

Determinants of Primary School Teachers' Level of Self-Efficacy

Song Zizhan, Jaruvic Rafols*

Silliman University, Dumaguete City, Negros Oriental, Philippines

*Corresponding author email: jaruvicrafols@su.edu.ph

Date received: March 6, 2024
Date revised: March 19, 2024
Date accepted: March 22, 2024

Originality: 90%
Grammarly Score: 94%
Similarity: 10%

Recommended citation:

Zizhan, S., & Rafols, J. (2024). Determinants of primary school teachers' level of self-efficacy. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Vol. 2, Number 4, pp. 138-147. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0060>

Abstract. In an evolving educational landscape, the competence of teachers plays an important role in shaping the quality of education. This study delves into the intricate relationship between teachers' selected profiles and their level of self-efficacy. Employing a descriptive-comparative design, this research was conducted among 198 primary school teachers in China. The study utilized the Alternative Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy (A-TSES) instrument to measure teachers' self-efficacy across various dimensions. The research uncovered a diverse demographic composition of teachers, with significant variations in age, educational attainment, teaching experience, and grade levels taught. Notably, younger teachers exhibited higher self-efficacy beliefs, while the influence of gender on self-efficacy was negligible. Furthermore, educational qualifications and the grade level taught played distinctive roles in shaping teachers' self-efficacy. By knowing their self-efficacy levels in terms of their selected profile, we can identify which teachers offer more qualifications in teaching and handling a class that will benefit the students and the school.

Keywords: Self-Efficacy; Primary school teachers; Determinants; China.

1.0 Introduction

Teachers in the new era are tasked to meet the demands and needs of the students (Baker, 2005). Especially since the education system has changed and improved over the years, the quality of teachers must improve as well. The role of the classroom teacher significantly influences the performance of students in learning. In general, teachers have a crucial role in determining the success or failure of an educational system as they implement the system's policies in the classroom. Therefore, the effectiveness of the educational system improves when teachers are competent (Shahzad & Naureen, 2017). Teacher competence is based on their beliefs in their own abilities, and a lack of self-efficacy can lead to various psychological issues such as low levels of confidence and self-esteem. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy is the integration of behavioral, social, and technical skills to attain goals. In the teaching context, self-efficacy is referred to as the ability to influence the outcomes of students' work (Shahzad & Naureen, 2017).

Teacher competence impacts student performance. Several studies tackled self-efficacy among teachers. They showed that teachers' self-efficacy influences themselves and the overall classroom and student performance. Numerous studies have shown that high level of teacher self-efficacy (TSE) directly contributes to increased commitment, a willingness to embrace new reforms, implementation of innovative strategies in teaching, and enhancement of the whole teaching-learning process (Brighton, 2003; Chesnut & Burley, 2015; Derrington & Campbell, 2015; Donnell & Gettinger, 2015; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Conversely, educators with lower self-efficacy tend to exhibit reduced enthusiasm, less control over the educational environment, heightened levels of stress, job anxiety, and burnout, making them more prone to leaving the job (Malinen & Savolainen, 2016; Schunk & Pajares, 2009; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Zee & Koomen, 2016).

Regrettably, the current distribution of teachers reveals an uneven allocation of less qualified and less experienced educators to classrooms attended by poor students (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2005; Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, & Wheeler, 2007; Peske & Haycock, 2006). A study by Bruno, Rabovsky, & Strunk (2020) discovered that novice teachers often find themselves with struggling students in classrooms and schools with less experienced colleagues, making their start into teaching more challenging. Although the distinctions between the settings of inexperienced and experienced teachers are generally minor, they seem to have significant implications for both students and educators. The more challenging assignments negatively impact the effectiveness and career expectations of new teachers, implying that students who are already lagging receive instruction from the least experienced educators (Bruno, Rabovsky, & Strunk, 2020).

