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Abstract:
The qualitative approach appears to be dominant in language teacher identity (LTI) research. Emerging LTI studies using non-qualitative methods have been overlooked. To date, a review that synthesizes English teacher identity (ETI) studies using non-qualitative methods is lacking. This paper reports on a PRISMA-based systematic review of 20 identified studies from the Google Scholar and CNKI databases. The outcomes of the review are as follows: First, studies tend to concentrate on five countries, but mostly in China and Iran. Second, Beijaard’s definition and measuring instruments of TI are most frequently cited. Third, samples were predominantly university teachers. Finally, a framework was proposed to capture six research themes: (i) ETI levels and socio-demographic factors, (ii) comparative study, (iii) ETI and one construct, (iv) ETI and two constructs, and (v) ETI and technology use or metacognition. Recommendations for future research and limitations of this study are discussed.
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Introduction
Teacher identity (TI), as a fundamental answer to ‘who I am as a teacher’, has emerged as a distinct research topic in teacher education (Nguyen & Loughland, 2018). It is useful for understanding teachers’ personal and professional lives (AlHarbi & Ahmad, 2020;
As an extension of TI research (Swearingen, 2019), language teacher identity (LTI) continues to gain scholarly interest (Nguyen et al., 2022; Nguyen & Ngo, 2023; Pennington & Richards, 2016; Richards, 2023; Seyri & Nazari, 2022; Yazan & Lindahl, 2020). LTI research has gone through changes in perspective, from linguistic to sociocultural identities of linguistic teachers. Recent studies have been influenced by post-structural approaches (Kayi-Aydar, 2019; Liu & Xu, 2022).

A vast body of literature has demonstrated that qualitative approach has been and is predominantly used to unpack LTI (Al Zadjali, 2017; Mulu et al., 2022; Nazari et al., 2021; Tang, 2017), particularly narrative inquiries (Charles, 2019; Cheng et al., 2022; Li & Xu, 2022; Meihami & Esfandiari, 2021; Ubaque & Castañeda-Peña, 2017; Wang, 2021), and case studies (Cobb et al., 2018; Du & Zhang, 2021; Goktepe & Kunt, 2021; Kocabaş-Gedik & Ortaçtepe Hart, 2021; Liu, 2022; Mehdizadeh et al., 2023; Nue & Manara, 2022; Yang & Huang, 2022), followed by phenomenological research (Hashemi Moghadam et al., 2019; Meihami & Rashidi, 2022). Nevertheless, and perhaps consequently, there is less (though emerging) research that examines LTI using the quantitative approach (Dilek & Altas, 2022; Fu & Zhou, 2019; Mofrad, 2016; Yazdani & Ghasedi, 2021).

Literature Review
Among the existing TI reviews, some narrowed down to a particular context, such as Turkey (Taner & Karaman, 2013), China (Fu, 2021; Liang et al., 2017), or the university context (van Lankveld et al., 2017), some targeted specific samples of participants, including veteran teachers (Carrillo & Flores, 2018), non-native English speaking teachers (Swearingen, 2019; Yuan, 2019), second language teachers (Ng & Cheung, 2022; Parks, 2017; Sadeghi & Bahari, 2022; Teng, 2018), and student teachers (Izadinia, 2013; Rodrigues & Mogarro, 2019). In addition, Hanna et al. (2019) synthesized TI measuring instruments, and Rosdi et al. (2020) examined TI and technology integration. Despite the fruitful findings, a scientific review on English teacher identity (ETI) is missing.

Previous literature reviews between 2004 and 2014 (Xun & Zheng, 2014), and between 2008 and 2018 (Shi & Cheng, 2020) reported diverging findings in terms of methodology, which might indicate the methodological development in this field. Therefore, a time limit of 2012–2022 was applied to capture changes in TI research over the last decade. Given the increased use of non-qualitative approaches, this study directs attention to the non-qualitative approach. The research findings will benefit future researchers and teacher educators.

This study aims to gather, review, summarize, and analyze ETI studies using non-qualitative approach from 2012 to 2022. The research questions are:
- What is the publication trend during the last decade?
- What are the countries of origin for these studies? In what contexts are these studies conducted?
- How are TI defined in these studies?
- What are the methodological (research design, instruments, and sample) issues?
- What are the research themes and foci of these studies?
- What major findings on TI are reported?
Methodology
To answer these research questions, a systematic review was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (Moher et al., 2009; Page et al., 2021).

