....	23
Organization of the Study.....	23
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	25
Introduction.....	25
Contextualizing the Problem.....	25

Theoretical Framework.....	27
Sociocultural Theory.....	27
Social Cognitive Theory.....	31
Self-Efficacy Theory.....	34
Professional Development.....	37
English Language Learner Instructional Challenges.....,.....	40
Gaps in the Literature.....	41
Summary.....	43
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	46
Introduction.....	46
Research Questions.....	46
Research Design.....	47
Phase One Pilot Study.....	48
Instruments.....	49
Participants.....	52
Data Collection.....	54
Data Management.....	56
Data Analysis.....	57
Discussion of Findings to Impact Current Study.....	59
Phase Two Full Study.....	60
Introduction.....	60
Participants.....	60

Data Collection.....	61
Data Management.....	63
Data Analysis.....	64
Validity and Reliability.....	66
Ethical Considerations.....	66
Summary.....	67
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS.....	69
Introduction.....	69
Participant Demographics.....	69
Instrument Reliability.....	70
Descriptive Statistics.....	71
Results for Research Question 1a.....	72
Results for Research Question 1b.....	73
Results for Research Question 1c.....	75
Results for Research Question 1d.....	81
Results for Research Question 2.....	83
Results for Research Question 3.....	85
Results from Open-Ended Questions.....	91
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS....	96
Introduction.....	96
Summary of the Study.....	96
Summary of Key Findings.....	97
Discussion of Findings.....	98

Implications.....	101
Limitations.....	103
Recommendations for Future Research.....	104
Conclusions.....	105
References.....	107

List of Tables

Table 1 (Mean Scores for Teachers Self-Efficacy Domains for Instrument Reliability) ..	65
Table 2 (Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices) (Gender)	67
Table 3 (Multivariate Test of Gender on Teacher Self-Efficacy)	67
Table 4 (Descriptive Statistics)	69
Table 5 (Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices) (Levels of Degrees)	70
Table 6 (Multivariate Test of Degree Level on Teacher Self-Efficacy)	71
Table 7 (Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances by Degree Level)	72
Table 8 (Bonferroni Post Hoc Comparisons for Classroom Management)	73
Table 9 (Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices)	74
Table 10 (Multivariate Test MANOVA)	74
Table 11 (Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices)	76
Table 12 (Multivariate Analysis of Variance Results for ELL Classroom Status)	76
Table 13 (Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices -PD Frequency)	78
Table 14 (Multivariate Effect of Professional Development Frequency)	79
Table 15 (Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices)	80
Table 16 (Multivariate Test Results for School Supports) (Wilk's Lambda)	80
Table 17 (Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices) (Availability of Resources) ..	81
Table 18 (Multivariate Test Results for Availability of Resources) (Wilk's Lambda)	82

List of Appendices

Appendix A Pilot Study Survey	105
Appendix B Pilot Study Interview Questions	106
Appendix C Full Scale Survey.....	107
Appendix D Research Questions Data Chart.....	108

List of Abbreviations

EL English Learner

ELL English Language Learner

ESL English as a Second Language

ESOL English as a Second or Foreign Language

IRB Institutional Review Board

ML Multilingual Learners

NCES National Center for Education Statistics

PD Professional Development

RTI Response to Intervention

SCT Social Cognitive Theory

SET Self-Efficacy Theory

SIOP Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol

SLA Second Language Acquisition

SLIFE Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education

SLT Social Learning Theory

TSES Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey

Definition of Key Terms

Key terms and phrases relevant to the present study are as follows:

ACCESS Scores: ACCESS is an assessment for ELLs that measures student proficiency in English across listening, speaking, reading, and writing domains (WIDA Consortium, 2020).

Differentiated Instruction: A teaching approach that adapts content, products, and process to meet the needs of diverse learners (Tomlinson, 2001).

English Language Learner (ELL): A student who is in the process of acquiring English proficiency while learning academic content (de Jong, E. J., & Harper, 2005).

Language Acquisition: The process by which individuals learn a language, either as a first language or an additional language (Krashen, 1982).

Professional Development (PD): Learning opportunities that are ongoing to enhance teachers' knowledge, skills, and instructional practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Scaffolding: The temporary instructional support that is provided to students to help them achieve higher levels of understanding, which is gradually removed as independence increases (Vygotsky, 1978).

Self-Efficacy: A teacher's belief in their ability to plan, organize, and carry out actions required to successfully teach and support student learning (Bandura, 1997).

Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP): An instructional framework designed to make academic content more comprehensible for English language learners through structured teaching strategies (Echevarría et al., 2017).

Chapter 1. Introduction

Teacher self-efficacy is the belief that educators have in their ability to teach effectively, facilitate learning, and influence student learning (Bandura, 1977). The level of confidence, or self-efficacy, can significantly influence their instructional practices and classroom success

(Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). In the United States, self-efficacy is a concern as teachers face demands with increasingly diverse classrooms. One statistic from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) shows that while most U.S. teachers feel confident in their classroom management and teaching skills, many teachers struggle with teaching students from diverse linguistic backgrounds, especially English language learners (ELLs) (NCES, 2021). The teacher confidence gap can be more of an issue in schools that have fewer resources or higher numbers of ELL students. Self-efficacy plays a major role in outcomes such as teacher retention, instructional quality, and student achievement (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). For example, teachers who feel confident in their abilities are more likely to try new teaching approaches, stay committed when challenges arise, and manage their classrooms well (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2021). Levels of self-efficacy can depend on factors such as school climate, access to training, and experience with diverse student groups (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2021).

In today's classrooms students from diverse linguistic backgrounds are learning together. The number of English Language Learners (ELLs) are steadily increasing and so does the need for teachers to feel prepared to support their student's educational needs (National

Center for Education Statistics, 2022). Although most schools do offer professional development training and resources, there is still a disparity between what's expected of teachers and the support they receive.

This research study explored the gap in research focusing on two areas: teacher self-efficacy and professional development opportunities teachers have been given.

Using surveys and open-ended questions, this quantitative study sheds light on teachers and provides an opportunity to add to the growing body literature.

Statement of the Problem

Teachers are faced with challenges in their classrooms daily and work hard to meet the needs of all their students. When it comes to their linguistically diverse students, they can sometimes feel under prepared (Villegas et al., 2018). Frustration in the classroom occurs when teachers feel that they are lacking in preparation and training (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018; de Jong & Harper, 2005). Confidence can play a role in the way teachers perform in the classroom and with how successful they are as well (Bandura, 1977).

The concept of teacher self-efficacy was introduced by seminal researcher, Albert Bandura. Bandura was the founder of the social cognitive learning theory (SCT) and pioneered this theory which is based on the concept that learning can be affected by environmental, behavioral, and cognitive factors (Bandura et al., 1996). Teacher self-efficacy is an optimistic belief that one can perform a difficult task or cope with adversity, and this can influence aspects of teaching (Bandura, 1977). One influential aspect includes the area of professional development for teachers of ELL. According to Bandura, individuals form self-efficacy beliefs by interpreting information regarding their

own capabilities. This information stems from four sources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective states (Bandura et al., 1996).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to investigate teacher self-efficacy in relation to ELL professional development. I recognized the need for this study as an educator myself. I have had an increase of ELL students in my classroom each year for the past four years. The school where I am employed is a rural Alabama elementary school and had an increased number of ELL students within the last five years. Data for this study will be collected from teacher surveys and will investigate teacher self-efficacy in relation to ELL professional development.

The aim of this study was to gain information on how teacher self-efficacy can influence teachers, what impacts teacher participation in professional development, and how resources impact teachers' decisions for participation in English Language Learner professional development. This research study provides information to support this gap in research and could provide the need for a community of practice to support ELL professional development.

A pilot study was conducted in the spring of 2025. Findings are reported in chapter four along with the full-scale study. Additional research is needed to investigate interactions between self-efficacy beliefs and English Language Learner professional development participation and engagement among teachers. The need for further research is needed because self-efficacy is known to influence teachers but unclear how these beliefs affect decisions to engage in ELL-focused professional development

and in turn, how the professional development participation shapes their self-efficacy over time. Teachers may seek professional development proactively where some may be reluctant due to insecurities.

Supporting Evidence and Rationale

From my observation, I have noticed a significant increase in ELL students in my English Language Arts classes. After speaking with the ESL teacher at my school, she confirmed that we have 86 active English Language Learner students and 22 more ELL students that are not considered active but are still being monitored. According to school data, we have 108 students in our school that speak another language other than English as their first language, which is about 20% of our student population. Understanding that this is a larger percentage in comparison to other schools in the state.

With ELL professional development, this research study investigates teacher self-efficacy in relation to ELL professional development, examining how it impacts teacher engagement and the role that school support systems play in encouraging teachers to participate in ELL-focused training.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) and selected demographic or professional variables (years of experience, gender, degrees achieved, or ELL experience)?

- A. Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) between teachers with different years of experience?
 - B. Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) based on gender?
 - C. Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) based on teachers' degrees?
 - D. Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) between teachers with and without ELL-specific training?
- 2. Which dimensions of teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) are most strongly reported by teachers working with English Language Learners?
 - 3. What factor most strongly predicts teachers' self-efficacy for teaching ELL students: (a) frequency of professional development (b) school support (c) availability of resources?

Significance of the Study

As the ELL population has continued to grow in the United States (NCES, 2021), so does the need for teachers to feel confident and capable to support those needs of their students (Bandura, 1977). When teachers feel supported and confident in their field, they are more likely to achieve success in the classroom (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy 2001). When teachers do not feel prepared to teach ELLs, students may not receive

quality instruction (Darling-Hammond, 2010). By looking closely at teacher self-efficacy and professional development, this study helps to bring attention to what is effective and what is not effective for teachers in the classroom. The findings from this research study can allow school districts and professional development programs to better understand how to support teachers in meaningful ways.

By exploring teacher perceptions of their own readiness for teaching ELLs and the effectiveness of the trainings they have received, this research contributes a broader perspective to understand how ELL related training or experiences and school supports can play a role. This study will highlight gaps and help to clarify the needs of teachers.

As an educator, I recognize the real-world challenges that teachers face each day. This study is rooted in a deep belief that when teachers are highly supported, they become empowered to make an impact in the lives of their students who are learning English as a second language.

Positionality

Having 22 years of classroom experience in Alabama, I bring professional and personal insights into this research study. I have worked with a diverse student population and these experiences have provided me with a deeper understanding of the challenges that teachers face when supporting ELLs.

In addition to my professional background, my personal life has also shaped my connection to this research topic. My husband is Filipino, and I have witnessed the language acquisition journey of his family as they have learned English. Experiencing

this has provided me with a personal appreciation for the complexities of learning a new language and adapting to a new culture.

I value education and am passionate about supporting teachers. Although my background offers value to the research study, I understand that there is a potential for bias. I used a validated survey, utilize participant anonymity, and data analysis to assure credibility of the findings for this research study.

Limitations of the Study

Although this study was designed to provide insight for educators into teacher self-efficacy and ELL professional development, there were several limitations that should be acknowledged through this study. This study relied on data that is teacher reported using surveys and open-ended questions. Although teacher surveys are valuable, they could have been influenced by personal biases. Teachers were completing these surveys in various locations in Alabama and their responses could have been biased considering them wanting to represent themselves and their schools in a positive light. When discussing professional development, I relied on teacher's memories of their past experiences as well, which could be considered a limitation.

Another limitation to consider was that teachers who were taking the survey are teachers who are currently teaching in Alabama and represent teachers across different school districts. Due to this study being in the southeast, the findings may not be representative of all educational settings in the United States.

Lastly, this study focused on teacher perspectives and their confidence of teaching ELLs and experiences with professional development but does not measure the direct impact of teacher self-efficacy on student achievement or specific classroom

outcomes. Knowing that teacher perceptions and confidence is important, additional studies would be needed to examine how the teacher perceptions translate into instructional practices with ELL student success results. This could be an opportunity for future research in this field.

Considering the limitations of this study, this research does provide professional development experiences of teachers and their perceptions of their own confidence with teaching ELLs, which gives direction for improvements for professional development opportunities.

Assumptions

There were several assumptions to consider while conducting this quantitative research study. One assumption was that teachers responded to the survey questions honestly and to the best of their ability. Considering that the data was teacher-reported, the findings relied on the teacher's willingness to respond to questions honestly and openly. It was also assumed that teachers that responded to the survey questions valued professional development and considered it to be important. It is also assumed that the teacher participants value the education field as well. Lastly, it was assumed that the teacher's experiences and insights would add value and contribute to the field of education, specifically on how to better support teachers and ELL students.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Each chapter will build upon the last in relation to teacher self-efficacy and professional development. The overall goal of this study is to shed light for stakeholders and to allow teacher's voices to be heard in support of educators and the diverse students they serve.

Chapter two reviews existing literature that is related to teacher self-efficacy, ELL, professional development, and theoretical frameworks related to this study. It identifies gaps and limitations in the research and justifies the need for this study. The chapter also connects the review of literature to the research questions.

Chapter three discusses the methodology and the research design of the study. This chapter dives deeper into the quantitative design and the rationale for choosing this design, the participants and the selection process, the data collection procedures, and how the data was analyzed. It describes the instruments, the validity, and reliability of the instrument. The chapter connects the methodology to the research questions.

Chapter four reveals the findings from the quantitative research study and analyzes the teacher surveys. It also analyzes the open-ended questions from the teacher surveys. Chapter four provides analysis of themes that emerged from the data.

Chapter five offers a discussion on the findings to the research in relation to the research questions, the existing literature, and implications. Limitations of the study will be discussed. Recommendations for future research will be discussed and final reflections on the study.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to explore the research that currently exists on teacher self-efficacy, professional development, and teaching ELLs. Chapter two reviewed the literature in relation to teacher self-efficacy and teaching ELL students. I explored the similarities, differences, and gaps that exist within the existing literature.

This study is grounded in Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory and Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive and Self-Efficacy Theory. These theories are the basis of my doctoral study as they relate to my research questions on self-efficacy and ELL professional development. Throughout this chapter, these theories will be explored and connected to this research project. Major sections of concern will be covered in this chapter including teacher self-efficacy, professional development, and the increase of ELLs in schools.

Contextualizing the Problem

This research study investigated teacher self-efficacy in relation to English Language Learner (ELL) professional development, examining how it impacts teacher engagement and the role that school support systems play in encouraging teachers to participate in English Language Learner-focused trainings. This is important due to the increasing number of English Language Learner students in the United States. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2022), "One in 10 public school students in the United States are designated as English learners (ELs), an increase of more than 25 percent over the past two decades" (National Center for Education Statistics, 2022, p. 1). Local demographics according to the Alabama State

Department of Education revealed that in 2021, 63,363 (8.4 % of the student population) were considered ELs, which means they had at some point been identified as English Language Learners (Alabama State Department of Education, 2021). Additionally, national trends showed that general education teachers in the United States have received little preparation for teaching English language learners in their classrooms (Villegas et al., 2018). This revealed the need for teacher preparation considering the increase of ELL students in the United States.

