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Abstract - Indonesian EFL teachers are currently facing many oppressive burdens regarding their profession. They are commanded to conduct effective English teaching as part of their pedagogical responsibility including constructing an English milieu at school. In other sides, they are required to cope with non-pedagogical tasks which are likely in a form of administrative things. Moreover, they are mandated to conduct several events and publish papers in accredited journals, of which those tasks can seize up their teaching responsibilities. Such phenomena can tragically cause the presence of teacher burnout that further shrinks their eagerness to perform better. The condition might also influence their self-willingness to commit with teacher absenteeism or even an early retirement as a result of teachers’ handling-capacity overload. Therefore, this study proposes a theoretical contribution that reinforcing teacher self-efficacy can be a penetration to make a robust teachers’ eagerness to perform better pedagogical and non-pedagogical responsibilities. This study is also supplemented with a teacher professional development model as an effort to reinforce teacher self-efficacy. Further, this study is expected to come in useful for Indonesian government to effectively hold certain programs in connection with enhancing Indonesian EFL teacher self-efficacy.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesian EFL teachers are required to deal with numerous tasks. In 2009, Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) indicated that their duties are more than to transfer knowledge and to make students skillful. Rather, the duties include understanding students’ multicultural backgrounds, developing students’ learning needs, promoting informative and technological awareness, considering proper learning strategy, and dealing with parent involvement (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009). Teachers are also asked to develop their teaching skill and capability in conducting student advisory. They, then, should be able to work within different school climates, educational goals, curricula, and others in accordance to any pedagogical matter (Zulfikar, 2009). In other sides, they cannot resist from bags of non-pedagogical responsibilities such as personal advancement and institutional assignments which are more into administrative things. According to the Law of Teachers and Lecturers Number 14 Year 2005, personal advancement covers personality, social, and professional competencies. Not to mention, it also involves a scientific publication which is in line with Indonesian Ministerial Law Number 35 Year 2010 about teacher’s mandate. By referring to above condition, Indonesian EFL teachers are currently facing severe challenges.

The aforementioned phenomena often navigate teachers to the heart of serious psychological issues concerning their professionalism. First, they might feel stressed because they feel their tasks are out of their handling-capacity. If such feeling goes on, consequently, they become more stressful which brings a matter to a head into occurring teacher burnout (Langari & Parvin, 2017). Some psychological scholars name teacher burnout as to represent a condition where a teacher feels upset with all of assigned professional burdens (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). Such psychological ill can turn into being more dangerous when nothing or none can motivate them to execute the whole duties. When they reach an acute level of burnout, they might commit to teacher absenteeism, a phenomenon where teachers unwillingly come to school and tend to avoid doing their roles. For instance, teachers might propose an early retirement or any activities that retract them from school-related matters. Once they come to this stage, they will be the ones who put Indonesian education quality in danger, especially for the field of EFL teaching.

Interestingly, some scholars proved that those psychological illnesses will never haunt teachers with high self-efficacy (Reilly, 2012; Sim & Moon, 2015; Vaezi &
Fallah, 2011). So, what is actually teacher self-efficacy? It is all about teacher’s beliefs in carrying out both pedagogical and non-pedagogical responsibilities to reach better performance. A robust construction of teacher self-efficacy depends on four basic factors including mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional state (Bandura, 1971; Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1997). Oh (2011) adds some possible factors that also affect teacher self-efficacy level such as support from cooperating teacher, university training, capabilities or skills, personality characteristics, and motivation. Those factors are able to be manifested in certain programs or activities in advancing teacher self-efficacy. For instance, the presence of professional learning community might be the best room for teachers accelerate their self-efficacy. So that, the higher their self-efficacy level, the more impossible they experience dramatic psychological illness. Unluckily, to the best of our knowledge, there is no study that serves an information regarding how to practically help Indonesian EFL teachers perceive high self-efficacy. There are a few previous studies dealing with Indonesian EFL teacher self-efficacy, of which most of them are extraneous to activities that can make teacher self-efficacy improved. For example, Lailiyah & Cahyono (2017) only revealed that Indonesian EFL teachers have high self-efficacy in using ICT during the classroom activities but did not explain particular efforts which might be beneficial in improving the teacher self-efficacy. To sum up the availability concerning related studies, Syamsu (2018) underscored that there is no study found in two Indonesian reputable journals (e.g. TEFLIN and IJAL) in accordance to Indonesian EFL teacher self-efficacy. Looking at above gaps, thus, this theoretical study aims to provide an information related to how to reinforce teacher self-efficacy as a penetration to make a robust teachers’ eagerness to perform better pedagogical and non-pedagogical mandates. Moreover, this study also explains how teacher self-efficacy works in coping with the teachers’ responsibilities.