Bruno, Rabovsky, & Strunk (2020) found that new teachers often face challenging classroom environments with struggling students and fewer experienced colleagues, impacting their performance and career trajectories. This results in students being taught by less experienced educators, despite the potential strengths of both generations. Geeraerts, Tynjälä, & Heikkinen's 2018 study revealed that younger teachers can learn innovative teaching methods and ICT skills, while older teachers primarily teach practical information, classroom management, self-regulation, and community building. Romano and Gibson's 2006 study revealed fluctuating successes and struggles of beginning teachers, with common issues being classroom management, parents, and teacher evaluation.

However, teachers from both old and new generations may offer different capabilities and strengths that can be used in the classroom. Geeraerts, Tynjälä, & Heikkinen (2018) conducted a study indicating that younger teachers may impart novel teaching methodologies and ICT skills to their veteran counterparts. Conversely, practical insights, classroom management proficiency, self-regulation, and community building were predominantly acquired from experienced teachers. A study by Romano and Gibson (2006) showed an initial understanding of the successes and struggles of beginning teachers. It was revealed that both successes and struggles fluctuated throughout the study. The respondent consistently mentioned that common issues were classroom management, parents, and teacher evaluation (Romano & Gibson, 2006).

Teachers' self-efficacy levels play a huge role in the overall success inside the classroom, and this may be influenced by teachers' age, sex, educational degree, teaching experience, or grade level taught. Despite the evidence discussed above, there are limited to no studies about teachers' level of self-efficacy and their selected profile in China. This will fill the knowledge gap, especially in the Chinese context. Thus, this study compared primary school teachers' level of self-efficacy in handling primary students in terms of their selected profiles. By knowing the correlation between their level of self-efficacy and profiles, we can identify which teachers offer more qualifications in teaching and handling a class that will benefit the students and the school.

2.0 Methodology

This study used the descriptive-comparative design. It was descriptive in the sense that it portrayed the distribution of the respondents about their demographic profile. It was comparative at the same time as it delved into determining whether a significant difference exists in their sense of self-efficacy when grouped according to demographic profile. The respondents were primary teachers in a school in China. The school has a total of 198 teachers. The entire teaching staff was included as respondents using the purposive sampling method (total population sampling method).

The Alternative Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy (A-TSES) was used in this study. It was based on the Traditional Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy Scale (T-TSES) that was developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). Part I looked at the respondents' demographics, and Part II looked at their teachers' sense of self-efficacy. The exploratory factor analysis (EFA) revealed that the analyzed instrument (A-TSES) and the chosen sample had a structure consisting of four factors. These factors collectively accounted for 67.01% of the total variance, indicating a substantial proportion of the variability in the data was explained. Factor 1(ESE) consisted of eight items, with loadings ranging from .417 to .612. Factor 2(EIS) comprised eight items, with loadings between .462 and .764. Factor 3(ECM) included four items, with loadings ranging from .461 to .688. Lastly, factor 4(ESM) was made up of four items, with loadings ranging from .499 to .556. It is important to note that loadings below .40 were disregarded in the analysis as they did not contribute significantly to the factors under consideration.

Before data gathering, a University Research Ethics Committee reviewed and approved the proposal. Once approved, authorization was sought from the school where the questionnaire was administered. The respondents were informed of the purpose of the study and that their participation was completely optional. After analyzing and evaluating the results, the data were deleted. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics such as frequency, percentage, t-test for independent groups, standard deviation, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1. Profile of respondents

Items	f	%
Age		
18-40	143	72.22
41-65	55	27.78
Sex		
Female	93	46.97
Male	105	53.03
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	192	96.97
Master's Degree	6	3.03
Teaching Experience (Years)		
1 to 3	66	33.33
4 to 6	40	20.20
7 to 9	38	19.19
≥ 10	54	27.27
Grade Level Taught		
1st grade	45	22.73
2nd grade	38	19.19
3rd grade	35	17.68
4th grade	31	15.66
5th grade	29	14.65
6th grade	20	10.10