I have personally seen the increase of ELL students in my own fifth grade classroom. I am employed at a rural Alabama public school, and I have been trained by the ESL (English as a Second Language) teacher at my school. I was taught how to give tests to our ELL students, but I do feel as though there is a need for more instructional strategies and direction on how to meet all their needs effectively. I have observed the ESL teacher working diligently for our ELL students, and I am doing the best I can with the resources provided to me in my classroom. Students in this school system, where I am employed, are monitored for four years. That means we have 108 students in our school who speak a language other than English as their first language out of the 534 students total that are enrolled in grades 3-5. This means that approximately 20% of students enrolled are considered English Language Learners.

I often use translation apps to help effectively communicate with my students. I provide alternate tests at a lower grade level containing the same skills to adequately assess my ELL students. This can be difficult at times, because I must find an alternate test and find time to read the test to my students, along with the test questions and answer choices. Juggling these tasks along with managing students who do speak

English can be challenging. Considering the increase of ELLs in the elementary school where I work, and my personal struggles associated with teaching ELLs, this reiterates the need for more instructional support for teachers. If I am having these issues, I am certain that other teachers are also having struggles with this same topic. I wanted to inquire if teachers feel as though they have enough professional development in relation to teaching their English Language Learners. I also wanted to know if teachers feel confident with teaching English Language Learners, or would more professional development provide assurance, and if so, what type would be most beneficial.

There are clear challenges for educators who are expected to teach ELL students as well as mainstream students. Some challenges include modifying ELL assignments to ensure they are at the appropriate academic level to meet their instructional needs, properly assessing ELL students, and providing grades for students.

There is a clear need for intentional support and training for teachers. I have reviewed literature from various databases to learn about research that has already been conducted. In the next section, I reviewed the three main topics of my research and research that support the theoretical frameworks related to self-efficacy, professional development, and English Language Learner instructional strategies.

Theoretical Framework

Sociocultural Theory

Lev Vygotsky's sociocultural theory is one of the theoretical frameworks that inspired this study. The sociocultural theory looks at the influence that the world has on development. More specifically, Vygotsky's theory focuses on the interaction of interpersonal (social), historical, and individual points as the essential aspects to human

development (Vygotsky, 1978). Sociocultural theory reveals that learning is a social process where learning and development takes place through interactions with other people who have more intelligence and knowledge than the learner (Schunk, 2012). In the following paragraphs, the core concepts that apply to my research from Lev Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory will be explained. The main concepts in this theory include social interaction, cultural tools, the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), and scaffolding.

Social Interaction

Vygotsky demonstrated that the way individuals view and comprehend the world is impacted by their interactions with other people (Tudge & Winterhoff, 1993). He wanted to look at thinking in a new way. Sociocultural theory explains that learning happens through social interaction and is influenced by culture and history (Schunk, 2012). Because of this, the connection between teachers and students is very important for learning. Research shows that using culturally responsive teaching can improve these relationships and help students do better in school (Schunk, 2012). Social interaction helps explain how thinking develops and connects our actions with our minds (Kozulin, 1986).

Cultural Tools

Our thinking is shaped by the social world around us, including things like language, culture, and schools. Interacting and collaborating with others helps connect the various influences that shape our learning and development (Schunk, 2012). We learn by using these cultural tools in social situations, then making sense of them in our own minds (Bruning et al., 2004). One of Vygotsky's concepts is called dialectical

constructivism because it focuses on the back-and-forth relationship between people and their environment. One main way learning happens is through mediation (Schunk, 2012). Kozulin (1990), considers mediation as a tool and plays a central role in cognitive development (Kozulin, 1990). It can come from physical tools, symbolic systems, or the social interactions with others (Schunk, 2012). These mediators, whether they are objects, symbols, or people, can help to transform natural responses into more advanced mental abilities, such as problem-solving and higher order thinking (Schunk, 2012).

When learning a language, mediation could include textbooks, visual aids, classroom discussions, opportunities to use a second language, direct instruction, or even teacher support. Social mediation can happen through interactions with teachers or more experienced peers, or even among peers themselves. Vygotsky believed that human thought develops through activities shaped by specific cultural and social environments (Schunk, 2012).

In the classroom, mediation could include the usage of teaching tools and spoken or written language. Both are vital for building knowledge and the support for cognitive growth (Schunk, 2012). The way individuals think can be influenced by speaking and interacting within the classroom. For English language teachers, acting as a mediator means the teacher collaborates with students through interaction to support and guide their learning (Schunk, 2012). Vygotsky's research showed that when children begin using symbols as tools to support their thinking and actions, their behavior changes and becomes shaped by cultural influences (Lantolf, 1994). Utilizing cultural tools can aide individuals with their learning (Lantolf, 1994).

Zone of Proximal Development

Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is a key component to the social cognitive theory. ZPD refers to what an individual can do on their own and what they can do with help from a more skilled peer (Vygotsky, 1978). ZPD reveals how much an individual can learn when the appropriate support is given (Vygotsky, 1978). In the ZPD, an individual works with someone more experienced such as a teacher or peer, on a task they couldn't do alone because it's too difficult.

ZPD is one way to understand how ready an individual is to learn something new in a certain subject area. It also helps explain the connection between learning and development (Bredo, 1997). Some researchers even see it as a different way to think about intelligence. Intelligence could be thought of not as something fixed, but as something that can grow with the right help (Belmont, 1989). This idea fits with the belief that learning often happens through group effort, where people share their skills and knowledge to help each other (Bruner, 1984). Collaboration can be a beneficial key element to the learning process.

Scaffolding

Scaffolding is an instructional approach rooted in the ideas of Vygotsky. It involves offering temporary guidance or support from a teacher, peer, or educational tool to assist individuals in completing tasks they cannot manage on their own (Vygotsky, 1978). As learners grow more capable, this support is gradually withdrawn, encouraging independent learning and skill mastery (Vygotsky, 1978). Scaffolding helps individuals move from what they can accomplish without assistance to what they can achieve with appropriate guidance. This progression takes place within the ZPD.

Social Cognitive Theory

The Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) explains how people learn by observing others and not just through their own direct experiences (Bandura, 1986). This theory was developed by psychologist Albert Bandura in 1986. SCT reveals that learning happens through watching and imitating the actions of others, which is called observational learning (Schunk, 2012). It also stresses that learning is influenced by a continuous interaction between a person's behavior, their thoughts, and the environment around them, which is an idea known as reciprocal determinism (Schunk, 2012). Important ideas within this theory include self-efficacy, which is the belief in one's ability to succeed, learning through others' experiences, receiving feedback or reinforcement, and setting personal goals. Unlike some learning theories that focus only on behavior, SCT considers internal mental processes and how people regulate their own learning and actions (Bandura, 1986). It emphasizes the dynamic and reciprocal relationships between individuals, their actions, and even their surroundings.

Reciprocal Determinism

Bandura's reciprocal determinism concept explains how human behavior includes interaction with three fundamental factors: personal factors, the environment, and behavior (Bandura, 1986). These three fundamental factors intersect which creates a cycle of reciprocal influence (Bandura, 1986). Personal factors can include an individual's thoughts, emotions, beliefs, and biological traits that influence how individuals interpret and respond to experiences (Schunk, 2012). Behavior involves the actions and reactions of individuals in different situations. The environmental factors

refer to the external conditions and surroundings, such as cultural norms, social influences, and physical settings, that can play a role in shaping one's behavior. Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory shows that these three factors are connected and always affect each other. (Schunk, 2012).

Observational Learning

Observational learning, also known as modeling in educational settings, is another concept with the Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1977). Observational learning is when individuals learn by watching others and seeing the results of their actions. Individuals can develop new behaviors, skills, or attitudes by observing those around them (Bandura, 1977). For this kind of learning to work well, learners must focus on the behavior of the individual they are observing, remember what they observed, and to be able to perform the behavior themselves (Bandura, 1977). Individuals also need to be motivated to copy the behavior depending on whether the observed actions had positive or negative outcomes (Bandura, 1977).

There are some key parts to observational learning which include: attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation (Bandura, 1977). The attention component is important because individuals must pay attention to the model and the behaviors that they are demonstrating. Retention is also an important factor due to the behaviors that are being observed must be remembered and retained for later. Considering the reproduction component, the participant must be able to complete the behaviors which they observed. Individual levels of motivation can be influenced by positive reinforcement and even perceived benefits of behaviors (Bandura, 1977). When considering teaching students, especially students who are ELL, much of the learning

process relies on observational learning. ELL students are listening to peers and their teachers and learning words to use in everyday life.

Agentic Perspective

Social Cognitive Theory expands on the concept of human agency to explain the various elements that shape people's behavior. Bandura proposes that individual factors such as our thoughts and beliefs, behavioral factors such as how we interact with others, and environmental influences including the community or setting in which we were raised, all play a role in guiding our actions (Bandura, 1986). This impacts our own personal beliefs, future behavior, and the environments we are involved in and allows for a continuous and common relationship among these three elements (Beauchamp et al., 2019). For example, choosing to work in a classroom setting may shift your perception of your own skills, allow you to build new abilities, and connect you with different people compared to another career path (Beauchamp, et al., 2019).

When looking at Bandura's agentic perspective, again rooted in Social Cognitive Theory, it views the ability of individuals to intentionally make choices that significantly impacts their lives (Bandura, 2001). The agentic perspective encompasses three major factors: personal factors, behavioral factors, and environmental factors (Bandura, 2001). Social cognitive theory presents that individuals learn by observing others and imitating their behaviors. In relation to this research study, this theory aligns with the process by which educators acquire and implement new instructional strategies introduced during professional development. Teachers often internalize and apply newly learned skills through practice within the classroom setting. For information to be retained, it must be effectively encoded into memory. Additionally, a certain level of motivation and self-

efficacy is necessary for educators to participate in professional development opportunities. This connection underscores the importance of examining teacher self-efficacy more deeply within the context of ongoing professional growth.

Self-Efficacy

Lastly, the basis of my research study stems from Albert Bandura's, Self-Efficacy Theory, which was developed from the Social Cognitive Theory. Teacher self-efficacy is a term that was defined by Albert Bandura in 1977. "Self-efficacy refers to people's judgements to their capabilities to organize and execute course of action to attain designated types of performances" (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). The concept of self-efficacy is believed to influence the types of activities individuals choose, their level of effort, their perseverance, and even their success (Bandura, 1997). Individuals develop their sense of self-efficacy through various sources including their own performance outcomes, observations of others, verbal encouragement, and emotional cues (Bandura 1997). Personal achievements serve as the most dependable indicator for self-assessment (McInerney & Etten, 2004).

Beliefs about one's personal efficacy are thought to influence whether coping strategies are initiated, the amount of effort that is invested, and the persistence of those efforts when facing obstacles or adversity (Bandura, 1977). The way teachers perceive themselves impacts their teachings and in turn, impacts students learning and student success.

Sources of self-efficacy include mastery, vicarious, verbal persuasion, and physiological state (Bandura, 1977). Mastery types of experiences are the most influential of all vicarious learning is known to happen without direct learning but rather

through observation and modeling of behaviors. Verbal persuasion can be referred to the act of influencing behaviors through language, which can boost confidence and can be motivational.

According to Bandura's theory of self-efficacy, there are four main sources that influence a person's belief in their abilities: personal achievements (mastery experiences), observing others (vicarious learning), verbal encouragement or persuasion, and physiological states (Bandura, 1977; McInerney & Etten, 2004). Personal success is especially influential in shaping strong self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1977). Observing others particularly those like oneself, can also impact self-efficacy. When individuals see others succeed, it reinforces the belief that they too can succeed. On the other hand, witnessing failure may reduce self-confidence (McInerney & Etten, 2004). Verbal encouragement can boost self-efficacy temporarily, but it often lacks long term impact on actual performance. People also rely on physical and emotional cues such as a racing heart or sweating to assess their abilities. These symptoms can be seen as signs of nervousness or low capability, potentially lowering self-efficacy. Conversely, seeing someone remain calm under pressure may help boost a person's confidence in their own abilities (McInerney & Etten, 2004). This sheds light on an important point that with success can bring confidence. Expectations must be developed. According to Bandura, after strong efficacy expectations are developed through repeated success, negative impacts of occasional failures are reduced (Bandura, 1977). An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can execute behaviors that are required to produce the outcome (Bandura, 1977). Looking at individual outcome expectations, individuals may believe

that a specific action will lead to a desired result. If they lack confidence in their ability to carry out the required steps, that belief alone is unlikely to impact their behavior (McInerney & Etten, 2004). Considering this information and the high demands in the classroom for teachers, self-efficacy does play a vital role in the education process.

Self-efficacy plays an important role in teacher effectiveness because it supports the overall classroom success and positively influences student outcomes. Research on self-efficacy has explored different topics including its relationship with teacher burnout, the role leadership plays, cognitive flexibility, and even explored behavior management strategies (Karabenick & Clemens, 2004). I plan to dive deeper into teacher self-efficacy to better understand teacher perspectives on teaching ELL students. By understanding teacher motivations and their attitudes towards teaching ELLs, I plan to explore ways to improve teacher confidence, which in turn, can improve student's outcomes.

Several findings on teacher self-efficacy in linguistically diverse classrooms include research on preservice teachers (Lavery & Youngblood, 2018). One study compared pre and post classroom assessment scores of students taught by preservice teachers to determine if a differentiated teacher education program prepared them to support ELLs achievement in classrooms including native and nonnative speakers of English (Lavery & Youngblood, 2018). Several studies were found on how students in linguistically diverse classrooms perform, but not teachers or their confidence levels (Machado & Hartman, 2019). One study in Mexico that does explore the teacher's role of multilingualism in teaching and classroom assessment design, explores the concept of translanguaging as a lens through which to look closely at the perceptions and practices of teachers (Schissel et. al, 2021). Again, the need for further exploration of

current teachers in the United States in teacher self-efficacy and ELL professional development is needed.

Professional Development

Effective professional development models share key characteristics: they are context focused, incorporates active learning that engages participants, promotes collaboration, models effective practice, provides expert support, include opportunities for feedback and reflection, and are sustained over time (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Professional learning communities (PLC) is another professional development model that incorporates several of these elements and supports learning (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). According to Darling-Hammond (2017), this collaborative professional development can be a source of efficacy and confidence for teachers and can result with improvements from within and even beyond the school level (DarlingHammond et al., 2017). It can also improve teacher practice and student achievement (DarlingHammond et al., 2009). From this, it is understood that collaboration with professional development is beneficial to teachers and students (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). This study aims to evaluate teacher self-efficacy and how it relates to teacher attendance and teachers' engagement in English Language Learner professional development.

Additionally, one study by Sepulveda-Escobar looked at a Chilean university-based English as a Second Language (ESOL) and how teachers work to continue the process of providing for professional development needs (Sepulveda-Escobar, 2023). Data was collected from a survey and a focus group, which revealed that individual learning opportunities were highly valued. This study provided evidence of the

importance of professional development in ELL (Sepulveda-Escobar, 2023).

