

Teacher Self-Efficacy as Situated Pedagogical Practice in Genre-Based EFL Writing Instruction

Benedicta Cindy Tamara^{*,1}, Rojab Siti Rodliyah¹

¹Department of English Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

Received: January 6, 2026 | Revised: August 18, 2026 | Accepted: August 20, 2026

Correspondence: benedictacindy1@gmail.com

Abstract

Although the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) is widely used in EFL writing instruction, research has predominantly emphasized learner outcomes, leaving limited understanding of how teacher self-efficacy is manifested in the enactment of particular GBA stages. This qualitative single-case study investigated how an experienced Indonesian EFL teacher's self-efficacy was reflected during the Building Knowledge of the Field (BKoF) and Modeling of Text (MoT) stages of a narrative-writing unit and examined the sources underlying her efficacy beliefs. The case involved one teacher at a junior secondary school in Bandung, Indonesia. Data were generated through three 80-minute classroom observations, pre- and post-observation semi-structured interviews, and analysis of one lesson plan. The data were analyzed thematically and interpreted through Bandura's four sources of self-efficacy, with cross-source comparison and member checking used to strengthen trustworthiness. Four interconnected themes emerged: instructional confidence and adaptive teaching, emotional regulation and classroom stability, engagement efficacy and student interaction, and task-specific self-efficacy across GBA stages. The teacher demonstrated confidence by structuring genre activities, rephrasing explanations, employing story mapping, maintaining composure during instructional difficulties, and encouraging student participation. Her confidence, however, was not uniform: she was more assured when modeling narrative structure than when explaining grammar and past-tense forms. Mastery-related experience and affective states were the most evident sources of efficacy, whereas vicarious experience and social persuasion lacked sufficient evidence to constitute distinct themes. These findings conceptualize teacher self-efficacy as situated, adaptive, and task-dependent rather than as a stable general disposition, highlighting the need for professional development that combines GBA knowledge with targeted support for linguistic modeling and responsive instructional decision-making.

Keywords: teacher self-efficacy; Genre-Based Approach; narrative writing; EFL instruction; qualitative case study

1. Introduction

Writing in EFL contexts requires learners to coordinate communicative purpose, textual organization, and lexicogrammatical choices, making it a complex form of language use that often requires explicit pedagogical support (Brisk et al., 2021; Cheng, 2021; Liu & Chen, 2022). The Genre-Based Approach (GBA) offers a systematic response by making genre expectations visible and gradually transferring responsibility for text production from teachers to learners (Emilia & Hamied, 2015; Hermansson et al., 2019; Kuiper et al., 2017). In its four-stage teaching-learning cycle, Building Knowledge of the Field (BKoF) develops relevant contextual and linguistic resources, Modeling of Text (MoT) guides learners in analyzing representative texts, Joint Construction of Text (JCoT) supports collaborative production, and Independent Construction of Text (ICoT) enables more autonomous application of genre knowledge (Humphrey & Macnaught, 2016; Liu & Chen, 2022; Triastuti et al., 2022). This progressive combination of explicit instruction, guided analysis, and scaffolded production has made GBA an influential framework for supporting EFL writing development (Hermansson et al., 2019; Liu & Chen, 2022; Nagao, 2019).

Despite its structured design, GBA does not function as a fixed instructional script. Classroom studies show that its stages may be combined, reordered, abbreviated, or only partially enacted as teachers respond to curricular expectations, established teaching practices, available resources, and local classroom conditions (Kartika-Ningsih & Gunawan, 2019; Liu & Chen, 2022; Nadjib & Triastuti, 2023). These situated demands are particularly visible during BKoF and MoT. In BKoF, teachers must activate and extend prior knowledge, contextualize the topic, introduce relevant vocabulary, and create opportunities for learners with different levels of readiness to participate in meaning-making activities (Abdel-Malek, 2020; Brisk et al., 2021; Troyan, 2016). In MoT, teachers must select accessible and representative texts and explicitly explain how communicative purposes are realized



through schematic organization and salient linguistic choices (Cheng, 2021; Humphrey & Macnaught, 2016; Nagao, 2019). For narrative writing, this work includes making orientation, complication, and resolution comprehensible while directing learners' attention to past-tense forms, temporal sequencing, and vocabulary for representing characters, settings, and events (Crane & Malloy, 2021; Janebi Enayat, 2025; Ridell & Walldén, 2023). Limited instructional time, uneven proficiency and participation, restricted vocabulary, and difficulties in identifying appropriate texts or tasks can interrupt this planned progression (Liu & Chen, 2022; Nadjib & Triastuti, 2023; Triastuti et al., 2022). Teachers must therefore make context-sensitive decisions about whether to re-explain content, intensify or withdraw scaffolding, alter participation structures, modify an activity, or proceed despite incomplete learner understanding (Kindenberg, 2021; Liu & Chen, 2022; Parsons et al., 2018). These demands indicate that successful GBA implementation depends not only on knowledge of its stages but also on how teachers interpret classroom conditions and judge their capability to respond to them.

Teacher self-efficacy provides a relevant theoretical lens for examining this relationship between pedagogical knowledge, perceived capability, and instructional action. Teacher self-efficacy refers not to generalized confidence or objectively demonstrated competence but to teachers' prospective judgments of their capability to organize and perform the actions required to accomplish particular instructional goals (Burić & Kim, 2020; Lauermann & König, 2016; Thommen et al., 2022). Such judgments are formed and revised through four principal sources of capability-related information. Mastery experience arises from teachers' interpretations of previous instructional successes and difficulties; vicarious experience develops through observing relevant models manage comparable situations; social persuasion encompasses credible feedback, encouragement, and professional recognition; and affective and physiological states involve teachers' interpretations of emotions and bodily reactions such as calmness, anxiety, frustration, stress, or fatigue (Gale et al., 2021; Morris et al., 2017; Pfitzner-Eden, 2016). These sources vary in salience and may interact when teachers evaluate their capabilities, meaning that they should be understood as information from which efficacy beliefs are constructed rather than as observable behaviors or fixed categories that must appear in every instructional episode (Gale et al., 2021; Morris et al., 2017; Yada et al., 2019). Self-efficacy is also differentiated according to instructional task, learner group, and classroom context instead of operating as a stable global belief across all dimensions of teaching (Schwab, 2019; Thommen et al., 2022; van Dijk et al., 2024). A teacher may consequently judge themselves capable of explaining narrative organization while experiencing less certainty when modeling past-tense usage or addressing persistent grammatical difficulties within the same lesson.