Table 1 provides the demographic characteristics of the respondents. A substantial majority of the respondents (72.22%) belong to the age group of 18–40, signifying a predominantly youthful teaching cohort. This finding is consistent with research conducted in China, where the teaching profession has experienced an influx of younger educators. Studies by Li and Zhang (2017) and Wang et al. (2019) have reported a growing trend of younger individuals pursuing teaching careers in China, possibly due to changes in education policies and increased opportunities for professional development. Moreover, 27.78% of the respondents were aged between 41 and 65, highlighting the presence of experienced educators in the sample. Understanding the age distribution of teachers is a critical aspect of teacher demographics and can inform targeted professional development and support programs for educators in China. In terms of sex, 53% were males while 47% were females. The distribution was nearly equal, suggesting a relatively balanced representation of genders in the sample.

Sarfo et al. (2015) found that female and male teachers are different in their instructional strategies, with female teachers having higher efficacy beliefs on average than male teachers. Regarding educational attainment, most of the respondents (96.97%) held a bachelor's degree, while a small proportion (3.03%) obtained a master's degree. This indicates that most teachers in the sample have completed at least a bachelor's degree. As for teaching experience, the distribution among the respondents was as follows: 33.33% have 1 to 3 years of experience, 20.20% have 4 to 6 years, 19.19% have 7 to 9 years, and 27.27% have 10 or more years of experience. This indicates a diverse range of teaching experience levels in the sample. Finally, for grade level taught, the respondents were assigned to different grade levels for teaching. The distribution was as follows: 22.73% teach first grade, 19.19% teach second grade, 17.68% teach third grade, 15.66% teach fourth grade, 14.65% teach fifth grade, and 10.10% teach sixth grade. This indicates a relatively balanced distribution of teachers across different grade levels.

3.2 Respondents' Level of Self-Efficacy

Table 2. Distribution of respondents in the level of self-efficacy

Scores	Instructional Strategies	Classroom Management	Student Engagement	Student Misbehavior
1-9 (Very Low/Poor)	4.55%	10.10%	9.60%	3.03%
10-25 (Low/Below Average)	19.70%	14.65%	16.67%	12.12%
26-39 (Low Average)	19.19%	9.60%	14.14%	18.69%
40-59 (Average)	17.68%	22.73%	21.21%	22.22%
60-75 (High Average)	13.13%	19.70%	15.15%	21.72%
76-89 (High/ Above Average)	13.13%	12.63%	13.64%	13.64%
90-99 (Very High/Superior)	12.63%	10.61%	9.60%	8.59%
Overall Mean	50.49%	50.11%	49.84%	51.41%

As delineated in Table 2, the overall mean score in teacher efficacy is at the average level. The overall mean is 50.49% for instructional strategies, 50.11% for classroom management, 49.84% for student engagement, and 51.41% for student misbehavior. This indicates that most respondents assess their teacher efficacy at a moderate level. The data also suggests some variations in teacher efficacy among the respondents. Some respondents rated themselves higher than the average level, indicating higher self-efficacy and confidence in their teaching tasks.

Teacher efficacy is a complex and multifaceted construct, as demonstrated by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's (2001) research, encompassing various dimensions such as classroom management, instructional strategies, student engagement, and teacher-student relationships. These dimensions often exhibit variations among educators, influenced by factors such as experience, training, and individual attributes. Previous study findings collectively emphasize the complexity of teacher efficacy and its susceptibility to various demographic factors, thereby providing valuable insights for educational institutions to tailor support, training, and development programs (Shaukat & Iqbal, 2012).

