

Research Article

MMSELT, Volume 1, Issue 1, 89-106

## EFL Teachers' Self-regulation Strategies and Teaching Effectiveness: A Mixed-method Study

Hoda Parvaneh Shirazi<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Human Resource Development, Texas A&M University

\*Corresponding author: ✉ Hoda.p87@gmail.com 📞 0009-0008-6050-3474

(Received: 04/06/2024 - Accepted: 17/06/2024)

### Abstract

Teachers' self-regulation (SR), which improves teaching practices, has not received due attention from EFL researchers. This mixed-methods study aimed to examine the SR strategies and teaching effectiveness of English language teachers in Iranian universities and institutes located in three Iranian cities. The first sample of this study comprised 172 EFL teachers (128 males and 44 females) from different socioeconomic backgrounds. Their ages ranged from 23 to 55 years old. The majority of them majored in the different branches of English—English literature (5 BAs, 30 MAs, 10 PhDs), English teaching (10 BAs, 50 MAs, 16 PhDs), and English translation (7 BAs, 28 MAs, 16 PhDs). On the other hand, the second sample comprised 153 EFL learners, who were the students of the participating teachers (49 males and 104 females). The age range varied from 14 to 35, and they came from different socioeconomic backgrounds. A study was conducted. Teachers completed a Teacher Self-Regulation Scale (TSRS) questionnaire to declare the types and frequency of SR strategies they used while the participating students completed the Characteristic of Successful Iranian EFL Teachers (CSIET) questionnaire, which included ten questionnaire items. According to the quantitative data analysis, SR strategies and teaching effectiveness were negatively correlated. Moreover, 20 EFL teachers were interviewed to determine their awareness of their teaching effectiveness. The study indicates that teachers were not familiar with SR strategies, which can negatively impact their teaching effectiveness. The findings of the study may have insights for teacher educators, administrators, and university teachers, highlighting the role of SR in EFL teaching effectiveness.

**Keywords:** EFL, self-regulation, self-regulation strategies, teaching effectiveness

**Cite as:** Parvaneh Shirazi, H. (2024). EFL teachers' self-regulation strategies and teaching effectiveness: A mixed-method study. *Mixed Methods Studies in English Language Teaching (MMSELT)*, 1(1), 89-106.

## 1. Introduction

Researchers have asserted that instructors' self-regulation (SR) may also contribute to successful teaching (Bielak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2020). According to Sahranavard et al. (2018), teachers' use of self-regulatory strategies may greatly improve their ability to design effective lesson plans, teach effectively, and affect students' learning. In the setting of second-language reflective instruction, Language teachers' feelings of self-efficacy are also influenced by their ability to self-regulate (Huang, 2022). Moreover, a teacher that lacks SR may have difficulty scaffolding activities and experiences that increase their students' SR skills (Opdenakker, 2022).

Teaching effectiveness can be influenced by the self-efficacy of teachers. Despite the recognition that SR plays a significant role in teachers' self-efficacy and instructional planning (Opdenakker, 2022), there is a dearth of research examining the specific relationship between SR strategies employed by EFL teachers and their teaching effectiveness. Previous studies have focused on the impact of SR on teachers' self-efficacy and lesson planning (Huang, 2022); however, there are a few studies, which explored the association between EFL teachers' success and their metacognitive abilities, particularly SR, in the area of EFL language teaching (Monshi Toussi et al., 2011). This gap in the literature highlights the need for further investigation into how EFL teachers utilize SR strategies and how these strategies affect their overall teaching effectiveness. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the association between teachers' SR and teaching effectiveness as perceived by students.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Self-Regulation

Self-regulation (SR) is defined as the “process of setting goals for oneself and engaging in behaviors and cognitive processes that lead to goal completion” (Bandura, 1986, p. 347). Bandura (1977) introduced the concept of SR as part of human agency and exercise of control, encompassing an essential component of humanness with the self-control of individuals over their situations, environments, and contexts. Zimmerman (2000) applied the concept of SR to academic contexts and viewed it as a fundamental element for academic success.