2. INDONESIAN EFL TEACHER’S RESPONSIBILITIES

As stated in the Law of Teachers and Lecturers Number 14 Year 2005, all Indonesian educators are mandated to conduct qualified teaching and learning process, including but not limited to dealing with student advisory. In regard to those who become EFL teachers, they also cannot resist that their responsibilities are multifaceted and require extra efforts when dealing with student’s learning problems. They are responsible for providing relevant materials and teaching techniques involving teaching improvisation to make students acquire English easier (Passasung, 2003; Yulia, 2013). They also have to consider student’s background as English language teaching (ELT) includes the transfers of cultural and social context in shaping pupil’s cognition (Marcellino, 2008). Moreover, Indonesian EFL teachers are burdened with other duties which are likely more non-pedagogical such as administrative, self-development, and functional mandates. Hence it is important to rigorously discuss the multifarious mandates as a means of characterizing how hard and distinguished being Indonesian EFL teachers compared to that of other subject teachers. Therefore, the following two subheadings will portray Indonesian EFL teachers’ responsibilities based on pedagogical and non-pedagogical aspects.

Teacher’s Pedagogical Responsibilities: Teaching and Student Advisory

Regardless the curriculum changes, teachers are still mandated to conduct effective teaching and learning process. For instance, they must be able to take in account the authenticity of the materials brought within classroom activities. Moreover, they are even not given excuses to repel with larger classes consisting of 40 up to 50 students with wide range of individual ability, knowledge, and skill in English (Lestari, 1999; Marcellino, 2008; Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011; Sulistyo, 2016; Yulia, 2013). In short, teachers are still demanded to conduct the best teaching practice that can eventually boost students’ English mastery no matter how hard the teachers plan the learning activities and execute the process in achieving the objectives.

To ease the above obligations, Lie (2007) suggests that teachers must be able to conduct needs analysis at which its concept has been coined by Hutchinson & Waters (1987). In EFL teaching, needs analysis is vital to research the resources regarding students’ learning needs and target needs (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). By conducting students’ needs analysis, teachers can cope with relevant and more authentic materials, teaching techniques, student’s motivation in learning English, and appropriate media. Not to mention, they can bring students to achieve significant learning attainments due to the presence of appropriate teaching and learning process. Analogically, a leader can bring a prosper living for his people with a strategy considering the condition of the people including their abilities, resources and intentions. Therefore, many studies also shed light on important understanding that effective EFL teaching is begun with the ability of teachers in analyzing students’ needs and then devising instruction in accordance (Astuti, 2009; Bedoya, Valencia, & Montoya, 2015; Poedjastuti & Oliver, 2017).

In addition, regarding the current development of information and communication technology (ICT), teachers should consider the use of ICT in EFL teaching practice as it is also stated in Indonesian Ministerial Law of Education and Culture Number 65 Year 2013 about integrating ICT in teaching practices. One of the rationales in implementing ICT-based teaching lays on its vitality in bridging students with the mastery of the 21st century skills covering critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity, of which the four Cs are indeed essential in EFL teaching (Kamilah & Anugerahwati, 2016). Mali (2016) gives a perspective that
the ICT integration into EFL teaching practice is also an actualizing form of teachers’ responsibility for achieving efficient and effective students’ learning. Moreover, the idea of ICT-based EFL teaching could become an enlightening response of what makes EFL teaching practice fail caused by the primitive teaching which is so-called textbook-driven teaching method (Lie, 2007; Marcellino, 2008). Therefore, teachers are mandatory for being able to use ICT in EFL classroom.

