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Abstract: The main purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ Continuing professional development (CPD) and their self-efficacy. The participants comprised of 247 EFL teachers teaching at different language institutes in several cities of Iran. Their selection was based on convenience sampling and the participation was entirely voluntary. In this study, two instruments were used: Continuing professional development questionnaire and self-efficacy scale. Pearson’s correlation coefficient and structural equation modeling (SEM) were run to analyze the relationships among the components. The results revealed that all the subscales of CPD are positive significant predictors of self-efficacy: collaborating, decision-making, reflecting, and updating. Also, according to the results, CPD has the highest positive correlation with instructional strategies and the lowest positive correlation with student engagement. In addition, there is a positive moderate significant relationship between CPD and total self-efficacy. Finally, these findings and their implications were discussed.
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PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

Continuing Professional Development refers to the programs or strategies that help teachers encounter the challenges of their work and accomplish their own and their learning center’s goals. This study aimed at investigating the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ Continuing professional development (CPD) and their self-efficacy. The participants comprised of 247 EFL teachers teaching at different language institutes in several cities of Iran. In this study, two instruments were used: Continuing professional development questionnaire and self-efficacy scale. The results revealed that all the subscales of CPD are positive significant predictors of self-efficacy: collaborating, decision-making, reflecting, and updating. Also, according to the results, CPD has the highest positive correlation with instructional strategies and the lowest positive correlation with student engagement. In addition, there is a positive moderate significant relationship between CPD and total self-efficacy. Finally, these findings and their implications were discussed.
1. Introduction

In recent years of investigation on teachers and teacher growth and development, the notion of professional development has taken into more consideration, growing investigation on teacher education, development, improvement, and teacher development strategies. Professional development of teachers is that constituent of any educational system dealt with the preparation and education of teachers to achieve the required proficiencies and competencies in teaching for enhancement of the quality of teachers in their classes (Afe, 1995). Teachers’ professional development includes activities that are attempted by teachers after they finalize their teacher training courses (Shawer, 2010). The term continuing professional development “encompasses the intentional, ongoing, and systematic processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students” (Collins & O’Brien, 2003, p. 284). Teachers’ continuing professional development comprises a lasting professional development process which is very critical in the overall requirement for competent, professional, and qualified teachers in a dynamic society (Ukpo, 1996). Therefore, continuing professional development is conceptualized as a process for development of proficiencies for meeting changing demands of the profession by common exposure to professional update plans (Miefa, 2004).

Although CPD has been considered in every fields, within the English language teaching (EFL) field is recognized as an essential factor in the support of professional development (Kirkwood & Price, 2011; Littlejohn, 2002), with taking part in workshops, conferences, on service training courses, using innovative technologies such as online discussions and wikis, etc. (Morris, 2010).

Effective professional development plans have the capacity to promote teachers’ knowledge and proficiencies in order to effectively affect student learning. In this respect, many studies confirm the idea that teachers’ proficiencies and knowledge are the most important factors that affect student achievement as well as teacher’s success (Marzano, 2001; Odden, Picus, Goetz, & Fermanich, 2006). Alexandrou, Field, and Mitchell (2005) mentioned that teachers who are engaged in the high-quality professional development programs eventually improve in knowledge and on pedagogical activities, which ultimately affect students’ achievement and success.

Also, teachers’ professional development can affect their self-efficacy. Self-efficacy described as teachers’ perception of their capability to promote student learning and engagement (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Teachers with high self-efficacy establish correct norms for themselves, endure while confronting educational barriers (Ross & Bruce, 2007), and have a stronger competence to improve student learning (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, & Steca, 2003; Shaugnessy, 2004; Tournaki & Podell, 2005). Examining the relationship between these two factors of English language teachers’ CPD and their self-efficacy can offer suggestions for EFL teachers and decision-makers in this field in order to improve the quality of both teaching/learning environments as well as the quality of professional development for teachers in Iran. In addition, gathering data based on CPD and self-efficacy provides information for schools, institutes, and universities to evaluate their available main professional development programs as well as future needed packages. Besides, it is important to know about the relationship between teachers’ continuing professional development and their self-efficacy to acquire whether professional development activities are worth attending and are available to teachers to attend in Iranian context especially English teachers in language institutes in Iran.