In the field of SR, various overlapping conceptualizations can be found. Gillebaart (2018) defined SR as “a system that guides behavior toward desired end states” (p. 3), mirroring Carver and Scheier's (2012) definition. The literature on teacher SR distinguishes between SR of teaching and SR of

learning from teaching' (Butler, 2003; Kramarski & Michalsky, 2009; Kramarski & Revach, 2009; Randi, 2004). Self-regulated teachers are primarily described as proactive agents who shape educational beliefs, construct suitable instructional practices, and control the teaching environment (Butler, 2003; Randi, 2004). Self-regulated teachers make deliberate and reflective decisions, which emphasize introspection and self-assessment, potentially leading to knowledge modification (Butler, 2003; Randi, 2004). As independent learners, self-regulated teachers employ strategies such as seeking mentorship, obtaining feedback, and researching new ideas (Butler, 2003; Randi, 2004).

Zimmerman (2000) elaborated on the notion of SR as “self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals” (p. 14). In other words, people set goals, make plans, decide on strategies to attain these goals, and self-evaluate their performance. They benefit from these experiences in their future performance. Zimmerman (1990) stated individuals set goals, impose structure on the learned materials, and self-assess their performance in the metacognitive phase. Via motivational processes, individuals exhibit persistence, high self-efficacy perceptions, and intrinsic task interest, while behavioral processes enable them to select, organize, and control the performed task, and they are involved in self-instructing and self-reaction during task performance (Bembenutty, 2011).

According to Panadero (2017), self-regulated learning encompasses three main components (i.e., cognition, metacognition, and motivation), which can be further subdivided into several subcomponents: a) cognitive component, which includes simple strategies, problem-solving, and critical thinking; b) metacognitive component, which consists of two general components-knowledge of cognition and regulation of cognition, each of which includes several subcomponents as declarative, procedural, conditional knowledge, planning, monitoring, and evaluation, respectively; c) motivation component, which comprises two subcomponents: self-efficacy and epistemological beliefs (Panadero, 2017).

SR supports individuals in learning and coping with demands and competing priorities. It might help teachers to increase their self-knowledge and maintain their motivation as well (Cardelle-Elawar & Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga, 2007). If teachers want to become effective in teaching, they need to become effective learners first. Likewise, they might benefit from SR as well (Dembo, 2001). Luckily, the nature of the teaching profession itself provides opportunities to develop SRL. Developing SRL skills thrive well in environments where learners can engage in complex meaningful tasks and get

opportunities to control their processes and outcomes (Peeters et al., 2014). Moreover, traditional teacher tasks such as lesson plans and assessments can also facilitate teachers' learning and SR (Randi, 2004).

According to Zimmerman (1990), self-regulated learners are aware when they know a fact or possess a skill and when they do not, view the acquisition as a systematic and controlled process, and accept responsibility for their achievement outcomes. Empirical studies demonstrated that SR is positively correlated to academic achievement and other cognitive and affective factors conducive to learning (Yumusak et al., 2007). Moreover, Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (1990) maintained that self-regulated learning strategies like rehearsal, elaboration, reflection, and goal setting are decisive factors in students' successful performance. Similarly, Zimmerman (1990) revealed that the level of SR predicted the academic achievement of the students.

## **2.2. Teaching Effectiveness**

Researchers agree that teachers are among the most important school-based resources for determining students' future academic success and lifetime outcomes (e.g., Chetty et al. 2014; Rivkin et al. 2005; Rockoff 2004). Consequently, there has been a strong emphasis on improving teacher effectiveness to enhance student learning. Chetty et al. (2014) found that students taught by highly effective teachers, as defined by student growth percentiles and value-added measures, were more likely to attend college, earn more, live in higher-income neighborhoods, save more for retirement, and were less likely to have children during their teenage years.