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria
The inclusion and exclusion criteria are listed in Table 1. Scholarly articles on empirical studies that used quantitative or mixed-methods involving English teachers were selected. English teachers working in preschools, primary and secondary schools, and universities were included. All Chinese-language journal ranks were confirmed in the CNKI database, and only CSSCI-indexed journals (top-tier journals in China) were selected. All the journals located from Google Scholar were screened by quartile ranking, which was sought from the Scimago SJR (https://www.scimagojr.com/) platform. Only papers with Scopus-indexed Q3 and above (Q1 and Q2) were included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication data</td>
<td>Jan, 2012 to Dec, 2022 English language teachers</td>
<td>Prior to 2012 and after Dec 2022 Teachers teaching subjects other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research method</td>
<td>Empirical articles using Quantitative or mixed methods</td>
<td>Qualitative, conceptual/theoretical, discussion papers, review papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication type</td>
<td>Original research from peer-reviewed journals</td>
<td>Books, book chapters, reports, conference proceedings, master and doctoral theses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal metrics</td>
<td>CSSCI-indexed papers in CNKI; Scopus-indexed papers (Q3 and above) in Google Scholar</td>
<td>Non-CSSCI-indexed papers; Non-peer-reviewed papers, non-Scopus-indexed papers, Scopus Q4 papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Language</td>
<td>English and Chinese</td>
<td>Languages other than English and Chinese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exclusion criteria were also applied. Studies on teaching disciplines other than English were excluded. Studies that gathered only qualitative data or focused on developing and validating TI questionnaires were removed. Articles published in non-peer-reviewed journals, non-Scopus indexed papers, or Q4 journals were excluded. Book chapters, books, master’s and doctoral theses, conference proceedings, and conceptual papers were discarded.

As suggested by PRISMA (Page et al., 2021), the two authors conducted the literature search and analysis independently before holding several discussions, and a consensus on the scope and outcome of the review was reached. The final search was conducted on January 3, 2023.

Search Platform
The search focused on literature that related the term ‘English teachers’ to the term ‘professional identity’. The online search for articles was performed using two important online databases: Google Scholar, and the Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI)
database. The choice of the databases is due to the endeavor to cover both English and Chinese languages, since previous studies have limited the scope of the literature to papers written in English.

**Study Selection**

Figure 1 illustrates the study selection process.

![Study Selection Flowchart](image)

First, the Google Scholar advanced search was used for literature search, publications whose titles included the term “language OR English OR EFL OR ELT OR ESL teacher” and which responded to the descriptor “professional identity” were sought. The first round of search yielded 746 studies. However, upon close examination, many of these studies did not meet the inclusion criteria regarding the research method (narrative inquiry, case study) or nature of the study (review paper rather than empirical studies). To eliminate qualitative studies and review studies, the Boolean operators “NOT” and “OR” were used. The search string was as follows: (NOT (construction OR development OR formation OR experience OR narrative OR case study OR review)). The second round of Google Scholar searches generated 124 studies. Due to corrigendum, one duplicate was found and removed. After reviewing titles and abstracts, 77 studies that met the exclusion criteria were removed. After checking the journal rank and full-text, 33 additional studies were excluded. Finally, 13 studies were included in the analysis.

When searching the CNKI database, the search terms were used differently because of language difference. First, the Boolean operator AND was used between “Wai Yu Jiao Shi (meaning foreign or English teacher in Chinese)” and “Ren Tong” OR “Shen Fen” (meaning identity or professional identity in Chinese), NOT was used before “Shu Ping” and “Zong Shu” (meaning critical review and review in Chinese) to exclude critical or review papers. 25 CSSCI-indexed papers were generated. Secondly, the Boolean operator AND was used
between “Wai Yu Jiao Shi” and “Ren Tong”, and 38 CSSCI-indexed papers were located. Among these 63 papers, 19 duplicates were found and removed, the remaining 44 papers were perused, 27 papers were removed by reviewing abstracts and titles, 10 papers were further excluded upon reading the full-text, and the final number of papers was reduced to 7. Hence, 20 papers were included in this systematic review.