Conceptualizing teacher self-efficacy as situated pedagogical practice places these capability judgments in relation to concrete instructional demands, learner responses, and classroom conditions. Research indicates that relationships between teacher self-efficacy and instructional quality vary according to the pedagogical domain, teaching context, learner group, and source used to assess classroom practice (Fackler & Malmberg, 2016; Hettinger et al., 2024; Lauermann & ten Hagen, 2021). Efficacy may become pedagogically relevant when teachers adapt explanations after noticing confusion, maintain composure when activities do not progress as expected, encourage reluctant learners, or modify planned support in response to emerging needs (Varga et al., 2023; Parsons et al., 2018; Putwain & von der Embse, 2019). Nevertheless, these actions cannot independently establish the presence or strength of self-efficacy. Multi-rater studies have found that teachers' efficacy judgments may correspond strongly with their own assessments of instruction while showing weaker relationships with student or expert-observer evaluations, demonstrating that perceived capability and observed performance are related but distinct constructs (Hettinger et al., 2024; Jerrim et al., 2025; Lauermann & ten Hagen, 2021). The same observable action may also reflect pedagogical knowledge, established routines, curricular expectations, or institutional constraints rather than self-efficacy alone (Varga et al., 2023; Burns et al., 2015; Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015). Classroom behavior should therefore be interpreted alongside teachers' explicit capability judgments and reflections on why particular instructional decisions were made (Ahmed & Montecillo Leider, 2024; Farrell & Ives, 2015; Yüksel et al., 2021).

Language-teacher research supports the contextual and task-specific character of self-efficacy but has generally examined it separately from genre-based pedagogy. Moradkhani and Haghi (2017) administered questionnaires to 106 Iranian EFL teachers and conducted follow-up interviews with 14 participants, finding that teachers working in private institutes reported stronger efficacy than those in public schools because their institutional

settings provided more frequent and varied efficacy-building experiences. [Wyatt and Dikilitaş \(2021\)](#) combined grammar-instruction efficacy measures, reported practices, language-proficiency and grammatical-awareness assessments, and qualitative profiling among teachers in a Turkish university program. Their analysis identified three teacher profiles and showed that stronger task-specific efficacy was associated, for some teachers, with greater grammatical awareness and more discovery-oriented instruction. Focusing directly on writing assessment, [Zhang et al. \(2022\)](#) conducted in-depth interviews with five Chinese tertiary EFL writing teachers and found that limited knowledge, experience, and implementation efficacy constrained their use of student self-assessment within examination-oriented institutional cultures. These studies demonstrate that language-teacher self-efficacy varies according to instructional domain, professional experience, and institutional conditions ([Moradkhani & Haghi, 2017](#); [Wyatt & Dikilitaş, 2021](#); [Zhang et al., 2022](#)). However, their predominant use of questionnaires and retrospective accounts provides limited process-level evidence of how teachers' explicit capability judgments relate to instructional decisions during classroom interaction.

Genre-pedagogy research provides complementary evidence about how instructional knowledge is transformed and adapted in practice. [Worden \(2019\)](#) analyzed preservice teachers' unfamiliar-genre projects, successive drafts, feedback, reflections, and follow-up interviews, finding that genre analysis developed their pedagogical knowledge while exposing difficulties in translating that knowledge into instruction. In Indonesia, [Kartika-Ningsih and Gunawan \(2019\)](#) used action research and classroom observations to examine a teaching-learning unit delivered by teachers trained in genre pedagogy. Their analysis showed that genre principles were only partially recontextualized because established teaching methods frequently displaced the intended pedagogy. In a genre-based EAP course, [Acar's \(2023\)](#) exploratory case study demonstrated how the participating instructor enacted writing-assessment and feedback literacy through situated decisions about classroom assessment and response. [Hakim \(2023\)](#), examining students' interaction during collaborative genre-analysis tasks, found that teachers' selection of materials and activities influenced whether learners engaged with formal genre knowledge, rhetorical knowledge, or broader genre awareness. These studies establish that genre pedagogy is mediated by teachers' pedagogical knowledge, task design, prior practices, and classroom conditions rather than implemented uniformly across settings ([Acar, 2023](#); [Kartika-Ningsih & Gunawan, 2019](#); [Worden, 2019](#)). Yet they provide limited explanation of how teachers' perceived capabilities and the sources underlying those beliefs relate to the adaptations observed during particular GBA stages.

A conceptual and methodological gap therefore remains between research on task-specific teacher self-efficacy and research on the situated enactment of genre-based writing instruction. Self-efficacy studies have rarely connected teachers' explicit capability judgments with observed instructional decisions during particular GBA stages, whereas genre-pedagogy studies have seldom examined the efficacy beliefs associated with teachers' adaptations and responses to learner difficulty. The present study addresses this separation by conceptualizing teacher self-efficacy as situated pedagogical practice and examining the relationship among the teacher's reported efficacy judgments, observed classroom actions, reflections, learner responses, and planned instruction. Its novelty lies in moving beyond generalized efficacy measures and procedural descriptions of GBA to provide a task-specific, process-oriented analysis of one experienced Indonesian EFL teacher during the BKoF and MoT stages of a narrative-writing unit. Accordingly, this study investigates how teacher self-efficacy is manifested as situated pedagogical practice and which sources of efficacy are evident within these stages. It addresses the following research questions: 1. How is the teacher's self-efficacy manifested as situated pedagogical practice during the BKoF and MoT stages of genre-based narrative-writing instruction? 2. Which sources of teacher self-efficacy are evident in the teacher's actions and reflections during these stages?

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative single-case study design to examine teacher self-efficacy as situated pedagogical practice during genre-based narrative-writing instruction. Qualitative case studies facilitate an in-depth investigation of a bounded phenomenon within its naturally occurring context ([Harrison et al., 2017](#); [Rashid et al., 2019](#)). The case was bounded by one experienced EFL teacher, one junior secondary class, one school in Bandung, West Java, and one narrative-writing unit. The investigation focused specifically on the

Building Knowledge of the Field (BKoF) and Modeling of Text (MoT) stages. The unit of analysis was the relationship between the teacher's expressed efficacy judgments and her pedagogical decisions during these stages. Data were generated through classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and analysis of one lesson plan.

