Novice and experienced foreign languages teacher's sense of efficacy and promoting citizenship education

Abstract

This study explored novice and experienced teacher’s self-efficacy beliefs and sense of promoting citizenship education among foreign language teachers working at University of Pula. Data were collected through a survey administered to 74 teachers. A modified version of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) was used to assess efficacy for management, engagement, and instructional strategies. A questionnaire was designed for the purpose of appraising the teachers’ sense of promoting citizenship education. Results indicated that teachers’ efficacy for instructional strategies was higher than efficacy for management and engagement. Results also showed differences between novice and experienced teachers in the areas of instructional strategy, classroom management, and student engagement. To shed light on the teachers’ sense of promoting citizenship education, there was non-significant difference between novice and experienced teachers. The findings provide implications for foreign language teacher preparation as well as professional development.
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Introduction

Teacher efficacy examines the factors that contribute to the confidence teachers have to successfully achieve their goals related to classroom instruction, reflective teaching, classroom management, engaging students, motivating students and other stakeholders in the educational process.

Teacher efficacy has been defined as a teacher’s “judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated” (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001, p. 783). Based on Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) teacher self-efficacy is cyclical in nature. At first, information about one's efficacy comes from four sources: mastery experience, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasions and physiological arousals (Bandura, 1997). Teachers then process the information by analyzing the teaching task and assessing their personal teaching competence. After the information is analyzed, they generate efficacy judgments or teacher self-efficacy. Next, teachers use these judgments or self-efficacy beliefs to set their goals, determine the amount of effort they invest in achieving these goals, and their level of persistence. The performance and outcomes of their efforts provide new mastery experiences that lead to future efficacy judgments. It is noted that like all self-efficacy judgments, teacher self-efficacy is context-specific (Bandura, 1997).

Of the four types, Pajares (1997) posits that mastery experiences tend to be the most influential because outcomes viewed as successful tend to raise self-efficacy, whereas those interpreted as failures tend to weaken it. Even though mastery experiences are still thought to be the most potent and powerful source of efficacy information, the teaching resources and interpersonal support available are much more salient in the self-efficacy beliefs of novice teachers. It may be that teachers who have a lower level of self-efficacy beliefs in their early teaching careers tend to rely on a great deal of colleagues’ support (Knoblauch and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2008).

Previous studies have shown that teachers’ sense of efficacy has been related to student outcomes such as achievement, motivation, and students’ own sense of efficacy, as well as to different teacher classroom behaviours that affect the teachers’ effort in teaching. Teachers’ sense of efficacy has been linked to their classroom management activities (Henson et al., 2001) and his or her persistence when things do not go smoothly and resilience in the face of difficulties with students (Bandura, 1977; Chan, 2008; Cruz and Arias, 2007; Dellinger et al., 2008; Friedman and Kass, 2002; Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Sharma et al., 2012; Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2007; Woolfolk et al., 1990).

According to Borg (2001) teachers’ beliefs in their personal efficacy are to advance teaching with resort to their knowledge and actions. Teachers’ beliefs in their collective efficacy pertaining to their achievement clearly specify that their perceived self-efficacy beliefs have a remarkable influence on cognitive, affective, and selection processes Bandura 1993). Teachers with high teaching efficacy are more humanistic in their beliefs about controlling students than are those with low teaching efficacy (Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990). The stronger the teacher’s belief that teaching can be successful, even with difficult and unmotivated students, the more humanistic the teacher’s student control orientation and the more the teacher supported student autonomy in solving classroom problems (Woolfolk et al., 1990). More efficacious teachers are less interventionist toward classroom management. Efficacious teachers perceive and experience less student failure, which likely corresponds to a decreased need to guard against their negative teaching outcomes. Teachers who believed that students must be controlled and cannot be trusted were also more likely to believe that extrinsic rewards are necessary to motivate the students. These results are discussed in terms of possible contextual effects on the relationships between management beliefs and efficacy and
the possible connections between sense of efficacy and class management (Anderson, Greene, and Loewen, 1988; Ashton and Webb, 1986; Midgley, Feldlaufer, and Eccles, 1989; Ross, 1992).