Furthermore, an additional research study was used to evaluate the impact of a professional development program on preschool teacher assistants' attitudes toward multilingualism and self-efficacy in working with linguistically and culturally diverse children and their parents. This mixed-methods study showed a decrease in negative feelings such as anxiety, disappointment, low self-esteem, and unpreparedness, and an increase in positive feelings such as happiness, pride, satisfaction, achievement, and self-efficacy. This article was important to my research due to the multicultural aspect along with the self-efficacy element in relation to attitudes and confidence levels of teachers (Toren & Schwartz, 2024). Although the grade levels were varied, similarly, both articles emphasize the importance of professional development and how self-efficacy effects teacher participation and professional development outcomes.

Moreover, Zhou et al, (2023) looked at the impact of teachers' perceptions of school climate and professional development (PD) participation on teacher self-efficacy in teaching and with job satisfaction for STEM teachers of ELLs (Zhou et al., 2023). This study included 985 public middle school teachers of ELLs in the United States. Results revealed that professional development participation in multicultural education and teachers' perceptions of school climate, "positively affected job satisfaction and self-efficacy in teaching ELL students" (Zhou et al., 2023). This article related to my research because it measured the impact of professional development in relation to teaching efficacy and job satisfaction. It shares the impact of school climate and self-efficacy as it relates to ELL professional development attendance.

Models of Professional Development

With ever-growing demands, educators are needing to understand language acquisition, how to differentiate instruction, how to use and monitor student progress, and how to advocate for ELLs. Understanding teacher's needs, professional development for ELL often incorporates individual guidance, collaborative inquiry, and Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). The individually guided development model aides in teacher reflection and focuses on improving instructional practices specifically with ELL students. Collaborative inquiry provides teachers time to collaborate with other teachers by sharing ideas and giving support. The SIOP model allows teacher to focus on integrating language into content instruction in their classroom. Ideas that are discussed during the SIOP model include lesson plans, content assessment, and the way to teach a lesson to ELL students (Echevarria et al., 2023). SIOP ensures ELLs have access to grade-level curriculum as well as opportunities to develop and learn English language proficiency (Echevarria et al., 2023). One additional related study created a professional development program called Project English Learners and Teacher Education (ELATE), which was a professional development program centered around the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). This study provided evidence that the program helped teachers improve their teaching abilities with ELL Students. The findings provided evidence on Project ELATE and revealed that it significantly improved the teachers' ability to use sheltered instructional practices (Williams, et al., 2024).

Professional development plays a role in shaping teacher beliefs, knowledge, and practices. Another related study created a professional development program with

the goal of increasing teacher efficacy of mathematics teachers. This professional development randomly assigned 106 sixth grade teachers in a school district to treatment and control conditions in a treatment design (Ross & Bruce, 2007). Results revealed that “treatment teachers outperformed control-group teachers on 3 measures of teacher efficacy, but results were statistically significant only for efficacy for classroom management” (Ross & Bruce, 2007).

There are limitations of one-size-fits-all professional development formats. Professional development as stated above, has several formats to achieve success. Teachers face a wide range of diverse challenges and have distinct needs, which makes a one-size-fits-all approach to support ineffective (Tomlinson, 2001).

ELL Instructional Challenges

Instructional challenges with teaching ELLs can include, but not limited to, language barriers, continuing the academic rigor for students, and providing cultural responsiveness. Looking at one recent study in Morocco on teaching ELL students, culturally responsive classroom management and professional development are essential for helping teachers build the skills they need (Qasserras, 2025). This includes using strategies like setting clear rules, using positive feedback, creating behavior agreements, and adjusting lessons to meet different student needs. The study highlights how important it is for teachers to receive continuous training and support (Qasserras, 2025). Although this study took place in Morocco, this reiterates the need for effective professional development for teachers of ELL students due to the academic challenges they face.

Another challenge mentioned in American schools includes transiency among ELL students (Jacobsen, 2001). According to one study, students who move more often have lower attendance rates and students are twice as likely to repeat a grade, and kids who move often even negatively impacts the academic achievement of settled students (Jacobsen, 2001).

According to a research study in Canada on effective instructional strategies for ELLs, mentioned strategies included having hand-on activities, having photographs, printed materials, manipulatives, art, maps, clocks, money, collaboration with other teachers, networking, having effective leadership, modeling, and pull outs and pull-ins (Mayda, 2015).

One research study in America included those effective strategies for teaching ELL students collected data from staff surveys and observations. In California's Sacramento Valley, a researcher collected data from 22 elementary school teachers (K-6th grade). Findings were that the staff at this elementary school specified the need for learning more strategies to support academic success for English language learners (Jacobsen, 2001).

With regards to teacher preparedness and perceptions of efficacy in ELL settings, according to one study, research revealed that teachers felt that they needed more resources, more training of teachers and pull-out support for ELL students (Mehu, 2023).

Gaps in the Literature

One gap that was found was research on teacher self-efficacy on who have been in the teaching field. There were many studies on preservice teachers that were found,

but minimal on teachers who have teaching experience (Glock, 2019; Zeichner, 2010). It became evident that there is lack of demographic association with teacher self-efficacy with teaching ELL students and teachers who have been in the teaching field. It is not known which demographic feels the most confident with teaching ELLs (for example looking into race, age, years of experience, etc.) Again, similar studies I have found focused on preservice teachers or from research that is more than five years old. I consider this to be a gap in the literature.

Another gap found was the type, frequency, and quality of professional development experiences, along with the follow through of using the learned strategies (Estrella, 2016; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Several studies focused on professional development, such as provided support and collaborative learning, but there are limited studies on how these factors enhance or inhibit teacher self-efficacy or how self-efficacy encourages teacher attendance in English Language Learner professional development (Estrella, 2016; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). As teachers progress through their career, their ideas and self-efficacy changes and transforms. Exploring the gap in research concerning teacher self-efficacy and ELL professional development participation is important for understanding ways to support teachers and productive learning environments.

Existing literature, both past and present studies focus on outcomes and numerical data, and often overlooks realities that are faced by educators. There is an absence of practitioner focused studies that inform real-world challenges (Creed et al., 2024). Through further research, this study will reveal some of those realities in the classroom and shed light on the concerns that teachers face with teaching ELLs.

Summary of Key Findings

Synthesis/Conclusion

This research study investigated teacher self-efficacy and the connection to ELL professional development. Due to the increase of ELL students in the United States this study will aid stakeholders in American K-12 public school districts to better understand and meet the needs of teachers (National Center for Education Statistics, 2022). This study is grounded through both theoretical frameworks of Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory and Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory. From the Social Cognitive Theory, Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory was the basis of my research. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory focuses on learning being a social process which takes place through interactions with other individuals who have more intelligence (Schunk, 2012). This brings value to my study regarding professional development for teachers. Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) considers how people regulate their own learning and actions along with internal mental processes (Bandura, 1986). One specific theory from Bandura focuses on self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory reveals that individuals believe their personal efficacy are thought to impact if coping strategies are initiated, how much time is invested, and how aggressive their efforts are when facing struggles (Bandura, 1977). The way that teachers view themselves influences their teachings and impacts student learning.

Findings discovered that there is a need for more professional development in ELL with preservice teachers (Howlett & Penner-Williams, 2020; Housel, 2023) Although these are great findings, it was also found that there was minimal information or

research conducted on teachers who teach ELLs and have been in the classroom for an extended period (Philbin, 2022).

Further research revealed that there are certain challenges that come with teaching ELLs. Challenges include providing cultural responsiveness, language barriers, and continuing the academic rigor for students (Qasserras, 2025). Effective strategies for teaching ELL students included strategies like setting clear rules, using positive feedback, creating behavior agreements, and adjusting lessons to meet different student needs (Qasserras, 2025). Again, the importance for teachers to receive continuous training and support was confirmed (Qasserras, 2025). There were several studies on how students in linguistically diverse classrooms perform academically, but not on experienced teachers or their confidence levels (Machado & Hartman, 2019).

It was found that effective professional development is context focused, is sustained over time, promotes collaboration, models effective practice, incorporates active learning, engages participants, provides expert support, and includes opportunities for feedback and reflection (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Considering this, effective professional development is necessary to help teachers with teaching ELLs successfully.

There are clear connections between the literature and the identified research gaps. There has been a steady increase of ELL students in the United States (Werblow et al., 2020). English learners are also the fastest-growing subgroup and there is a possibility that by the year 2025, ELLs will make up 25% of all public-school students (Werblow et al., 2020). There are minimal current findings for teacher self-efficacy intersecting with ELL professional development.

In summary, this research study delved into research on teachers with various years of experience, and other demographics. This study explored teacher self-efficacy with regards to teaching ELLs and with attending ELL professional development and provided information to K-12 stakeholders about self-efficacy and ELL professional development.

This research study was necessary to shed light on the issue of the lack of ELL professional development which could lead to lowered levels of teacher self-efficacy. When teachers have low self-efficacy, they have higher rates for teacher burn out and not being effective in the classroom. With the ever-growing numbers of ELL students in the United States, this study is valued. In the next chapter, I will explain my methodology and further explanations for this mixed methods study.

Chapter 3. Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter, the research methodology used to unveil the gaps with teacher self-efficacy and ELL professional development will be outlined. This quantitative study included a survey which had demographic questions, self-efficacy and professional development questions, along with three open-ended questions. This chapter includes a description of the research design, study participants, instruments, and the survey design. Considering the quantitative survey design, research includes a validated survey which was adapted from Darling-Hammond (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002). Survey questions on professional development were added as well. A survey was chosen for the quantitative approach to provide data and to identify correlations between teacher self-efficacy and teaching ELLs.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) and selected demographic or professional variables (years of experience, gender, degrees achieved, or ELL experience)?
 - A. Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) between teachers with different years of experience?
 - B. Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) based on gender?

- C. Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) based on teachers' degrees?
 - D. Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) between teachers with and without ELL-specific training?
2. Which dimensions of teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) are most strongly reported by teachers working with English Language Learners?
 3. What factor most strongly predicts teachers' self-efficacy for teaching ELL students: (a) frequency of ELL professional development (b) ELL school support (c) availability of ELL resources?

Research Design

This study includes a quantitative research design to explore elementary teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes towards teaching ELLs along with their perspectives regarding ELL professional development. A survey design was used including two phases: a mixed methods pilot study phase and a quantitative full-scale phase (Taherdoost, 2022). The reasonings for using a survey study was to understand patterns and trends from teachers' perspectives using a quantitative survey on a larger scale, and to also explore those findings in greater depth using open ended questions. This method was utilized to compare and analyze the findings from the quantitative research along with the open-ended questions.

Phase One

For phase one, a pilot study was conducted. Research questions were developed in hopes of providing insight on the effectiveness of the proposed research design, data collection instruments, and the methodology prior to the full-scale implementation of the research study. The research questions used for the pilot study were modified for the full-scale study.

Pilot Study Research Questions

1. How does teacher self-efficacy influence engagement in English Language Learner activities?
 - A. To what extent do teachers with self-efficacy in English Language Learner report engagement in professional development activities?
 - B. What aspects of self-efficacy (e.g., confidence in teaching strategies and classroom management) are most strongly associated with professional engagement?
2. What impacts teachers' participation in professional development?
 - A. To what extent do school support systems (e.g., administrative encouragement and peer support) influence teachers' decisions to participate in professional development?
 - B. How do available resources (e.g., time, financial support, materials) impact the level of professional development participation?

Instruments

Quantitative

This pilot study utilized a survey that was originally created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001), and later was adapted by Darling-Hammond et al. (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002). The original survey title was *Teacher Self Efficacy Survey* (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk, 2001). The long form of this survey had 24 questions in the original format and 12 questions on the short form in the original format. It utilized a 5-point Likert scale to collect data in four different domains including teacher perceived perceptions, self-efficacy, attitude towards ELLs in the classroom and attitude towards parents of ELLs.

One study that used this survey was focused on preservice teachers (Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010). This study was titled, *How Prepared are the U.S. Preservice Teachers to Teach English Language Learners?* (Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010). This pilot study utilized twenty-seven questions with perceived perceptions, self-efficacy, attitude towards ELLs in the classroom and attitude towards parents of ELLs as the four subscales. The original planned purpose of the survey was to collect data on pre-service teachers and their perceived perceptions and self-efficacy for teaching English Language Learners. For this pilot study, the researcher felt that the short form of the adapted survey was an appropriate survey to answer the research questions and because it was validated and reliable (Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010).

Using the knowledge of the original survey and the adapted survey results along with the literature reviews, the researcher decided to adapt the original survey as the questions asked about teacher self-efficacy with teaching ELLs. Although the original

survey was geared towards pre-service teachers, the researcher prefaced that this survey is specifically for teachers who currently have at least one ELL student in their classroom, thus adapting the survey to fit the needs of this research study. Considering this information, the survey was adapted from its original format. The researcher asked many of the same survey questions but adjusted the focus not on pre-service teachers, but to all teachers who currently have an ELL student. Three open ended questions were added to the end of the survey to provide teachers with an opportunity to express their opinions on teaching ELLs. The three open ended questions that were added included: 1.) How can educators differentiate instruction to meet the diverse language proficiency levels of ELL students? 2.) In what ways can collaborative learning strategies be used to enhance engagement among ELL students? 3.) How can technology be utilized to create an inclusive and supportive learning environment that fosters language development for ELL students? To give teachers an opportunity to type in their responses, they had the ability to share openly their thoughts pertaining to these questions.

Qualitative

The instrument used for the qualitative portion of this pilot study included researcher created interview questions. These interview questions were originally created with the intentions of collecting data from teachers about their input and opinions on various professional development opportunities they have attended, and their feeling and thoughts about their own self-efficacy when it comes to teaching English Language Learners. The researcher wanted to provide a time for teachers to share their experiences, inputs, and challenges with professional development.

The qualitative phase of the pilot study was conducted to gain a deeper insight into themes that are evident from the quantitative data that will be collected. A convenience sampling technique was used to select participants for the interview. Convenience sampling was an appropriate approach for this portion of the pilot study, especially considering that there was certain information about their experiences with professional development where their expertise was needed (Ahmed, 2024). The researcher chose five teachers to interview out of the teachers who volunteered to be interviewed.

The last question on the survey asked teachers if they were interested in being interviewed for further research. If teachers chose to answer yes and included their email address, a follow up email was sent to them thanking them for the opportunity to interview them. The survey explained that the interview would take no more than thirty minutes, and that the researcher would contact them to schedule an interview that was convenient for them.

Participants had to type their name and email to contact them for an interview. The researcher contacted participants by email to schedule an interview time. To protect teacher confidentiality, all interview participants and responses were anonymized. Each interview participant was assigned a numerical code in the place of their name. These codes were used throughout the transcription and analysis.