In this context, effective teachers are described as self-regulated agents who can activate their beliefs to take appropriate actions leading to successful and effective teaching (Randi, 2004). Delfino et al. (2010) added that the complexity of individual and social aspects of teaching roles calls for self-regulated teachers who can demonstrate effective teaching. Overall, effectiveness in teaching typically refers to the types of actions that produce or facilitate learning (Ferguson & Danielson, 2015). In this article, we define teacher effectiveness as the impact of high-quality teaching on student learning in terms of achievement gains. We regard high-quality teaching as the dynamic and interactive process of creating, fostering, adapting, and negotiating learning environments in which all students are supported in activities that have a good chance of improving learning (Seidel & Shavelson, 2007).

### 2.3. Related Studies

Birjandi and Bagherkazemi (2010) conducted a study aimed at substantiating the relationship between EFL teachers' critical thinking ability and their student-evaluated professional success. To this end, measures of the critical thinking ability of 67 Iranian EFL teachers were obtained using the Farsi version of Watson-Glaser critical thinking appraisal, form A (WGCTA-FA) (Watson & Glaser, 1980). The Pearson product-moment correlation analysis indicated a statistically significant relationship between the two sets of measures. More specifically, the multiple regression analysis demonstrated that three of the five aspects of critical thinking (i.e., drawing inferences, interpreting evidence, and evaluating arguments) are significantly positively correlated with Characteristics of Successful Iranian EFL Teachers questionnaire scores. The results suggested the need to accommodate critical thinking as an essential aspect of EFL teacher education and teacher evaluation programs and to readdress the concept of EFL/ESL teacher effectiveness with an eye to teachers' critical thinking ability.

Monshi Toussi et al. (2011) investigated the relationship between EFL teachers' SR and teaching effectiveness. In so doing, 76 EFL teachers were selected according to a convenience sampling from different English language institutes in Mashhad, Iran. The findings of the study indicated that teacher educators, administrators, and policymakers are recommended to incorporate self-regulated learning strategies into teacher training programs. In line with the current trends in teaching effectiveness, these programs are expected to undergo a shift from curricula pivoting around solid bases of content area knowledge to equipping teachers with regulating their actions, thoughts, and emotions, as recommended by Dembo (2001). This in turn should encourage teacher educators, administrators, and policymakers to introduce self-regulated learning strategies to teacher training programs. Subsequent data analyses indicated that among the components of SR, intrinsic interest, mastery-goal orientation, and emotional control have the highest correlations with teaching effectiveness. In line with this, prospective teachers should be equipped with self-regulatory strategies to be able to teach these skills and model for their students, since it seems plausible to presume that teachers who lack self-regulatory skills will find it difficult or even impossible to construct the SR of their students. The findings of the present study may also highlight the contributing roles of intrinsic and emotional factors in teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, the contributing effects of intrinsic and emotional factors on teaching, especially those targeted at improving teaching tasks and personal interest, should be considered by the EFL trainers and teachers themselves.

Heydarnejad et al. (2021) investigated the impact of teacher SR on university teachers' emotions and preferred teaching styles. Using the Teacher Self-Regulation Scale (TSRS), emotions questionnaire for teachers (EQT), and Grasha's teaching style inventory (TSI), the research involved 320 university teachers in Iran specializing in English literature, English teaching, and English translation. The results of Path analysis revealed that teachers' SR positively predicts pleasant emotions and student-centered teaching styles (i.e., facilitator and delegator), while negatively predicting unpleasant emotions and teacher-centered teaching styles (i.e., formal authority, personal model, and expert). The findings underscore the significance of teachers' SR in fostering positive emotions and student-centered teaching approaches. These results have practical implications for teacher psychology and education, suggesting avenues for enhancing teachers' psychological well-being and professional development.

This study sought to bridge this gap by exploring the relationship between EFL teachers' SR strategies and their teaching effectiveness, as perceived by their students. Besides, the study aimed to contribute to a better understanding of how EFL teachers utilize SR strategies and how these strategies affect their overall teaching effectiveness. Given the previous background, the following research questions were put forward:

**RQ1:** Is there any statistically significant relationship between EFL teachers' self-regulated strategies and teachers' effectiveness in language teaching?