Findings from research on teachers' perceptions and beliefs indicate that they are related to their students' achievement (Johnson, 1992). There was more student achievement growth in the classes of teachers who had stronger beliefs in their personal efficacy. Additionally, efficacious teachers perceive and experience less student failure, which likely corresponds to a decreased need to guard against their negative teaching outcomes. Teachers with higher self-esteem regarding the pure process of educating demonstrate greater efficacy in spite of problems encountered at the workplace (Medgyes, 1994; Reves and Medgyes, 1994). Efficacy beliefs are said to influence teachers' persistence when things are not going well and their resilience in the face of setbacks (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). Greater efficacy can be associated with teachers’ capacity to be less critical of students when they err (Ashton and Webb, 1986) and teachers working longer with struggling students (Gibson and Dembo, 1984). Additionally, past performance appears to be the single greatest contributor to one’s confidence and ability to achieve in school. Bandura (1997) suggests that if students have been successful at a particular skill in the past, they probably will believe that they will be successful at the skill in the future. Once strong self-efficacy is cultivated from one’s personal accomplishments, occasional failures may not have a negative effect.

A number of studies confirm that teacher self-efficacy belief has a significant positive impact on the level of motivation and performance (Bandura and Locke, 2003; Lee, Cawthon, and Dawson, 2013; Cho and Shim, 2013). Bandura (1977) states that self-efficacy belief is much stronger than an individual’s actual competences and this belief affects others’ motivation levels and affective states. For that reason, “a teacher who is not hopeful about being successful in his/her classes will tend to put in less effort in preparation for teaching and in the teaching process” (Tschannen-Moran and Johnson, 2011, 751).

Teachers' sense of efficacy, the belief that they can have a positive effect on student learning, appears to be related to teachers' classroom management approaches. Furthermore, the three dimensions of efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management represent the underlying factors affecting good teaching performance. In Cruz and Arias’s (2007) study, the principal factors, including classroom management efficacy, personal teaching efficacy, and general teaching efficacy, emerged in the general teaching dimension.

Thus, knowing the perceptions and beliefs of teachers enables one to make predictions about teaching and assessment practices in classrooms. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007, 953) state that “it is of both theoretical and practical importance to understand the sources coaches tap when making judgments about their capability for instruction”.

Citizenship education

Citizenship education includes all the practices that are aimed to construct a strong yet flexible identity, based on solid principles to guide new generations through change in an ever changing, inhospitable world that doesn’t take into consideration the needs of humans (Dusi et al 2012).

Even more so, today’s world is developing in a context of multiculturalism and globalization that, while allowing for a faster exchange of information and goods and services, provides a
fair amount of social issues as well. For that reason, Solis-Gadea (2010) implies it’s important for contemporary educational institutions to take into account the context of late modernity and globalization of their surroundings to permit an effective citizen education of their students.

Not excluded from the globalizing and multicultural tendencies of the world is the educational sector. Dusi et al (2012) states that new generation are being faced with sociopolitical changes like migration and neoliberalism that result in cross generational conflicts between a racially, ethnically and linguistically diverse youth and a monoethnic, monocultural and monolingual teaching contingence. Within this conflicting background, schools must permit the developing of a “global consciousness” that will make of young people, active citizens.

To allow for that to happen, schools must switch from a social conservative education, promoting a top-down interaction with students, to an interactive and critical thinking based social transformative education (Sigauke 2013).

Understanding teachers’ perceptions and beliefs is important because teachers, heavily involved in various teaching and learning processes, are practitioners of educational principles and theories (Jia, Eslami and Burlbaw, 2006).

**Purpose**

The current study assessed novice and experienced teacher self-efficacy beliefs in teaching foreign languages and the influence of the several potential subscales of the teachers’ self-perceived efficacy (i.e. instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management) as well as the teacher’s sense of promoting citizenship education.

To this end, the purpose of this research study was to identify and describe:

1. The levels of self reported teachers’ sense of efficacy in students’ engagement, classroom management, and instructional strategies among foreign language teachers at the Juraj Dobrila University of Pula and the differences in self efficacy beliefs between novice and experienced teachers,
2. The levels of self reported foreign language teacher’s sense of promoting citizenship education and the difference in beliefs between novice and experienced teachers.