2.2 Research Context and Participant

The study was conducted in one EFL class at a junior high school in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. The primary participant was a mid-career female EFL teacher with more than five years of teaching experience. She was selected through criterion-based purposive sampling, which enables researchers to recruit an information-rich participant whose characteristics correspond to the research questions (Robinson, 2014). The selection criteria required the teacher to have experience implementing GBA in narrative-writing instruction, be willing to participate in observations and interviews, engage regularly in reflective teaching, and have participated in professional-development activities. Students in the participating class were present during the observations but were not treated as primary participants. Their observable responses and interactions were used as contextual evidence for interpreting the teacher's instructional decisions. The study did not investigate students' beliefs, experiences, or learning outcomes.

2.3 Data Collection

Data were collected through three classroom observations, two semi-structured interviews, and analysis of one lesson plan. These sources provided evidence of the teacher's planned instruction, enacted classroom practices, and reflections on her efficacy judgments and instructional decisions (Bowen, 2009; Natow, 2020).

2.3.1 Classroom Observations

Four classroom observations were initially scheduled, but one was cancelled because the teacher attended a professional-development program. Three observations were completed, each lasting approximately 80 minutes, producing approximately 240 minutes of observational data. Classroom observation was used to document instructional actions, teacher-student interactions, and contextual conditions as they occurred during the lessons (Kawulich, 2005). The observations focused on the teacher's implementation of BKoF and MoT, including instructional explanations, scaffolding strategies, classroom management, student engagement, responses to learner difficulty, and modifications to planned activities. A structured observation guide informed by Bandura's four sources of self-efficacy and the instructional-strategy, classroom-management, and student-engagement domains identified by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) guided the observations. Descriptive and reflective field notes were recorded during each session. Detailed interaction transcripts were prepared for the first two observations, while the third observation was documented through field notes.

2.3.2 Semi-Structured Interviews

Two semi-structured interviews were conducted, one before and one after the observation period. Each interview lasted approximately 20–30 minutes. The interview protocol was aligned with the research questions while allowing follow-up questions to explore relevant experiences and classroom episodes in greater depth (Castillo-Montoya, 2016). The pre-observation interview explored the teacher's experience with GBA and narrative-writing instruction, her perceptions of the pedagogical demands of BKoF and MoT, and her anticipated capability to address those demands. The post-observation interview focused on specific classroom events, instructional decisions, perceived successes and difficulties, emotional responses, and task-specific capability judgments.

The interview questions were informed by Bandura's (1997) four sources of self-efficacy: mastery experience, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and affective and physiological states. Open-ended questions and follow-up prompts elicited concrete examples and clarified the teacher's explanations of particular instructional decisions. The interviews were conducted in Indonesian, audio-recorded with the teacher's consent, and transcribed verbatim. Relevant excerpts were translated into English for analysis and reporting, with attention to the interpretive decisions involved in cross-language qualitative research (Abfalter et al., 2021). The interviewer had no supervisory or evaluative relationship with the participant (Berger, 2015).

2.3.3 Lesson-Plan Analysis

One lesson plan prepared before the narrative-writing unit and used during the observed instructional period was analyzed as documentary evidence of intended instruction. Document analysis provides a systematic procedure for examining written materials and interpreting their relevance to the phenomenon under investigation (Bowen, 2009). The analysis focused on the intended learning objectives, instructional sequence, classroom activities, scaffolding strategies, and alignment with BKoF and MoT. The lesson plan was compared with the observational records to identify consistencies and deviations between planned and enacted instruction. Deviations were interpreted in relation to teacher self-efficacy when supported by the teacher's interview accounts.

2.4 Data Analysis

The observation records, interview transcripts, and lesson plan were analyzed through theoretically informed thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006, 2021) six-phase procedure. The analysis combined inductive theme development with subsequent theory-informed interpretation (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). First, the dataset was read repeatedly to develop familiarity with the instructional sequence, teacher accounts, and relationships across the data sources. Second, meaningful segments were coded according to instructional actions, capability judgments, emotional responses, learner-related demands, and contextual conditions. Third, related codes were organized into candidate themes. Fourth, the candidate themes were reviewed against the coded extracts and complete dataset to assess their coherence, distinctiveness, and relevance to the research questions. Fifth, each theme was defined and named according to its central organizing concept. Finally, the themes were developed into an analytical account supported by classroom episodes and interview excerpts.

Bandura's (1997) framework was applied after the initial themes had been developed to examine whether mastery experience, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and affective and physiological states were evident in the teacher's accounts. The four sources were used as interpretive categories rather than predetermined themes. Observed classroom actions were connected to self-efficacy only when supported by the teacher's expressed capability judgments or explanations in the interview data.

Trustworthiness was strengthened through data-source triangulation, examination of converging and discrepant evidence, and member checking (Natow, 2020; Nowell et al., 2017). Observations represented enacted instruction, interviews provided the teacher's efficacy judgments and reflections, and the lesson plan documented intended instruction. Preliminary interpretations were shared with the teacher, who was invited to confirm, clarify, or correct the representation of her instructional practices and efficacy beliefs (Harvey, 2015).

3. Findings

The analysis identified four interrelated themes through which teacher self-efficacy was manifested during genre-based narrative-writing instruction: instructional confidence and adaptive teaching, emotional regulation and classroom stability, engagement efficacy and student interaction, and task-specific self-efficacy across GBA stages. The themes were developed primarily from classroom observations and interviews, while the lesson plan provided contextual evidence for comparing intended and enacted instruction. The analysis subsequently examined how the teacher's actions and reflections related to the four sources of self-efficacy.

The lesson plan positioned BKoF as a stage for activating students' background knowledge and developing their understanding of narrative elements. MoT was designed to introduce a model narrative text and guide students in examining its generic structure and linguistic features. The observed instruction generally followed this sequence. During BKoF, the teacher introduced narrative elements and employed story mapping to organize students' ideas. During MoT, she guided students in identifying orientation, complication, and resolution and provided explicit support for using past-tense forms. The lesson plan therefore established the intended instructional sequence against which the teacher's classroom decisions and adaptations were examined.