There were twenty planned interview questions, and the interview lasted no more than thirty minutes. During the first part of the interview, the researcher explained the purpose of the research study and briefly explained what self-efficacy was and the importance of the study. This was planned to assure that the participant knew what self-

efficacy meant. The first question asked teachers what they felt was their level of self-efficacy on a range from one to ten (one being the lowest, and ten being the highest). The second question asked how collaboration with colleagues impacted their self-efficacy as a teacher. As the interview progressed, other interview questions asked teachers about their experiences with professional development and the support they felt from administration and colleagues. One question asked about any challenges they have faced with professional development. The last planned questions asked teachers how they think ongoing professional development could be designed to support teacher self-efficacy who work with ELL students.

These interviews were planned to interpret teacher self-efficacy beliefs and how their experiences have shaped their attitude toward professional development. The interviews were used to gain insight on what professional development teachers had experienced, which professional development they consider to be highly beneficial, and their perspectives on support, both financial and encouragement, from administration and colleagues. These interviews hoped to provide rich data to help further explore teacher self-efficacy and professional development.

Participants

The pilot study was conducted in Spring of 2025 for the completion of a class titled, CTEE 7510, with the purpose to seek insight whether the survey and the interview questions were appropriate for a full-scale study. Participants in this pilot study included third through fifth grade teachers who worked in a rural elementary school in Alabama. Permission was granted from the school system and the principal to conduct this research in advance along with an approved IRB. The researcher was an employee at

this school, therefore access to email addresses were available. Teachers in this school were sent a survey through e-mail. Participants were selected for both quantitative and qualitative phases of the study. All participants received informed consent. Participation in both the survey and the interview was voluntary, and participants were informed that they could withdraw at any time without penalty. No identifying information was included in the reporting of the results. There were no rewards or incentives for participating in either the survey or the interview.

Quantitative Participants

For the quantitative research portion of the pilot study, a convenience sampling approach was used to recruit participants. An email to participate in an anonymous online survey was distributed to educators in one Alabama third through fifth grade elementary school. The first question of the survey asked teachers if they had an English Language Learner in their current classroom. If they answered yes, then they would continue to take the survey. If they answered no, then they were prompted to end the survey.

Qualitative Participants

The last question on the quantitative survey asked teachers if they were interested in participating in an interview by the researcher. If they answered yes, they were contacted to set up a time for the interview via email. There were eleven teachers who agreed to the interview. Five participants were chosen for the interview to conduct a sampling of the information to see if the interview questions were applicable to answer the research questions. The first five to agree were chosen because all had at least one

ELL student in their current classroom. Participants in the interviews ranged from veteran teachers (20+ years) to one who had been teaching for six years. Two participants were black (one male and one female) and three were white (females). Demographic questions were not included for the pilot study, but being an employee at this school and being the interviewer, years of experience and race were noted.

Data Collection for Pilot Study

Quantitative

Upon IRB approval on December 19th, 2024, data was collected over a four-week period. Twenty-seven digital surveys (Appendix A) were emailed to third through fifth grade teachers in a rural Alabama elementary school, who currently have at least one English Language Learner in their classroom. Participants varied with some being experienced veteran teachers having more than 20 years of experience, while others being new to the teaching field. Academic backgrounds also varied with one teacher participant having their doctorate degree, one was a doctoral candidate, ten teachers having their master's degree, and five having their bachelor's degree. The sample included participants of diverse ethnic backgrounds, primarily Caucasian and African American. Permission was granted from the principal and the school system for conducting research. Teachers were asked to answer the survey questions honestly. The last question on the digital survey asked teachers if they would be interested in being interviewed. Eleven teachers agreed to an interview from the seventeen completed surveys. The first five teachers to agree were chosen for the interviews, as it

was the amount planned for this study. Five teacher interviews were scheduled and conducted (See Appendix C).

During the first week of data collection, there were only seven teacher surveys that were completed. After the principal of this elementary school encouraged teachers to complete the survey with a reminder email, ten more surveys were then completed. After collecting the initial data on the surveys, scheduling of teacher interviews took place. During week three of the research study, teachers and students were out of school for spring break. Survey data collected up to that point was analyzed during the time away from school.

Data Collection for Pilot Study

Qualitative

Interview protocol interviews were conducted using a one-on-one format, in person, depending on the participant's availability. Before the interview, participants listened to a detailed explanation of the study's objectives, data handling procedures, and confidentiality measures. An electronic informed consent was collected for participation at the beginning of the survey which covered the potential interview as well. Five interviews were conducted, and each interview took approximately 30 minutes.

Throughout week four of research collection, only one teacher interview took place. Considering that teachers had just returned from spring break, and RTI (Response to Intervention) meetings were in process, lack of time was a factor for scheduling interviews.

During week five, four additional teacher interviews were conducted. After all teacher interviews were completed, week six was used for the analyzation of the data from both the surveys taken in Qualtrics and written notes from teacher interviews was performed. Below is a week-by-week schedule of how the research was conducted.

Data Management for Pilot Study

Below is a schedule of the data collection for the six-week research pilot study which was conducted during the spring in 2025. On Monday, February 24th, an email was sent including an introduction letter and a link to the Qualtrics survey to twenty-seven teachers. The chosen twenty-seven teachers all have at least one English Language Learner student in their current classroom. Qualtrics was closely watched to determine the results, and to determine which teachers were interested in being interviewed.

On Monday, March 3rd, only seven surveys had been completed. Observations continued as the completion date had not ended. Interview times were scheduled that was convenient for the teachers. During the third week of my research, March 10-14th, teachers and students were out of school for spring break. While out of school, data was viewed from the surveys. During the week of March 17th, only one teacher interview took place. Teachers were busy and finding a time to interview this week was difficult due to the return from spring break and RTI (Response to Intervention) meetings.

During the week of March 24th-28th, research continued through interviews. Four interviews were conducted during this week. Teachers graciously offered their time for

the interviews. Survey data and teacher interview data was reviewed and analyzed during week six. Pre-determined priori codes were used to organize and code the data.

Data analysis was completed by viewing the graphs in Qualtrics and breaking down the questions one at a time. A five-point Likert scale was utilized to access the level of confidence reported by teachers. The mean, median, and mode was conducted for clear representation of teacher perceptions of their self-efficacy. Analyzing teacher' responses to open-ended questions will provide an opportunity to gain insight into their perspectives. Priori codes will be used to organize the data from the teacher interviews and color coded for clear understanding. Notes will be made to group commonalities found from teacher interviews in chapter four.

Data Analysis for Pilot Study

Quantitative

Data analysis was completed by viewing the graphs in Qualtrics and breaking down the questions one at a time. A five-point Likert scale was utilized to access the level of confidence reported by teachers. The mean, median, and mode was conducted for clear representation of teacher perceptions of their self-efficacy. Analyzing teacher' responses to open-ended questions provided an opportunity to gain insight into their perspectives. Priori codes were used to organize the data from the teacher interviews and color coded for clear understanding. Notes were made to group commonalities found from teacher interviews.

Following implementation of teacher surveys and teacher interviews, the data was analyzed to determine teacher self-efficacy and the impact from professional development. To analyze teacher self-efficacy, the data was viewed from the validated

survey which was emailed to teachers. By using the data, a bar graph was utilized which was provided under results in Qualtrics to illustrate the results. Using the information from Qualtrics, I proceeded to calculate the mean, median, and mode of the information to determine how teachers perceive their own self-efficacy with teaching ELL students. A chart was created to help organize this information, which will be discussed further in chapter four.

Qualitative

While analyzing the data from teacher interviews, the researcher focused on predetermined priori codes which were utilized during the teacher interviews. These codes were created during the initial planning process. Considering the investigation of teacher self-efficacy and professional development accessibility, six priori codes were created to best recognize findings, and to organize the information. I used varied colored highlighters to differentiate the categories while analyzing data from the teacher interviews.

Priori Codes

1. Self-Efficacy

- Confidence in teaching ELLs (C) =Pink
- Perceived ability to adapt instruction (PAAI) =Orange
- Impact of self-efficacy on student outcomes (ISESO)=Yellow

2. Professional Development Accessibility

- Institutional support for teacher training (ISTT) =Baby Blue
- Barriers to accessing professional development (BAPD) = Green

- Self-efficacy impact from professional development (SEIPD) =Blue

The codes allowed the researcher to determine whether teachers have similar outlooks on their own self-efficacy and their outlooks with teaching English Language Learners. The codes also provided a way to organize the information collected into categories, so the researcher could determine confidence levels with teaching ELLs, and how professional development has impacted their self-efficacy. I also wanted to investigate if English Language Learner professional development made an impact on teacher self-efficacy.

Discussion of Findings to Impact the Current Study

An overall summary of the survey data indicated that confidence lowers when there are high academic expectations, when family communication or engagement occurs, and when differentiating assessments for ELLs. There is a slight instructional uncertainty for teachers with the survey item “I am uncertain how to teach some of my ELL students.” This emphasizes the importance for continued professional development with ELL-specific strategies. Findings from this pilot study revealed teachers wanted more professional development for helping with teaching of ELL students, specifically, with how to provide assessments.

The findings from this pilot study provided meaningful insight into the relationship between ELL professional development and teacher self-efficacy. The findings confirmed that the survey provided appropriate data, but noted changes are to be made for the full study. The research questions were changed to better align with the study’s purpose and to ensure that the analysis would yield measurable results. The survey was adjusted for the full-scale study. The researcher decided to use the long-form version of

the Teacher Self-Efficacy survey for the full-scale study and changed the open-ended questions to better fit the revised research questions. One question asked teachers about technology, and this is not necessary for this research study. In addition to different open-ended questions, demographic questions will be added to the survey for the full-scale study. This will provide context for answering the research questions and will provide a clearer understanding of correlation between teacher self-efficacy to years of experience, age, degrees earned, and experiences with teaching ELL students. The changes being made are to gain alignment between the survey.

Phase Two

Introduction

For this full-scale research study, a quantitative survey was conducted to examine how prepared and confident teachers feel when educating English Language Learners along with collecting information about ELL professional development. A quantitative survey research design was selected to gather measurable data from a large sample of educators.

Participants

Participants included elementary school teachers in grades K-6 in Alabama. An anonymous link was generated in Qualtrics and included in an invitation email sent to a random sample of 1000 elementary, K-6 teachers using contact information purchased from Market Data Retrieval (MDR). In the email, there was a letter explaining the research study. Prior to participating in the survey, all participants answered a consent question and had the option to opt out of the survey at any time. Participants were

informed that they would not be compensated for completing the survey. The survey should have taken no longer than ten minutes for teacher participants to complete.

Data Collection for Full Study

Quantitative

The full-scale survey included a letter explaining the purpose of the research study, a question regarding whether teachers have an ELL student in their classroom, a consent question, four demographic questions, 24 self-efficacy questions, and four professional development questions. The long form of Teacher Self-Efficacy survey (TSES) was used along with three professional development survey questions developed by the researcher to add to the TSES survey, along with three open-ended questions which were also created by the researcher (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk, 2001). The original survey was developed by Megan Tschannen Moran and Anita Woolfolk Hoy with the intention of measuring the self-efficacy of preservice teachers (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The survey used for this research study utilized a modified version of the TSES survey by adding demographic questions and merging the long form of TSES with three professional development questions and three open-ended questions. The three professional development survey questions included the following questions. How often do you attend ELL professional development? Do you feel supported by your school to attend ELL professional development? Do you feel that there are adequate resources for you to teach your ELL students? The three professional development survey questions were added to answer research question three using a five-point Likert scale using agreement choices ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. For the frequency item question for

professional development, it ranged from 1=never to 5=very often. The researcher chose this format for these questions to make it easier for teacher participants to make a choice.

The three open ended questions included: 1.) In your experience, does attending professional development regularly make a difference in your classroom practices with ELLs? 2.) What has been the most impactful experience that improved your self-efficacy with ELLs? 3.) What kinds of resources are available to you for teaching ELLs? These open-ended questions were created by the researcher with the goal to allow participants to freely share their personal experiences and experiences with ELL in hopes of adding depth to the research study.

The surveys were distributed to teachers across the state of Alabama through e-mail. The survey was created using Qualtrics, a secure, web-based program that allows researchers to distribute, design, and collect survey responses. Qualtrics was used because of the range of question formats and the data exporting capabilities. Using Qualtrics provided anonymity and protects data through encrypted storage. Using Qualtrics ensured compliance with ethical and institutional standards. The survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete.

An email was sent out to teachers and included an explanation letter for the research followed by a link for the survey. In the email, it explained why I decided to conduct this research and a brief background of the study. Once teachers clicked on the survey link, the first question asked teachers if they consent to taking this survey. If they click yes, they proceeded. The next question on the survey asked teachers if they currently teach grades K-6 and have an English Language Learner in their classroom. If

they answered yes, then they proceeded with the survey. If they answered no, they were prompted to exit the survey. The beginning of the survey included demographic questions to allow for subgroup data analysis. Demographic questions included asking teachers how many years of teaching experience they had, if they have lived abroad, their race and ethnicity, and their age. Analysis and descriptive methods were used to analyze the data from this study. Considering this was a quantitative design, varied analysis was utilized to ensure validity.

Data Management

The six-week quantitative research study was planned to begin in October of 2025. Due to waiting on IRB approval, the study did not officially start until November 12, 2025. An email was sent to teachers on Monday, November 19th, 2025, including an introduction letter explaining the research study and the purpose. In the email, a link to the Qualtrics survey was attached for teachers to complete. Qualtrics was closely monitored to determine the results. The data continued to be observed into the next several weeks of research.

E-mails had to be sent out in increments of 500 and no more than 1,000 emails in a day, due to university email restrictions. Emails were purchased from MDR and filtered to K-6 public school teachers in Alabama. The first round of emails was purchased on November 17th, 2025. On November 19th, 498 emails were sent out, on November 25th, 287 emails were sent out, on November 30th, 100 emails were sent out, on December 1st, 143 emails were sent, on December 8th, 499 emails were sent, on December 9th, 401 emails were sent, and lastly on December 12th, 884 emails were sent out. During the study, the researcher sent out reminder emails (included in these

numbers) due to not having enough completed surveys. Additional email addresses were purchased on December 9th, in hopes of receiving more completed surveys.

This research study ended on December 19th and data was reviewed and analyzed during the spring of 2026. Data analysis was completed by viewing the graphs in Qualtrics and breaking down the research questions one at a time.

Data Analysis

The data collection through surveys was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). SPSS is a software program used for statistical analysis in research. SPSS was chosen to run the analysis due to the ability to manage large data sets and because it can perform a variety of tests. Various tests ran using SPSS included Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) for research questions: 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, and 2. The reason for using a MANOVA regression for these research questions was due to the independent variables being categorical, and the dependent variables being continuous.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was specifically selected for research question 1a because the dependent variable of teacher self-efficacy is conceptualized as multidimensional which consists of three subscales: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. Instead of treating each subscale as independent outcomes, running MANOVA will allow the subscales to be analyzed simultaneously as a set of correlated dependent variables. MANOVA is the most appropriate test to run using SPSS because it evaluates years of teaching experiences across multiple, related aspects of teacher self-efficacy (See Appendix D).