**RQ2:** How are EFL teachers aware of their teaching effectiveness?

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Design

The purpose of this research was to examine the link between teachers' SR strategies and teaching effectiveness. To achieve this, two research questions (i.e., Is there any statistically significant relationship between EFL teachers' self-regulated strategies and teachers' effectiveness in language teaching? and Are EFL Teachers aware of their teaching effectiveness?) were formulated. Therefore, this research utilized a sequential mixed-methods design to explore the relationship between SR strategies and effective teaching among different genders, using two questionnaires and an interview as part of a descriptive correlational study followed by a qualitative phase (i.e., QUAN-qual).

## 3.2. Participants

Convenience sampling was used between April and August 2017 in three big cities in Iran, which relied on the availability of participants. A sample of 172 EFL teachers that consisted of 128 males and 44 females from different socioeconomic backgrounds, aged from 23 to 55 years old. The majority of whom had majored in the different branches of English—English literature (5 BA, 30 MA, 10 Ph.D.), English teaching (10 BAs, 50 MAs, 16 PhDs), and English translation (7 BAs, 28 MAs, 16 PhDs). On the other hand, the second sample comprised 153 EFL learners, who were the students of the participating teachers. They were 104 females and 49 males, whose ages varied from 14 to 35, and who came from different socioeconomic backgrounds. Their language proficiency varied from elementary to advanced level. This research sampling method was in the case of availability.

## 3.3. Instruments

### 3.3.1. *Teacher Self-Regulation Scale*

To measure EFL teachers' SR, the researcher applied the Teacher Self-Regulation Scale (TSRS), designed and validated by Capa-Aydinet al. (2009). This questionnaire is based on the model proposed by Zimmerman's (2000) self-regulation. It consisted of 40 items using a six-point Likert scale ranging from 6 (*strongly agree*) to 1 (*strongly disagree*). Scores on this test represented a teacher's degree of self-regulated strategies, which they applied in classrooms. The internal consistency reliability of TSRS was acceptable ( $\alpha=0.85$ ).

### 3.3.2. *Characteristics of Successful EFL Teachers' Questionnaire*

To evaluate language teachers' performance and success in language teaching, the Characteristics of Successful EFL Teachers Questionnaire (CSIET), which was designed and validated by Moafian and Pishghadam (2009) was used in this research. It consists of 47 Likert scale items ranging from 5 (*strongly agree*) to 1 (*strongly disagree*). The results of the reliability analysis show that the total reliability of the questionnaire was very high ( $\alpha=0.94$ ). The results of factor analysis indicated that the questionnaire measures 12 constructs: teaching accountability, interpersonal relationships, attention to all, examination, commitment, learning boosters, creating a sense of competence, teaching boosters, physical and emotional acceptance, empathy, class attendance, and dynamism.

### **3.3.3. Interview**

A structured interview protocol was utilized to collect data from 20 EFL teachers (12 BAs, 4 MAs, 4PhDs) to recognize their awareness of their teaching effectiveness. The CSIET questionnaire was used, consisting of 10 questions. The questions covered topics such as the teacher's interest in the subject, their willingness to help students in and out of the classroom, their behavior towards learners, the way they respect learners as individuals, and their ways of encouraging learners.

### **3.4. Procedure**

For this research, the process of data collection was carried out in English institutes and universities of Qom, Tehran, and Shiraz in Iran between April and August 2017. There were three steps in the data collection procedure of this research: collecting the data on SR strategies, the data collection on effective teaching, and interviewing teachers.

To gather the TSRS questionnaire data, the institutes were selected based on convenience sampling. The teachers were distributed a TSRS questionnaire, which they completed and delivered back to the researcher. The process of data collection took four weeks. The institute teachers of Qom were given a TSRS questionnaire to fill in and deliver back to the researcher in a week. In all the institute teachers delivered back the questionnaire on time, and they completely answered the questions based on their activities. Before distributing the questionnaires, the researcher assured the respondents about the anonymity of their personal information and asked them not to write their names. Simultaneously, a TSRS questionnaire was sent to the professors at the universities of Qom, Tehran, and Shiraz by email. They were asked to send back the questionnaire in three weeks. All the professors answered and delivered back the TSRS questionnaire based on the following time and helped the researcher to achieve the goals. Teachers' questionnaires were coded numerically, and they were asked not to write any names on their questionnaires. They were just required to provide demographic information such as gender, degree, age, and field of study.