3.3 Difference in the Level of Self-Efficacy in Terms of Age, Sex, and Educational Attainment

Table 3. Differences in primary school teachers' level of self-efficacy when grouped according to age, sex, and Educational Attainment

Age	Instructional Strategies				Classroom Management				Student Engagement				Student Misbehaviour			
	x	SD	t	p	x	SD	t	p	x	SD	t	p	x	SD	t	p
18-40	54	814			52	826			49	833			54	753		
41-65	42	813	2.50	0.01*	45	804	1.57	0.12	53	796	-0.85	0.40	46	771	1.88	0.06

Sex	Instructional Strategies				Classroom Management				Student Engagement				Student Misbehaviour			
	x	SD	t	p	x	SD	t	p	x	SD	t	p	x	SD	t	p
F	47	948			48	799			52	732			49	773		
M	53	725	-1.55	0.12	52	850	-1.00	0.32	48	898	1.18	0.24	53	762	-1.02	0.31

EA	Instructional Strategies				Classroom Management				Student Engagement				Student Misbehaviour			
	x	SD	t	p	x	SD	t	p	x	SD	t	p	x	SD	t	p
B.	50	834			50	834			49	819			51	784		
MA	80	25	-2.55	0.01*	69	252	-1.66	0.10	79	62	-2.54	0.01*	59	232	0.68	0.05

Note: B (Bachelor), MA (Masters), x (mean), SD (standard deviation), t (test-statistic), p (p-value), * (significant)

Based on Table 3, teachers aged 18–40 demonstrated significantly higher self-efficacy, as indicated by their higher mean ranks when compared to their counterparts in the 41–65 age group. Previous research conducted by Li and Zhang (2017) on Chinese teachers' professional development has noted that younger teachers in China often benefit from more updated pedagogical training and exposure to modern teaching methodologies, which may contribute to their increased self-efficacy. Conversely, older teachers may face challenges in adapting to new educational approaches and technologies, which could affect their self-efficacy (Wang et al., 2019).

Analyzing the self-efficacy scores in specific dimensions, teachers aged 18–40 showed higher self-efficacy in instructional strategies (EIS) compared to those aged 41–65. This aligns with Wang's (2014) study, which emphasized the receptiveness of younger Chinese teachers to innovative instructional approaches, potentially enhancing their self-efficacy in this domain. However, in terms of classroom management (ECM), there was no significant age-related difference in self-efficacy, consistent with the findings of Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998),

who suggested that classroom management self-efficacy may be relatively stable across different age groups of teachers.

Moreover, while teachers aged 18–40 had slightly lower self-efficacy in student engagement (ESE) and student misbehavior (ESM) compared to their older counterparts, these differences were not statistically significant. This mirrors the findings by Yin and Huang (2016), who observed that older teachers in China often excel in classroom management and student engagement due to their accumulated experience.

The examination of self-efficacy scores across various dimensions, including instructional strategies (EIS), classroom management (ECM), student engagement (ESE), and student misbehavior (ESM), revealed no significant differences based on gender. Both male and female teachers exhibited comparable self-efficacy levels in these domains. This agrees with the findings of Sarfo et al. (2015), which showed similar trends in the Chinese educational context.

Sarfo et al. (2015) indeed recognized gender-based disparities in self-efficacy among Chinese teachers, particularly noting that female teachers tend to exhibit higher efficacy beliefs in instructional strategies. This finding is consistent with a broader body of research that suggests women often excel in various aspects of teaching, such as fostering positive teacher-student relationships, communication, and the implementation of diverse instructional strategies (Gu et al., 2020; Yin & Lee, 2012). However, it is important to emphasize that this study did not replicate those gender-based differences, particularly in classroom management and student engagement self-efficacies.

Teachers with master's degrees exhibited significantly higher self-efficacy in instructional strategies (EIS) and student engagement (ESE) when compared to their counterparts with bachelor's degrees. This aligns with the assertion made by Shahzad and Naureen (2017) that professional qualifications play a substantial role in the teaching profession, enabling teachers to participate in continuous training and development.

In terms of educational attainment and its impact on specific self-efficacy dimensions (EIS, ECM, ESE, and ESM), the data shows that significant differences were observed in self-efficacy in instructional strategies (EIS) and student engagement (ESE) between teachers with bachelor's and master's degrees. However, there were no significant differences in self-efficacy related to classroom management (ECM) and student misbehavior (ESM). This indicates that the influence of educational attainment may be particularly prominent in the realms of instructional strategies and student engagement, emphasizing the need for further research and attention to enhancing these areas of teacher efficacy.