3.1 Instructional Confidence and Adaptive Teaching

The first theme captured the teacher's ability to structure narrative-writing activities and adapt her instruction when students experienced difficulty. During the first BKoF observation, she began by communicating the lesson

objectives and introducing the principal elements of narrative texts, including setting, characters, plot, and conflict. Her explanation proceeded in an organized manner, but the students initially experienced difficulty connecting the individual elements to the structure of a complete story. In response, she rephrased the explanation and introduced a story-mapping activity that represented the narrative elements visually.

The classroom interaction demonstrated how the teacher moved from explanation to guided elicitation. She began by saying, *“Now, let’s look at the structure of a narrative text. Do you know the elements of a story? Let’s begin with the setting. Where does the story take place? Who are the characters, and what problem do they face?”* A student responded, *“In a castle, there is a king and a princess, and they have to solve a big problem.”* The teacher acknowledged the response and redirected the class toward textual organization by stating, *“Good. Let’s divide the story into sections so that we can understand the plot more clearly”* (Classroom transcript, Day 1).

The teacher did not abandon the intended BCoF objective when the initial explanation produced limited understanding. Instead, she changed the form of support by moving from verbal explanation to visual organization. Story mapping enabled her to retain the planned focus on narrative knowledge while responding to students’ immediate difficulty. Her structured presentation, rephrasing, and use of an alternative scaffold reflected instructional confidence expressed through adaptive action rather than strict adherence to the original explanation.

3.2 Emotional Regulation and Classroom Stability

The second theme concerned the teacher’s emotional regulation when students struggled with the linguistic demands of narrative writing. During MoT, several students had difficulty recognizing and producing past-tense forms. Although their responses indicated incomplete understanding, the teacher maintained a calm manner, repeated the explanation, and continued the activity without interrupting the flow of the lesson. In the post-observation interview, she explained the importance of composure by stating, *“I feel that when I remain calm, the students are more likely to stay focused. If I show frustration, they notice it, and it affects their own focus”* (Post-MoT interview). This reflection indicated that the teacher regarded her emotional response as consequential for maintaining a productive classroom environment.

Her explanation was consistent with the manner in which she addressed students’ difficulty with tense usage. During the lesson, she reminded the class, *“Remember that we use the past tense in a narrative. Let’s look at the verb go. Can anyone give me its past form?”* After a student answered, *“Went,”* the teacher confirmed the response and continued, *“Exactly. Now, let’s use went in a sentence”* (Classroom transcript, Day 2). By reducing the grammatical problem to a familiar verb, eliciting its correct form, and extending the response into sentence-level practice, the teacher maintained the instructional sequence without displaying frustration.

The alignment between her classroom behavior and interview reflection characterized emotional regulation as an enabling instructional capability. Her composure allowed the MoT activity to continue while preserving students’ willingness to respond. Emotional stability therefore functioned as part of her situated pedagogical practice when linguistic difficulty threatened to disrupt the lesson.

3.3 Engagement Efficacy and Student Interaction

The third theme reflected the teacher’s efforts to involve students in the BCoF activities. Rather than remaining at the front of the classroom, she circulated among groups, monitored their progress, and provided assistance when students had difficulty contributing ideas. She also used open questions to invite students to extend the developing narrative and repeatedly emphasized that each group member should participate.

One interaction illustrated how the teacher acknowledged an individual contribution and incorporated it into the shared activity. She asked the class, *“What happens next in the story? Who can tell me more about the plot?”* A student proposed, *“The princess finds a magical sword.”* The teacher responded, *“Good. Let’s write that down. Everyone has something to contribute, so let’s make sure that each person participates”* (Classroom transcript, Day 1). Her response validated the student’s idea before redirecting attention toward collective participation.

The teacher’s questioning, movement among groups, and provision of individual support created several points of access to the activity rather than relying exclusively on whole-class responses. These practices represented the behavioral expression of engagement efficacy through sustained efforts to elicit, acknowledge, and distribute

student participation during BKoF. They also demonstrated how her perceived responsibility for student engagement was enacted through direct interaction and responsive classroom support.

3.4 Task-Specific Self-Efficacy Across GBA Stages

The fourth theme revealed that the teacher's self-efficacy was not uniform across the instructional demands of MoT. Classroom observations showed that she explained the schematic organization of narrative texts fluently and guided students through orientation, complication, and resolution with limited difficulty. Her confidence became less stable when the instructional focus shifted from textual organization to grammar, particularly past-tense usage.

The teacher explicitly articulated this contrast during the post-observation interview. She stated, *"I'm confident when teaching story structure because it is easier for me. But when it comes to grammar, especially tenses, I feel less confident. I have taught this many times, but some students still do not understand it, which can be frustrating"* (Post-MoT interview). This statement provided the clearest direct evidence of her efficacy judgment because she explicitly differentiated her perceived capability across two instructional tasks within the same GBA stage.

Modeling narrative structure was associated with stronger perceived capability, whereas explaining grammatical features generated greater uncertainty and frustration. The contrast indicated that teaching experience did not produce a uniform sense of capability across all aspects of narrative-writing instruction. Her self-efficacy instead varied according to the knowledge being taught, the perceived difficulty of the task, and her interpretation of students' responses.

3.5 Sources of Teacher Self-Efficacy

The source analysis produced uneven evidence across the four categories. Mastery-related experience was most visible in the teacher's reference to having taught narrative structure and tense usage repeatedly. These previous experiences did not produce an equally strong efficacy judgment across the two tasks. Repeated experience supported her confidence in explaining narrative organization, whereas students' continuing difficulty with tense usage weakened her perceived capability in grammar instruction. Prior experience therefore informed her efficacy through her interpretation of its instructional outcomes rather than through experience alone.

The affective component of efficacy was evident in the contrast between calmness and frustration. The teacher described remaining calm as important for sustaining students' focus, while persistent difficulty with tense usage generated frustration and reduced confidence. No explicit physiological responses were reported. The data also provided insufficient evidence of vicarious experience or social persuasion. The teacher did not attribute her decisions or capability judgments to observing colleagues or other professional models, nor did she identify feedback, encouragement, or professional evaluation from others as a source of efficacy. Vicarious experience and social persuasion were consequently not retained as distinct findings.