**Method**

**Participants**

The study was carried out on a total of 74 foreign language teachers at University of Pula. They were teaching English, Italian, German, French and Russian languages. The sample population consisted of 19 novice teachers with less than 3 years of experience and 53 experienced teachers with more than 5 years of teaching experience.

**Instruments**

In this study, the adapted Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy’s (2001) scale containing 24 items was used in order to measure teachers’ self-perceptions of teaching efficacy. The reliability of the instrument was assessed by computing Cronbach alpha coefficients each of
the three major subscales, which resulted in .86 for FL teachers’ self-efficacy in engagement, .87 for their self-efficacy in management, .86 for self-efficacy in implementing instructional strategies. The reliability obtained in this study was similar to those reported by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2007), the range of reliability was from 0.86 to 0.90 for the subscales of teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs measure. The reliability for the questionnaire which was designed for the purpose of appraising the teachers’ sense of promoting citizenship education was 0.84. Both questionnaires used a 5-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1-nothing to 5-a great deal and were completed with no personal identification to insure anonymity and increase the probability of honest responses..

Data Analysis

T-test and SPSS are conducted to the data as a way of data analysis. Accordingly, appropriate descriptive statistical procedures follow to interpret the results of the document analyses quantitatively and determine the significant differences between novice and experienced foreign languages teacher's sense of efficacy and promoting citizenship education.

Results and discussion

Efficacy for Engagement, Class Management, and Instructional Strategies

Mean, standard deviation and t-test were all calculated to investigate the sample's sense of efficacy for the 24 items. Level of significance reflects difference in means between responses from sample, novice and experienced.

TABLICA 1

The means of the three subscales indicate that the FL teachers in Pula rated themselves as more efficacious in instructional strategies (M= 3.61) than in managing the class (M = 3.59) and engaging students interactively (M = 3.41). This suggests that the FL teachers judged their abilities to motivate and engage students to learn English and to manage the class to be lower than their use of effective instructional strategies. According to the results presented in the above table, for both experienced and novice teacher, the lowest means were found in engagement subscales. Novices had the lowest mean in item 16, while the experienced scored the lowest means in item 9. These items are both related to students' motivation and attitudes towards English. It seems like our survey participants perceived their abilities to change the motivation or the attitude of the students toward the benefits of English language was not as high as their other abilities such as provide appropriate challenges (item 24) and establish routines to keep activities running smoothly (item 3). Those abilities were found to have the highest means for novices and experienced respectively. It’s interesting to note that providing appropriate challenges for very capable students had the second highest mean for experienced teachers, being only 0.01 lower than the highest value. We found statistically significant differences linked to the item 3 “How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?” (p=0.02); for item 13 “How much can you do to help your students value learning?” (p=0.01) and item 19 “To what extent can you craft
good questions for your students?” (p=0.01) where experienced teachers reported more confidence and support than novices.

These conclusions are based on the computed $t$ – test of the differences between both groups (2 – tailed significance levels) shown in Table 1. According to the computed $p$ – values, experienced teachers have shown improved quality in governing a class in relation to novice educators. It seems that experienced teachers express more confidence in establishing a consistent, daily routine; in minimizing the behaviours that impede learning for both individual students and groups of students, while maximizing the behaviours that facilitate or enhance learning. As reported by Freund and Holling (2008) preparing learning materials, making seat assignments, passing in homework, or doing a brief physical “warm-up” activity would all be examples of entry routines. This technique can avoid the disorder and squandered time that can characterize the beginning of a class period. The experienced tend to craft good discussion questions which call for more than simply recalling facts or guessing what the teacher already wants to know, but are open-ended, leading to a variety of responses. That may be attributed to greater experience in implicit pedagogy. Experienced ones may apply a variety of classroom instruction strategies that may range from alternative explanations to assessment strategies. This supports the possibility that educators may use their language teaching strategies in domains within a variety of disciplines.

These findings are in line with those of Chan (2008). The author realised that while experienced teachers are generally provided with information about how best to teach, including an abundance of mastery experience to develop their teaching efficacy, prospective teachers generally do not have this source of information, at least not until they have had their teaching practice in school, during which time they receive emotional arousal and verbal persuasion, including performance feedback from supervisors, classroom teachers, and other peers.

