

On the Relationship between Iranian EFL Teachers' Burnout, Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction

Mehran Davaribina *

Department of English Language, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

Zahra Ghobadi Asl

Department of English Language, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

Abstract

Teachers occupy crucial role in the process of educating an individual and a nation. In foreign language setting, there are some social psychological variables that can highly influence on the teachers' performance and efficiency; three of these important variables in language pedagogy are burnout, self-efficacy and job satisfaction. This study, which utilized quantitative methodology, aimed at measuring the relationship between the teacher burnout, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of Iranian English teachers. The data were gathered through the application of the three questionnaires: Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey, developed by Maslach and Jackson (1986), (Bandura, 1997) Instrument Teacher Self-efficacy Scale for measuring teachers' self-efficacy and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (job satisfaction). Statistical analysis showed low level of burnout in Iranian EFL teachers, after doing correlation analysis; negative relationship was presented between burnout and self-efficacy. Also, the role of self-efficacy and its subscales as a burnout predictor for teachers was about 38%. In the next step, Iranian EFL teacher job satisfaction was analyzed, Statistical analysis showed low level of job satisfaction in Iranian EFL teachers, too, after doing correlation analysis; negative relationship was presented between job satisfaction and burnout, also it was revealed that job satisfaction and its components 21% could predict teachers' burnout.

Keywords: Teacher Burnout, Self-efficacy, Job Satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Teaching is a profession that demands high levels of intellectual, physical, and emotional resources. Some personal problems make teachers feel worried, disappointed, confused or unstable, and stressed. Finally, all these feelings combined can lead to the development of burnout (Saksri, Chunin & Nokchan 2018). Maslach and Jackson defined burnout as "a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do 'people work' of some kind" (1986, p. 1). Burned out teachers negatively affect themselves, their students, and the educational system (Hughes, 2001). In a study on teacher burnout and their performance

Weinreich (2014) concluded that the teachers who experienced higher levels of burnout had poorer performances in their classrooms. Teacher burnout is a job-related syndrome which is viewed as a syndrome of physical, emotional, and attitudinal exhaustion toward teaching and work-related issues (Kyriacou, 2015; Schaufeli, Leiter & Maslach, 2008). As one of the crucial teacher variables, self-efficacy is concerned with one's beliefs and perceptions of his or her competencies to yield favorable results (Bandura, 1997). This belief is defined as teachers' opinions about their capability to have effects on the students' learning (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Self-efficacy helps individuals to be successful in being better teachers and fosters their sense of job satisfaction in their teaching practice (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). Like burnout, job satisfaction is a renowned variable in organizational behavior studies. It means being satisfied of various job elements (Raju & Srivastava, 1994). Spector (1985) defines job satisfaction as "an emotional affective response to a job or specific characteristic of a job". Another definition about job satisfaction is given by Locke (1968) as "being an emotional response that results from the employee's perceived fulfillment of their needs and what they believe the company to have offered". Mulugetasay, Deribeworkineh and Bhatara Mohit (2019) understood job satisfaction has a positive correlation with personal accomplishment and negative correlation with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"Teachers have increasingly become the focus of attention in mainstream education, since they play one of the most significant roles in teaching contexts." (Akbari & Tavassoli, 2011). Different factors such as burnout, motivation, and self-efficacy and job satisfaction can influence the job. Burnout is a significant problem in the working life because it affects work performance, turnover, job satisfaction, service quality and stress related health problems. In general, burnout diminishes performance, job satisfaction and quality of service (Maslach & Jackson, 1984, Piko, 2006). Burnout is defined as a psychological syndrome of cynicism, emotional exhaustion, and reduced personal accomplishment which occurs among individuals working with other people (Schaufeli et al., 2008). Burnout includes three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach, 1986). Emotional exhaustion/depletion refers to a condition which is caused by excessive amounts of stress that can have social, physical, and psychological effects. In this condition people feel as if they do not have the essential physical and emotional resources (Schaufeli et al., 2008). Depersonalization/cynicism refers to the state in which individuals become indifferent to other people and ignore them in order to put distance between themselves and others (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh 2016). Burnout is common in occupations that have face to face relationships with people (Barutçu & Serinkan, 2008).