For research questions 1b, MANOVA was conducted due to the independent variable being categorical (See Appendix D). The reason for choosing multiple linear regression for this question was due to using more than two predictors to explain or predict the value of a single continuous outcome (dependent variable). The regression will provide coefficients which will tell the direction and strength of each relationship. Using a multiple linear regression for this question provided the ability to determine which independent variable contributed most strongly to the dependent variable and revealed the unique contribution by statistically controlling the demographic factors. Male was coded as 1, and women was coded as 2. All other options were removed due to them being outliers in the data.

For research question 1c, a MANOVA test was also appropriate due to the independent variable being categorical including four categories of teacher degrees (bachelors, master's, educational specialist, and doctoral). The dependent variable used self-efficacy as a continuous factor.

For research question 1d, a MANOVA was also appropriate using the independent variable as categorical with teachers choosing either with or without ELL specific training and the dependent variable being continuous with self-efficacy.

For research question 2, a MANOVA was appropriate as the independent variable included teachers who work with ELL Students as a categorical response being 1 for yes or 2 for no. The dependent variable includes self-efficacy. This information came from one demographic question and the validated survey questions.

For research question 3, teachers were asked to type in their responses. This research question was analyzed according to key findings and common word phrases found in teacher responses.

Validity and Reliability

To assure that the study was valid and reliable, the instrument selection and the research design were carefully chosen with the research questions in mind. The survey used was adapted from previously established instruments. These instruments have been tested and validated in peer-reviewed research studies (Stevenson et al., 2021; Duffin, et al., 2012).

The reliability of the TSES survey was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, a statistical measure which tested multi-scale items. Cronbach's alpha was used as the most appropriate reliability measure because it accesses the internal consistency of multi-item scales. In similar studies on teacher self-efficacy, alpha values of above .70 have been reported, which supports the reliability of this instrument for educational research. Therefore, it was considered a reliable scale. Considering the validated instrument along with using the appropriate data analysis procedures, ethical safeguards, all will contribute to the overall credibility of the study's findings.

Ethical Considerations

This quantitative research study adhered to ethical research standards to protect the right and privacy of all involved participants. Before data collection began, approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Auburn University was obtained. All participants were provided with a question of consent that clearly outlined the purpose

of this research study, the estimated time commitment, potential risks from the study, and the assurance of having confidentiality.

Data was stored securely and only accessible to the researcher using password protected files. DUO two-factor authentication was used for data protection. The collected data was used for this research study but may be used to inform future research related to teacher self-efficacy and professional development for ELLs. There were no physical, professional, or emotional risks anticipated for teacher participants. The researcher ensured that the study was conducted with transparency, integrity, and respect for all participants in the study. There was no identifiable information collected during the survey. Participant confidentiality was strictly maintained throughout the study, therefore all responses from the survey remain anonymous.

Summary

Throughout this chapter, the research design, methodology, and research procedures have been outlined to examine the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and professional development in relation to teaching ELLs. A quantitative teacher survey was chosen to conduct research from teachers who teach K-6 at who have at least one ELL in their current classroom. A validated survey was planned to be used to collect data from a large sample of educators distributed by email through Qualtrics in Alabama. This chapter provided information on the pilot study, the planned data collection process, the planned analytical procedures using SPSS, the validity and reliability of the study, and ethical considerations. This study provided valid and reliable results to contribute a deeper understanding of the impacts of having ELL-specific training on teacher self-efficacy along with results from demographic relationships to the

three sub-groups of instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement. In chapter 4, the findings from this research study will be presented.

Chapter 4. Findings

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and selected demographic and professional variables, as well as to determine which dimensions of self-efficacy are most strongly reported by teachers working with English Language Learners (ELLs). In addition, this study identified which factor, frequency of professional development, school support, or availability of instructional resources, most strongly predicts teachers' self-efficacy for teaching ELL students. This chapter reveals the descriptive statistics, inferential analyses, and findings aligned to each research question. The results are organized into five major sections: participant demographics, descriptive statistics and instrument reliability, results for research questions 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2, and 3. This chapter presents the analysis and findings of the survey study and addresses each of the research questions.

Participant Demographics

The usable response rate was 90%. A total of 100 teachers participated in the survey study. Surveys with more than 50% missing data were excluded from the dataset prior to analysis. The final dataset included 90 completed surveys that met the previously established criteria. Quantitative data was collected via a survey created in Qualtrics, a secure, web-based platform that allows researchers to design and collect survey responses. Qualtrics provided anonymity and protected data through encrypted storage. The teachers who participated in the study represented K-6 grade levels in public schools located in Alabama. Participants were both male and female, had a wide range of years of teaching experience, and held a variety of academic backgrounds.

According to the demographic information on gender, the data reveals that 89% of teachers who filled out the survey were female, and 11% of the teachers were male. This encompassed 80 female participants and 10 male participants.

A review of teaching experience data revealed that 11% of teachers had 0-5 years of teaching experience, 13% of teachers had 6-10 years of experience, 12% of participants had 11-15 years of teaching experience, 19% had 16-20 years of teaching experience, 27% had 21-25 years of teaching experience, and 18% of participants had 25 or more years of teaching experience.

An analysis of the highest degree earned by teacher participants showed that 14% held a bachelor's degree, 66% held a master's degree, 15% held an education specialist degree, and 5% held a doctoral degree.

Instrument Reliability

The internal consistency reliability of the TSES and its three subscales (student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management) was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α). The overall Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey (TSES) demonstrated strong reliability, $\alpha = .96$. The subscale reliability coefficients include student engagement: $\alpha = .91$, instructional strategies: $\alpha = .91$, and classroom management: $\alpha = .91$. These results indicate good to excellent internal consistency, suggesting that the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale is a reliable instrument for measuring teachers perceived self-efficacy within this sample.

To create the subscales for analysis in SPSS, survey items were grouped according to the three established domains of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale. The student engagement subscale included survey items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, and 22.

The instructional strategies subscale consisted of survey items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, and 24. The classroom management subscale included survey items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 21. These groupings follow the instrument's original structure and have been used consistently in prior research (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were calculated to summarize teacher responses to the Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy Survey (TSES). The TSES measured three domains of teacher efficacy: self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. There were 90 completed teacher surveys that were analyzed.

The Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) has demonstrated consistency in prior research, with reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from .87 to .91 across all three subscales including student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). In the present survey study, reliability estimates were analyzed to confirm internal consistency for the current sample (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Scores were computed by averaging item responses within each subscale and across the total scale.

Self-efficacy in student engagement reported having the lowest mean among the three domains ($M = 6.68$, $SD = 1.20$). This suggested that while respondents still reported a relatively strong sense of efficacy, they felt slightly less confident in their ability to actively engage students in learning compared to managing the classroom or using instructional strategies.

The classroom management subscale had the highest mean score ($M = 7.21$, $SD = 1.22$). This suggested that teachers felt most confident in their ability to manage student behavior and maintain an effective classroom environment.

Self-efficacy in instructional strategies had the second highest mean ($M = 7.10$, $SD = 1.08$). This suggested that teachers felt confident in their capability to implement effective teaching methods and instructional strategies.

Given that higher scores reflect greater perceived self-efficacy, classroom management emerged as the highest rated category, followed by instructional strategies and then student engagement. These differences are revealed in Table 1. (See Table 1 below.)

Table 1

Mean Scores for Teacher Self-Efficacy Domains (TSES)

Variable	N	Min	Max	M	SD
SE subscale engagement	90	4.00	9.00	6.68	1.20
SE subscale instructional strategies	90	4.50	9.00	7.10	1.08
SE subscale classroom management	90	3.38	9.00	7.21	1.22

Results

Results for Research Question 1a

Research Question 1a examined whether teacher self-efficacy differed based on years of teaching experience. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess differences in instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement across levels of teaching experience.

Box's M of equality of covariance matrices was significant, Box's $M = 54.27$, $p = .019$, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was violated. Therefore, Pillai's Trace was used as a more robust multivariate test statistic.

The MANOVA revealed that there was not a statistically significant effect of years of teaching experience on the combined dependent variables, Pillai's Trace = .205, $F(15, 252) = 1.23$, $p = .248$, $\eta_p^2 = .068$.

Because the multivariate effect was not statistically significant, no follow-up univariate analyses were conducted.

Interpretation

These findings from the MANOVA indicate that years of teaching experience did not have a statistically significant effect on the combined dependent variables. This suggests that the outcome measures did not differ meaningfully across groups with different levels of teaching experience. Therefore, teachers with varying years of experience showed similar overall patterns on the dependent variables included in the analysis. Understanding that the overall multivariate effect was not significant, no further analyses were conducted. This means there is no evidence from this study to that years of teaching experience are associated with differences in self-efficacy subscales.

Results for Research Question 1b

Research Question 1b examined whether there were significant differences in teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement) based on participants' gender. A total of 90 participants completed the survey, including 80 females and 10 males. Gender was coded in Qualtrics as 1 = *male*

and 2 = *female*. Other response options (non-binary, prefer not to say, and open-ended responses) were not selected and were therefore excluded from analysis.

Prior to conducting the MANOVA, Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was performed to assess the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices. The result was statistically significant, (Box's $M = 15.78$, $p = .033$), indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was violated. Given this violation and the unequal group sizes, Pillai's Trace was used as a more robust multivariate test statistic. (See Table 2 below.)

Table 2

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices (Gender)

Test	Value	F	df1	df2	p
Box's M	15.78	2.30	6	1379.47	.033

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine whether teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement) differed by gender. Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was significant, Box's $M = 15.78$, $p = .033$, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was violated. Therefore, Pillai's Trace was used as the multivariate test statistic.

The MANOVA revealed no statistically significant difference in teacher self-efficacy based by gender, Pillai's Trace = .046, $F(3, 86) = 1.39$, $p = .253$, $\eta_p^2 = .046$.

Because the multivariate effect was not statistically significant, no follow-up univariate analyses were conducted. (See Table 3 below.)

Table 3*Multivariate Test of Gender on Teacher Self-Efficacy*

Effect	Pillai's Trace	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	p	η_p^2
Gender	.046	1.39	3	86	.253	.046

Interpretation

The results indicated no statistically significant multivariate effect of gender on the combined dependent variables. This suggests that the dependent variables, when considered together, did not differ significantly between gender groups. Therefore, gender does not appear to have a meaningful influence on teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement) which was measured in this study.

Results for Research Question 1c

Research Question 1c examined whether there was a significant difference in teachers' self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement) based on teachers' highest earned degree. Participants reported their highest level of education from four categories: bachelor's degree, master's degree, education specialist degree, and doctoral degree. These categories were coded numerically for analysis as follows: bachelor's degree (1), master's degree (2), education specialist degree (3), and doctoral degree (4).

Of the 90 teachers who completed the survey, the majority held a master's degree ($n = 60$, 66.7%), followed by an education specialist degree ($n = 13$, 14.4%), a bachelor's degree ($n = 12$, 13.3%), and a doctoral degree ($n = 5$, 5.6%).

Classroom Management

Descriptive statistics were computed to examine teacher self-efficacy across degree levels. For the classroom management subscale, mean scores were as follows: bachelor's degree ($M = 7.90$, $SD = 0.84$), master's degree ($M = 7.19$, $SD = 1.13$), education specialist degree ($M = 6.36$, $SD = 1.53$), and doctoral degree ($M = 8.00$, $SD = .90$). These results suggest that teachers with doctoral and bachelor's degrees reported higher levels of self-efficacy in classroom management, whereas teachers with an education specialist degree reported the lowest levels. However, this finding should be interpreted with the understanding that only five participants reported having a doctoral degree.

Instructional Strategies

For the instructional strategies subscale, mean scores were bachelor's degree ($M = 7.28$, $SD = .95$), master's degree ($M = 7.08$, $SD = 1.07$), education specialist degree ($M = 6.76$, $SD = 1.13$), and doctoral degree ($M = 7.78$, $SD = 1.36$). A similar pattern was observed, with teachers holding doctoral and bachelor's degrees reporting higher levels of self-efficacy, whereas those with an education specialist degree reported the lowest levels

Student Engagement

For the student engagement subscale, mean scores were bachelor's degree ($M = 6.95$, $SD = 1.10$), master's degree ($M = 6.68$, $SD = 1.18$), education specialist degree ($M = 6.14$, $SD = 1.26$), and doctoral degree ($M = 7.48$, $SD = 1.33$). These results indicate that teachers holding a doctoral degree reported the highest levels of self-

efficacy in student engagement, whereas those with an education specialist degree reported the lowest levels. (See Table 4 below for descriptive statistics.)

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics

<i>Subscale</i>	<i>Degree Level</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>
Classroom Management	Bachelor's degree	7.90	0.84	12
	Master's degree	7.19	1.13	60
	Education specialist degree	6.36	1.53	13
	Doctoral degree	8.00	0.90	5
	Total	7.21	1.22	90
Instructional Strategies	Bachelor's degree	7.28	0.95	12
	Master's degree	7.08	1.07	60
	Education specialist degree	6.76	1.13	13
	Doctoral degree	7.78	1.36	5
	Total	7.10	1.08	90
Student Engagement	Bachelor's degree	6.95	1.10	12
	Master's degree	6.68	1.18	60
	Education specialist degree	6.14	1.26	13
	Doctoral degree	7.48	1.33	5
	Total	6.68	1.20	90

Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices across degree levels. The result

was not significant, Box's $M = 30.69$, $F(18, 1042.00) = 1.41$, $p = .117$, indicating that the assumption was met. (See Table 5 below for Box's test results.)

Table 5

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices (Levels of Degrees)

Test	Value	F	df1	df2	p
Box's M	30.69	1.41	18	1042.00	.117

Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices prior to conducting the MANOVA. Based on this assessment, Wilks' lambda was selected as the appropriate multivariate test. A one-way MANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of teacher degree level on three self-efficacy subscales: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. The MANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of degree level on the combined dependent variables, Wilks' $\lambda = .81$, $F(9, 204.59) = 2.08$, $p = .033$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$, indicating that teacher self-efficacy differed significantly across degree levels.

The MANOVA analysis showed that the teachers' highest earned degree had a statistically significant effect on the combined dependent variable of self-efficacy as interpreted below. (See Table 6 below.)

Table 6*Multivariate Test of Degree Level on Teacher Self-Efficacy*

Effect	Test	Value	F	df (Hypothesis, Error)	p	η^2p
Degree Level	Wilks' Lambda	.81	2.08	(9, 204.59)	.033	.07

Wilks' Lambda test was selected based on Box's test of equality of covariance matrices. The results indicated a moderate effect size, $\eta_p^2 = .07$

Interpretation for Research Question 1c

The results of the MANOVA indicated that teachers' highest earned degree had a statistically significant effect on the combined dependent variables of self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement), Wilks's $\lambda = .81$, $F(9, 204.59) = 2.08$, $p = .033$. This suggests that teachers' self-efficacy differs across degree levels. The effect size was moderate, $\eta_p^2 = .07$, indicating that degree level accounts for a modest proportion of variance in self-efficacy. (See Table 7 below for Levine's Test results.)