Therefore, since the speed of change and the expansion of knowledge require teachers to learn at many different times throughout their lives (Duta & Rafaila, 2014) and education is possibly one
of the most significant social activities in the life of human beings, this issue is so significant for teachers. So, regarding the importance of teachers’ professional development in EFL context, also scarce studies have been devoted to this issue. Therefore, because of the importance and scarcity of studies in this field, this study aimed to engage in this important issue. So, the main purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ continuing professional development and their self-efficacy.

The following research question was posed and was investigated in this study:

**RQ1:** Is there any significant relationship between EFL teachers’ continuing professional development and their self-efficacy?

2. Review of the literature

Continuing professional development is a constant cycle of teacher education starting with primary training and enduring for as long as a teacher persists in the job (Alibakhsh & Dehvari, 2015). Teaching as a social job stimulates teachers and intensifies their social expectations to discover ways to enhance students’ achievement (Mushayikwa & Lubben, 2009). Learning new competencies and adding to their skills and knowledge are among the main reasons teachers attempt to engage activities planned for professional development (Bailey, Curtis, & Nunan, 2001). Such as the teachers of the other fields, EFL professionals argue that continuing professional development is of great importance, especially in today’s fast, continually, and technologically changeful world. EFL teachers are more probable to attempt the new innovations and educational technologies in language teaching theories with their learners (Allwright, 2005) that allow them to continuously develop in the adaptation and utilization of their art and skills, which is vital for their professional development.

Another variable of this study is teacher self-efficacy. Bandura (1997) was the first who made known the concept of self-efficacy and defined it as “belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3). Different definitions have been demonstrated for teacher self-efficacy in the teaching context (e.g. Dellinger, Bobbett, Olivier, & Ellett, 2008; Guskey & Passaro, 1994). Also, Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, and Hoy (1998) mentioned that teacher self-efficacy is “the teacher’s belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context” (p. 22).

Bandura (1997) supposes four main sources for self-efficacy: (1) mastery experience, (2) vicarious experience, (3) verbal persuasion, and (4) physiological and emotional arousal. In the educational context, mastery experience is the strongest source of self-efficacy and is related with teachers’ experiences of students’ achievement or defeat. Palmer (2006) differentiated between enactive and cognitive mastery experience. Enactive mastery experience requires improving self-efficacy by being engaged in effective teaching, but, cognitive mastery experience is achieved chiefly by being involved in CPD practices such as taking parts in conferences, workshops, and implementing action research. Vicarious experiences deal with pursuing other good teachers’ model in instructing a special topic to students. Verbal persuasion has to do with the motivation that teachers get as a good feedback from others. Physiological and emotional mechanisms may perform as assistance or obstacle in boosting self-efficacy ideas.

Various studies have been done on the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy with other teachers’ characteristics. In an attempt, Moradkhani, Raygan, and Moein (2017) investigated the relationship between EFL teachers’ reflective practices and self-efficacy. Their findings revealed that teachers’ reflective practices had a significant positive effect on their self-efficacy. This result highlighted the role of reflection in improving teachers’ self-efficacy. Also, reflective teaching has been considered as an effective way to develop and empower teachers (Motallebzadeh, Hosseinnia, & Domskey, 2016). So, from this aspect it can be related with CPD. Chacon (2005) and Choi and Lee
English proficiency is one of the components of teachers' self-efficacy has a positive significant effect on language learners' achievement. In another study, Ghanizadeh and Moafian (2011) and Rastegar and Memarpour (2009) revealed that EFL teachers with a strong sense of self-efficacy enjoy higher levels of emotional intelligence. With improving teachers' emotional intelligence, teachers will be developed in their profession. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2014), Federici (2013), Noormohammadi (2014) and Rahimi and Riasati (2015) in their studies, found a significant relationship between teacher autonomy and teacher self-efficacy. Self-efficacy has been approved to have a positive effect on some students' variables. For example, Ponton, Reysen, Wiggers, Eskridge, and Eskridge (2005) found that EFL teachers' self-efficacy has a positive significant effect on language learners' achievement. Finally, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) devised the Teachers' Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) that assesses based on three dimensions of (1) student engagement, (2) efficacy for instructional strategies, and (3) efficacy for classroom management. This scale gives us information about teachers' level of self-efficacy in educational context.