Teacher burnout may also lead to development of teachers' negative feelings towards their students, lower tolerance and sympathy with them (Abdolzadeh, 2014). In contrast to burnout that hinders teachers' quality of teaching, some factors like self-efficacy or motivation may help increase teachers' performance or efficiency. Self-efficacy is based on Social Cognitive Theory, in this theory the behavior of a person, the characteristics of that person, and the environment within which the behavior is performed, are constantly

interacting (Bandura, 1977, 1986). Teachers' efficacy is the degree to which a teacher considers himself capable to help students to learn, and it affects teachers' educational efforts in the classroom (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). People who have high levels of self-efficacy would be more likely to succeed in their life than those who have low levels of self-efficacy. Teacher self-efficacy is also negatively associated with teacher stress and burnout with available evidence suggesting reciprocal effects over time (Brouwers & Tomic, 1999).

Teacher's job performance is negatively affected by burnout and even it can have effect on reducing teaching quality, student's academic performance and general educational system in general (Blandford, 2000, Hughes, 2001). Job burnout seems to significantly predict reduced job satisfaction and increased turnover intention, while reduced job satisfaction also seem to significantly predict increased turnover intention (Lu & Gursoy, 2016). Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences". Satisfied worker is more effective and productive than an unsatisfied worker (Martin, 2002). In 2019 Karavasilis did a research by 324 primary and secondary school Greek teachers to check the relationship between burnout, work satisfaction and work engagement. Having high level of work engagement and low level of burnout was considered as result of this study. In a meta-analysis study by Kasalak and Dağyar, in 2020, 102 independent reports of 2008, 2013, 2018 from Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) of 50 countries were chosen to check the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teacher job satisfaction. As a result of study positive and significant relationship was found between teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Also, it was revealed that teacher job satisfaction can be enhanced by teachers' self-efficacy.

Toropova, Myrberg & Johansson (2021) in a study investigated the factors of job satisfaction and its relationship with school working conditions and teacher characteristics between male and female teachers. Some factors like teacher workload, teacher perceptions of student discipline in school and teacher cooperation were important factors that could affect teachers' job satisfaction. Female teachers had more job satisfaction than male teachers. The relationship between job satisfaction and cooperation was prominent among men teachers. For teachers with low level of self-efficacy student discipline was considered as an important for job satisfaction. Reilly, Dhingra, Boduszek (2014) was another research to understand the amount and role of some factors for predicting job satisfaction between male and female Irish primary school teachers. The results revealed that there wasn't any significant difference in the amount of these variables between men and women because for both of them high job satisfaction, high self-esteem, moderate stress and moderate self-efficacy was reported. There wasn't any significant relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. It was cleared that teachers with high self-esteem were more satisfied in their work. Statistical analysis indicated that just perceived stress was considered as a predictor for job satisfaction. Anastasiou and Belios (2020) studied the relationship between occupational burnout and job satisfaction. Their study showed that female teachers had more job satisfaction and low level of burnout in contrast male teachers had high level of burnout

and they were less satisfied. Poulou, Reddy and Dudek (2019) in a study investigated the self-reported teachers' self-efficacy and their observed self-efficacy by considering their instructional, classroom management, and student engagement involvements. At the end of research teachers self-reported self-efficacy was higher than real observed self-efficacy in classroom practice.

Kara (2020) in his research studied 308 male and female secondary and high school art teachers from private and public schools. The results obtained from statistical analysis showed that male teachers' mean scores of emotional burnout and depersonalization was lower than female teachers. Kara (2020) declared that the mean scores of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction for male teachers in contrast to female teachers was significantly high. Also, the finding indicated the role of marital status in both burnout and job satisfaction, as the results presented married and single teachers had low level of burnout but divorced teachers job satisfaction mean scores were higher than married and single ones. Kara's another result of this study was about comparing job satisfaction and burnout in private and state schools. Burnout level in state schools was lower than private schools but job satisfaction was lower in private schools than public schools.

Demir (2020) the base of creating a successful education system can be provided by teachers' high self-efficacy that can cause to having positive attitude to the work and work environment. Demir (2020) showed that teachers' job satisfaction enhancement is possible by empowering teachers' self-efficacy, it means that there is a positive relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and teachers' job satisfaction. In a similar research by Chan, Ho, Ip, and Wong (2020) positive relationship was found among three important factors in teaching self-efficacy, work engagement and job satisfaction. Their study also presented that more satisfaction and engagement at work is influenced by self-efficacy, it means that being satisfied with work is because of having more self-efficacy. Pratt, Zaier and Wang (2021) teachers' ability or inability to maintain the students' interest in language is independent from teachers' sense of efficacy.