Table 7*Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances by Degree Level*

Dependent Variable	F	df1	df2	p
Classroom management	1.93	3	86	.130
Instructional strategies	0.28	3	86	.842
Student engagement	0.16	3	86	.924

Levene's test of equality of error variances was not significant for classroom management, $F(3, 86) = 1.93, p = .130$. It was also not significant for instructional strategies, $F(3, 86) = 0.28, p = .842$, or student engagement, $F(3, 86) = 0.16, p = .924$. These results indicate that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met.

Follow-up univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to examine the effect of teacher degree level on each self-efficacy subscale.

For the classroom management subscale, there was a statistically significant difference among degree levels. Bonferroni post hoc comparisons indicated that teachers with a bachelor's degree reported significantly higher self-efficacy in classroom management than those with an education specialist degree ($M_{diff} = 1.54, SE = 0.46, p = .008, 95\% CI [0.29, 2.79]$). Additionally, teachers with a doctoral degree reported significantly higher self-efficacy than those with an education specialist degree ($M_{diff} = 1.64, SE = 0.61, p = .049, 95\% CI [0.00, 3.29]$). No other pairwise comparisons were statistically significant.

For the instructional strategies subscale, the ANOVA was not statistically significant, and Bonferroni post hoc comparisons indicated no significant differences between degree levels (all $ps > .05$).

Similarly, for the student engagement subscale, the ANOVA was not statistically significant, and no significant differences were found among degree levels based on Bonferroni post hoc comparisons (all $ps > .05$).

There was no significant difference between teachers with bachelor's and doctoral degrees ($M_{diff} = -0.10, SE = 0.61, p = 1.000, 95\% CI [-1.56, 1.76]$).

(See Table 8 below.)

Table 8*Bonferroni Post Hoc Comparisons for Classroom Management by Degree Level*

Comparison	Mean Difference	SE	p	95% CI
Bachelor's vs. Ed. Specialist	1.54	0.46	.008	[0.29, 2.79]
Doctoral vs. Ed. Specialist	1.64	0.61	.049	[0.00, 3.29]
Bachelor's vs. Doctoral	-0.10	0.61	1.000	[-1.56, 1.76]
Bachelor's vs. Master's	0.71	0.39	.430	[0.29, 2.79]
Master's vs. Ed. Specialist	0.83	0.40	.245	[-0.24, 1.90]
Master's vs. Doctoral	-0.81	0.56	.911	[-2.32, 0.70]

Results for Research Question 1d

Research question 1d examined whether there was a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement) between teachers with and without ELL-specific training. This variable was coded as 0 (no training) and 1 (training). Criteria for training included any ELL-specific coursework or professional development. For example, a general master's degree was not counted, whereas a master's in ELL or participation in ELL-focused professional development was counted as training.

Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was not significant, $M = 13.49$, $F(6, 147.49) = 1.34$, $p = .242$, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was met. (See Table 9 below.)

Table 9

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices

Test	Value	F	df1	df2	p
Box's M	13.49	1.34	6	147.49	.242

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of certification on the combined dependent variables of instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. The multivariate test using Wilks' λ indicated that there was no statistically significant effect of certification on the combined dependent variables, (Wilks' $\lambda = .56$, $F(60, 200.73) = 0.73$, $p = .924$). (See Table 10 below.)

Table 10

Multivariate Test (MANOVA)

Effect	Wilk's λ	F	df (hyp, error)	p
Certification	.555	0.73	(60, 200.73)	.924

Interpretation for Research Question 1d

The MANOVA indicated that there was no statistically significant effect of ELL-specific training on the self-efficacy subscales of instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. This suggests that teachers who had received ELL specific training did not report significantly different levels of self-efficacy compared to those who had not received such training. In other words, participation in ELL coursework or professional development did not appear to influence teachers' overall

perceptions of their ability to effectively teach English Language Learners within this sample. Therefore, based on these findings, there is no evidence to suggest that ELL specific training is associated with differences in teacher self-efficacy across the three domains measured in this study.

Results for Research Question 2

Research question 2 aimed to determine which dimensions of teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) are most strongly reported by teachers working with English Language Learners. Out of the 90 usable survey responses, 81 teachers stated that they have an ELL in their classroom and 9 reported that they did not have an ELL in their classroom.

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices prior to performing the MANOVA. Box's M test was not significant, $\text{Box's } M = 9.41, F(6, 1079.00) = 1.35, p = .234$, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was met. (See Table 11 below.)

Table 11

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices

Test	Value	F	df1	df2	p
Box's M	9.41	1.35	6	1079.00	.234

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to examine differences in the dependent variables based on ELL classroom status. The multivariate effect was not statistically

significant, Wilks' $\lambda = .93$, $F(3, 86) = 2.06$, $p = .112$, indicating no significant differences between groups on the combined dependent variables. (See Table 12 below.)

Table 12

Multivariate Analysis of Variance Results for ELL Classroom Status

<i>Effect</i>	<i>Wilks λ</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df1</i>	<i>df2</i>	<i>p</i>
ELL Classroom Status	.933	2.06	3	86	.112

Interpretation of Research Question 2

The results of the MANOVA test indicated no statistically significant differences in teacher self-efficacy by whether teachers had English Language Learners in their classroom. The results suggest that the presence of ELL students did not significantly influence teachers' overall levels of self-efficacy across the three self-efficacy subscales of instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement.

Descriptive findings revealed that teachers reported the highest levels of self-efficacy in classroom management and instructional strategies and the lowest in student engagement. This pattern suggests that teachers felt most confident in managing classroom behaviors and maintaining an effective learning environment, while feeling comparatively less confident in engaging students.

Overall, these findings indicate that although ELL classroom status did not produce statistically significant differences, classroom management was the strongest reported dimension of teacher self-efficacy among teachers, while student engagement was the weakest among teachers.

Results for Research Question 3

Research question 3 examined which factor most strongly predicts teachers' self-efficacy for teaching English Language Learners (ELLs): (a) frequency of professional development (b) school support or (c) availability of resources. To answer this question, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted. The MANOVA was used to determine differences with teachers' self-efficacy across three domains (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement) based on the independent variables.

The independent variables were categorical and included frequency of professional development, school support, and availability of resources. The dependent variables were continuous and consisted of three subscales: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. SPSS was used to conduct all analyses.

Frequency of Professional Development

To analyze teacher's self-efficacy and the frequency of professional development, responses were used for the survey question asking teachers how often they attended ELL professional development. For the professional development variable, survey responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale and coded numerically as follows: 1= Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Often, and 5= Very Often. For the self-efficacy portion of this research question, three subscales were used: efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instrumental strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. The self-efficacy subscales represented the dependent

variable (continuous) and the frequency of professional development represented the independent variable (categorical).

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices. The test was not significant, Box's $M = 19.25$, $F(18, 2218.92) = 0.94$, $p = .530$, indicating that the assumption was met. Therefore, a MANOVA was conducted, and Wilks' Lambda was used to evaluate multivariate significance. (See Table 13 below.)

Table 13

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices (Professional Development Frequency)

Test	Box's M	F	$df1$	$df2$	p
Box's Test	19.25	0.94	18	2218.92	.530

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the effect of professional development frequency on teacher self-efficacy subscales (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement). Results indicated that the multivariate effect of professional development frequency was not statistically significant, Wilks' $\lambda = .816$, $F(12, 214.60) = 1.43$, $p = .156$. (See Table 14 below for results.)

Table 14

Multivariate Effect of Professional Development Frequency (Wilk's Lambda)

Effect	Wilks' λ	F	$df1$	$df2$	p
PD Frequency	.816	1.43	12	214.60	.156

School Support

Teacher's self-efficacy was examined in relation to perceived school support. Teacher responses were used from the survey question assessing the level of support provided to teachers of ELLs to attend professional development. For the school support variable, survey responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale and coded numerically as follows: 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Somewhat Disagree, 3= Neither Agree or Disagree, 4= Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. For the self-efficacy portion of this research question, three subscales were used: efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instrumental strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. The independent variable was represented by the school supports professional development survey question which was categorical, and the dependent variable was represented by the self-efficacy subscales (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement) which were continuous.

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices. The test was statistically significant, Box's $M = 41.50$, $F(24, 5298.18) = 1.56$, $p = .041$, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was violated. Although Box's M was statistically significant at $p = .041$, it did not exceed the more stringent criterion of $p < .001$. Therefore, the assumption was considered tenable, and Wilks' Lambda was used. (See Table 15 below for Box's M results.)

Table 15*Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices (School Supports)*

Test	Box's M	F	df1	df2	p
Box's Test	41.50	1.56	24	5298.18	.041

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the effect of school support on teacher self-efficacy subscales (instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement). Results indicated that the multivariate effect of school support was not statistically significant, Wilks' $\lambda = .802$, $F(12, 219.89) = 1.59$, $p = .096$. (See Table 16 below for MANOVA results.)

Table 16*Multivariate Test Results for School Supports (Wilks' Lambda)*

Effect	Wilks' λ	F	df1	df2	p
School Supports	.802	1.59	12	219.89	.095

Availability of Resources

Teacher self-efficacy was examined in relation to the perceived availability of resources for teaching English Language Learners (ELLs). Data was drawn from a survey item assessing teachers' perceptions of whether adequate resources were available to support ELL instruction. Responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale which was coded as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Teacher self-efficacy included three subscales: student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom

management. The independent variable in this analysis was perceived availability of resources, and the dependent variables included the teacher self-efficacy subscales of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices. The test was not statistically significant, Box's $M = 32.02$, $F(24, 1448.41) = 1.13$, $p = .302$, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was met. Therefore, the results of the MANOVA were interpreted using Wilks' Lambda. (See Table 17 below for Box's test results.)

Table 17

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices (Availability of Resources)

Test	Box's M	F	$df1$	$df2$	p
Box's Test	32.02	1.13	24	1448.41	.302

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the effect of the frequency of professional development on teacher self-efficacy subscales (student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management). Results indicated that the multivariate effect of professional development frequency was not statistically significant, Wilks' $\lambda = .803$, $F(12, 219.89) = 1.59$, $p = .096$. (See Table 18 below for MANOVA results.)

Table 18*Multivariate Test Results for Availability of Resources (Wilks' Lambda)*

<i>Effect</i>	<i>Wilks' λ</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df1</i>	<i>df2</i>	<i>p</i>
Availability Resources	.803	1.59	12	219.89	.095

Interpretation of Research Question 3

The results of the MANOVA analyses indicated that none of the examined professional factors which includes frequency of professional development, perceived school support, or availability of resources, had a statistically significant effect on the combined teacher self-efficacy subscales of instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. This suggests that variations in these external supports did not meaningfully influence teachers' perceptions of their ability to effectively teach English Language Learners within this sample.

Although slight differences were observed across groups, these differences were not statistically significant, which indicates that teacher self-efficacy remained relatively consistent regardless of the level of professional development participation, perceived support, or access to instructional resources. The findings suggest that none of these factors are a strong predictor of teacher self-efficacy. Overall, these results indicate that teacher self-efficacy for working with ELLs may be influenced by outside factors beyond this study.

Open-Ended Questions

Although the open-ended questions were not posted as specific research questions in my study, they provided insight into how teachers felt about them. I knew that allowing teachers an opportunity to add in their opinions could provide useful information. Responses to these open-ended questions could be used in future research studies.

The first open-ended question asked teachers if attending professional development regularly made a difference in their classroom practices with ELLs. The results were color-coded for easier identification with orange representing no, and yellow representing, yes. There were 54 out of 90 teachers who said that professional development does make a difference. Alternatively, 16 out of the 90 teacher participants said that professional development did not make a difference with classroom practices with ELLs.

A commonality in the teacher responses was the words “depends on the training,” which was coded as DT. Six teachers reported that it depends on what is being presented whether professional development makes a difference within classroom practices with ELLs. For example, one teacher mentioned that it is only beneficial if teachers have hands-on learning experiences. Another common finding includes five teachers who mentioned they had never had ELL professional development. This finding was coded as “No PD.”

The second open-ended question asked teachers what the most impactful experience was improved their self-efficacy with ELLs. After analyzing the data, common themes were revealed. The results were color-coded for easier identification

with orange representing PD training, yellow representing working directly with an EL, and pink representing resources such as technology applications.

The most common theme that was revealed from this teacher open-ended response question included hands-on learning where the teacher is in the classroom with ELL students. Of the 90 surveys completed, 19 teachers reported that just having an EL in their classroom was the most impactful experience because they had to find ways to support them. One teacher mentioned that the more they work with ELs, the more they learn and the more confident they feel. Nine teachers mentioned various PDs or classes have impacted them. PDs mentioned included learning to use Elevation, understanding the Access scores, and SIOP training. Technology using translation applications were mentioned as most impactful by seven teachers.

The third open-ended question asked teachers what kinds of resources were available to them for teaching ELLs. Through color coding the teacher responses, common themes were found. Pink represented translation applications, orange represented student books with a curriculum, trade books, or dictionaries, yellow represented they received help from their ELL teacher or were provided PD opportunities, and blue represented that they have no resources to assist them.

Nineteen teachers mentioned that translator applications were available to them. A notable mention were other apps such as Magic AI, a companion tool in Kami using Canva, Readworks.com, Elevation, and Story Works. Thirty-four teachers mentioned their ESL teacher at their school was a major resource for them, while only two teachers mentioned that they do not have any available resources.

One interesting finding was that many applications and programs were mentioned that they provided the assignments in Spanish, but did not provide them in other languages, which made it difficult for teachers to correctly translate student assignments.

Summary

This research study examined teacher self-efficacy, chosen demographic and professional variables, as well as which factors most strongly predict self-efficacy among teachers working with ELLs. There was a total of 90 completed surveys that were analyzed. The Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) demonstrated a strong reliability across all subscales ($\alpha=.91-.96$), which indicates that the instrument was appropriate for this study. Descriptive statistics were conducted and revealed that teachers reported the highest levels of self-efficacy in classroom management, followed by instructional strategies, and the lowest in student engagement.

Reviewing the results from research questions 1a-1d, it revealed that demographic variables were not significantly related to teacher self-efficacy. There were no statistically significant differences found based on years of teaching experience, gender, or ELL-specific training. However, teacher degree level was found to have a statistically significant multivariate effect on teacher self-efficacy. A follow-up analyses revealed that differences were present only in the classroom management subscale, where teachers with bachelor's and doctoral degrees reported significantly higher self-efficacy than those with an education specialist degree or master's degree.

For research question 2, results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in teacher self-efficacy based on whether teachers had ELL

students in their classroom. However, findings showed that classroom management was the strongest reported domain of self-efficacy, while student engagement was the lowest.