Also, different studies have been done in the area of professional development for teachers. Mizell (2010) in his study revealed that how teachers benefit from CPD. He argued that continuing professional development strategies assist teachers choose the best instructional approaches for the improvement of learners' learning processes. In another study, Alibakhsh and Dehvari (2015) investigated the perceptions of Iranian EFL teachers of CPD and recognized their major professional development strategies by means of a phenomenological research design and interviewing 20 EFL teachers. According to their results “the participants perceived continuing professional development to entail skills development, continuous learning, keeping up to date, learning for interest, and professional revitalization. Additionally, they developed professionally through work, formal education, and attending and presenting at continuing professional development events” (p. 29). So, CPD is understood in two ways: as improving skills in related contexts and as lifelong development or growth because context-related CPD is perceived to be developing skills that are applicable to the teaching context and that help teachers perform effectively within the working environment. Richards and Farrell (2005) also highlighted the importance of CPD for in-service teachers to become familiar with the recent innovations and technologies. In another study, Iyunade (2017) investigated the correlates of 500 Basic Junior Secondary Schools and Primary Schools teachers' CPD on universal basic education in Nigeria by a descriptive survey. His results showed that the level of teacher development for the universal basic education was almost low. Also, it was revealed that teachers were not sufficiently developed for the universal basic education scheme. So, it was concluded that Bayelsa State has not been fully ready for the existence of universal basic education. Therefore, If the goal of teachers' education must be achieved, which is to provide teacher trainees with both intellectual and professional background adequate for their assignments, and to make them adaptable to any changing situation, not only in life of their country but in the wider world, then any effective professional training program for teachers must rest on the foundation of truth and critical thinking through regular professional and exhibition of scholarship on the job. AlMutlaq, Dimitriadi, and McCrindle (2017) in their study explored the perceptions and perspectives of 12 academics from one college in Qassim University (QU) in Saudi Arabia by using semi-structured interviews regarding factors affecting academics' involvement in Technology-enhanced Learning (TEL) Continuing Professional Development (CPD). In their study, they argued that “significant challenges existed to the active participation of TEL programs, including time and workload, relevant and realistic program content that address needs, opportunities to practice the use of TEL, and accessibility and awareness” (p. 142).

Participating in teacher training programs are considered as CPD strategies. Leather and Motallebzadeh (2015) in a study investigating the current teacher training programs at private schools in Iran, claims that the “major principles underlying such programs are based on the EFL teachers’ and teacher trainers’ preferences,” and such curricula highlight
the improvement of good EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers. He also maintains that teacher training programs have little room for students’ or trainees’ needs and follow a trainer centered mode.

In addition, some empirical studies investigated the paths that link CPD, teachers’ knowledge, and teaching practice (Banilower, Heck, & Weiss, 2007; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Heck, Banilower, Weiss, & Rosenberg, 2008). Using path analysis (Garet et al., 2001) showed that the main features of the Professional Development Program such as content focus and active learning had a significant relationship with teachers’ knowledge and skills. Using a structural equation model (Banilower et al., 2007; Heck et al., 2008) also found that teachers’ approaches in standards-based teaching are significant in the relationship between CPD and investigative teaching practice. Moreover, in a study of investigating the relationship between teachers’ knowledge of subject matter (mathematics) and their pedagogical content knowledge and their learning needs within a CPD program using Smart PLS, Tajudin, Chinnappan, and Soad (2017) stated that the results of path analysis showed the direct effect of subject matter on CPD, mediating by pedagogical content knowledge. Tabatabaee Yazdi, Motallebzadeh, Ashraf, and Baghaei (2017) in their study designed and validated Continuing Professional Development (CPD) scale based on four subscales on updating, collaborating, decision-making, and reflecting. They tried to determine any significant interconnection among CPD’s components, through examining the proposed model in the EFL context in general, and the Iranian context in particular. Proposing and validating such a suitable model of English language teachers’ CPD strategies can improve the quality of professional development for teachers and can explore the relationship of CPD with other teacher-related variables such as self-efficacy in this study.