Through the CSIET questionnaire, the teachers' performance was evaluated by their students. Simultaneous with the TSRS questionnaire data collection, the CSIET questionnaire was given to the learners of those teachers who took part in the previous part of the study. The researcher gave the CSIET questionnaire to the institute teachers of Qom and asked them to give the questionnaire to their students. Moreover, the researcher emailed the CSIET questionnaire to one of the teachers in Tehran and another one in Shiraz. They were requested to distribute the questionnaires to all students of the professors



that had taken part in the TSRS data collection. Before, the researcher got permission from all of the professors that participated in this study by emailing them and receiving their permission. To receive a reliable evaluation by the learners, the researcher explained the purpose of completing the questionnaire and assured the learners that their views would be confidential. Besides, learners' questionnaires were coded numerically, and they were asked not to write any names on their questionnaires. They were just required to provide demographic information such as gender, degree, age, and major. The students delivered back the questionnaires within four weeks.

The study utilized a structured interview protocol to collect qualitative data on teachers' awareness of their teaching effectiveness. The CSIET questionnaire questions were used. The interviews were recorded. The researcher asked 10 questions individually from 20 teachers to gather data. The interviews were conducted in two ways, with 10 teachers from Qom participating in the face-to-face interviews, and 10 professors from Tehran and Shiraz universities participating in phone interviews. The interviews took an hour on average and were tape-recorded. Some participants did not respond to some questions, but all MA teachers answered completely.

### **3.5. Data Analysis**

To analyze the data, the researcher applied SPSS version 20. To explore whether there was a correlation between teachers' SR and teachers' effectiveness, the Spearman correlation coefficient was run. Due to the qualitative nature of the interview data for the second question, Dörnyei's (2007) interview analysis guidelines were used to analyze the data.

## **4. Results**

### **4.1. Results of the First Research Question**

To investigate the first research question (i.e., Is there any relationship between EFL teachers' self-regulated strategies and teachers' effectiveness in language teaching?), the data were tested for normality assumption via Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the results of which indicated that the data violate the normality assumption ( $p < .05$ ). Therefore, the researcher used the Spearman correlation coefficient. Table 1 shows the results of descriptive statistics for the questionnaire data.

**Table 1**  
*Descriptive Statistics of TSRS and CSIET Questionnaires*

	N	M	SD
CSIET	153	5.3642	.56308
TSRS	172	4.6735	.28006

As shown in Table 1, the CSIET scale yielded a mean score of 5.36 ( $SD = 0.56$ ) based on responses from 153 participants. The mean score of 5.36 suggests that, on average, participants scored around 5.36 on the CSIET scale. This indicates a relatively high level of community teachers' effectiveness in education among the participants. Moreover, the teachers' self-regulation scale (TSRS) resulted in a mean score of 4.67 ( $SD = 0.28$ ) based on data from 172 participants. The mean score of 4.6735 suggests that, on average, participants scored around 4.67 on the TSRS scale. This indicates a moderate level of SR among the teachers.

To address the first research question, the researcher used the Spearman correlation coefficient to measure the strength and direction of association between teachers' SR strategies and teachers' effectiveness (Table 2).

**Table 2**  
*Results of Spearman Correlation Coefficient*

		Effectiveness	Self-regulation
Effectiveness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.125
	Sig. (2-tailed)	-	.124
	N	153	153
Self-regulation	Correlation Coefficient	-.125	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.124	-
	N	153	172

As shown in Table 2, the null hypothesis (i.e., There is not any relationship between EFL teachers' self-regulated strategies and teachers' effectiveness in language teaching.) was rejected since the significance value was more than 0.5.

#### 4.2. Results of the Second Research Question

The interview data for the second question were transcribed and analyzed as follows. The first question (i.e., Can you please talk about your interests in the subject matter that you are teaching?) was about teachers' interests in the subject that they teach in classes. While analyzing the

interviews, the researcher considered that 18 teachers used their immediate knowledge and their subjects to teach all lessons, and they did not concentrate on special subjects in books and 2 of them had lesson plans to teach each session based on the book's subjects.