Further, conducting the best version of teaching and learning has not been solely adequate for teachers to boost students’ English mastery due to the presence of various students’ learning obstacles. Marcellino (2008) states that diverse students’ cultural backgrounds, values, and beliefs are too tight to EFL teaching practice in Indonesia. For instance, students’ sociocultural and L1 linguistic problems may interfere the advancement of English mastery (Choi & Lee, 2008; Yulia, 2013). Henceforth, another teachers’ pedagogical mandate is at which teachers can give the best advisory to elicit students’ learning obstacles and lead them to the best learning attainment. This type of mandate is codificatively written in the Law of Teachers and Lecturers Number 14 Year 2005. The externalization of student advisory may cover the area of students’ learning motivation, strategy and performance. For example, teachers can help students troubleshoot bad learning achievements by giving personal counseling and formulating relevant learning strategy. Therefore, the presence of advisory given by teachers is pedagogically essential in scaffolding stringent learners. Unfortunately, the two pedagogical mandates do not likely run in accordance with what to be expected. Indonesian EFL teachers still face problems in conducting instruction such as not meeting the qualified teaching skills, providing inadequate media to support learning process, hesitating the use of English for communication, and not supporting the creation of English milieu (Lie, 2007; Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011; Sulistyo, 2016; Yulia, 2013). In addition, Choi & Lee (2008) whose study aims at contrasting EFL teaching practices in 16 Asian countries including Indonesia conclude that ELT problems in Indonesia encompass the lacks of authentic language use, proper resources and materials, learners’ motivation, and qualified teachers. Moreover, there is a teachers’ resistance in using ICT in EFL classroom (Kamilah & Anugerahwati, 2016; Mali, 2016). The phenomena report that Indonesian EFL teachers’ pedagogical mandates still need to be researched especially on teachers’ teaching qualification as it is the most essential aspect in educating people.

Teacher’s Non-Pedagogical Responsibilities: Personal Advancement and Institutional Task

The second teachers’ responsibility places on non-pedagogical mandates which include personal development and coping institutional assignment. In connection with personal advancement, the Law of Teachers and Lecturers Number 14 Year 2005 especially in the fifth section article 32 states that teachers are obligatory to do self-development that includes pedagogical, personality, social, and professional competencies. Not to mention, to always enhance the knowing of developing concepts, Indonesian Ministerial Law Number 35 Year 2010 assigns teachers to conduct a research and publish or present it in a national-accredited conference minimally for the sake of their promotion or preferment. By meeting all prerequisites stated in the formal written-laws, teachers are benefitted when facing a teacher’s competency test officially conducted by Indonesian Ministry of Education. Those complex governmental mandates indeed further make teachers, but not limited to Indonesian EFL teachers, always deal with relevant competencies.

To bring the mandate into more practical, for example, Indonesian EFL teachers need to develop their English mastery including grammar and pronunciation. Lie (2007) shows that most Indonesian EFL teachers are poor English speakers which are hard to be expected to sensibly being a proper role model of English users. Mattarima & Hamdan (2011) support Lie’s stance by arguing that most teachers are not confident to speak English as they are worried of making mistakes or errors in which, then, they blame the students’ bad English mastery for hiding their anxiety. Another fact shows that most teachers tend to avoid teacher-student confrontation which makes teachers as the ones who know everything (Lestari, 1999) and whose arguments are undeniable (Marcellino, 2008). Therefore, teachers are still necessary to be exposed to numbers of self-development trainings and professional developments, especially on English mastery (Lie, 2007). In coping with teacher training and professional development, Hartono (2016) portrays several practical responses that can be done by Indonesian EFL teachers. As a mandate to upgrade personal qualification, teachers may participate in seminars, conferences or workshops about EFL teaching or ELT instruction. In such forums attended, they can exchange ideas, inform new issues, build conceptual reinforcement, or even make connections. The activities do not only benefit for personal advancement, but also contribute to collective development which further significantly affects the Indonesian EFL teachers’ quality in the world eyes. Moreover, by joining such activities, teachers always keep being updated and thus their perspective of EFL teaching can be broader and more relevant along with the changed eras (Hartono, 2016). Finally, teachers with persistent willingness for advancing personal knowing are the ones who are successful in fulfilling one of non-pedagogical mandates, which are engaging the pedagogical mandate either.