**Analysis Method**

A grid template was used to document extracted information, including author, year, country of origin, research context, focus of study, methodology, and finding to facilitate the systematic comparative analysis.

**Results**

As mentioned earlier, the final number of included studies was reduced to 20 after the study selection process. The findings of this review are organized into six aspects: (1) publication trend, (2) country of origin and research context, (3) definitions of TI; (4) research approach and instruments, (5) sampling technique and characteristics, and (6) research themes, foci and major findings.

**Publication Trend**

Publication trends were identified in terms of the number of papers published each year between 2012 and 2022. As seen in Figure 2, no papers were published in 2012 or 2013, and two papers were published each year in 2014, 2015 and 2016. This number increased to three in 2017, which persisted in 2018. Despite zero publication in 2020, the number increased to five in 2021 and decreased to one in 2022.

![Figure 2: Publication Trend](image)

**Country of Origin and Research Context**

Figure 3 illustrates the authors’ countries of origin. The 20 papers provide a global perspective including: mainland China (9), Iran (9), Spain (1), South Korea (1), and Turkey (1). Notably,
in Tafazoli and Sadeghi’s (2018) study, the first authors’ affiliated country differs from that of the second author, suggesting cross-country collaboration among researchers.

**Figure 3: Geographical Distribution**

In terms of research context, all 20 studies specified the countries in which the studies were carried out, however, the exact geographical locations were not indicated in two studies (Tafazoli & Sadeghi, 2018a; Tajeddin & Adeh, 2016). Xun and Zheng (2015) concealed the real name of the province and used the S Province instead. Most studies provided information about the name of the province or city or both. Most studies appeared to limit their scope to one university (Liu & Cai, 2021), a single county (Xiong & Xiong, 2017), a single city (Han, 2021; Mofrad, 2016; Ostad et al., 2019; Rozati, 2017), and a single province (Liu, 2014; Xun & Zheng, 2015; Zhang & Xu, 2017). However, a few studies have extended the coverage to more institutions, cities and provinces, as seen in Kalali Sani et al.’s (2022) study involving different cities in all provinces of Iran and three studies in China (Cai, 2021; Tang, 2014).
Definitions of Teacher Identity

The definitions of TI in each of the 20 studies was examined and shown in Figure 4.

Surprisingly, 25% (n=5) of the studies did not explicitly define TI (Celebi & Eraldemir-Tuyan, 2021; Kalali Sani et al., 2022; Liu, 2014; Tafazoli & Šadeghi, 2018a; Xiong & Xiong, 2017). The definitions of TI in the remaining 15 studies can be categorized into six categories:

- **TI as teachers’ self-perception.** This was seen in five studies. Four of these studies viewed teacher identity as the answer to the question ‘who I am’ (Abbasian & Esmailee, 2018; Motallebzadeh & Kazemi, 2018; Rozati, 2017; Tang, 2015). Tang (2015) emphasized the dynamic nature of TI. Han (2021) added that TI includes teachers’ beliefs about and attitudes towards pedagogies, profession, and professionalism.
- **TI as being the experts in three fields.** Beijaard et al.’s (2000) TI dimensions as subject matter expert, pedagogical and didactical expert were cited by two studies (Mofrad, 2016; Tajeddin & Adeg, 2016).
- **TI as emotional attachment.** This definition highlights teachers’ emotion and attachment to the profession, as shown in two studies (Sheybani & Miri, 2019; Tajeddin & Adeh, 2016).
- **TI as career evaluation.** Teacher identity is defined as the evaluation of the profession by Tang (2014).
- **TI as role conception.** Lai and Jin (2021) operationalized TI as teachers’ role conception within the school community.

Methodologies

Findings in relation to methodological issues, including research approach and instruments, sampling technique, sample size, and characteristics are presented.
Research Approach and Instruments

In terms of research approach, a quantitative approach was adopted in 11 studies and mixed methods were used in nine studies. Figure 5 shows the research instruments that have been applied.