The second question (i.e., How are EFL teachers aware of their teaching effectiveness?) was all about helping their students in and out of the classroom. 15 teachers claimed that they preferred to answer students' questions all in class. They believed that interaction between teachers and students could be the most helpful way to increase learning and student's enthusiasm, and 5 of them preferred to continue answering students' questions out of the class to focus more on their mistakes and to be more friendly with them. For example, a student explained to a teacher that something unexpected happened in a classroom situation, or the teacher gained insight while interacting, and they helped their students to obtain the answers only in the class due to a shortage of teachers' time out of the classes.

Thirdly, in response to the third question (i.e., Are you friendly toward your learners?), All teachers agreed on being strict and almost friendly, which was mostly formal in interactions in universities. They thought it could be the most helpful way. The fourth question (i.e., How do you respect learners as individuals?) was about the ways that teachers could respect learners as individuals. All teachers believed that teachers should be well-behaved towards their learners to respect them, and there should be a friendly relationship between teachers and their students to help them from all aspects.

The fifth (i.e., What ways do you use to create opportunities for discussions and asking questions in whole classes?) and sixth (i.e., 4.2.6. How do you create equal opportunities for the students to participate in discussions?) questions were all about the ways that teachers used to create opportunities to participate in discussions. Twenty teachers claimed that they tried to take turns among students and asked them questions by addressing their names and asking them special questions, also let all students speak individually in the class and have their own time was their best way.

In response to the seventh question (i.e., What are the ways that you utilize to return the test results to your students?), all interviews assumed that they were in shortage of time to give comments on students' papers. They opined that addressing student's most vital mistakes and errors could be the only option.

The eighth (i.e., What are the best ways of encouraging learners?) and ninth (i.e., What are your ways to attend to your students' problems in learning?) questions were dealt with together by the teachers. They believed

that encouragement could be one of the best ways of solving students' problems in learning. They thought that with increase in the number of teachers' classes, they could not take enough time and passion to pay more attention to individuals because they should just create an opportunity for the whole class to get them to help each other and solve their problems.

The last question (i.e., Can you please talk about the effect of your tidiness and cleanliness of your appearance on students?) was about the effect of tidiness and cleanliness on teachers' appearance. Even though five teachers claimed there was no reason for paying attention to appearance, and they did not care about this issue, fifteen teachers believed that they took care of their appearance and tried to be completely tidy. They assumed that tidy teachers could be effective on students' personalities, and it was the most imperative motivation for them to even participate in classes.

## 5. Discussion

The first purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' SR and their teaching effectiveness. It was found that there was a negative relationship between EFL teachers' self-regulated strategies and teachers' effectiveness in language teaching. This finding was confirmed by the qualitative finding that most teachers did not pay attention to SR too much. This agrees with the qualitative finding that although teacher SR is a significant factor for all teachers, most teachers do not pay attention to SR and teaching effectiveness (Lee et al., 2020; Zhang, 2024). However, the findings of this study contradict the common assumption that teachers' effectiveness solely relies on their subject matter knowledge and teaching experience (Kini & Podolsky, 2016).

On the other hand, although it could be crucial to emphasize the positive role of teachers' self-regulatory skills in the successful accomplishments of their professional tasks, it seems that the Iranian educational system has failed to emphasize this issue and to enhance EFL teachers' self-regulatory skills (Gol & Royaei, 2013). Therefore, the more EFL teachers develop their self-regulatory skills, the more likely they are to be evaluated successfully by their students. Considering this, teachers need to be taught how to increase self-regulatory skills, and the educational system should provide this course. This finding may also be due to the study's context (i.e., private language institutes and universities in Iran). Most Iranian language institutes are characterized by their disciplined conduct and the implementation of communicative language teaching approaches (CLT), but universities are not as strictly evaluated as the language institutes. Since most institutes are run by private administrations and rely heavily on language learners' interests,

these institutes and particularly their teachers are constantly evaluated and observed by institute authorities, students, and their parents. Due to this, institute teachers are more effective and self-regulatory than university professors (Kreber et al., 2005). The teachers' training programs should introduce self-regulated learning strategies, and courses for teachers' improvement should be genuine and strong.