Teacher-student relationship can influence teachers' self-efficacy and teachers' job satisfaction (Admiral et al., 2019). In a research that was done by Samadi, Sadegh Bagheri, Sadighi and Yarmohammadi in 2020 the role of a job satisfaction as moderator among EFL teachers' burnout, job insecurity, organizational silence, and their relationship was studied. The evidence showed no moderator role for job satisfaction and there was a positive relationship among the above variables. Other result was a bout understanding the reason and the level of burnout by organizational silence and job insecurity. Smetackova (2017) in a conducted research examined the connection between burnout syndrome and self-efficacy among the teachers at Czech grammar schools. The findings showed that there was a significant negative correlation between self-efficacy and burnout syndrome. Teachers with low self-efficacy had high level of burnout and teachers with high level of self-efficacy had low level of burnout.

Additionally, Saksri, Chunin and Nokchan (2018) did a research, their findings revealed that there was a negative relationship between self-efficacy and job burnout of teachers. Türkoğlu, Cansoy and Parlar (2020) did a research by elementary, middle and high school teachers to understand the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and their job

satisfaction prediction, the result showed a positive relationship between them and being self-efficacy as a predictor of job satisfaction. In 2011, the result of a study by Gorozidis and Papaioannou indicated that teachers with high self-efficacy had a positive attitude toward the physical education curriculum in a Greek junior high school after new curriculum guidelines and intended to continue their current efforts in the future. Pan, Chou, Hsu, Li and Hu (2013) also found that teachers' self-efficacy could have a direct influence on their commitment to teach health and physical education curricula in elementary schools in Taiwan.

In a study (Etminan, 2014) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and the components of burnout among EFL teachers in Iran. There was a positive relationship with personal accomplishment and a negative relationship with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Another study on occupational burnout experiences and job satisfaction among secondary school teachers was done by Mulugetasisay, et al. (2019), they understood that secondary school teachers were at high level of burnout in terms of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment. In this study, there was a positive correlation between job satisfaction and personal accomplishment and negative correlation with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

The aimed of this study was measuring the relationship between the teacher burnout, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of Iranian English teachers. Following research questions were raised:

- **RQ1.** What are the Iranian EFL teachers' burnout profiles?
- **RQ2.** What are the Iranian EFL teachers' self-efficacy profiles?
- **RQ3.** What is the Iranian EFL teachers' job satisfaction profiles?
- **RQ4.** Is there a significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout?
- **RQ5.** Do Iranian EFL teachers' self-efficacy factors significantly predict their burnout?
- **RQ6.** Is there a significant relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and teachers' burnout?
- **RQ7.** Do Iranian EFL teachers' job satisfaction factors significantly predict their burnout?

METHOD

Participants

Because of Coronavirus and having no access to teachers at universities, schools or language centers (they were all off), the questionnaires were distributed on line in different groups in Telegram, Instagram and Whats App, the participants voluntarily participated in this study, they were 80 people (27 male and 53 female), they were English teachers with different ages, different teaching experiences, from different schools and different language centers.

Instruments

Three questionnaires of Burnout, self-efficacy and job satisfaction were used in this study

Maslach Burnout Inventory Educators Survey (MBI-ES)

Teacher burnout was measured using Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educator's Survey (MBIES)(MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Represented 22-item consisted of three subscales: emotional exhaustion (9 items), was able to measure tiredness at work; personal accomplishment (8 items), for representing feelings of competence and successful achievement of teachers; and depersonalization (5 items), was used to reflect teachers' impersonal response to students. The items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never), to 7 (every day). The reliability of the questionnaire, measured by Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, was .75.

Teacher's self-efficacy scale

Teachers' self-efficacy was measured (Bandura, 1997) Instrument Teacher Self-efficacy Scale questionnaire. This 30-item questionnaire concluded 5 subscales: efficacy to influence decision making, instructional efficacy, disciplinary efficacy, efficacy to enlist parental and community involvement, and efficacy to create a positive school climate. Items were measured on a 5-point scale: nothing, very little, some influence, quite a bit, and a great deal. The reliability was estimated using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was .91.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire consists of two short and long forms, in this study its short form included 20 questions in Likert scale form was used. They were scored as 1 very dissatisfied, 2 dissatisfied, 3 neutral, 4 satisfied, 5 very satisfied. The reliability of the questionnaire, measured by Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, it was .85.

Procedures and Data Analysis

This study employed quantitative method of research design in order to answer the research questions. Participants' burnout and motivational profiles were found out through data collecting in quantitative way and to examine the relationship between the EFL teachers' motivation to teach and their burnout. Descriptive statistics, Spearman rank order correlation, and multiple regression analysis were then used to analyze quantitative data.