3.4 Analysis of Variance for the Difference in Level of Self-Efficacy

Table 4. ANOVA table for the differences among primary school teachers' levels of self-efficacy in instructional strategies in terms of length of service

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between groups	1679.68	3	559.89	0.67	0.57	2.65
Within groups	162911.80	194	839.75			
Total	164591.48	197				

Table 4, presenting the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), indicates that there is no significant difference in the sense of self-efficacy among primary school teachers when categorized based on their length of service. This aligns with the findings of Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998), who applied Bandura's concept of self-efficacy (SE) to the teaching context. In this context, self-efficacy is defined as teachers' beliefs in their abilities to effectively handle various teaching tasks through different actions. Mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and emotional and physiological states are four factors that influence the development of self-efficacy in an individual.

Table 5. ANOVA table for the differences among primary school teachers' levels of self-efficacy in classroom management in terms of length of service

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between groups	1159.07	3	386.36	0.46	0.71	2.65
Within groups	161561.70	194	832.79			
Total	162720.77	197				

Table 5 presents the results of a single-factor ANOVA analysis in examining the differences among primary school teachers' sense of self-efficacy based on their length of service, specifically focusing on the "ECM" variable. It can be observed that the p-value is greater, indicating that there is no significant difference in self-efficacy based on the length of service for the "ECM" variable.

Table 6. ANOVA table for the differences among primary school teachers' levels of self-efficacy in student engagement in terms of length of service

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between groups	7277.01	3	2425.67	2.40	0.06	2.65
Within groups	154639.81	194	797.11			
Total	161916.83	197				

Table 6 presents the results of a single-factor ANOVA analysis in examining the differences among primary school teachers' sense of self-efficacy based on their length of service, specifically focusing on the "ESE" variable. It can be observed that the p-value is slightly higher, but close to the significance level, indicating a marginal level of significance. This indicates that there may be some variation in self-efficacy levels based on the number of years of service, but it is not strong enough to reach statistical significance at the conventional 0.05 level. Further investigation or a larger sample size might be needed to draw more conclusive results..

Table 7. ANOVA table for the differences among primary school teachers' levels of self-efficacy in student misbehavior in terms of length of service

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between groups	654.39	3	218.13	0.28	0.84	2.65
Within groups	150561.47	194	776.09			
Total	151215.86	197				

Table 7 provides the results of a single-factor ANOVA analysis in examining the differences among primary school teachers' sense of self-efficacy based on their length of service, specifically focusing on the "ESM" variable. It can be observed that the p-value is much higher, indicating that there is no significant difference in the sense of self-efficacy among primary school teachers based on their length of service for the "ESM" variable.

Table 8. ANOVA table for the differences among primary school teachers' levels of self-efficacy in instructional strategies in terms of grade level taught

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between groups	8720.93	5	1744.19	2.15	0.06	2.26
Within groups	155870.55	192	811.83			
Total	164591.48	197				

Table 8 presents the results of a single-factor ANOVA analysis in examining the differences among primary school teachers' sense of self-efficacy based on the grade level they taught, focusing on the "EIS" variable. It can be observed that the p-value is slightly higher, indicating a marginally significant difference in the sense of self-

efficacy among primary school teachers based on the grade level they teach for the “EIS” variable. Further investigation or analysis is needed to confirm this finding. Other factors not considered in this analysis may have a stronger influence on self-efficacy among teachers.