Besides personal advancement, teachers must be in a contact with bags of institutional tasks (Zulfikar, 2009). Coping with such tasks is not resistible to them as they live in an institutional circumstance. The task is more likely to pursue institution’s targets in which the process in reaching the goals needs collaborative works among school members. Here, teachers deal more with administrative burdens such as accreditation blank forms, a-year syllabus and lesson plan, student progress reports, a
class report for those being a class teacher, and others in connection with functional positions. In some extends, they are also demanded to arrange particular events such as seminars, workshops, or conferences in which the duties are too distant from teaching and learning matter. Thus, the institutional tasks are another negotiable non-pedagogical mandate for them.

All in all, it is important to note that teachers’ responsibility is not only about pedagogic, but also non-pedagogical ones. When teachers cannot handle such huge burdens, teacher burnout may come to haunt and obstruct all things related to their professionalism. Tremendously, teachers will lose their willingness to cope with any teacher’s responsibilities when experiencing burnout, of which such condition will result teacher absenteeism. So, how serious are those psychological problems for teachers? How do they exist? Thus, the next section will discuss them in depth.

3. TEACHER STRESS, BURNOUT, AND ABSENTEEISM: EFFECTS OF TEACHER’S HANDLING-CAPACITY OVERLOAD

Indeed the aforementioned responsibilities become a stressful to-do-list for teachers (Chaplain, 2008). Most Indonesian EFL teachers find their prides and satisfactory feelings from their jobs, such as being successful in achieving an English-school title or making students achieve the highest score in the national examination compared to other subjects. Unfortunately, majority of them feel suffered when multilayered problems block them from easily achieving their prides and satisfactions. For example, teachers face the fact that their students feel ignorant about English and have no intention to use it for communication. Moreover, when teachers also face difficulty in inviting other subject teachers and whole school members to come in supports for the creation of English milieu, they might come to a higher stress level. Additionally, their stress level can be higher when there is no support from the school principal, the school policy maker, and their colleagues. Consequently, they will be upset and give up in getting their prides and satisfactions then triggering negative emotional feelings such as anger, guilty, sad, disappointment, and suppressed (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2009). These feelings further initiate the presence of high level of teacher stress.

Teacher stress, “experienced negative emotions resulting from a teacher’s work” (Klassen, 2010:343), can give a firm effect on their performance, career, both physical and psychological health, and their job satisfaction (Klassen, 2010; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2009). It can be manifested during teachers’ day-to-day works, for instance, no motivation to find out authentic materials for EFL classroom, less motivated to solve students’ problems, and being apathetic towards English teaching quality. Teachers have a few willingness to be creative or innovative so that they will perform monotonously and be stagnant in a particular level of teaching competence that allows a professional degradation. In this case, their career development will be hard and tend to be unimproved. They will also get too many complaints issued by their school and colleagues. They, moreover, face too many oppressive pressures that can make them more stressful. They might experience several physical illness as a result of too many mental burdens they have to encounter such as reflux, gastric problems, migraine, hepatic diseases, and other serious ills (Reyes-Gordillo, Shah, & Muriel, 2017; Sauro & Becker, 2009; Song, Jung, & Jung, 2013). When such domino impacts are experienced, teachers will lose their job satisfactions because their performance is never contributive, parasitic rather, to the school development. It is therefore they might not get rewards and compensations for their bad performance from school.