![Figure 5: Overview of Measuring Instruments](image)

As is clear from Figure 5, the most frequently used questionnaires were self-designed questionnaires (n=6), including Cai’s (2021) ESP Teacher Identity Questionnaire, Tajeddin and Adeh’s (2016) Questionnaire on TI Perception, Han’s (2021) Questionnaire on TI constituents, and Lai and Jin’s (2021) role-based TI Questionnaire. Zhang and Xu (2017) and Liu (2014) developed instruments to measure university English teachers’ TI.

Next, Beijaard et al. (2000) Teacher Professional Identity Questionnaire was utilized in four studies, followed by Xun et al. (2014) Teacher Identity Inventory for EFL Teachers that appeared in three studies. The Cheung (2008) HK In-service Teacher Identity Scale was employed in two studies. The five least cited instruments were developed by Kao and Lin (2015), Wei (2008), Liou (2008), Tang (2013), and Hasegawa and Kudomi (2006).

Qualitative instruments were also adopted in the nine mixed-methods research, and semi-structured interviews appeared to be the most widely used, and were used in five studies (Cai, 2021; Celebi & Eraldemir-Tuyan, 2021; Han, 2021; Ostad et al., 2019; Tajeddin & Adeh, 2016). In-depth interviews were conducted in two of the nine studies (Liu & Cai, 2021; Tang, 2015). Classroom observations were employed to collect qualitative data (Abbasian & Esmaliee, 2018; Xun & Zheng, 2015).

Sampling Technique, Sample Size and Characteristics

Table 2 presents a summary of sample characteristics, including sampling technique, sample size and sample work setting.
Table 2: Overview of Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample characteristics</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling technique</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random sampling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quota sampling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random cluster sampling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer sampling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>No more than 100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample work setting</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language institute</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surprisingly, 40% (N=8) of these studies failed to articulate the sampling technique. Half of these studies described the questionnaire administration procedure, including using an online survey platform (Kalali Sani et al., 2022; Xiong & Xiong, 2017), obtaining informed consent (Han, 2021), using both email and letters (Tang, 2015). Of these, 25% (N=5) adopted convenience sampling, 20% (N=4) of the studies used random sampling. Quota sampling was employed in one study by Zhang and Xu (2017), random cluster sampling by Tang (2004), and volunteer sampling by Lai and Jin (2021).

The sample size ranged from 24 to 750 participants. Of the 20 studies, five studies (25%) recruited no more than 100 participants, of which three studies involved less than 50 participants. Seven studies (35%) recruited 100-200 participants, four studies (20%) recruited a sample size between 201-300, another four studies (20%) involved more than 300 participants. Except for Abbasian and Esmailiee’s (2018) study, which involved both learners and teachers, Tafazoli and Sadeghi’s (2018) study covered student teachers and in-service teachers, and the remaining 18 papers involved in-service teachers only. Regarding participants’ work settings, two studies did not specify the work settings (Tafazoli & Sadeghi, 2018b; Tajeddin & Adeh, 2016). Only one study has targeted primary school English teachers. Seven studies conducted in China recruited university English teachers, and five studies conducted in Iran involved teachers working in language institutes. The remaining five studies concerned teachers working in secondary schools, including junior and senior high schools.

**Emerging Themes in the Literature**

Table 3 presents descriptive information concerning research themes and research foci. Five themes, as discussed below, emerged from the 20 studies.
### Table 3: Summary of Research Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research themes</th>
<th>Research foci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETI levels and Socio-demographic factors (N=7)</td>
<td>ETI level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, length of service, educational level,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academic title, type of institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, length of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative study (N=4)</td>
<td>Native-speaking and non-native speaking teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhuangang and non-Zhaungang teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI and a Specific Construct (N=3)</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attributional style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI and Two Constructs (N=3)</td>
<td>Burnout, teaching efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional identity, teaching efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI and Technology use and metacognitive thinking (N=2)</td>
<td>Technology use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metacognitive thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETI Levels and Socio-demographic Factors**

English teachers’ TI levels and their association with socio-demographic factors emerged as a significant theme. Of the seven studies, six in China focused predominantly on university EFL teachers, and two were concerned with ESP teachers (Cai, 2021; Liu & Cai, 2021). The socio-demographic factors cover gender, length of service, educational level, academic title, and type of institution. Varying ETI levels were reported. Zhang and Xu (2017) and Tang (2015) reported low TI levels among university EFL teachers ($M = 3.73$ and $M = 3.91$ respectively). Cai (2021) also reported low levels among university ESP teachers, with no specific values. By contrast, three other studies recorded high ETI scores: except for the low level ($M < 4$) of one TI dimension, Liu (2014) and Xun and Zheng (2015) reported high levels ($M > 4$) on the remaining three dimensions among university and secondary school EFL teachers. Similarly, except for the low level ($M < 4$) on one TI dimension (subject matter field), Mofrad (2016) reported high levels ($M > 4$) in the other two dimensions of TI (didactical and pedagogical field).