RESULTS

The first research question was aimed at identifying the EFL teachers' burnout profiles. More specifically, it was intended to find out the levels of burnout experienced by the EFL teachers. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics of total burnout and three dimensions of burnout questionnaire (emotional exhaustion, personal fulfillment and depersonalization).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Burnout and Its Subscales Scores

Burnout and dimensions	N of items	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Total burnout	22	27	96	54.25	14.59	.62	.10

EE	9	9	44	21.45	7.77	.73	.08
PF	8	11	41	20.92	5.57	.81	1.55
DE	5	5	23	11.87	4.25	.17	-.41

Note.EE=emotional exhaustion; PF=personal fulfillment; DP= depersonalization

Table 1 demonstrates the total burnout mean score was 54.25 with Standard deviation of 14.59, after the total burnout the greatest mean score belonged to the emotional exhaustion dimension (M = 21.45, SD = 7.77). Likewise, the mean score of 20.92 and standard deviation of 5.57 (on a 7-point likert scale) for personal fulfillment indicated level of burnout on this dimension. Unlike the mean score for the emotional exhaustion dimension, the mean score for the depersonalization dimension was low (M = 11.87, SD = 4.25). According to Maslach et al. (1996), the high scores on emotional exhaustion and personal fulfillment and low scores on depersonalization are all indicative of burnout.

In order to answer the third question that was about understanding teachers' self-efficacy, descriptive statistics was done to get the answer. It is presented in table 3.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Self-efficacy and Its Subscales Scores

	N of Items	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Total Self-efficacy	30	96	238	181.77	33.79	-.14	-.63
Decision Making	2	2	18	10.45	4.14	.34	-.74
School Resources	1	1	9	5.01	2.07	.12	-.57
Instructional	9	35	79	57.15	11.40	-.15	-.75
Disciplinary	3	12	27	21.53	3.98	-.56	-.37
Paternal Involvement	3	7	27	18.27	5.13	-.04	-.79
Community Involvement	4	4	36	15.58	8.21	.29	-.95
School Climate	8	24	72	53.76	11.57	-.51	-.18

As table 2 shows the mean score for total self-efficacy is 181.77 and its standard deviation is 33.79. As it is clear from the table among seven subscales of self-efficacy, instructional subscale has the highest mean score of 57.15 with standard deviation of 11.40 and the next highest mean score is for school climate 53.76 with standard deviation of 11.57. The other subscales are ranked as disciplinary by (M= 21.53; SD= of 3.98), paternal involvement by (M=18.27; SD=5.13), community (M=15.58; SD=8.21), decision making (M=10.45;SD=4.14) and school resources (M=5.01;SD=.2.07)

Table 3. Descriptive Statistic for Job Satisfaction and Its Subscales

	N of items	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Total job satisfaction	20	39	91	70.72	10.37	-.76	.68
JINM	14	31	65	51.51	7.00	-.56	.08
JEXM	6	7	27	19.21	4.19	-.61	.51

Note, JINM=Job Intrinsic Motivation; JEXM= Job Extrinsic Motivation

As table 3 shows the total job satisfaction mean score is 70.72 with 10.37 as its standard deviation. Two subscales of job satisfaction are illustrated as job intrinsic and job extrinsic subscales by mean scores of 51.51 and 19.21, also by standard deviations of 7.00 and 4.19. As it is clear the mean score of job intrinsic motivation is higher than job extrinsic motivation.

Table 4. Correlation Coefficients between Burnout and Self-Efficacy Subscales
Correlations

	Total Burnout	Total self-efficacy	Decision Making	School Resources	Instructional	Disciplinary	Paternal Involvement	Community Involvement	School Climate
Total Burnout	1	-.459**	-.097	-.114	-.489**	-.274*	-.328**	-.037	-.538**
		.000	.392	.312	.000	.014	.003	.747	.000
Total self-efficacy	-.459** (.000)	1	.580** (.000)	.450** (.000)	.817** (.000)	.593** (.000)	.740** (.000)	.571** (.000)	.874** (.000)
Decision Making	-.097	.580** (.000)	1	.575** (.000)	.395** (.000)	.287** (.000)	.281* (.000)	.298** (.000)	.409** (.000)
School Resources	-.114	.540** (.000)	.575** (.000)	1	.470** (.000)	.156 (.000)	.275* (.000)	.284* (.000)	.353** (.000)
Instructional	-.489** (.000)	.817** (.000)	.395** (.000)	.470** (.000)	1	.406** (.000)	.553** (.000)	.221* (.000)	.632** (.000)
Disciplinary	-.274* (.000)	.593** (.000)	.287** (.000)	.156 (.000)	.406** (.000)	1	.424** (.000)	.185 (.000)	.536** (.000)
Paternal Involvement	-.328** (.000)	.740** (.000)	.281* (.000)	.275* (.000)	.553** (.000)	.424** (.000)	1	.353** (.000)	.626** (.000)
Community Involvement	-.037 (.000)	.571** (.000)	.298** (.000)	.284* (.000)	.221* (.000)	.185 (.000)	.353** (.000)	1	.361** (.000)
School Climate	-.538** (.000)	.874** (.000)	.409** (.000)	.353** (.000)	.632** (.000)	.536** (.000)	.626** (.000)	.361** (.000)	1