What will happen to them if a tremendously chronic teacher stress harms them? Indeed teachers cannot drag themselves away from teacher burnout, a syndrome of teacher’s “emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment” (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007: 613). It is mainly resulted from a long-term occupational stress (Langari & Parvin, 2017; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). Langari & Parvin (2017) portray three dimensional aspects of teacher burnout. First, emotional exhaustion is conceptualized as a psychological or mental tiredness, of which it might also involve physical exhaustion such as freshen out of energy and serious fatigue (Langari & Parvin, 2017; Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). Second, depersonalization is meant as a negative attitude produced as a result of unintended situations where teachers feel insecure, benefitted, uncomfortable, and less cared. The last dimension is low personal accomplishment that is resulted from overworking or handling-capacity overload. Those three dimensions, then, bear such a set of psychological ill that conflicts some vital issues like health and professionalism in career. Moreover, teachers’ intrapersonal and interpersonal skills can change dramatically (Langari & Parvin, 2017) that might give negative effects to classroom activities (Shen, McCaughtry, Martin, Garn, Kulik, & Fahlman, 2015). Teachers who experience burnout might leave their profession in any form of practices, of which such phenomenon is called an absenteeism. They can propose an early retirement because they feel no longer happy with their job. They think that there is no way out from their problems except leaving of being teachers. However, some of them might not consider that an early retirement is the best solvency because they still need to focus on searching for other opportunities to run their families. These teachers rather decide to still work as teachers but they will not care with school-related matters. In other words, they become more apathetic to the school as their institution and also to their students as the main stakeholder who should be responsibly handled. In Indonesia, there is a current phenomenon of teacher absenteeism that are affected by numerous causes. For example, teachers might not come to
school due to several influences such as school contextual factors, school working environment, and system-level policies and practices (Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership, 2014). ACDP (2014) also emphasizes that teachers are absent from school because there are too many responsibilities to cover in which the condition makes teachers find too many excuses for not coming to school. By analyzing the report given by ACDP (2014), teachers in Indonesia are indeed physically and mentally exhausted as a result of too many assigned works so that they commit to teacher absenteeism.

In short, all forms of above psychological illness are a set of domino impacts of teachers’ handling-capacity overload. In that case, the less progressive teachers face multilayers of responsibilities due to the accumulation of postponed works. Another possibility is the fact that they are unsuccessful to accomplish every single responsibility so that they are put in a situation where the sum of tasks is too burdening. The condition raises a deleterious mental problem that can trigger more dangerous effects, i.e. the presence of teacher burnout and absenteeism. Such domino impacts are caused by teachers’ incapability in executing all assignments or responsibilities. They are simply incapable since they are less confident and motivated that they have a power to accomplish every single matter. As a result, they always think all responsibilities look like fear arousals instead of seeing a challenge that they have to take place (Bandura, 1994; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). They finally see that they are always given a number of overloaded works and, moreover, they judge themselves as the ones who are never able to cope with those works. Such feeling can stimulate the presence of negative emotional state which only drags teachers to underestimate their handling-capacity. In other words, when their efficacy to cope with the responsibilities is low, teachers have a perspective that they do not have a sufficient handling-capacity or their responsibilities as a teacher are too overloaded to handle. Therefore, it can be said that teachers experience a set of psychological illness because they do not have high efficacy in handling the responsibilities.

4. TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY: AVOIDING PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Self-efficacy is often being contrasted to other self-conceptions such as self-concept and self-esteem to get clearer views. It is more specific in the context of individual’s beliefs about his competency to perform given responsibilities (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1997). Since it sets on the ability of executing tasks, it is relatively meant more into goal-directed, or future-oriented, and task-specific depending on a particular definite context (Al-Shukri, 2016; Swanson, 2014). Even so, Al-Shukri (2016) confirms that high self-efficacy in a particular context cannot promise high efficacy in others, so that efficacy is understood as a context-dependence. In contrast to self-efficacy, self-concept covers a number of diverse perceptions about one’s self which is developed by comparing the self to other persons’. Al-Shukri (2016) argues that self-concept is further being a constant self-judgment regarding the one’s image, or mostly known as self-image. For example, a teacher who perceives high self-efficacy in speaking English but with low self-efficacy in speaking Javanese is still stereotyped as, for example, a strict teacher since he constructs his self-concept in such a way; thus self-concept “does not have the specificity that self-efficacy has” (Al-Shukri, 2016:16). Moreover, self-efficacy is also indeed distinct from self-esteem (Adalsteinsson et al, 2014). Bandura (1997) formerly argues that self-esteem regards to judgments given of one’s worthiness (Al-Shukri, 2016), or self-worth (Basikin, 2006). For example, being a strict teacher is another self-worthness and value that may increase his pride of being himself. Only in a certain case, self-efficacy can boost a teacher’s self-satisfaction in developing an autonomy, that the sense of satisfactory feeling is relevantly referred to positive self-esteem (Basikin, 2006). So that, self-efficacy is indeed conceptually different from self-concept and self-esteem.