To sum up, professional development of teachers is shown in the relevant literature in various ways. However, almost always main point of such studies is the understanding that professional development is about teachers learning, learning how to learn, and transforming their knowledge into practice for the benefit of their students’ growth (Avalos, 2011). Therefore, scarce studies have been implemented in this issue in EFL settings using Structural Equation Modeling has addressed a blended model of CPD and teachers’ self-efficacy. In this study, the selected paths of the model are to find whether the subscales of CPD are significant predictors of self-efficacy. So, the purpose of the present study is to examine the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ continuing professional development and their self-efficacy., and administrators who wish to conduct and implement teacher professional development programs.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

The participants comprised 247 EFL teachers teaching at different language institutes in several cities of Iran. Their selection was based on random sampling and the participation was entirely voluntary. They were 107 females and 140 males whose age varied from 21 to 36 (M = 28.42, SD = 3.21) with 2 to 16 years of teaching experience (M = 8.24, SD = 2.79). The teachers had all majored in the various branches of English such as teaching, literature, and translation at B.A. or M.A., or PhD. Although private institutes follow their distinctive procedure in recruiting new teachers, they typically try to make sure that teacher applicants enjoy near-native language proficiency (Rahimi & Zhang, 2015). Care was taken to involve teachers who were teaching various proficiency levels (ranging from elementary to advanced). All the teachers confirmed that they had the experience of attending CPD programs during their teaching career. Also, these language institutes offer similar kinds of professional development trainings/opportunities such as workshops and educational courses for their teachers freely. In addition, regarding the importance of being up to date in language institutes in Iran, professional trainings required and/or expected in this context.
3.2. Instruments

In this study, two types of instruments were used, in order to address the research question. One instrument is the Continuing professional development questionnaire and the other is self-efficacy questionnaire.

3.2.1. Continuing professional development questionnaire

Continuing Professional Development (CPD) designed and validated by Tabatabaee Yazdi et al. (2017) and includes 21 items based on a 5-point Likert scale varying from (1) “No impact” to (5) “Large impact.” CPD questionnaire was a measure to evaluate EFL teachers’ ideas on different strategies/programs and the degree to which these strategies impact their teaching practices. The inventory included four subscales on Updating, Collaborating, Decision-making, and Reflecting. This inventory has high reliability and validity and their reliability, using Cronbach’s Alpha, was estimated to be 0.9. Cronbach’s Alpha is used for examining the reliability of the questionnaires. Also, in this study, the alpha coefficient for total CPD with 19 items (.89), and for total Self-Efficacy with 24 items (.85), suggest that the items have relatively good internal consistency.

3.2.2. Self-efficacy questionnaire

The Teachers’ Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) devised by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) and it was adopted as such in this study. This scale is used for examining the teachers’ self-efficacy. The questionnaire includes 24 items and assesses three dimensions (eight items for each) of “1. student engagement, 2. efficacy for instructional strategies, and 3. efficacy for classroom management.” Responses were given a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) “not at all” to (5) “a great deal.” This scale has high reliability and validity. In this study, the alpha coefficient for total Self-Efficacy with 24 items (.85), was assessed and suggested that the items have relatively good internal consistency.

3.3. Procedure

The aim of the present study is to examine the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ Continuing professional development and their self-efficacy based on quantitative design. The data collection of this study took place in November and December 2017. This correlational study collected quantitative data through two questionnaires of Continuing professional development and their self-efficacy. The participants (teachers) answered the questionnaires in the presence of the researcher. The questionnaire took about 35–45 minutes. After a brief explanation of the purpose of the research, the teachers received the questionnaires. Moreover, the process of distribution of questionnaires was done by hand. We explained the purpose of completing the questionnaire and asked them not to write a name on them. They were required to provide demographic information, such as gender and years of experience only. After gathering the data, they were calculated in SPSS 22 software using Pearson correlation coefficient to find relationship between different components of self-efficacy and Teachers’ CPD and were analyzed by Structural equation modeling of Amos software 24.

4. Results

Descriptive statistics of sub-components of self-efficacy (Efficacy for Student Engagement, Efficacy for Instructional Strategies, and Efficacy for Classroom Management), and sub-components of CPD (Collaborating, Decision-making, Reflecting, and Updating), are presented in Table 1. The possible range of score for all three sub-components of self-efficacy with eight items is between 8 and 40. Moreover, the possible range of score for collaborating with seven items is between 7 and 35, for Decision-making and Reflecting with three items is between 3 and 15, and for updating with six items is between 6 and 30.