For research question 3, none of the examined factors (frequency of professional development, school support, or availability of resources) were found to significantly predict teacher self-efficacy when analyzed using MANOVA. Although slight variations were observed, the multivariate effects for all three predictors were not statistically significant. This suggests that, within this sample, these professional factors did not have a meaningful impact on teachers perceived self-efficacy across the three domains.

Although the open-ended questions were not aligned with a specific research question, responses were coded and analyzed for potential future research. Most teachers ($n = 54$) reported that professional development positively influenced their classroom practices with ELLs, whereas a smaller group ($n = 16$) indicated that it did not make a difference. Some participants ($n = 6$) noted that the effectiveness of professional development depends on the quality and type of training, emphasizing the importance of hands-on experiences. Additionally, a few teachers ($n = 5$) reported that they had not received any professional development specific to ELL instruction.

Teachers reported that the most impactful experience for improving their confidence with ELLs was hands-on classroom experience working directly with EL students. Professional development (such as SIOP, Access score training, and Elevation) and the use of translation technology were also noted as helpful.

When it comes to available resources, teachers most commonly rely on translation apps, instructional materials (books, curriculum, dictionaries), and support

from ELL teachers or PD opportunities, though some reported having no resources at all.

Overall, the findings indicate that teacher self-efficacy is relatively consistent across most demographic and professional variables, except for degree level, which showed a moderate effect.

Chapter 5. Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

This research study has explored teacher self-efficacy including years of experience, gender, and age, and whether differences can be found between teachers who have been trained in working with English language learners and those who do not have formal training. This chapter discusses the study's limitations, summary of the findings, the implications for practice, and possible areas for future research.

Summary of the Study

Following the theoretical framework grounded in Sociocultural Learning Theory, Social Cognitive Theory, and the Self-Efficacy Theory, the current study sought to determine whether certain demographic and professional aspects affected teacher self-efficacy through working with ELLs.

This study employed a quantitative research design and administered the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). The scale measured teachers' sense of efficacy in terms of three main domains including: classroom management, instruction, and engaging students. The study surveyed 90 K-6 teachers in Alabama with diverse educational backgrounds. Besides self-efficacy, teachers were required to share their demographic characteristics including years of teaching experience, gender, education level, and ELL training.

Findings indicated that teachers reported the highest levels of self-efficacy in classroom management, followed by instructional strategies, with the lowest levels in student engagement. The demographic variables, including years of experience, gender, and ELL specific training, were not significantly related to teacher self-efficacy.

Teacher's degree level demonstrated a statistically significant effect, particularly in classroom management. Variables such as the frequency of professional development, perceived school support, and availability of resources were not found to be significant predictors of teacher self-efficacy.

Overall, the results from this study suggested that teacher self-efficacy in working with ELLs remains relatively stable across most measured variables, with degree emerging as the only factor associated with meaningful differences. The findings from this study contribute to the existing literature by highlighting the limited impact of PD frequency and experience on teacher self-efficacy with ELL instruction.

Summary of Key Findings

Results indicated that demographic variables were not significantly associated with teacher self-efficacy. Specifically, no statistically significant differences were found based on years of teaching experience, gender, or ELL-specific training. These findings suggest that teacher self-efficacy remains stable across these key characteristics. However, teacher degree level demonstrated a statistically significant multivariate effect on self-efficacy. A follow-up analyses revealed that this difference was limited to the classroom management subscale, where teachers with bachelor's and doctoral degrees reported significantly higher self-efficacy than those with education specialist degrees. No significant differences were found across degree levels for instructional strategies or student engagement.

Additionally, findings related to the dimensions of teacher self-efficacy indicated that classroom management was the strongest reported domain, followed by instructional strategies, with student engagement identified as the weakest. Although no

statistically significant differences were found based on whether teachers had ELL students in their classrooms, the descriptive results highlight variations in confidence across self-efficacy domains.

Lastly, professional factors were examined in this study, including frequency of professional development, perceived school support, and availability of resources, and were not found to be statistically significant predictors of teacher self-efficacy.

Multivariate analyses indicated that none of these variables had a meaningful impact on the combined self-efficacy subscales. These findings suggest that commonly assumed supports, such as professional development and institutional resources, may not independently influence teachers' perceived efficacy in working with ELLs.

Overall, the findings indicated that teacher self-efficacy is largely consistent across most demographic and professional variables. The only variable associated with significant differences were degree level, specifically in classroom management. In addition, teachers reported the highest confidence in managing classrooms and the lowest in engaging students, highlighting an area for potential focus in future research and practice.

Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher self-efficacy in relation to demographic characteristics and professional development factors among K-6 public school teachers working with English Language Learners (ELLs). The findings from this study provided several important insights into the factors influencing teacher self-efficacy and how these results align with theoretical frameworks and prior research.

Consistent with Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory, teacher self-efficacy is expected to develop through mastery experiences, social persuasion, and environmental supports. The findings of this study revealed that commonly assumed influences such as years of teaching experience, gender, and ELL specific training were not significantly related to teacher self-efficacy. This suggests that self-efficacy may not automatically increase with experience or participation in professional development, especially if those experiences do not provide meaningful, sustained opportunities for skill development. These results align with prior research indicating that the quality of professional learning experiences may be more important than frequency or participation alone.

One notable finding of this study was the statistically significant effect of degree level on teacher self-efficacy within the domain of classroom management. Teachers who have a bachelor's and doctoral degrees reported higher levels of self-efficacy compared to those with education specialist degrees. This finding may suggest that differences in preparation programs, depth of training, or professional experiences associated with their degree influenced teachers' confidence in managing classroom environments. This result should be interpreted with caution because of the smaller number of participants in some degree categories, particularly at the doctoral level. There were only five teachers who reported to have a doctoral degree. This finding highlights the importance of academic preparedness in shaping specific aspects of teacher self-efficacy.

Another key finding was that classroom management emerged as the strongest subscale of teacher self-efficacy, while student engagement was consistently reported

as the weakest. This pattern suggests that teachers may feel more confident in maintaining order and structure in the classroom rather than in actively engaging students, particularly ELLs, in meaningful learning experiences. This aligns with existing literature indicating that engaging diverse learners, especially those with language barriers, presents unique instructional challenges. It may also reflect a need for more targeted professional development focused on culturally responsive teaching practices and strategies for increasing student engagement among ELL populations.

Professional factors such as frequency of professional development, perceived school support, and availability of resources were not found to significantly predict teacher self-efficacy. These findings suggest that the presence of these supports alone may not be sufficient to influence teachers' confidence. For example, one-time workshops or generalized training sessions may not provide the sustained, context-specific support needed to impact self-efficacy. This finding reinforces the importance of ongoing, professional learning that is directly aligned with teachers' instructional needs.

Additionally, the presence of ELL students in the classroom was not associated with significant differences in teacher self-efficacy. This suggests that simply having experience with ELL students does not necessarily translate into increased confidence in teaching them. This finding further supports the idea that experience alone is insufficient without targeted support, reflection, and opportunities for skill development.

Overall, the findings of this survey study suggest that teacher self-efficacy for working with ELLs is relatively stable across the demographic and professional variables that were tested. The limited number of statistically significant relationships indicates that self-efficacy may be influenced by more complex or unmeasured factors,

such as the quality of teacher preparation, school culture, or individual teacher beliefs. These results contribute to the existing literature by challenging assumptions about the impact of experience and professional development, and by emphasizing the need for more intentional and effective approaches to supporting teachers of ELLs.

Implications

This study has several important implications for practice, policy, and professional development for teachers working with ELLs. The lack of statistically significant relationships between teacher self-efficacy and variables such as years of experience, gender, and ELL-specific training suggests that traditional assumptions about teacher development may need to be reconsidered. Simply increasing years of teaching experience or requiring participation in ELL- focused professional development may not be enough to enhance teacher self-efficacy. Therefore, school leaders and policymakers may be more successful if they focus on improving the quality, relevance, and sustainability of professional development rather than on frequency alone. Professional learning opportunities should be job-embedded, ongoing, and directly connected to classroom practice with ELL students.

One finding was that classroom management was the strongest domain of self-efficacy, while student engagement was the weakest. This highlights a critical area for instructional improvement. This finding suggests that teachers may benefit from targeted support in developing strategies to actively engage ELL students in learning. Professional development initiatives should prioritize culturally responsive teaching practices, differentiated instruction, and language support strategies that promote meaningful student participation and interaction.

The significant effect of degree level on classroom management self-efficacy indicates that formal education and preparation programs may play a role in shaping teacher confidence. This finding suggests that teacher preparation programs and advanced degree coursework should include more focused training on classroom management within diverse and multilingual settings.

Additionally, school districts may consider providing incentives or support for teachers to pursue advanced degrees that emphasize effective instructional practices for diverse learners. The finding that professional factors such as frequency of professional development, school support, and availability of resources was not significant predictors of teacher self-efficacy suggests that these supports may not be effectively implemented. This has important implications for school leadership. Administrators should not only provide resources and professional development opportunities but also ensure that these supports are meaningful, accessible, and aligned with teachers' instructional needs. Mentoring, coaching, and collaborative learning communities may be more effective approaches for enhancing teacher self-efficacy than isolated workshops.

Finally, the overall consistency of teacher self-efficacy across variables suggests that self-efficacy may be influenced by more complex, internal, or contextual factors not examined in this study. This underscores the importance of fostering supportive school environments that encourage teacher reflection, collaboration, and continuous growth. Building a positive school culture that values teacher development may be a key factor in strengthening teacher self-efficacy over time.

In summary, the findings of this study suggest that improving teacher self-efficacy for working with ELLs requires more than traditional approaches to professional development. Instead, educators and policymakers should focus on meaningful, sustained, and context-specific supports that directly impact classroom practice and student engagement.

Limitations

Limitations include several ideas that should be considered when interpreting the findings of this research study. First, the study utilized a small, convenience sample of 90 K-6 public school teachers from Alabama. As a result, the findings may not be compared to teachers in other states, grade levels, or other educational contexts. Differences in school systems, student populations, and policies may influence teacher self-efficacy in ways that are not shown in this sample. Also, the power analysis was 180, however there were only 90 survey responses.

Another limitation is that the study relied on self-reported survey data, which may be subject to response bias. Participants may have overestimated or underestimated their levels of self-efficacy due to personal perceptions. Due to the data being based on teacher perceptions, the results may not fully reflect instructional effectiveness.

Also, the study identified relationships between variables, it cannot determine whether specific factors directly influence teacher self-efficacy over time. Longitudinal research would be needed to examine changes in self-efficacy and the long-term impact of professional development.

Additionally, the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) is a well-established and reliable instrument that measures general teaching efficacy rather than efficacy

specific to English Language Learner instruction. As a result, the instrument may not fully capture the unique challenges and competencies associated with teaching ELL students.

Some subgroup sizes in the sample were small and uneven, particularly for participants holding doctoral degrees. This imbalance on sizes may have influenced the findings related to degree level. Therefore, results associated with smaller groups should be interpreted with caution.

Finally, this study examined a limited set of demographic and professional variables. School culture, administrative support, teacher beliefs, prior experiences with diverse learners, or the quality of professional development were not directly measured. These unexamined variables may play a significant role in shaping teacher self-efficacy. These are topics that could lead to future research.

Overall, these limitations suggest the findings provide valuable insight into teacher self-efficacy in relation to ELL instruction and should be interpreted within the context of the study's design and scope.

Recommendations for Future Research

There are several recommendations for future research on teacher self-efficacy with teaching ELLs in relation to professional development. The findings and limitations of this study suggest several directions for future research on teacher self-efficacy in working with ELLs.

Future studies would benefit from including a larger and more diverse sample across multiple geographic regions, school settings, and grade levels. Expanding beyond a single-state context may improve the findings and provide a broader

perspective on how environmental factors influence teacher self-efficacy. Including participants from various states, not only Alabama, may reveal variations that are not captured in the current study.

Using a longitudinal research design would be beneficial to examine changes in teacher self-efficacy over time. This would allow researchers to explore how self-efficacy develops through experience, professional learning, and exposure to ELL populations.

Additional research could examine the quality and type of professional development rather than focusing solely on frequency. The results of this study suggest that participation alone may not significantly influence teacher self-efficacy. Exploring specific features of effective professional learning such as duration, opportunities for practice, content relevance, and the alignment with classroom and teacher needs could provide more meaningful insights. Qualitative and mixed-methods approaches could provide an additional outlook of teachers' experiences and perceptions.

Lastly, looking at the relationship between student outcomes and teacher self-efficacy would provide insight to future research. By exploring how teacher confidence relates to student achievement, students' engagement, and the development of language, especially with ELL students, might strengthen the connection between classroom outcomes and teacher beliefs.

Conclusions

Findings from this research study contribute to the existing body of literature by challenging assumptions regarding the influence of experience and professional development on teacher self-efficacy. The results suggest that teacher self-efficacy may

be shaped by more complex factors than just those examined in this study, highlighting the need for more intentional and targeted approaches to supporting teachers of ELLs.

In conclusion, this study underscores the importance of understanding teacher self-efficacy as a multifaceted construct that is not easily influenced by traditional demographic or professional variables alone. Continued research and practice should focus on researching more meaningful supports and instructional strategies that enhance teachers' confidence and effectiveness in working with linguistically diverse student populations.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2024). How to choose a sampling technique and determine sample size for research: A simplified guide for researchers, *Oral Oncology Reports* (12).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oor.2024.100662>.
- Ancho, I., & Arrieta, G. S. (2021). *Filipino teacher professional development in the new normal*. 16(3), 25–43. <https://doi.org/10.26907/esd.16.3.04>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527692>
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. *Child Development*, 67(3), 1206-1222. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1131888>
- Bandura, A. (2001). *Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1>
- Beauchamp, M. R., Crawford, K. L., & Jackson, B. (2019). Social cognitive theory and physical activity: Mechanisms of behavior change, critique, and legacy. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 42, 110–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.11.009>

- Belmont, J. M. (1989). Cognitive strategies and strategic learning: The socio-instructional approach. *American Psychologist*, 44(2), 142–148.
- Bruner, J. S. (1984). *Vygotsky's zone of proximal development: The hidden agenda*. In B. Rogoff & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), *Children's learning in the "zone of proximal development"* (pp. 93–97). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bruning, R. H., Schraw, G. J., Norby, M. M., & Ronning, R. R. (2004). *Cognitive psychology and instruction* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Creed, E., Filippi, R., & Holliman, A. (2024). *Teaching bilingually: Unlocking the academic and cognitive potential—Teachers' insights*. *Education Sciences*, 14(4), 406. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14040406>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2002). *Learning to teach for social justice*. *Educational Leadership*, 59(6), 9–13.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Richardson, N. (2009). Research review/teacher learning: What matters? *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 46–53.
<https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/teacher-learning-what-matters>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2017). *Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development*. *Applied Developmental Science*, 21(2), 97–140.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2017.1306038>
- de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 101–124. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23478683>

- Duffin, L. C., French, B. F., & Patrick, H. (2012). *The Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale: Confirming the factor structure with beginning pre-service teachers*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(6), 827–834. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.03.004>
- Durgunoğlu, A. Y., & Hughes, T. (2010). How prepared are the U.S. preservice teachers to teach English language learners? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(1), 32–41.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M. E., Short, D. J., & Toppel, K. (2023). *Making content comprehensible for multilingual learners: The SIOP® model* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Estrella, I. (2016). *Teacher self-efficacy to teach English Language Learners in mainstream*. <https://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/158635>
- Franklin, F. & Cheung, M. (2017). Legacy interventions with patients with co-occurring disorder: Legacy definitions, life satisfaction, and self-efficacy. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 52(14), 1840-1849. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2017.1316290>
- Glock, S., Kleen, H., & Morgenroth, S. (2019). *Stress among teachers: Exploring the role of cultural diversity in school*. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 87(4), 696–713. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2019.1574700>
- Housel, D. A. (2023). Reflections of instructors in the United States on the TESOL standards for ESL/EFL teachers of adults. *Mid-Atlantic TESOL Journal*. (Manuscript received July 20, 2022; accepted September 9, 2022). https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php?id_article=46440&page=journal
- Howlett, K. M., & Penner-Williams, J. (2020). Preparing preservice teachers to work with multilingual learners: Using quality indicators to improve teacher preparation programs.