Table 4 shows a negative correlation between burnout and self-efficacy ($r = -.459$; $p = .000$) and its subscales, among the self-efficacy subscales, school climate ($r = -.538$; $p = .000$) had the highest negative relationship with burnout and after it the other subscales like instructional ($r = -.489$; $p = .000$), paternal involvement ($r = -.328$; $p = .003$) disciplinary

($r=-.274$; $p=.014$), school resources($r=-.114$; $p=.312$), decision making($r= -.097$; $p=.392$) and community involvement($r=-.037$; $p=.747$) had negative relationship with burnout.

Table 5. Model Summary for Burnout

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.619 ^a	.383	.323	12.00798

a. Predictors: (Constant), school climate, school resources, community involvement, disciplinary, decision making, paternal involvement, instructional

b. Dependent Variable: Total burnout

The multiple regression, as presented in Table 5, revealed that the self-efficacy variables explained 38% of the variation in the EFL teachers' burnout scores ($R^2 = .38$).

Table 6. Regression Coefficients for the Predictors of Burnout

Model	Coefficients ^a						
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Part
B	Std. Error	Beta					
(Constant)	95.984	8.565			11.207	.000	
Decision Making	.443	.420	.126		1.054	.295	.098
School Resources	.655	.857	.093		.764	.447	.071
Instructional	-.425	.170	-.332		-2.498	.015	-.231
Disciplinary	.144	.411	.039		.350	.727	.032
Paternal Involvement	.152	.359	.053		.422	.674	.039
Community Involvement	.236	.184	.133		1.279	.205	.118
SchoolClimate	-.649	.182	-.515		-3.575	.001	-.331

Table 6 presents and predicts the role of self-efficacy variable as a predictor factor for teachers' burnout by showing its role by 38 % as an answer for our seventh question. Among seven subscales of self-efficacy just instructional and school climate by Beta scores of -.33 and -.51 could contribute for predicting the teachers' burnout.

Table7. Correlation Coefficients between Burnout and Job Satisfaction

	Correlations			
	Total Burnout	Total job satisfaction	Job Intrinsic	Job Extrinsic
Total Burnout	1	-.385** (.000)	-.445** (.000)	-.208 (.064)
Total job satisfaction	-.385** (.000)	1	.957** (.000)	.875**
Job Intrinsic	-.445** (.000)	.957** (.000)	1	.698** (.000)
Job Extrinsic	-.208 (.064)	.875** (.000)	.698** (.000)	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 7 shows the answer for the sixth question by presenting a negative correlation between burnout and job satisfaction ($r=-.385$; $p=.000$), subscales job intrinsic($r=-.445$; $p=.000$) and job extrinsic factors($r=-.208$; $p=.064$).

Table 8. Model Summary for Burnout

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.468 ^a	.219	.199	13.06968

a. Predictors: (Constant), job extrinsic, Job intrinsic

b. Dependent Variable: Total burnout

The multiple regression, as presented in Table 8, revealed that the job satisfaction variables explained 21% of the variation in the EFL teachers' burnout scores ($R^2 = .21$).

Table 9. Regression Coefficients for the Predictors of Burnout

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	part		
(Constant)	103.674	10.971			9.450	.000
Job intrinsic	-1.218	.293	-.585		-4.157	.000
job extrinsic	.694	.490	.199		1.419	.160

Table 9 presents and predicts the role of intrinsic job satisfaction variable as a predictor factor for teachers' burnout by showing its role by -58% as an answer for our seventh question.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study revealed that Iranian EFL teachers had some level of burnout, and among three subscales of burnout, emotional exhaustion and personal fulfillment contributed more than depersonalization in burnout shaping. In this study the self-efficacy level of Iranian EFL teachers was analyzed, too. Negative relationship was found out between burnout and self-efficacy, and according to regression analysis it was revealed that self-efficacy could play the role of predictor for burnout, its contribution for predicting was 38%. Kroupis, Kouli and Kourtessis (2019) investigated job satisfaction and burnout among Greek Physical Education (PE) teachers. Their findings revealed that teachers who work in schools with very satisfactory sport facilities seem to be more satisfied and experience lower burnout in contrast to teachers who work in poor sport facilities. Motallebzadeh and Ashraf (2014) in a study, worked on 616 Iranian ELT teachers in different language schools from different cities, from both genders and from different ages with different years of experiences to investigate the relationship between their self-efficacy and job burnout. The result showed that the participants' self-efficacy had a reverse relationship with their burnout. Ghasemzadeh, Nemati, & Fathi (2019)

studied the role of teacher reflection and self-efficacy in predicting burnout among 171 male and female Iranian EFL teachers was considered as the aim of the study. The findings indicated that both variables had a unique effect on teaching burnout, but teacher self-efficacy out to was stronger predictor of burnout.