The association between ETI and socio-demographic factors was also investigated. Mofrad (2016) examined gender and length of service, whereas Tang (2015) explored three additional factors. Concerning gender, Mofrad (2016) noted that female teachers perceived themselves more as pedagogical experts than did male teachers. Both Mofrad (2016) and Tang (2015) found no significant differences in TI levels between male and female teachers. With regards to length of service, both studies found significant difference in TI levels. However, mixed findings have been revealed. Mofrad (2016) found that experienced teachers recorded significantly higher TI score in subject matter fields than did novice teachers. Tang (2015) noted that teachers with five or fewer years of experience had the highest TI levels. Interestingly, teachers’ educational levels and academic titles appear to have no impact on their TI levels (Tang, 2015). However, working in different institutions, particularly, in prestigious universities, appears to affect ETI levels. Surprisingly, teachers in prestigious universities have significantly lower ETI levels than those in regular universities (Tang, 2015).
Comparative Study
Three studies under this theme focused on comparing ETI between the two groups of teachers. Another study compared TI perceptions before and after peer coaching. Tafazoli and Sadeghi (2018) found a significantly different perceptions between current and prospective teachers. Xiong and Xiong (2017) demonstrated a significant difference (p=0.005) in ETI levels between Zhuangang (M=138.48) and non-zhuangang teachers (M=148.03). According to Tajeddin and Adeh (2016), nonnative teachers are less confident and aware of their role and status than native-speaker teachers. Abbasian and Esmailee (2018) revealed changed perceptions of TI before and after peer coaching. There was significant differences in questioning skills, focus and attention, review and practice; no significant effect was detected in teaching skills and classroom management.

Relationship between ETI and a Specific Construct
Specific constructs included self-esteem, critical thinking, and attributional style. The findings report either correlation, or both correlation and predictive effect. Kalani Sani et al. (2020) found a significant and positive correlation between TI and attributional style. In the other two studies, both correlation and predictive effects were reported. For instance, Motallebzadeh and Kazemi (2018) examined the correlation between TI components and self-esteem, the highest correlation was between the Pedagogical Field and Satisfaction (r=0.81, p=.000) and the lowest was between the Subject Matter Field and Communication (r=0.16, p=.021). In addition, all five dimensions of self-esteem predicted TI positively (β>.20) and significantly (p=.000). Sheybani and Miri (2019) found a positive and significant relationship between total TI and critical thinking (r=.64, p=.000). All three TI dimensions were predicted by critical thinking positively (β>.20) and significantly (p=.000) for subject matter, didactical and pedagogical fields.

Relationship among Three Constructs, including ETI
Theme four demonstrates the relationships among three constructs. ETI was measured against two other constructs: job burnout and teaching efficacy (TE), TE and institutional efficacy, and job satisfaction (JS) and commitment. Among these constructs, teaching efficacy was examined twice (Rozati, 2017; Tang, 2014). Three types of findings were observed: (i) predicting effect, (ii) correlation, and (iii) mediating effect. Tang (2014) established the predicting and mediating effects: ETI predicted job burnout (β = -0.39, p < 0.001), job burnout predicted teaching efficacy (β = -0.84, p < 0.001), ETI predicted teaching efficacy (β = 0.10, p< 0.001), ETI exerts an indirect effect on teaching efficacy, and job burnout is the mediating factor. Rozati (2017) reported both correlation and predicting effect. A significant positive association (r = 0.350, p < 0.05) between TE and ETI, as well as between TE and institutional identity (r=0.245, p < 0.05) was established. ETI (β=0.30, r=3.10) was a better predictor of EFL teachers’ TE. Ostad et al. (2019) found the mediating role of JS in self-expectation and teachers’ duties. JS was influenced by external influential factors. JS predicted teacher commitment both directly and indirectly via its effect on teachers’ duties and citizenship behavior.