The results of our study are similar to those found by Tschanne-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2007). The authors stated that the experienced teachers had higher self-efficacy beliefs in instructional strategies and efficacy for classroom management. However, the findings of their study indicated no differences between novice and experienced teachers in efficacy for student engagement. When compared to the findings of this study, one possible explanation might be that the field of foreign language teaching requires cultivation of a variety of instructional strategies.

Generally, attending to student engagement is a demanding task for language teachers. Analysing papers regarding teaching literature we may conclude that, literature instruction has primarily focused on student engagement to enable students to identify the organization of a literary text and to progressively build their language proficiency and literary knowledge (Harper, 1988; Kramsch, 1985; Paesani, 2005). As a result, engagement and management concerns often dominate the time and efforts of foreign language instructors.

There was a statistically significant difference regarding item 14 “How much can you do to foster creativity?” (p=0.03). Novices expressed more confidence in encouraging creativity and inventiveness than experienced teachers. They try to bring the student's initiatives into full play, to create an open and active classroom atmosphere and allow students to express their opinion freely. The theory may be supported by the mere fact that novice teachers are, in rule, younger, hence, show more susceptibility in connecting with students regardless of how much effort they put in their studies.

Freund and Holling (2008) similarly found that novice teacher may seem to be more likely to encourage creativity. The authors' study of creativity stated that “some teachers simply seem to reward creativity more than others”(2008, 317). Gu et al. (2014) state that such findings should partly be attributed to the novice teachers’ capability, which was acquired mainly
through their teaching and observations of students’ learning as well as confidence in dealing with daily matters. On the other hand, Kwang and Smith (2004) studied Asian teachers and found that experienced teachers were more likely than novice teachers to encourage and favour students' creativity. Chan (2008) emphasized that active classroom atmosphere contributes to positive learning experiences and fosters educators and students' creativity. Thus, Soodak and Podell, (1996) suggested that it is necessary to provide opportunities for novice teachers to engage in a safe and supportive environment.

It is of great interest to explore the development of efficacy beliefs among novice teachers, given that coach efficacy is related to their own sense of efficacy. In addition, given the importance of a strong sense of efficacy for optimal motivation in teaching, exploring factors that contribute to the initial development of novice teachers’ efficacy will help them develop strong efficacy beliefs early in their career (Yildrim et al. (2008); Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2001)

Citizenship education

Mean, standard deviation and t-test were all calculated to investigate the sample's sense of promoting citizenship education for the 5 items. Level of significance reflects difference in means between responses from sample, novice and experienced.

TABLICA 2

In examining the citizenship education of experienced compared to novice teachers, it was found that the FL teachers similarly evaluated their way of promoting citizenship education. There are no statistically significant differences between novice and experienced teachers for the items measuring promotion of citizenship education. Our participants reported high sense of promoting citizen education (M= 3.59).

According to the results presented in the Table 2 the highest rating for both groups, experienced and novice teachers, was found for (item 5). The lowest rating for experienced teachers was found in (item 2) and for novice teachers in (item 4). It seems like teachers perceived their abilities to foster mutual respect and share actions in order to create common rules higher than their other abilities such as encouraging a sense of belonging in the classroom (experienced teachers) and managing conflicts in order to create a democratically respectful environment in the classroom (novice teachers).

Our results are similar to those presented by Richardson (2006). The author stated that promoting active learning as the classroom value allowed him to mutually respect his students without losing his authority as a teacher. Richardson (2006, 244) refers to the shared attitude of active learning as establishing an “atmosphere of mutual respect” in which the teacher and student act as equals in the learning process.