Table 9. ANOVA table for the differences among primary school teachers’ levels of self-efficacy in classroom management in terms of grade level taught

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between groups	10569.89	5	2113.98	2.67	0.02	2.26
Within groups	10569.89	192	792.45			
Total	10569.89	197				

Table 9 shows a significant difference in the sense of self-efficacy among primary school teachers based on the grade level they teach for the “ECM” variable. Regarding the specific significant differences, the following findings were observed: (1) The sense of self-efficacy of first-year teachers was significantly higher than that of second-year teachers. (2) The sense of self-efficacy of first-year teachers was significantly higher than that of third-year teachers. (3) The sense of self-efficacy of first-year teachers was significantly higher than that of fifth-year teachers. (4) The sense of self-efficacy of third-year teachers was significantly lower than that of sixth-year teachers. (5) The sense of self-efficacy of fifth-year teachers was significantly lower than that of sixth-year teachers. These findings highlight the differences in teachers’ sense of self-efficacy based on the grade level they teach, indicating that certain years of experience or grade levels may influence self-efficacy levels differently. Further investigation and understanding of these differences can inform targeted support and professional development programs for teachers at different grade levels.

Table 10. ANOVA table for the differences among primary school teachers’ levels of self-efficacy in student engagement in terms of grade level taught

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between groups	9700.63	5	1940.13	2.45	0.04	2.26
Within groups	152216.20	192	792.79			
Total	161916.83	197				

Table 10 presents the results of a single-factor ANOVA analysis in examining the differences among primary school teachers’ sense of self-efficacy based on their grade level taught, specifically focusing on the “ESE” variable. It can be concluded that there is a significant difference in the sense of self-efficacy among primary school teachers based on the grade level they teach for the “ESE” variable. Regarding the specific significant differences, the following findings were observed: (1) The sense of self-efficacy of first-year teachers was significantly higher than that of third-year teachers. (2) The sense of self-efficacy of third-year teachers was significantly lower than that of sixth-year teachers. (3) The sense of self-efficacy of fourth-year teachers was significantly lower than that of sixth-year teachers. (4) The sense of self-efficacy of fifth-year teachers was significantly lower than that of sixth-year teachers. These findings indicate that there are significant differences in the sense of self-efficacy among primary school teachers based on the grade level they teach. Specifically, teachers with more years of experience (sixth-year teachers) tend to have higher levels of self-efficacy compared to teachers with fewer years of experience (third-, fourth-, and fifth-year teachers).

Table 11. ANOVA table for the differences among primary school teachers’ levels of self-efficacy in student misbehavior in terms of grade level taught

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between groups	654.39	3	218.13	0.28	0.84	2.65
Within groups	150561.47	194	776.09			
Total	151215.86	197				

Table 11 provides the results of a single-factor ANOVA analysis in examining the differences among primary school teachers' sense of self-efficacy based on their grade level taught specifically focusing on the "ESM" variable. It can be concluded that there is a significant difference in the sense of self-efficacy among primary school teachers based on the grade level they teach for the "ESM" variable. Regarding the specific significant differences, the following findings were observed: (1) The sense of self-efficacy of first-year teachers was significantly higher than that of third-year teachers. (2) The sense of self-efficacy of first-year teachers was significantly higher than that of fifth-year teachers. (3) The sense of self-efficacy of second-year teachers was significantly higher than that of third-year teachers. (4) The sense of self-efficacy of second-year teachers was significantly higher than that of fifth-year teachers. (5) The sense of self-efficacy of third-year teachers was significantly lower than that of sixth-year teachers. (6) The sense of self-efficacy of fifth-year teachers was significantly lower than that of sixth-year teachers. These findings indicate that there are significant differences in the sense of self-efficacy among primary school teachers based on the grade level they teach. Specifically, first and second-year teachers tend to have higher levels of self-efficacy compared to third and fifth-year teachers. Additionally, teachers in their sixth year of teaching demonstrate higher levels of self-efficacy compared to third and fifth-year teachers.