## **6. Conclusions and Implications**

According to the present study, it can be concluded that teachers' SR is critical to teaching effectiveness. A major teaching implication of the present study lies in the fact that EFL teachers need courses to become familiar with this aspect of teacher effectiveness and SR. The improvement of EFL teachers' success is directly related to their SR, so teacher educators, administrators, and policymakers should be encouraged to incorporate self-regulated learning strategies into teacher training programs, and there should be genuine and effective courses for teachers. This, in turn, necessitates exploiting and developing courses and preparation programs for EFL teachers that emphasize self-regulatory skills to help them handle their classes and their skills appropriately, pay close attention to their effectiveness in the classroom, and be sensitive to students' emotions. Both more experienced and less experienced teachers, as well as males and females, should be targeted in these programs.

Based on the findings of the present study, developing EFL teachers' SR contributes to their success. Teachers should undergo long training programs to enhance their self-regulatory skills in such a case. In addition to the recent trends in teaching effectiveness, these programs are expected to make a shift from curricula balancing around a solid basis of content area knowledge to those equipping teachers with regulating their actions, thoughts, and emotions, as recommended by Dembo (2001). Thus, effective ways must be found to develop SR in teachers. Furthermore, EFL trainers and teachers should consider how intrinsic factors contribute to effective teaching, especially those aimed at improving teaching tasks.

It can be suggested to other researchers to use the strategies presented in this study to analyze participants in other parts of the country. Also, in this study, the relationship between SR strategies and teachers' effectiveness was not considered across different degrees. In that case, the relationship between these two variables could be investigated in terms of degrees in sufficient numbers of participants across different genders with various academic degrees. Since this study was conducted only in language institutes and universities, further research is needed in high schools in order to compare the results.

In the present study, the researcher faced some limitations. Regarding the limitations of the study, two issues are concerned. It was clear that not much has been done in this study to observe the teachers' classroom practices. The sample of the study was limited, and if more precise results are needed, a much bigger sample is necessary.



## References

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
- Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 4(3), 359–373. doi:10.1521/jscp.1986.4.3.359
- Bembenuity, H. (2011). Meaningful and maladaptive homework practices: The role of self-Efficacy and self-regulation. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 22(3), 448–473. doi:10.1177/1932202x1102200304
- Bielak, J., & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A. (2020). Language teachers' interpersonal learner-directed emotion-regulation strategies. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(6), 1082-1105. doi:10.1177/1362168820912352
- Birjandi, P., & Bagherkazemi, M. (2010). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' critical thinking ability and their professional success. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 135-145.
- Butler, D. L. (2003). Structuring instruction to promote self-regulated learning by adolescents and adults with learning disabilities. *Exceptionality*, 11(1), 39–60. doi:10.1207/s15327035ex1101\_4
- Capa-Aydin, C.A., Sungur, S. & Uzuntiryaki, E. (2009). Teacher self-regulation: Examining a multidimensional construct. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 29(3), 345–356.
- Cardelle-Elawar, M., Irwin, L., & Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga, M.L. (2007). A cross-cultural analysis of motivational factors that influence teacher identity. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 5, 565-592.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2012). A model of behavioral self-regulation. In P.A.M. Van Lange, A.W. Kruglanski, & E.T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 505–525). doi:10.4135/9781446249215.n25
- Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2014). Measuring the impacts of teachers II: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood. *American Economic Review*, 104(9), 2633–2679. doi:10.1257/aer.104.9.2633