The next case that was investigated in this study was about level of self-efficacy and its relationship and its role about burnout in teachers. According to statistical analysis Iranian teachers' self-efficacy in average point was 181.77, in its low level was 96 and in its high level was 238. As the study showed there was a significant negative relationship between teachers' burnout and their self-efficacy, also self-efficacy and its subscales about 38% could predict the existence of burnout in teachers.

In this study the job satisfaction level of Iranian EFL teachers was analyzed, too. Negative relationship was found out between burnout and job satisfaction, and according to regression it was revealed that job satisfaction could play the role of predictor for burnout, its contribution for predicting was 21%. In a similar study Phaik and Kanesan (2016) found that there is a negative significant correlation relationship between burnout and job satisfaction indicating that lower the level of burnout, it would increase a higher job satisfaction among teachers and vice versa. Katsantonis, I. (2021) teachers with high level of self-efficacy are more satisfied with their occupation in contrast to teachers with low level of self-efficacy.

CONCLUSION

This research was conducted to answer 7 questions that were about Iranian EFL teachers' burnout, self-efficacy and job satisfaction that participated in this study, the minimum score of 27 as their burnout score an average score of 54.25 and maximum score of 96 were presenting their burnout level. The results of this study presented the existence of negative correlation between burnout and motivation; also, it was revealed that motivation and its subscales had the role of predictor for predicting the existence of burnout in teachers' job. The next case that was investigated in this study was about level of self-efficacy and its relationship and its role about burnout in teachers. According to statistical analysis Iranian teachers' self-efficacy in average point was 181.77, in its low level was 96 and in its high level was 238. As the study showed there was a significant negative relationship between teachers' burnout and their self-efficacy, also self-efficacy and its subscales about 38% could predict the existence of burnout in teachers. The third point about teachers was checking their job satisfaction, Iranian EFL teachers' job satisfaction was conducted statistically and was presenting the 39 score as a minimum level of job satisfaction, 70.72 the average point of their job satisfaction and 91 was as the maximum level of their job satisfaction level in teaching. The results of this study presented the existence of negative correlation between burnout and job satisfaction; also, it was revealed that job satisfaction and its subscales had the role of predictor for predicting the existence of burnout in teachers' job. Job satisfaction and its subscales 21% ($R^2=.21$) could predict teacher burnout. The intrinsic job satisfaction-.58 could predict teachers' burnout.

REFERENCE

- Abdolzadeh, F. (2014) Handling causes of teacher burnout in ELT classrooms. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)* 7(3), 636- 641.
- Admiraal, W., Veldman, I., Mainhard, T., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2019). A typology of veteran teachers' job satisfaction: Their relationships with their students and the nature of their work. *Social Psychology of Education*, 22, 337-355. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-09477-z>
- Akbari, R., & Tavassoli, K. (2011). Teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence. *Possible relationships and differences*, 14(2), 31-61.
- Anastasiou,S., & Belios,E.(2020). Effect of Age on Job Satisfaction and Emotional Exhaustion of Primary School Teachers in Greece. *Health Psychol. Educ.* 10, 644–655; doi:10.3390/ejihpe10020047
- Bandura, A., (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barutcu, E & Serinkan, C (2013). Burnout syndrome of teachers: An empirical study in Denizli in Turkey. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 89, 318 – 322
- Blandford, S. (2000). *Managing professional development in schools*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Brouwers, A. & Tomic,W. (1999). 'Teacher burnout, perceived self-Efficacy in classroom management, and student disruptive behavior in secondary education', *Curriculum and Teaching* 14(2), 7–26.
- Chan,E.S.S, Ho ,S.K, Ip,F.F.L & Wong,M.W.Y(2020). Self-Efficacy, work engagement, and job satisfaction among teaching assistants in Hong Kong's Inclusive Education. *SAGE Open. journals.sagepub.com/home/sgo*. DOI: 10.1177/2158244020941008
- Demir, S. (2020). The role of self-efficacy in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, motivation, and job involvement. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 85, 205 - 224.
- Etminan, E. (2014). The tragic endpoint of teaching profession: A comparative study of job burnout among Iranian EFL teachers (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.
- Ghasemzadeh,S, ,Nemati,M, & Fathi,J,.(2019). Teacher Self-Efficacy and Reflection as Predictors of Teacher Burnout: *An Investigation of Iranian English Language Teachers. Issues in Language Teaching (ILT)*, 8(2), 25-50, December 2019. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/gjedr.v17i2.2>
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2016). Teacher burnout: A review of sources and ramifications. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioral Science*, 6, 24–39.
- Gorozidis, G., & Papaioannou, A. (2011). Teachers' self-efficacy, achievement goals, attitudes and intentions to implement the new Greek physical education curriculum. *European Physical Education Re*
- Hughes, R.E. (2001) 'Deciding to leave but staying: Teacher burnout, precursors and turnover', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(2), 288–98.
- Kara, S. (2020). Investigation of job satisfaction and burnout of visual arts teachers. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 6(1), 160-171.