Across the dataset, teacher self-efficacy was manifested through the interaction of perceived capability, instructional task, learner response, and classroom conditions. Adaptive explanation, emotional composure, and participation-oriented support characterized the teacher's enacted practice, while her interview account established that confidence varied between teaching narrative structure and explaining grammatical features. The findings therefore represented teacher self-efficacy as situated and task-specific rather than as a uniform attribute applied equally across BKoF and MoT.

4. Discussion

This study examined how teacher self-efficacy was manifested in the implementation of the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) during narrative-writing instruction and which sources of efficacy were evident during the Building Knowledge of the Field (BKoF) and Modeling of Text (MoT) stages. The findings indicate that teacher self-efficacy did not function as a uniform sense of confidence applied across the lesson. Instead, it was situated within the interaction among instructional tasks, pedagogical knowledge, learner responses, and classroom conditions. This interpretation is consistent with research showing that teacher self-efficacy varies according to the instructional domain, student group, classroom context, and specific teaching task being considered (Fackler & Malmberg, 2016; Schwab, 2019; Thommen et al., 2022). In the present study, the teacher demonstrated stronger perceived capability when explaining narrative organization than when teaching grammatical features.

Her self-efficacy was consequently manifested through task-specific judgments that informed how she maintained instructional direction, adapted pedagogical support, regulated her emotional responses, and encouraged student participation.

4.1 Manifestations of Teacher Self-Efficacy During the BKoF and MoT Stages

In response to the first research question, teacher self-efficacy was manifested in four interrelated dimensions: instructional confidence and adaptive teaching, emotional regulation, engagement efficacy, and task-specific variations in confidence. These dimensions indicate that self-efficacy became pedagogically meaningful through the teacher's responses to particular instructional demands rather than through generalized statements of confidence. This situated interpretation extends research connecting EFL teachers' efficacy beliefs with their instructional practices by showing how efficacy judgments may differ within individual stages and activities of the same lesson (Alibakhshi et al., 2020; Choi & Lee, 2018; Hoang, 2018).

During the BKoF stage, instructional confidence was particularly evident in the teacher's capacity to modify her explanation when students experienced difficulty understanding narrative elements. After recognizing that the initial explanation was insufficient, she rephrased key concepts and introduced story mapping to make the relationships among setting, characters, problems, and plot development more accessible. This adjustment was consistent with the pedagogical purpose of BKoF, in which learners are supported in developing the contextual and conceptual knowledge required to engage with a target genre (Emilia & Hamied, 2015; Nagao, 2019; Triastuti et al., 2022). The use of story mapping also provided a visual scaffold through which abstract narrative components could be represented more explicitly, reflecting the potential value of graphical models in supporting learners' understanding of narrative organization (Ridell & Walldén, 2023).

The teacher's adaptation demonstrates that confident GBA implementation involves more than following a predetermined instructional sequence. Although the lesson plan established the intended progression of activities, classroom enactment required additional decisions in response to learners' immediate understanding. The teacher's willingness to change the form of support while maintaining the objective of the BKoF stage suggests confidence in her capacity to select an alternative instructional route. This finding corresponds with research characterizing instructional adaptation as teachers' deliberate modification of teaching in response to learner needs (Parsons et al., 2018). It also supports studies showing that genre pedagogy is recontextualized through teachers' interpretations, classroom decisions, and local constraints rather than reproduced as an invariant pedagogical script (Varga et al., 2023; Kartika-Ningsih & Gunawan, 2019; Worden, 2018).

Emotional regulation constituted a second manifestation of the teacher's self-efficacy. During the MoT stage, students' difficulty with past-tense forms created an instructional challenge, yet the teacher maintained a calm manner, simplified the task, elicited the past form of a familiar verb, and subsequently placed it within a sentence. Her emotional control allowed the activity to continue without transforming students' incorrect or incomplete responses into a source of visible frustration. This pattern is consistent with research locating teacher self-efficacy within a broader relationship among emotional regulation, occupational stress, professional wellbeing, and classroom functioning (Lauermann & König, 2016; Putwain & von der Embse, 2019).

Nevertheless, observable composure should not automatically be equated with high self-efficacy. Calm behavior may arise from professional norms, habitual classroom management, or deliberate emotional display rather than from a strong belief in personal capability. In this study, the interpretation was strengthened by the teacher's interview reflection that remaining calm helped her preserve students' attention. The convergence between observed conduct and reflective explanation therefore provided a more defensible basis for interpreting emotional regulation as part of her situated pedagogical capability. This analytical distinction reflects language-teacher cognition research emphasizing the need to examine teachers' stated beliefs alongside their contextually situated classroom practices rather than assuming a direct correspondence between cognition and behavior (Ahmed & Montecillo Leider, 2024; Burns et al., 2015; Farrell & Ives, 2015).

The third manifestation concerned engagement efficacy. During BKoF, the teacher circulated among groups, invited students to develop the plot, acknowledged their contributions, and reminded them that all group members had a role in the activity. These actions suggest that she regarded student participation as an instructional condition that she could actively influence. Her engagement efficacy was therefore reflected not in a

single invitation to answer but in sustained attempts to create opportunities for contribution and to support students who required assistance. This interpretation is compatible with research associating teacher self-efficacy with instructional practices, perceived instructional quality, and students' motivational experiences (Burić & Kim, 2020; Choi & Lee, 2018; Hettinger et al., 2024).

The observations do not, however, establish that every learner was equally engaged or that the teacher's strategies produced measurable improvements in motivation or achievement. Students were not the primary participants, and their engagement was not independently measured. The findings instead show that the teacher continued to employ participation-oriented strategies and appeared to perceive student involvement as responsive to her pedagogical actions. Engagement efficacy in this case should therefore be interpreted as the teacher's perceived and enacted capacity to promote participation, not as evidence of uniform student engagement or subsequent learning outcomes.