Henceforth, teacher self-efficacy (TSE) can be conceptualized as teacher’s ability in carrying out all responsibilities to reach the best outcome (Berman et al., 1977). Gibson & Dembo (1984) argue that the presence of TSE is also important in helping unmotivated students perform better even up to achieving best learning accomplishment. Tschanen-Moran, Hoy & Hoy (1998) also add that perceived TSE will make teachers internally control their teaching consequences on their student learning motivation and performance. Skaalvik & Skaalvik (2007) argue that teachers with low efficacy fail to be an facilitator for students to possess good learning motivation. It is, thus, the lower teachers’ efficacy to teach particular skills, the lower the students’ learning achievement (Swanson, 2014). For example, when students cannot participate the teaching and learning process well, consequently their performance will be too distant from which learning objectives have been settled at the beginning of the course. Henceforth, perceiving high efficacy must not be an option for teachers for the sake of bridging students to get better learning attainments. Moreover, the perceived high TSE helps teachers avoid some teacher’s mental problems, such as teacher stress and burnout (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). Skaalvik & Skaalvik (2017) provide an evidence that teachers with high self-efficacy are negatively connected with teacher stress. When teachers with high TSE are not interrelated with teacher stress, they are safe from experiencing burnout. Such assertion is valid because the presence of burnout is the incessant impact of stress (Langari & Parvin, 2017; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). Thus, having highly perceived TSE is indeed more suggested to keep away from psychological illness.
5. MODELS TO REINFORCE TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY

There are some studies which conceptualized models for reinforcing self-efficacy. Some of them have been already focused on the teaching field and dealt with teacher self-efficacy (Adalsteinsson et al, 2014; Garvis & Pendergast, 2016; Renner & Pratt, 2017; Schleicher, 2015). Wood & Olivier (2008) worked on a theoretical study about way of generating a model to increase teacher self-efficacy. In that model, the departure of the respective processes lays on the fact that disempowered teachers perceive low self-efficacy. Teachers with negative feeling, behavior and attitude are then cared by facilitators to come into the initiation of the three simultaneous processes covering intrinsic growth, the development of an internal locus of control, and interaction with the environment. Each process remains the reinforcement of four Bandura’s (1977, 1997, 2006) sources of information and is further maintained through reflective practice which then arises positive feelings, behavior and attitude. Such maintenance process exerts the occurrence of perceived high self-efficacy. Another study is conducted by Harding (2016) who serves a model for professional development to improve teacher self-efficacy. Harding (2016) proposes an integrated model whose content covers a reflection component where teachers can experience it during the teaching and learning process. The self-reflection includes exploring teachers’ mastery experience and feelings while teaching and using diverse media to teach. Teachers, then, can sit around with their colleagues to share things or just to speak and to listen to others. The center of such discursive model is to put teachers in a full empowerment atmosphere. Meaning that, teachers can empower themselves in coping with how to face people while the colleagues help them build the confidence or boost the self-efficacy. Harding’s (2016) model is actually familiar to other scholars who propose professional development as a bridge to accelerate self-efficacy such as Wang (2013), Malone (2001), Best et al (2016), Chao et al (2017), and Fritz et al (1995). So that, the following sub-section provides a model that can be helpful to reinforce Indonesian EFL teacher self-efficacy in which the generated model adapts to some similarly previous studies.