- Karavasilis, G. (2019). Work satisfaction or burnout and their impact on innovative work behavior of Greek teachers. *Journal of Contemporary Education, Theory & Research* 3(2) <http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3635027>
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019237>
- Kasalak, G., & Dağyar, M. (2020). The relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teacher job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS). *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 20(3), 16 - 33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12738/jestp.2020.3.002>
- Katsantonis, I. (2021). Cross-Country Perspective on Reverse Pathway Dynamics Between Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction. *Pedagogical Research*, 6(2), em0092. <https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/9726>
- Kroupis, I., Kouli, O., & Kourtessis, T. (2019). Physical education teacher's job satisfaction and burnout levels in relation to school's sport facilities. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(4), 579-592. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12437a>
- Kyriacou, C. (2015). Teacher stress and burnout: Methodological perspectives. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24, 72-74
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 3(2), 157-189.
- Locke, E. A. (1976) *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction*, In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 1297-1349. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1984a). Burnout in organizational settings. *Applied Social Psychology Annual*, 5, 133-153
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1986). *Maslach burnout inventory manual* (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001) Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Martin, A. B. (2002). Work/family variables influencing the work satisfaction of Tennessee extension agents. *Learning and Satisfaction Symposium 5: Honolulu, HA*.
- Motallebzadeh, K., Ashraf, H., & Tabatabaee Yazdi, M. (2014). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' burnout and self-efficacy. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1255-1262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.541>
- Mulugetasisay, Deribeworkineh & Bhatara Mohit. (2019) Assessment of Occupational Burnout Experiences and Job Satisfaction among Secondary School Teachers of Hawassa City. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*. 24(5). 79-86. DOI: 10.9790/0837-2405057986. e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
- Pan, Y.H., Chou, H.S., Hsu, W.T., Li, C.H., & Hu, Y.L. (2013). Teacher self-efficacy and teaching practices in the health and physical education curriculum in Taiwan. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 41(2), 241-250. doi:10.2224/sbp.2013.41.2.241
- Pratt, C., Zaier, A., & Wang, Y. (2021). Foreign Language Teachers' Self-efficacy Beliefs and Perspectives about Maintaining Their Students' Interest. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(1), pp. 12-22. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1201.02>

- Phaik, W., Kanesan A. (2016). Burnout and job satisfaction among teachers in Chinese independent secondary school. *International Journal of Elementary Education*. 5 (5), 47-50.
- Piko, B. F. (2006) Burnout, Role Conflict, Job Satisfaction and Psychosocial Health among Hungarian Health Care Staff: A Questionnaire Survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 4: 311 – 318.
- Poulou, M.S, Reddy ,L.A & Dudek, ch. M. (2019). Relation of teacher self-efficacy and classroom practices: A preliminary investigation. *School Psychology International* 40(1) 25–48. DOI: 10.1177/0143034318798045
- Reilly, E., Dhingra, K., & Boduszek, D. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, self-esteem, and job stress as determinants of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28(4), 365 - 378. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2013-0053>
- Raju, P. M. & Srivastava, R.C. (1994). Factors contributing to commitment to the teaching profession. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 8(5), 6-13.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S.(2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99, 611–625.
- Schaufeli, W.,B, Leite,M, P.& Maslach, Ch.(2008). Burnout: 35 years of research and Practice. *Career Development International*,. 14(3), 2009
- Saksri,S., Chunin , M and Nokchan, Ch(2018). Self-efficacy and Social Support Predicting Job Burnout of Teachers. *International Journal of Recent Innovations in Academic Research*.2(8). 206-216
- Samadi,L., Sadegh Bagheri ,M , Sadighi,F., &Yarmohammadi,L.(2020). An inquiry into EFL instructors' organizational silence, job insecurity, job satisfaction and burnout. *Journal of Language and Translation*.10 (1).p 93-111
- Smetackova,I (2017). Self-efficacy and burnout syndrome among teachers. *The European Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences EJSBS*
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713. doi:10.1007/BF00929796
- Toropova, A. , Myrberg, E. & Johansson, S. (2021).Teacher job satisfaction: the importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics, *Educational Review*, 73:1, 71-97, DOI: 10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247
- Türkoğlu, M.E., Cansoy,R., & Parlar, H.(2020). Examining relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 5(5): 765-772. <http://www.hrpub.org>. DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2017.050509
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A.(2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)
- Weinreich, T. (2014). Burnout and work engagement among elementary teachers: Are there differences among teachers? A cross-sectional study. Bachelor's thesis, University of Twente. Retrieved May 2015 from <http://essay.utwente.nl/65818/>