Conclusion

Teacher self-efficacy is a crucial factor in improving teacher education and promoting education reform because high teacher self-efficacy consistently has been found to relate to
positive student and teacher behaviours (Johanson, 1992). Greater efficacy also points to improved commitment which, in turn, results in higher enthusiasm for teaching. Teachers’ sense of efficacy, the belief that they can have a positive effect on student learning, appears to be related to teachers’ classroom management approaches. Furthermore, the three dimensions of efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management represent the underlying factors affecting good teaching performance. This study was an attempt to explore novice and experienced teacher’s self-efficacy beliefs and sense of promoting citizenship education among foreign language teachers. The research has shown that participants judged themselves more efficacious for instructional strategies than for managing the class and engaging students. This finding indicates that the teachers judged their abilities to motivate students to learn foreign language lower than their capabilities in designing instructional strategies, providing explanations, and assessing students as well as in managing student behaviour. Test results show that experienced educators are more efficient in two sections, which are classroom management and instructional strategies. That can be attributed to experience in both teaching and implicit pedagogy.

On the other hand, novice educators have shown most efficacy in motivating students to undertake the challenges of the classroom. This feature can be ascribed to the youth of the novice educators, which makes it easier for them to connect with their students. Regarding citizen education, the teachers who participated in our study assume that their role in educating new generations is according to a model in which citizenship education is based on ethical values, ability to listen and fostering mutual respect. However, to obtain the high levels of teachers’ efficacy, university teacher education programs should provide positive information from vicarious experience, social persuasion, and a form of mastery experience offered by student colleagues, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. This research has implications for teacher preparation and induction into the profession.

We may conclude with the following words “We need an environment that involves action, in words, and in the practice of a democratic habitus, based on confrontation, discussion, planning, and taking mutual responsibility. For a community to work, the members must participate in the continuous construction of it” (Ross, 2007, 293).
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Appendix

Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale

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.

How much can you do?
Rank the each statement on a scale from 1 to 5 (1-nothing; 2-very little; 3-some influence; 4-quite a bit; 5-a great deal)

1. How much can you do to control disruptive behaviour in the classroom? 1 2 3 4 5
2. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behaviour? 1 2 3 4 5
3. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly? 1 2 3 4 5
4. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules? 1 2 3 4 5
5. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy? 1 2 3 4 5
6. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students? 1 2 3 4 5
7. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson? 1 2 3 4 5
8. How well can you respond to defiant students? 1 2 3 4 5
9. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students? 1 2 3 4 5
10. How much can you do to help your students think critically? 1 2 3 4 5
11. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work? 1 2 3 4 5
12. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work? 1 2 3 4 5
13. How much can you do to help your students’ value learning? 1 2 3 4 5
14. How much can you do to foster student creativity? 1 2 3 4 5
15. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing? 1 2 3 4 5
16. How much can you do in helping students do well in school? 1 2 3 4 5
17. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students? 1 2 3 4 5
18. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught? 1 2 3 4 5
19. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students? 1 2 3 4 5
20. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students? 1 2 3 4 5
21. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies? 1 2 3 4 5
22. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused? 1 2 3 4 5
23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom? 1 2 3 4 5
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students? 1 2 3 4 5

Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.
Rank the each statement on a scale from 1 to 5 (1-nothing; 2-very little; 3-some influence; 4-quite a bit; 5-a great deal)

The teachers’ sense of promoting citizenship education

1. How well do you recognize differences in multicultural environment? 1 2 3 4 5
2. How much do you encourage a sense of belonging in the classroom? 1 2 3 4 5
3. How good is your ability to listen and understand others thoughts before criticizing it and generating new thoughts? 1 2 3 4 5
4. How well do you manage conflicts in order to create democratically respectful environment in the classroom? 1 2 3 4 5
5. To what extent are you fostering mutual respect and shared actions in order to create common rules? 1 2 3 4 5
Table 1. FL novice and experienced teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacy in classroom management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Disruptive behaviour</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expectations of behaviour</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish routines</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Follow rules</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Calm noisy students</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establish management</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ruin lessons</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Defiant students</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacy in student engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Difficult students</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Think critically</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Motivate low interest</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Persuasion to do well</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Value learning</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Foster Creativity</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Improve understanding</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Help student to do well</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacy in instructional strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Respond to questions</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Gauge comprehension</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Craft questions</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Adjust level</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. FL novice and experienced teacher’s sense of promoting citizenship education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Differences in multicultural</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to listen</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managing conflicts</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fostering mutual respect</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>