The clearest evidence of the situated character of self-efficacy was the teacher's different confidence judgments across tasks within the MoT stage. She explicitly reported feeling confident when teaching orientation, complication, and resolution but less confident when explaining grammar and tense usage. MoT therefore did not represent a single efficacy domain. Modeling narrative organization required genre knowledge and the ability to explain how a text was structured, whereas linguistic modeling required the teacher to explain the relationship between grammatical choices and narrative meaning. Genre-based writing instruction necessarily integrates these structural and linguistic dimensions, but teachers may possess unequal confidence in enacting them (Cheng, 2021; Humphrey & Macnaught, 2016; Nagao, 2019). The teacher's lower confidence in grammar instruction is also consistent with research demonstrating that language teachers develop efficacy judgments specifically related to their capacity to teach grammar rather than relying solely on a generalized sense of teaching competence (Wyatt & Dikilitaş, 2021).

This task-level difference explains why describing the teacher as simply "confident" or "unconfident" would obscure the findings. Confidence in narrative structure did not transfer automatically to confidence in linguistic modeling, even though both tasks occurred during the same GBA stage. Such variation supports context-specific conceptualizations of teacher self-efficacy, which distinguish broad efficacy beliefs from judgments associated with particular students, instructional domains, and teaching tasks (Schwab, 2019; Thommen et al., 2022; van Dijk et al., 2024). The relevant analytical question is consequently not whether the teacher possessed self-efficacy in general, but what she believed she could accomplish under the demands of a specific pedagogical situation.

The findings further reinforce the importance of distinguishing efficacy beliefs from observable teaching behavior. Adaptive explanations, calm conduct, and participation strategies provided evidence of how the teacher acted, but they did not independently demonstrate what she believed about her capability. The strongest interpretation emerged when these actions were examined alongside her explicit efficacy judgments in the interview, while the lesson plan clarified the relationship between intended and enacted instruction. This combined interpretation is consistent with research recommending the contextual examination of teacher beliefs, reflective accounts, and classroom practices because none of these sources alone provides a complete representation of teachers' pedagogical cognition (Ahmed & Montecillo Leider, 2024; Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015; Yüksel et al., 2021).

4.2 Sources of Teacher Self-Efficacy During the BKoF and MoT Stages

In response to the second research question, mastery-related experience and affective states were the most evident sources of the teacher's efficacy judgments. Vicarious experience and social persuasion did not appear with sufficient strength in the dataset to support separate interpretive themes. The unequal visibility of these sources is consistent with research showing that efficacy sources are filtered through teachers' professional histories and teaching contexts and do not necessarily contribute equally to efficacy development (Gale et al., 2021; Moradkhani & Haghi, 2017; Phan & Locke, 2015).

Mastery-related experience was evident in the teacher's contrasting judgments about narrative structure and grammar. Her confidence in explaining story structure appeared to have developed through repeated experiences of teaching narrative organization and perceiving that she could make its components understandable. By contrast, repeated difficulty helping some students understand tense usage weakened her confidence in grammar

instruction. The same history of teaching narrative writing thus generated different efficacy judgments because the teacher interpreted her previous outcomes differently across instructional tasks. Research on the sources of teacher self-efficacy similarly identifies mastery experience as especially influential while emphasizing that its effect depends on how teachers cognitively interpret their teaching experiences (Morris et al., 2017; Pfitzner-Eden, 2016; Yada et al., 2019).

The finding clarifies that mastery experience should not be inferred merely from teaching frequency or years of service. Although the teacher had taught the relevant content repeatedly, repetition alone did not produce uniformly strong confidence. Experiences interpreted as successful appeared to strengthen her perceived capability in structural modeling, whereas persistent learner difficulty generated uncertainty in grammatical modeling. What influenced efficacy was therefore not simply the occurrence of prior teaching but the meaning the teacher assigned to its perceived success or failure. This interpretation is consistent with critical accounts cautioning against treating efficacy sources as objective events separated from teachers' cognitive appraisal of those events (Gale et al., 2021; Morris et al., 2017).

Students' classroom responses also appeared to function as immediate information through which the teacher evaluated her instruction. When students responded successfully to questions about narrative structure, their responses appeared to confirm the effectiveness of her explanation. When they continued to struggle with tense usage, the difficulty contributed to her uncertainty and frustration. This pattern suggests a potentially recursive relationship in which efficacy influences instructional action, while perceived student responses provide feedback that may reinforce or revise subsequent efficacy judgments. Such an interpretation is compatible with studies linking teacher self-efficacy, perceived teaching practices, and student motivational or classroom processes over time (Burić & Kim, 2020; Hettinger et al., 2024; Lauermann & ten Hagen, 2021).

Affective states constituted the second visible source of efficacy information. The teacher's calmness during classroom interaction and her frustration regarding students' persistent grammatical difficulties represented different affective experiences associated with particular instructional demands. Her ability to remain composed supported the continuation of instruction, whereas frustration accompanied her lower confidence in teaching tense usage. Research has similarly connected teacher self-efficacy with emotional regulation, stress, burnout, and professional wellbeing, indicating that teachers' emotional experiences can shape—and be shaped by—their perceived instructional capability (Lauermann & König, 2016; Zee & Koomen, 2016).

Emotional regulation and affective sources should nevertheless remain conceptually distinct. Emotional regulation refers to how the teacher managed her emotional expression and maintained classroom stability, whereas affective states refer to the emotional information she may have used when judging her capability. The teacher could therefore display calm behavior while simultaneously experiencing uncertainty or frustration. The available data supported an interpretation of emotional calmness and frustration but did not provide sufficient evidence about physiological indicators such as fatigue, tension, or bodily arousal. The conclusions are consequently limited to the affective experiences explicitly reported by the teacher or meaningfully connected to observed classroom episodes.

Vicarious experience and social persuasion were not sufficiently evident in the observations, interviews, or lesson plan. The dataset contained no clear account of the teacher modeling her instruction on an observed colleague, and it did not include sufficiently specific feedback from supervisors, peers, or students that the teacher identified as influencing her capability judgments. Their absence from the findings does not mean that these sources had never contributed to her professional development. It means only that their influence could not be established within the observed unit and the available accounts. This cautious interpretation is important because studies of EFL teachers have shown that the salience of efficacy sources varies across institutional settings and individual professional trajectories (Moradkhani & Haghi, 2017; Phan & Locke, 2015).