Table 2 summarizes the information obtained from Cronbach alpha analyses. A reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered “acceptable” in most social and psychological science research situations. As can be seen, the both questionnaires gained acceptable indices of Cronbach alpha.
Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the variables

|                          | N  | N  | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|----|----|-----|-----|------|----------------|
| Student Engagement       | 247| 247| 12.00| 40.00| 28.14| 2.99           |
| Instructional Strategies | 247| 247| 10.00| 39.00| 25.17| 3.10           |
| Classroom Management     | 247| 247| 13.00| 40.00| 29.97| 2.16           |
| Collaborating            | 247| 247| 10.00| 35.00| 23.21| 3.15           |
| Decision-making          | 247| 247| 4.00 | 15.00| 9.19 | 1.10           |
| Reflecting               | 247| 247| 4.00 | 15.00| 8.93 | 1.19           |
| Updating                 | 247| 247| 11.00| 30.00| 20.24| 2.75           |
The alpha coefficient for total CPD with 19 items (.89), and for total Self-Efficacy with 24 items (.85), suggest that the items have relatively good internal consistency.

To examine the research question, the proposed model was tested using the Amos 24 statistical package. To check the strengths of the causal relationships among the components, the standardized estimates were examined. A number of fit indices were examined to evaluate the model fit: the chi-square magnitude which should not be significant, Chi-square/df ratio which should be lower than 2 or 3, the normed fit index (NFI), the good fit index (GFI), and the comparative fit index (CFI) with the cut value greater than .90, and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of about .06 or .07 (Schreiber, Nora, Stage, Barlow, & King, 2006). As Table 3 shows the chi-square/df ratio (2.87), RMSEA (.06), GFI (.93), NFI (.92) and CFI (.95), all the fit indices lie within the acceptable fit thresholds. Hence, it can be concluded that the proposed model had perfect fit with the empirical data.

Figure 1 represents the schematic relationships between Teachers’ CPD and their self-efficacy. The results demonstrated that all the subscales of CPD are positive significant predictors of self-efficacy: Collaborating (B = .29, p = .00), Decision-making (B = .14, p = .03), Reflecting (B = .27, p = .00), and Updating (B = .39, p = .00).

The correlation coefficients between different components of self-efficacy, and Teachers’ CPD are presented in Table 4.

As Table 4 shows, CPD has the highest positive correlation with Instructional Strategies (r = .48, p < 0.01), and the lowest positive correlation with Student Engagement (r = .35, p < 0.01). In addition, there is a positive moderate significant relationship between CPD and total self-efficacy (r = .51, p < .01).

### Table 2. Results of Cronbach alpha

| Scale     | Subscales              | Cronbach alpha |
|-----------|------------------------|----------------|
| Self-Efficacy | Student Engagement | .85            |
|           | Instructional Str.     | .79            |
|           | Classroom Manage.      | .83            |
|           | Total SE               | .85            |
| CPD       | Collaborating          | .81            |
|           | Decision-making        | .79            |
|           | Reflecting             | .81            |
|           | Updating               | .84            |
|           | Total CPD              | .89            |

### Table 3. Goodness of fit indices

|                | X2/df | GFI   | CFI   | NFI   | RMSEA |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Acceptable fit | <3    | >.90  | >.90  | >.90  | <.08  |
| Model          | 2.87  | .93   | .95   | .92   | .06   |

The alpha coefficient for total CPD with 19 items (.89), and for total Self-Efficacy with 24 items (.85), suggest that the items have relatively good internal consistency.

To examine the research question, the proposed model was tested using the Amos 24 statistical package. To check the strengths of the causal relationships among the components, the standardized estimates were examined. A number of fit indices were examined to evaluate the model fit: the chi-square magnitude which should not be significant, Chi-square/df ratio which should be lower than 2 or 3, the normed fit index (NFI), the good fit index (GFI), and the comparative fit index (CFI) with the cut value greater than .90, and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of about .06 or .07 (Schreiber, Nora, Stage, Barlow, & King, 2006). As Table 3 shows the chi-square/df ratio (2.87), RMSEA (.06), GFI (.93), NFI (.92) and CFI (.95), all the fit indices lie within the acceptable fit thresholds. Hence, it can be concluded that the proposed model had perfect fit with the empirical data.

Figure 1 represents the schematic relationships between Teachers’ CPD and their self-efficacy. The results demonstrated that all the subscales of CPD are positive significant predictors of self-efficacy: Collaborating (B = .29, p = .00), Decision-making (B = .14, p = .03), Reflecting (B = .27, p = .00), and Updating (B = .39, p = .00).

The correlation coefficients between different components of self-efficacy, and Teachers’ CPD are presented in Table 4.

As Table 4 shows, CPD has the highest positive correlation with Instructional Strategies (r = .48, p < 0.01), and the lowest positive correlation with Student Engagement (r = .35, p < 0.01). In addition, there is a positive moderate significant relationship between CPD and total self-efficacy (r = .51, p < .01).