Reinforcing Indonesian EFL Teacher Self-Efficacy

This study makes the best use of English teacher community, or called MGMP in Bahasa Indonesia, to be a room to reinforce Indonesian EFL teacher self-efficacy. MGMP becomes a place where English teachers in a particular area gather, share ideas, conduct seminars or workshops, and have activities regarding to various annual programs. This community is like borderless for those seniors and the novice teachers. So that, this platform might be important to promote collaborative works and help each other in needs.
In addition, teachers registered in this community are put in a scheme of family bounding, meaning that MGMP is the home to them and a place to rebuild a firm teaching spirit. For instance, one teacher can strengthen the others who slip on some problems and help them recover very soon. Such family scheme remains the fact that teachers are basically not working alone, rather, their community helps as resources. Therefore, the presence of MGMP is vital and, regarding to this study, becomes a helpful room to boost their self-efficacy in accomplishing pedagogical and non-pedagogical responsibilities.

This study features a model of professional development program that can be implemented in MGMP during some specific meetings. The goal of the program is to enhance Indonesian EFL teacher self-efficacy in accomplishing both pedagogical and non-pedagogical responsibilities. Meanwhile, the objectives cover five aspects namely accomplishing responsibility to teach, doing student advisory, using English for classroom communication, creating English milieu, and coping with institutional assignments (see Figure 1). Each aspect is further considered to have two sessions with one a half hours per session. The contents cover theoretical (in the first session) and practical (in the second session) materials. The first session aims to reinforce teachers’ schemata and knowledge, including the English skill. Teachers will be given materials related to a particular aspect then have a classical discussion led by the facilitator of the program. Because this session seems like more theoretical, a lecture with two-ways communication mode is suitable to reinforce their mastery experience. The feedback of this session might be in a form of self-understanding evaluation sheet for teachers as the participants of the program. The evaluation sheet exposes the difference between their previous knowledge with the new ones delivered by the facilitator. This is so important to confirm that their mastery is about upgrading. The evaluation sheet better in a form of yes-no rating for the sake of easier confirmation whether their mastery has been developed. Moreover, the evaluation sheet could be more helpful in portraying the difference if it accommodates participants’ feelings and opinions. In other words, it might be in a form of semi-structure evaluation sheet. The second session wholly consists of practices of the theories given from the first session. This session is better conducted in the next meeting just after the first session finished to confirm how the teachers master the delivered materials. The practices can be in a form of role play, situational vignette, and discussion of personal experience using jigsaw model (Best et al, 2016:6). The focus of the second session engages with the reinforcement of vicarious experience, verbal persuasion and emotional state.

The program is suitable for ten sessions excluding the pre and post activities, however, it might be more depending on the needs of the participants toward the materials. Moreover, one important component is the availability of the assessment to measure the progress of the participant self-efficacy. Thus, pre- and post-test design should be administered to see the changes of teacher self-efficacy. The suggested measure is questionnaire, of which it has been widely constructed by a number of scholars whose study is on developing self-efficacy measure (Bandura, 2006; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). By seeing the changes, therefore, there could be revealed how significant the progress is and how contributive the model to the teachers as the participants. Once the teachers perceive high self-efficacy, they could maintain it through participating such a program that is conducted by MGMP persistently. Consequently, the facilitators should serve the teachers with various materials and innovative practices in order to make the teachers willing to come. Figure 1 confirms the concept of the professional model proposed in this study.

6. CONCLUSION

Indonesian EFL teachers can conduct their pedagogical and non-pedagogical responsibilities well once they have perceived high self-efficacy. Meaning, they have already had a confidence to cope with the burdening tasks since they have no longer seen the tasks as threats or fear arousals but challenges. They have also improved their handling-capacity to deal with more challenged assignments that might lead them to avoid couple of psychological ill such as stress and burnout. Teachers with no such ill run their professionalism better so that they are in to participate on the national agenda namely developing education quality. When they are conscious about their role as educators, who are fundamental in bridging to brighter human resources, they will not be in touch with teacher absenteeism. As a result, they make the EFL learning atmosphere more conducive and effective. In addition, teacher professional development could be a way to reinforce their self-efficacy. This study has provided a relevant model for Indonesian EFL context. This model is coined by referring to previous studies which basically work on different fields of studies. However, this adaptable model still can be developed to reach what teachers need, also the situation and location where they live and work. Therefore, this theoretical study suggests that conducting field research dealing with investigating the effectiveness of the model is important because the result might become a reference for Indonesian government to set a program maintaining teacher self-efficacy.
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