APPENDICES**Appendix A.**

1. Name: _____ 2.age _____
3. What grade are you teaching?
4. How long have you been teaching?

MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY-EDUCATORS SURVEY (MBI-ES)

Instruction: Please indicate your answer to each item by choosing the appropriate choice on the 7-point scale below

Items	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0-6	Never	A few times	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	Few times a week	Every day
1.I feel emotionally drained from my work							
2. I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects.							
3. I can easily understand how my students feel about things.							
4. I feel used up at the end of the workday.							
5. I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.							
6. I deal very effectively with the problems of my students.							
7. I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.							
8. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.							

9. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job							
10. Working with people all day is really a strain for me.							
11. I don't really care what happens to some students.							
12. I feel very energetic.							
13. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students.							
14. I feel students blame me for some of their problems.							
15. I feel burned out from my work.							
16. I feel frustrated by my job.							
17. I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students.							
18. I feel I'm working too hard on my job.							
19. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.							
20. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.							
21. In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly							
22. I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.							

Appendix B.**BANDURA'S INSTRUMENT TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE**

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinions about each of the statements below by circling the appropriate number. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and will not be identified by name.

Efficacy to Influence Decision making

1.How much can you influence the decisions that are made in the school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				

2.How much can you express your views freely on important school matters?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				

Efficacy to Influence School Resources

3.How much can you do to get the instructional materials and equipment you need?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				

Instructional Self-Efficacy

4.How much can you do to influence the class sizes in your school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				

5.How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal				

6.How much can you do to promote learning when there is lack of support from the home?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

7.How much can you do to keep students on task on difficult assignments?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

8.How much can you do to increase students' memory of what they have been taught in previous lessons?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

9.How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

10.How much can you do to get students to work together?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

11.How much can you do to overcome the influence of adverse community conditions on students' learning?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

12.How much can you do to get children to do their homework?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

Disciplinary Self-Efficacy

13.How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

14.How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence			Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

15.How much can you do to prevent problem behavior on the school grounds?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence			Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement

16.How much can you do to get parents to become involved in school activities?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence			Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

17.How much can you assist parents in helping their children do well in school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence			Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

3

18.How much can you do to make parents feel comfortable coming to school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence			Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement

19.How much can you do to get community groups involved in working with the schools?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence			Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

20.How much can you do to get churches involved in working with the school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence			Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

21.How much can you do to get businesses involved in working with the school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence			Quite a Bit		A Great Deal

22. How much can you do to get local colleges and universities involved in working with the school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	

Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate

23. How much can you do to make the school a safe place?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	

24. How much can you do to make students enjoy coming to school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	

25. How much can you do to get students to trust teachers?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	

26. How much can you help other teachers with their teaching skills?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	

4

27. How much can you do to enhance collaboration between teachers and the administration to make the school run effectively?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	

28. How much can you do to reduce school dropout?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	

29. How much can you do to reduce school absenteeism?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence		Quite a Bit		A Great Deal	

30. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

Appendix C.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (job satisfaction)

<i>On my present job, this is how I feel about</i>	Very dissatisfied	dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	satisfied	Very satisfied
1. Being able to keep busy all the time					
2. The chance to work alone on the job					
3. The chance to do different things from time to time					
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community					
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers					
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions					
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience					
8. The way my job provides for steady employment					
9. The chance to do things for other people					
10. The chance to tell people what to do					

11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities					
12. The way company policies are put into practice					
13. My pay and the amount of work I do					
14. The chances for advancement on this job					
15. The freedom to use my own judgment					
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job					
17. The working conditions					
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other					
19. The praise I get for doing a good job					
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job					