4.0 Conclusion

Based on the analyses and the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

- a) The demographic composition of the respondents is notably diverse, with a significant portion falling within the age group of 18–40. This diversity in age and the nearly balanced gender distribution among the respondents enriches the insights derived from the study.
- b) Most participants held a bachelor's degree, emphasizing the importance of professional qualifications in the field of teaching. While a smaller percentage held a master's degree, this subgroup demonstrated higher self-efficacy in instructional strategies and student engagement, consistent with Shahzad and Naureen's argument (2017) about the positive impact of advanced qualifications in teaching.
- c) The teaching experience varied widely among respondents, ranging from 1 to more than 10 years. This range in experience contributes to a holistic view of teacher self-efficacy and provides a more comprehensive perspective on the subject.
- d) The study revealed an average level of teacher self-efficacy among the respondents. Some educators displayed high confidence in their abilities, while others acknowledged room for improvement, reflecting the multifaceted nature of teacher efficacy.
- e) The significant differences in self-efficacy were observed based on age, with younger teachers exhibiting higher efficacy beliefs. This underscores the role of age in shaping self-perceived efficacy, aligning with previous research on this subject.
- f) No significant gender-based differences were found in self-efficacy across various instructional domains, in line with Sarfo et al.'s (2015) findings. This suggests that gender may not be a significant factor in influencing teacher self-efficacy in instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement, and student misbehavior.
- g) While years of service did not significantly impact self-efficacy in instructional strategies and classroom management, this finding is consistent with Tschannen-Moran et al.'s perspective (1998) that the length of service may not significantly affect teacher self-efficacy.
- h) The study revealed significant differences in self-efficacy based on the grade levels taught, highlighting the dynamic nature of classroom management and engagement across different grade levels. These findings underscore the importance of considering the specific teaching context when addressing teacher self-efficacy.
- i) The study reveals, after careful examination, that age has a major influence on self-efficacy, with younger teachers displaying higher levels of self-efficacy. Therefore, it is also important to explore other demographic factors such as economic status, and educational background as they may yield possible significant correlation with teacher's self-efficacy.
- j) The respondents' self-efficacy showed an overall average level of teacher self-efficacy. While some respondents exhibited higher-than-average self-ratings, reflecting strong confidence in their teaching capabilities, others provided lower ratings, indicating room for growth. Therefore, there is a need to enhance teacher self-efficacy from average to high, thereby enhancing their ability to effectively handle the tasks, obligations, and challenges related to their profession. Teachers with high levels of self-

efficacy experience higher levels of job satisfaction, and lower levels of job-related stress, and face fewer difficulties in dealing with students' misbehaviors. Teacher self-efficacy is a powerful predictor of teaching performance and can result in improved teacher mental health and job satisfaction, as well as student academic performance. Self-efficacy develops from a combination of mastery experience, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and physiological and emotional states. Self-efficacious teachers model self-efficacy, are intrinsically motivated, open-minded, and innovative, and demonstrate competence and confidence in their ability to perform actions that lead to positive student outcomes. Strategies for developing and maintaining self-efficacy in teachers include providing opportunities for mastery experiences, creating a supportive and collaborative work environment, providing positive feedback, and promoting self-reflection.

- k) School administrators can use this data to make educated decisions about hiring teachers, potentially improving overall educational quality. Similarly, students stand to benefit from a better understanding of the variation in teacher self-efficacy across different profiles, which can lead to a more dynamic learning environment. Furthermore, future researchers might build on these findings, using them as a framework for further investigation of teacher profiles and self-efficacy within the unique setting of China's educational system.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

The authors confirm their equal contribution to every part of this research. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of this paper.

6.0 Funding

This work received no specific grant from any funding agency.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflicts of interest

8.0 Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful for all the support and encouragement received throughout the conduct of the study.