### 5. Conclusion and discussion

As stated before, the present study sought to examine the relationship between Iranian English teachers’ continuing professional development and their self-efficacy. With this aim a research question was raised: “Is there a significant relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ continuing professional development and their self-efficacy?” To get a clear picture of the yield results, the research question was addressed by examining the proposed model with SEM and using Pearson correlation coefficient. The results revealed that all the subscales of CPD are positive significant
predictors of self-efficacy: collaborating, decision-making, reflecting, and updating. Also, according to the results, CPD has the highest positive correlation with instructional strategies and the lowest positive correlation with student engagement. In addition, there is a positive moderate significant relationship between CPD and total self-efficacy.

So, collaborating subscale is positive significant predictor of self-efficacy. Being a collaborating teacher, according to McKay (2005) and Farrell (2008), positively affects on how a teacher decides on important matters in educational settings. Based on the findings of this study, teachers' collaboration influences on their belief in their professional capability.

Also, decision-making subscale is positive significant predictor of self-efficacy. According to the result of this study, teachers who are good design makers have high self-efficacy.

Also, reflective subscale is positive significant predictor of self-efficacy. According to McKay (2005), reflectiveness helps teachers cope with issues they encountered in the educational settings and assisted them assess their experience and cooperate with each other so as to find solutions that work well in their classroom context. Having reflection and getting feedback, influences on their level of self-efficacy.

**Table 4. The correlation coefficients between CPD and their self-efficacy**

|                     | Student Engagement | Instructional Strategies | Classroom Management | Total Self-efficacy |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| CPD                 | .35**              | .48**                    | .42**                | .51**               |

**Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01.**
Furthermore, being up-to-date teachers also positively affect on teachers’ self-efficacy. Because updating of our knowledge is influential on how we, as teachers, think and believe in our professional capabilities.

This finding is in line with the finding of Drossel and Eickelmann (2017). They found that teachers’ participation in professional development concerning the implementation of new technologies in class has a significant relationship with their self-efficacy. Also, the results of this study confirm the results of Yoo (2016) study who found that teachers’ online professional development experience increases their self-efficacy. Rose and Reynolds (2017) in their study argued regarding the advantages of collaborative CPD for teachers. They demonstrated that collaborative CPD was found to lead to greater teacher confidence, enhanced self-efficacy, an acceptance to new ideas and changing performance, greater eagerness for collaborative working.

Regarding the importance of the relationship between CPD and teachers’ self-efficacy, Caena (2011) argued that teachers’ self-efficacy is significantly connected to teachers’ professional development opportunities that can create expertise and vicarious experiences, so increasing teachers’ personal competencies levels. Therefore, teachers’ professional development opportunities can respond to self-directed wishes for academic change, which can then promote the motivation to keep attempts and overcome restrictions. Based on the results, teacher educators and institutes supervisors should plan some instructional courses to get EFL teachers acquainted with theoretical as well as practical basis of CPD techniques and hold workshops to inform teachers to apply those techniques and improve their reflectivity, and provide feedbacks to them to get stimulated and raise their self-efficacy and quality.

The results of this study are important because CPD has a significant impact on teachers’ self-efficacy. With this aim, it seems important to recognize CPD which is one of the variables contributing to the self-efficacy. EFL teachers will better recognize the importance of CPD as a tool for improving their professional competencies, and this will also be effective for their students. Also, EFL teachers should be familiarized with new knowledge and technologies to improve themselves and modify instruction for students, to support all students meet high standards, to become familiarized with students’ progress and development, and to interact with their parents.

The significant limitation of this study is that teachers’ CPD and self-efficacy were evaluated by the questionnaire. Further studies can do a mix method approach and evaluate teachers’ CPD and self-efficacy by both questionnaire and interviewing. Also, in this study, the researcher examined the relationship between EFL teachers’ CPD and their self-efficacy among language institute teachers. Further research can examine the role of these two variables in public schools and compare them with the results of the present study. Another limitation is related to the issue of one country (Iran), where different countries have different systems of education. Thus, the findings will be considered only within one country. So, this study should be repeated with more participants from various parts of the world and use methods that guarantee a higher level of randomization and at last greater generalizability. This can also set the ground for the cross-comparison of the findings. Also, other researches can be implemented to explore the relationship between EFL teachers’ CPD with other variables such as students’ achievements.
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