International Multilingual Research Journal, 14(3), 279–299.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2020.1760931>

Jacobsen, M. (2001). Building different bridges: Technology integration, engaged student learning, and new approaches to professional development. *Journal of Computing n Teacher Education*, 17(2), 12–21.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10402454.2001.10784427>

Karabenick, S. A., & Clemens Noda, P. A. (2004). Professional development implications of teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(1), 55-75.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2004.10162612>

Kozulin, A. (1986). *Vygotsky in context*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kozulin, A. (1990). *Vygotsky's psychology: A biography of ideas*. Harvard University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*.

Pergamon Press.

http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf

Lantolf, J. (1994). Sociocultural theory and second language learning: Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02058.x>

Lavery, M. R., Nutta, J. W., & Youngblood, A. C. (2018). Analyzing student learning gains to evaluate differentiated teacher preparation for fostering English learners' achievement in linguistically diverse classrooms. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 69(2), 172–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117751400>

Lawrent, G. (2024). Sources of teacher efficiency related attributes alongside Bandura's perspectives. *Journal of Education*, 204(1), 3-12.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00220574221094238>

Machado, E., & Hartman, P. (2019). Translingual writing in a linguistically diverse primary classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 51(4), 480–503.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X19877462>

Mayda, A. (2015). Effective instructional strategies for English language learners (72 pp.). LAP Lambert Academic Publishing. ISBN 978-3659788581

McInerney, D. M., & Van Etten, S. (Eds.). (2004). *Big theories revisited* (Vol. 4).

Information Age Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-358X\(2004\)4](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-358X(2004)4)

Mehu, J. (2023). *Teacher perceptions of preparedness to teach a diverse group of English language learners with different literacy levels and languages in the mainstream elementary classroom* (Publication No. 30486589) [Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University]. NSUWorks.

https://nsuworks.nova.edu/fse_etd/456

Mockaitis & Butler, (2024). Elgar encyclopedia of cross-cultural management. *Edward Elgar Publishing 2024*, 133-134. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781803928180>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). *English language learners in public schools*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2021). *Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2018 U.S. technical report* (NCES 2021–070).

<https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2021/2021070.pdf>

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). *Report on the condition of education 2022* (NCES 2022-144). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2022144>
- Pauw, J., Olsson, D., Berglund, T., & Gerricke, N. (2022). Teachers' ESD self-efficacy and practices: a longitudinal study on the impact of teacher professional development. *Environmental Education Research*, 28, 867-885.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2022.2042206>
- Philbin, K. A. (2022). *Veteran elementary teachers' perceptions of their preparedness to teach English Language Learners literacy* (Doctoral dissertation). Walden University. Retrieved from Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies repository.
- Piazza, S., Williams, C., Protacio, M. S., David, V., Tigchelaar, M., & Kuo, H. (2020). Improving instruction for English learners: A professional development study using SIOP. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 9(3), 383–405. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1281863.pdf>
- Qasserras, L. (2025). Managing discipline problems in ESL/EFL classrooms: A review of challenges and strategies. *Contemporary Research in Education and English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.55214/26410230.v7i1.4656>
- Romorosa, Q. & Uchang, J. (2025). *Professional development in the lens of public-school teachers*. International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 11(1), 140149. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.3540>
- Ross, J. A., & Bruce, C. D. (2007). Teacher self-assessment: A mechanism for facilitating professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(2), 146–

159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.035>

Schissel, J. L., De Korne, H., & López-Gopar, M. (2018). Grappling with translanguaging for teaching and assessment in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: teacher perspectives from Oaxaca, Mexico. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and*

Bilingualism, 24(3), 340–356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1463965>

Schunk, D. H. (2012). *Learning theories: An educational perspective* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Sepulveda-Escobar, P. (2023). ESOL teacher educators' learning initiatives and perceived learning needs: still a pending task. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 49(2) 280-296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2022.2038517>

Stevenson, K. R., Duran, M. R., Barrett, J. K., & Colarossi, L. (2021). *Exploring the relationship between principal leadership behaviors and teacher self-efficacy. Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 11(1), 183–199.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1328648.pdf>

Taherdoost, H. (2022). What are different research approaches? Comprehensive review of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method research, their applications, types, and limitations. *Journal of Management Science & Engineering Research*, 5(1), pp.53-63. <https://hal.science/hal-03741840v1>

Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). ASCD.

- Toren, N. & Schwartz, M. (2024). Professional development of preschool teacher assistants in multilingual and multicultural contexts. *Early Childhood Education Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-024-01629-5>
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1).
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2021). *Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct*. In H. Fives & M. G. Gill (Eds.), *International handbook of teacher beliefs* (2nd ed., pp. 532–549). Routledge.
- Tudge, J. R. H., & Winterhoff, P. A. (1993). Vygotsky, Piaget, and Bandura: Perspectives on the relations between the social world and cognitive development. *Human Development*, 36(1), 61–81. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000277297>
- Villegas, SaizdeLaMora, Martin, & Mills (2018). Future mainstream teachers to teach English language learners: A review of the empirical literature. *Educ. Forum*, 82, 138-155. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1420850>
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Werblow, J., Duesbery, L., & Koulidobrova, H. (2020). The case for dual language programs as the future of public education. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 3(3). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1252036.pdf>
- Wu, P. & Wang, Z. (2025). The impact of the student perception of teacher talk on student language learning attainment. *BMC Psychol* 13, 221.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02508-3>

Zeichner, K. (2010). *Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education*. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1–2), 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671>

Zhang, Y. (2017). Walking a mile in their shoes: Developing pre-service music teachers' empathy for ELL students. *International Journal of Music Education*, 35(3), 425–434. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761416647191>

Zhou, X., Padron, Y., Waxman, H., Baek, E. & Acosta, S. (2023). How do school climate and professional development in multicultural education impact job satisfaction and teaching efficacy for STEM teachers of English Learners? A path-analysis. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 22, 447-469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-023-10381-y>

Appendix A

Pilot Study Survey Questions

Perceived Perceptions: Answer how you feel in regards to teaching ELL students.

1. I am prepared to tailor instructional and other services to the needs to ELL students.
2. I possess a clean understanding of the language demands of the content area that I will teach.
3. I am knowledgeable of teaching strategies and instructional practices for ELL students that are developmentally appropriate.
4. I am knowledgeable of alternate ways of giving feedback.
5. I am knowledgeable of teaching practices that are attuned to students' language proficiencies and cognitive levels.
6. I am knowledgeable of teaching practices that are culturally supportive and relevant.

Teacher Self-Efficacy:

Answer according to how you feel about teaching ELL students.

1. If I try hard, I can get through to most of the ELL students.
2. I am confident in my ability to handle most discipline problems with ELL students.
3. I am confident in my ability to teach all ELL students to high levels.
4. I am confident I am making a difference in the lives of my students.
5. I am uncertain how to teach some of my ELL students.
6. I feel confident in providing a positive learning environment and create a climate characterized by high expectations.
7. I am confident of my skills to effectively communicate with parents and guardians of ELL students.
8. I am confident of my skills to provide alternative/performance assessments to ELL students.
9. I feel confident in providing linguistically and cultural appropriate learning experiences for ELL students.

Attitudes Towards Parents of ELLs:

Answer according to how you feel in regards to parents of ELLs.

1. Parents of ELLs do not try to learn English.
2. In order for ELLs to learn English, their parents should learn to speak English as well.

Open-ended Questions:

1. How can educators differentiate instruction to meet the diverse language proficiency levels of ELL students?
2. In what ways can collaborative learning strategies be used to enhance engagement among ELL students?
3. How can technology be utilized to create an inclusive and supportive learning environment that fosters language development for ELL students?

Darling-Hammond, L., & Richardson, N. (2009). Research review/teacher learning: What matters? *ASCD*, 65, 46-53.

[https://jorluisector.github.io/EQUIP1/supplemental_docs/PLC/Darling-Hammond,%20L.%20and%20Richardson,%20N.%20\(2009\).%20Teacher%20Learning..pdf](https://jorluisector.github.io/EQUIP1/supplemental_docs/PLC/Darling-Hammond,%20L.%20and%20Richardson,%20N.%20(2009).%20Teacher%20Learning..pdf)

Appendix B

Pilot Study Interview Questions

1. Explanation: Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their ability to succeed in specific situations or accomplish a task, influencing motivation, effort, and persistence.
2. How would you describe your level of teacher self-efficacy?
3. How does collaboration with colleagues impact your self-efficacy as a teacher?
4. Can you think of a time when your self-efficacy was diminished and how you overcame that challenge?
5. In what ways do you think self-efficacy can be fostered in new teachers?
6. How do professional development opportunities contribute to your self-efficacy?
7. What strategies do you use to enhance your self-efficacy in teaching English Language Learner (ELL) students?
8. Can you provide a challenge you have faced while teaching ELL students and how you overcame it?
9. What role do you believe that professional development plays in improving teacher self-efficacy particularly in relation to ELL instruction?
10. How has attending professional development sessions influenced your teaching practices?
11. Can you share a time when you felt that you learned something from professional development that you transferred to your classroom?
12. How has attending ELL focused professional development sessions influenced your teaching?
13. Can you discuss any collaborative opportunities that arose from attending ELL professional development sessions?
14. What specific skills have you gained from ELL-focused professional development that you believe enhanced your effectiveness as a teacher?
15. How has administration and/or co-workers supported your professional development in applying strategies in the classroom?
16. How do you envision continuing to develop your self-efficacy in relation to teaching ELL students?
17. How do you think ongoing professional development could be designed to support teacher self-efficacy who work with ELL students?

*Researcher created interview questions and adjusted them as the interview was conducted.

Appendix C

Full-Scale Survey

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale¹ (long form)

Teacher Beliefs		How much can you do?								
Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.		Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal				
1.	How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
2.	How much can you do to help your students think critically?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
3.	How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
4.	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
5.	To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
6.	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
7.	How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students ?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
8.	How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
9.	How much can you do to help your students value learning?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
10.	How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
11.	To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
12.	How much can you do to foster student creativity?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
13.	How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
14.	How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
15.	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
16.	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
17.	How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
18.	How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
19.	How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
20.	To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
21.	How well can you respond to defiant students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
22.	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
23.	How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
24.	How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)

PD Survey Questions: How often do you attend ELL professional development?

Do you feel supported by your school to attend ELL professional development?

Do you feel that there are adequate resources for you to teach your ELL students?

Open-Ended Questions:

- 1.) In your experience, does attending professional development regularly make a difference in your classroom practices with ELLs?
- 2.) What has been the most impactful experience that improved your self-efficacy with ELLs?
- 3.) What kinds of resources are available to you for teaching ELLs?

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)

Appendix D

Research Questions Data Chart

Research Questions	Independent Variables/ Measure	Dependent Variable/ Measure	Survey Items	Data Analysis
RQ1 What is the relationship between teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) and selected demographic or professional variables (years of experience, gender, degrees achieved, or ELL experience)?	Years of Experience, Gender, Degrees, ELL Experience	Self-Efficacy/ Continuous	Teacher Self Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21 Demographic Questions: Years of experience (multiple choice), gender (2 categories), degrees achieved (4 categories), ELL experience (yes/no)	

Research Questions	Independent Variables/ Measure	Dependent Variable/ Measure	Survey Items	Data Analysis
RQ 1a Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) between teachers with different years of experience?	Years of Experience/Categorical	Self-Efficacy/ Continuous (3 subscales)	Teacher Self Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21 Demographic Questions: Years of experience (multiple choice)	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Research Questions	Independent Variables/ Measure	Dependent Variable/ Measure	Survey Items	Data Analysis
RQ1b Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) based on gender?	Gender/Categorical (2 categories: male, female)	Self-Efficacy/ Continuous (3 subscales)	Teacher Self Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21 Demographic Question: gender (2 categories)	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Research Questions	Independent Variables/ Measure	Dependent Variable/ Measure	Survey Items	Data Analysis
RQ1c Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) based on teacher's degrees?	Teacher Degrees/Categorical (4 categories: Bachelor's, Master's Education Specialist, Doctoral)	Self-Efficacy/ Continuous (3 subscales)	Teacher Self Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21 Demographic Questions: Degrees achieved: (4 categories) Bachelor's=1 Masters=2, Ed. Specialists=3 Doctoral=4)	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Research Questions	Independent Variables/ Measure	Dependent Variable/ Measure	Survey Items	Data Analysis
RQ1d Is there a significant difference in self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) between teachers with and without ELL specific training?	Teachers with and without ELL Specific Training/Categorical (2 categories)	Self-Efficacy/ Continuous (3 subscales)	Teacher Self Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21 Demographic Questions: (ELL Training=1; No ELL Training=0)	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Research Questions	Independent Variables/ Measure	Dependent Variable/ Measure	Survey Items	Data Analysis
RQ2 Which dimensions of teacher self-efficacy (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement) are most strongly reported by teachers working with English Language Learners?	Teachers who work with ELL students/ Categorical	Self-Efficacy/ Continuous (3 subscales)	Teacher Self Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24 Teacher Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21 Demographic Questions: Teachers work with ELL students (yes=1, no=0)	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Research Questions	Independent Variables/ Measure	Dependent Variable/ Measure	Survey Items	Data Analysis
RQ3 What factor most strongly predicts teachers' self-efficacy for teaching ELL students: (a) frequency of ELL PD, (b) school supports for ELL, (c) availability of ELL resources?	Frequency of attending ELL PD (Likert) School support for attending ELL (Likert) Availability of ELL resources (Likert) Categorical	Self-Efficacy/ Continuous (3 subscales)	PD survey questions: Frequency question: How often do you attend ELL PD? Do you feel supported by your school to attend ELL PD? Do you feel that there are adequate resources for you to teach your ELL students?	Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)