5. Conclusion

This study investigated how teacher self-efficacy manifested in the implementation of the Genre-Based Approach during narrative-writing instruction and which efficacy sources were evident in the teacher's actions and reflections throughout the BKoF and MoT stages. The findings demonstrate that teacher self-efficacy was not a stable or generalized form of confidence but a situated and task-specific judgment shaped by pedagogical

demands, learner responses, and classroom conditions. During BKoF, self-efficacy was manifested through the teacher's confidence in structuring instruction, adapting explanations through story mapping, and encouraging student participation. During MoT, it was evident in her ability to maintain emotional stability and instructional continuity when students encountered difficulties. Her confidence nevertheless varied within this stage: she felt more capable of modeling narrative structure than explaining grammar and past-tense usage. Mastery-related experience and affective states were the most evident sources of these efficacy judgments. Experiences interpreted as successful reinforced her confidence in teaching narrative organization, whereas recurring learner difficulties and associated frustration contributed to lower confidence in grammar instruction. Vicarious experience and social persuasion were not sufficiently evident in the dataset, although this does not establish their absence from the teacher's broader professional development.

The study contributes a situated account of teacher self-efficacy by connecting explicit capability judgments with observed instructional practices and lesson-plan evidence while avoiding the assumption that teaching behavior alone constitutes proof of efficacy. Pedagogically, the findings indicate that teacher development should address efficacy at the level of specific instructional tasks, particularly through focused support for genre-informed grammar instruction, peer observation, collaborative lesson analysis, and task-specific feedback. Because this case involved one teacher, three observations, one narrative-writing unit, and only the BKoF and MoT stages, the findings are analytically rather than statistically generalizable. Future studies should examine multiple teachers across the complete GBA cycle, incorporate students' perspectives and learning evidence, and employ longer observation periods to clarify how task-specific efficacy develops and interacts with classroom practice over time.

References

- Abdel-Malek, M. (2020). Empowering Arabic learners to make meaning: A genre-based approach. *System*, 94, Article 102329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102329>
- Abfalter, D., Mueller-Seeger, J., & Raich, M. (2021). Translation decisions in qualitative research: A systematic framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 24(4), 469–486. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1805549>
- Acar, A. S. (2023). Genre pedagogy: A writing pedagogy to help L2 writing instructors enact their classroom writing assessment literacy and feedback literacy. *Assessing Writing*, 56, Article 100717. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100717>
- Ahmed, A. A., & Montecillo Leider, C. (2024). Stimulated recall, teacher beliefs, and teacher practices: Using structured reflective practice to examine teacher talk. *TESOL Journal*, 15(4), Article e838. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.838>
- Alibakhshi, G., Nikdel, F., & Labbafi, A. (2020). Exploring the consequences of teachers' self-efficacy: A case of teachers of English as a foreign language. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1), Article 23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00102-1>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 15(2), 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794112468475>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/qj0902027>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Brisk, M. E., Tian, Z., & Ballard, E. (2021). Autobiography writing instruction: The journey of a teacher participating in a systemic functional linguistics genre pedagogy professional development. *System*, 97, Article 102429. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102429>

- Burić, I., & Kim, L. E. (2020). Teacher self-efficacy, instructional quality, and student motivational beliefs: An analysis using multilevel structural equation modeling. *Learning and Instruction*, 66, Article 101302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101302>
- Burns, A., Freeman, D., & Edwards, E. (2015). Theorizing and studying the language-teaching mind: Mapping research on language teacher cognition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(3), 585–601. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12245>
- Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for interview research: The Interview Protocol Refinement Framework. *The Qualitative Report*, 21(5), 811–831. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2016.2337>
- Cheng, A. (2021). The place of language in the theoretical tenets, textbooks, and classroom practices in the ESP genre-based approach to teaching writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 64, 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.07.001>
- Choi, E., & Lee, J. (2018). EFL teachers' self-efficacy and teaching practices. *ELT Journal*, 72(2), 175–186. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx046>
- Crane, C., & Malloy, M. (2021). The development of temporal-spatial meaning in personal recounts of beginning L2 writers of German. *System*, 99, Article 102498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102498>
- Emilia, E., & Hamied, F. A. (2015). Systemic functional linguistic genre pedagogy (SFL GP) in a tertiary EFL writing context in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 26(2), 155–182. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/155-182>
- Fackler, S., & Malmberg, L.-E. (2016). Teachers' self-efficacy in 14 OECD countries: Teacher, student group, school and leadership effects. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.03.002>
- Farrell, T. S. C., & Ives, J. (2015). Exploring teacher beliefs and classroom practices through reflective practice: A case study. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(5), 594–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541722>
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500107>
- Gale, J., Alemdar, M., Cappelli, C., & Morris, D. B. (2021). A mixed methods study of self-efficacy, the sources of self-efficacy, and teaching experience. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, Article 750599. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.750599>
- Hakim, A. (2023). Genre-related episodes as a lens on students' emerging genre knowledge: Implications for genre-based writing pedagogy, collaborative tasks, and learning materials. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 60, Article 101001. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.101001>
- Harrison, H., Birks, M., Franklin, R. C., & Mills, J. (2017). Case study research: Foundations and methodological orientations. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 18(1), Article 19. <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-18.1.2655>
- Harvey, L. (2015). Beyond member-checking: A dialogic approach to the research interview. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 38(1), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727x.2014.914487>
- Hermansson, C., Jonsson, B., Levlin, M., Lindhé, A., Lundgren, B., & Norlund Shaswar, A. (2019). The (non)effect of Joint Construction in a genre-based approach to teaching writing. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 112(4), 483–494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2018.1563038>
- Hettinger, K., Lazarides, R., & Schiefele, U. (2024). Longitudinal relations between teacher self-efficacy and student motivation through matching characteristics of perceived teaching practice. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 39(2), 1299–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-023-00744-y>