9.0 References

- Baker, P. H. (2005). Managing student behavior: How ready are teachers to meet the challenge? *American secondary education*, 51-64.
- Bandura, A. (1977b). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy*. New York: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1977a). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Brighton, C. M. (2003). The effects of middle school teachers' beliefs on classroom practices. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 27(2-3), 177-206.
- Bruno, P., Rabovsky, S. J., & Strunk, K. O. (2020). Taking their first steps: The distribution of new teachers in school and classroom contexts and implications for teacher effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal*, 57(4), 1688-1729.
- Chesnut, S. R., & Burley, H. (2015). Self-efficacy as a predictor of commitment to the teaching profession: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 15, 1-16.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2005). Who teaches whom? Race and the distribution of novice teachers. *Economics of Education Review*, 24, 377-392.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H.F., Vigdor, J. L., & Wheeler, J. (2007). High-poverty schools and the distribution of teachers and principals (Working Paper). Washington, DC: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Educational Research. Retrieved November 17, 2007, from http://www.caldercenter.org/PDF/1001057_High_Poverty.pdf
- Derrington, M. L., & Campbell, J. W. (2015). Implementing new teacher evaluation systems: Principals' concerns and supervisor support. *Journal of Educational Change*, 16, 305-326.
- Donnell, L. A., & Gettinger, M. (2015). Elementary school teachers' acceptability of school reform: Contribution of belief congruence, self-efficacy, and professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, 47-57.
- Geeraerts, K., Tynjälä, P., & Heikkinen, H. L. (2018). Inter-generational learning of teachers: What and how do teachers learn from older and younger colleagues? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(4), 479-495.
- Gu, Q., Wang, C., & Wu, L. (2020). Gender Differences in Teachers' Work: Evidence from China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1609. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01609
- Lee, J. S. (2014). The relationship between student engagement and academic performance: Is it a myth or reality? *The Journal of Educational Research*, 107(3), 177-185.
- Li, J., & Zhang, Y. (2017). Teacher Career Development and Training: The Chinese Way. In P. W. Richardson & Q. Wang (Eds.), *Globalization and the Learning Society* (pp. 199-216). Springer.

- Malinen, O. P., & Savolainen, H. (2016). The effect of perceived school climate and teacher efficacy in behavior management on job satisfaction and burnout: A longitudinal study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 60, 144–152.
- Peske, H. G., & Haycock, K. (2006). Teaching inequality: how poor and minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality: a report and recommendations by the education trust. Education Trust.
- Romano, M., & Gibson, P. (2006). Beginning teacher successes and struggles: An elementary teacher's reflections on the first year of teaching. *Professional Educator*, 28(1), 1–16.
- Sarfo, F. K., Amankwah, F., Sam, F. K., & Konin, D. (2015). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: The relationship between gender and instructional strategies, classroom management and student engagement. *Ghana Journal of Development Studies*, 12(1–2), 19–32.
- Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2009). Self-efficacy theory. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 35–53). Routledge.
- Shahzad, K., & Naureen, S. (2017). Impact of teacher self-efficacy on secondary school students' academic achievement. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 4(1), 48–72.
- Shaukat, S., & Iqbal, H. M. (2012). Teacher self-efficacy as a function of student engagement, instructional strategies and classroom management. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9(3), 82–85.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 611.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944–956.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measurement. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202–248. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068002202>
- Wang, Y. (2014). An Analysis of the Impact of Teacher Professional Development Programs on Student Achievement. *Frontiers in Education*, 2, 43. doi:10.3389/feduc.2017.00043
- Wang, Y., Fan, C., & Zhang, J. (2019). Chinese Teachers' Professional Development: Three Decades of Progress. In X. Wang & L. Cheng (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education and Professional Development* (pp. 376–392). IGI Global.
- Yin, H., & Huang, S. (2016). The Role of Teacher Expertise in Enhancing Learning and Instruction in Shanghai: A Perspective from a Large-Scale Classroom Teaching Practices Study. In L. Volante & C. K. Ng (Eds.), *The Future of Educational Change: International Perspectives* (pp. 151–166). Springer.
- Yin, H., & Lee, J. C. K. (2012). Differentiating effective and ineffective teachers by comparing student learning in mathematics classrooms in China. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 10(4), 805–823. doi:10.1007/s10763-011-9315-2
- Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 981–1015.