Association of ETI with Technology Use and Metacognition
The fifth theme associates TI with technology use and metacognitive thinking procedure. Lai and Jin (2021) found that broader and more learner-focused ETI orientations were significant predictors of teacher technology use, and that TI orientations had differential influences on different types of teacher technology use. Han (2021) showed that ETI contained pedagogic meanings that highly regarded teachers’ language knowledge and skills, realized learner-
centered practices, teaching communication skills for practicality, and developed professionalism.

**Discussion**

Consistent with Shi and Cheng’s (2000) observation that the quantitative approach is becoming dominant and that mixed methods are more frequently utilized, this study confirms that non-qualitative approach to ETI research is gaining momentum. Concurring with Golzar (2020), this study asserts the potential for more quantitative and mixed-methods studies.

The research contexts in most studies were limited to a single university, county, city, or province, but four studies extended the research scope to many provinces across the country.

Six categories of TI definitions were identified. 25% of studies failed to provide clear definition. Since Beijaard’s definition of TI in 1995 and the TI instrument in 2000 were the most frequently cited, this study supports prior claims that Beijaard is one of the most influential authors in this field (Izadinia, 2013; Rodrigues & Mogarro, 2019). Richards’ (2008) specific definition of EFL teachers’ identity was also widely quoted; this is not surprising as this study focuses only on English teachers. The quantitative approach (N=11) was favored over the mixed-methods (N=9) approach. The most frequently used questionnaire was the self-designed questionnaire (N=6), followed by the Beijaard et al. (2000) Questionnaire (N=4), Xun et al. (2014) Teacher Identity Inventory for EFL teachers (N=3) and Cheung (2008) Hong Kong In-service Teacher Identity Questionnaire (N=2). 40% of these studies did not articulate the sampling technique. 25% used convenience sampling and 20% used random sampling. Sample size ranged from 24 to 750. Two studies did not indicate the work setting. Most participants worked at universities (N=7), followed by language institutes (N=5), secondary schools (N=5), and primary schools (N=1). The samples of the included studies seemed to be skewed towards female teachers, which might be attributed to the disproportionate gender distribution in the English teaching profession.

Figure 6 captures the main findings of this review. The most salient theme “TI and Socio-demographic factors” was observed in 35% of the reviewed studies (n=7). “Comparative study” ranked the second with four relevant studies. The remaining themes (Theme 3: ETI and One Construct, theme 4: ETI and Two Constructs) are linked with personal, work and cognitive constructs. Although TI, technology use, and metacognitive thinking was the least examined theme, this indicates an extension of the research scope to interdisciplinary fields.
Figure 6: Framework for English Teacher Professional Identity Research

Conclusion

In conclusion, while 20 studies are insufficient to make a significant comment on the ETI research trend, the past decade has seen an increasing interest in measuring ETI among teachers in language institutes, universities, and schools, particularly in China and Iran, which implies that research on ETI could be proliferating in these two countries.

Given the flaws of certain studies within this systematic review, future research should provide a clear definition of TI and specify the sampling method. The predominant use of self-designed questionnaires implies that current TI instruments might not suit the sample being investigated. Hence, more domain-specific TI (such as science teacher identity, music teacher identity) questionnaires are needed. Since current mixed-methods studies rely heavily on semi-structured interviews, future studies could consider using other forms of interviews. Observation, which is less used, is also called for in future work. Since no significant difference in ETI levels were detected based on academic titles and educational levels, future researchers could examine these factors further, as findings might vary in varying contexts. They could also tap into new socio-demographic factors, including school location, leadership position, etc. Other recommendations include studies involving new socio-demographic factors and new constructs. Studies could also explore models that examine the relationship between ETI and the three constructs.

This study has several limitations. First, the search was conducted using two databases. Other databases, such as Web of Science, SCOPUS, and EBSCO, which may fall under the review scope, were excluded. The second limitation arises from the focus of this study, which was
only on ETI. Had the focus of the sample been enlarged to include more types of teachers, more constructs in relation to TI might be discovered.
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