- Hoang, T. (2018). Teacher self-efficacy research in English as foreign language contexts: A systematic review. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(4), 976–990. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.4.6.976>
- Humphrey, S., & Macnaught, L. (2016). Functional language instruction and the writing growth of English language learners in the middle years. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(4), 792–816. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.247>
- Janebi Enayat, M. (2025). Computationally derived linguistic features of L2 narrative essays and their relations to human-judged writing quality. *Language Testing in Asia*, 15(1), Article 35. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00374-9>
- Jerrim, J., Prieto-Latorre, C., Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O. D., & Shure, N. (2025). Teacher self-efficacy, instructional practice, and student outcomes: Evidence from the TALIS Video Study. *American Educational Research Journal*, 62(2), 378–413. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312241300265>
- Kartika-Ningsih, H., & Gunawan, W. (2019). Recontextualisation of genre-based pedagogy: The case of Indonesian EFL classrooms. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20231>
- Kawulich, B. B. (2005). Participant observation as a data collection method. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(2), Article 43. <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-6.2.466>
- Kindenberg, B. (2021). Fixed and flexible, correct and wise: A case of genre-based content-area writing. *Linguistics and Education*, 64, Article 100938. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2021.100938>
- Kubanyiova, M., & Feryok, A. (2015). Language teacher cognition in applied linguistics research: Revisiting the territory, redrawing the boundaries, reclaiming the relevance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(3), 435–449. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12239>
- Kuiper, C., Smit, J., De Wachter, L., & Elen, J. (2017). Scaffolding tertiary students' writing in a genre-based writing intervention. *Journal of Writing Research*, 9(1), 27–59. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2017.09.01.02>
- Lauermann, F., & König, J. (2016). Teachers' professional competence and wellbeing: Understanding the links between general pedagogical knowledge, self-efficacy and burnout. *Learning and Instruction*, 45, 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.06.006>
- Lauermann, F., & ten Hagen, I. (2021). Do teachers' perceived teaching competence and self-efficacy affect students' academic outcomes? A closer look at student-reported classroom processes and outcomes. *Educational Psychologist*, 56(4), 265–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1991355>
- Liu, C., & Chen, M. (2022). A genre-based approach in the secondary school English writing class: Voices from student-teachers in the teaching practicum. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 992360. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.992360>
- Moradkhani, S., & Haghi, S. (2017). Context-based sources of EFL teachers' self-efficacy: Iranian public schools versus private institutes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 259–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.019>
- Morris, D. B., Usher, E. L., & Chen, J. A. (2017). Reconceptualizing the sources of teaching self-efficacy: A critical review of emerging literature. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(4), 795–833. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-016-9378-y>
- Nadjib, N., & Triastuti, A. (2023). Indonesian EFL teachers' portrayal of genre-based teaching practices: Perceptions, implementation, and challenges. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 13(2), 475–498. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v13i2.6501>
- Nagao, A. (2019). The SFL genre-based approach to writing in EFL contexts. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 4(1), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-019-0069-3>
- Natow, R. S. (2020). The use of triangulation in qualitative studies employing elite interviews. *Qualitative Research*, 20(2), 160–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794119830077>

- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Parsons, S. A., Vaughn, M., Scales, R. Q., Gallagher, M. A., Parsons, A. W., Davis, S. G., Pierczynski, M., & Allen, M. (2018). Teachers' instructional adaptations: A research synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(2), 205–242. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317743198>
- Pfitzner-Eden, F. (2016). Why do I feel more confident? Bandura's sources predict preservice teachers' latent changes in teacher self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, Article 1486. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01486>
- Phan, N. T. T., & Locke, T. (2015). Sources of self-efficacy of Vietnamese EFL teachers: A qualitative study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 52, 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.09.006>
- Putwain, D. W., & von der Embse, N. P. (2019). Teacher self-efficacy moderates the relations between imposed pressure from imposed curriculum changes and teacher stress. *Educational Psychology*, 39(1), 51–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1500681>
- Rashid, Y., Rashid, A., Warraich, M. A., Sabir, S. S., & Waseem, A. (2019). Case study method: A step-by-step guide for business researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919862424>
- Ridell, K., & Walldén, R. (2023). Graphical models for narrative texts: Reflecting and reshaping curriculum demands for Swedish primary school. *Linguistics and Education*, 73, Article 101137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101137>
- Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 11(1), 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2013.801543>
- Schwab, S. (2019). Teachers' student-specific self-efficacy in relation to teacher and student variables. *Educational Psychology*, 39(1), 4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1516861>
- Thommen, D., Grob, U., Lauermann, F., Klassen, R. M., & Praetorius, A.-K. (2022). Different levels of context-specificity of teacher self-efficacy and their relations with teaching quality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 857526. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.857526>
- Triastuti, A., Madya, S., & Chappell, P. (2022). Genre-based teaching cycle and instructional design for teaching texts and mandated curriculum contents. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46563>
- Troyan, F. J. (2016). Learning to mean in Spanish writing: A case study of a genre-based pedagogy for standards-based writing instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(2), 317–335. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12192>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944–956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003>
- van Dijk, E. E., van Tartwijk, J., van der Schaaf, M. F., Jansen, R. S., & Kluijtmans, M. (2024). Phases in novice university teachers' development of self-efficacy across and within teacher tasks: A Rasch analysis. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 48(9–10), 831–846. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2024.2410975>
- Varga, P. A., Hipkiss, A. M., & Staf, S. (2023). Getting to grips with genre pedagogy—Mapping and analysing the recontextualisation of Sydney school genre pedagogy in the Swedish educational context. *Linguistics and Education*, 78, Article 101246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2023.101246>
- Worden, D. (2018). Balancing stability and flexibility in genre-based writing instruction: A case study of a novice L2 writing teacher. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 42, 44–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.09.003>

- Worden, D. (2019). Developing L2 writing teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of genre through the unfamiliar genre project. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 46, Article 100667. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100667>
- Wyatt, M., & Dikilitaş, K. (2021). English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for grammar instruction: Implications for teacher educators. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(5), 541–553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1642943>
- Yada, A., Tolvanen, A., Malinen, O.-P., Imai-Matsumura, K., Shimada, H., Koike, R., & Savolainen, H. (2019). Teachers' self-efficacy and the sources of efficacy: A cross-cultural investigation in Japan and Finland. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 81, 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.01.014>
- Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 362–382. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12336>
- Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 981–1015. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801>
- Zhang, X. S., Zhang, L. J., Parr, J. M., & Biebricher, C. (2022). Exploring teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs for implementing student self-assessment of English as a foreign language writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 956160. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.956160>