- Delfino, M., Dettori, G., & Persico, D. (2010). An online course fostering self-regulation of trainee teachers. *Psicothema*, 22(2), 299-305.
- Dembo, M. H. (2001). Learning to teach is not enough: Future teachers also need to learn how to learn. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(4), 23-35.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, R. F., & Danielson, C. (2015). How framework for teaching and tripod 7Cs evidence distinguish key components of effective teaching. In T.J. Kane, K.A. Kerr, & R.C. Pianta (Eds.), *Designing teacher evaluation systems* (pp. 98–143). doi:10.1002/9781119210856.ch4
- Gillebaart, M. (2018). The “operational” definition of self-control. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, Article 1231. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01231
- Gol, A. K., & Royaei, N. (2013). EFL teachers' self-regulation and job performance. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(10). doi:10.4304/tpls.3.10.1855-1861
- Heydarnejad, T., Hosseini Fatemi, A., & Ghonsooly, B. (2021). The interplay among self-regulation, emotions and teaching styles in higher education: a path analysis approach. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 14(2), 594-609. doi:10.1108/jarhe-08-2020-0260
- Huang, Q. (2022). Influence of EFL teachers' self-assessment on their self-regulation and self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.891839
- Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2016). *Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of the research*. Learning Policy Institute. [https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teaching\\_Experience\\_Report\\_June\\_2016.pdf](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teaching_Experience_Report_June_2016.pdf)
- Kramarski, B., & Michalsky, T. (2009). Investigating preservice teachers' professional growth in self-regulated learning environments. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(1), 161-175. doi:10.1037/a0013101
- Kramarski, B., & Revach, T. (2009). The challenge of self-regulated learning in mathematics teachers' professional training. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 72(3), 379-399. doi:10.1007/s10649-009-9204-2
- Kreber, C., Castleden, H., Erfani, N., & Wright, T. (2005). Self-regulated learning about university teaching: an exploratory study. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(1), 75-97. doi:10.1080/1356251052000305543



- Lee, D., Allen, M., Cheng, L., Watson, S., & Watson, W. (2020). Exploring the relationships between self-Efficacy and self-regulated learning strategies of English language learners in a college setting. *Journal of International Students, 11*(3). doi:10.32674/jis.v11i3.2145
- Moafian, F., & Pishghadam, R. (2009). Construct validation of a questionnaire on characteristics of successful EFL teachers. *Research in Contemporary World literature, 14*(54), 127-142.
- Monshi Toussi, M., Boori, A., & Ghanizadeh, A, (2011). The role of EFL teachers' self-regulation in effective teaching, *World Journal of Education, 1*(2), 39-48.
- Opdenakker, M.-C. (2022). Developments in early adolescents' self-regulation: The importance of teachers' supportive vs. undermining behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 1021904. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1021904
- Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, Article 422. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422
- Peeters, J., De Backer, F., Reina, V. R., Kindekens, A., Buffel, T., & Lombaerts, K. (2014). The role of teachers' self-regulatory capacities in the implementation of self-regulated learning practices. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116*, 1963–1970. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.504
- Randi, J. (2004). Teachers as self-regulated learners. *Teachers College Record, 106*, 1825-1853.
- Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica, 73*(2), 417-458. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0262.2005.00584.x
- Rockoff, J. E. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *American Economic Review, 94*(2), 247-252. doi:10.1257/0002828041302244
- Sahranavard, S., Miri, M.R., & Salehiniya, H. (2018). The relationship between self-regulation and educational performance in students. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion, 7*(7), 154. doi:10.4103/jehp.jehp\_93\_18
- Seidel, T., & Shavelson, R. J. (2007). Teaching effectiveness research in the past decade: The role of theory and research design in disentangling

- meta-analysis results. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(4), 454-499. doi:10.3102/0034654307310317
- Yumusak, N., Sungur, S., & Cakiroglu, J. (2007). Turkish high school students' biology achievement in relation to academic self-regulation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 13(1), 53-69. doi:10.1080/13803610600853749
- Zhang, T. (2024). Effects of self-regulation strategies on EFL learners' language learning motivation, willingness to communication, self-efficacy, and creativity. *BMC Psychology*, 12, 75. doi:10.1186/s40359-024-01567-2
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Journal of Educational Psychologist*, 25(1), 3-17.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attainment of self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-39). Academic Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 51-59.

