**Introduction**

Research in professional efficiency demonstrated that the issue of job motivation has received considerable attention particularly from organizational managers as well as practitioners (Fernet, Austin, Tre'panier, & Dussault, 2013). One of the professions highly influenced by motivation is teaching. Teachers’ motivation is believed to be pivotal for ultimate functioning given that teachers who are highly motivated have higher job satisfaction and are more committed (Levesque, Blais, & Hess, 2004). Furthermore, it seems plausible to presume teachers who do not have ideal level of motivation would find it formidable or even impossible to shape motivational disposition of their students (Ghanizadeh & Rostami, 2015). Job resources are one of the main determinants of job motivation (Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2015; Jahedizadeh, Ghanizadeh, & Ghonsooly, 2016). It refers to physical, psychological, social, and organizational perspectives that facilitate individuals’ task achievement. Previous studies demonstrated that work motivation fluctuates in concert with job-related environment. For example, Deci, Connell, and Ryan (1989) noted when the work atmosphere is autonomy-supportive, motivation raises and within this domain, individuals believe it is their right to make a decision and they feel they are supported in their profession (as cited in Fernet et al., 2012). They argued that in such an autonomy-supportive environment that supervisors create, employees enjoy job functioning and as the result they have higher level of job-satisfaction and are more psychologically well-being (as cited in Fernet et al., 2012). On the other hand, when the job-related environment is threatening, helplessness, emotional collapse, and depersonalization appear (Hobfoll & Freedy, 1993). These states are all indicators of burnout syndrome which is defined as “an erosion of engagement that what started out as important, meaningful, and challenging work becomes unpleasant, unfulfilling, and meaningless” (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001, p. 416). Based on resources theory (Hobfoll & Freedy, 1993), when influential resources are strained or threatened, burnout emerges (Fernet et al., 2013).

In this study, the researchers extended the line of study investigating intra-individual differences on burnout; in particular, in this study, the dynamic interplay between burnout, self-efficacy, and motivation is explored among EFL teachers.
Theoretical Framework

Self-efficacy

Teacher efficacy is defined as “the teacher’s belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context” (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p. 22). In Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) framework, teachers’ self-efficacy is composed of three parts: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. Self-efficacy in instructional strategies focuses on teachers’ own confidence in their ability to create new tasks, effectively use of teaching strategies, and assess the simplification of students learning process. Self-efficacy regarding classroom management refers to teachers’ own beliefs about regulating their learners’ behavior. Self-efficacy in student management concerns with teachers’ own perception in their ability to encourage and motivate learners to value and be actively involved in their learning.

Teacher self-efficacy is shaped and influenced by a host of intra-individual and inter-individual factors. For instance, learners’ individual differences have a determining role in configuring teachers’ sense of efficacy beliefs (Wolters & Daugherity, 2007). Self-efficacious teachers are assumed to establish both challenging and accessible goals (Ghonsooly & Ghanizadeh, 2013; Wang, Hall, & Rahimi, 2015). Tschannen-Moranan and Woolfolk Hoy (2007) explored the various predictors of sense of efficacy of 255 experienced teachers and novice teachers. They reported that instruction resources and interpersonal support available had a better link with novice teachers’ self-efficacy than experienced teachers since the latter had more mastery experiences. Research demonstrated that individuals’ conception toward effective instructors comprised six groups: 1) academic qualification as well as publication, 2) preparedness and subject information, 3) individual factors, 4) interactions with learners, 5) motivation, 6) classroom operation (Zhang, 2009). Teachers with high self-efficacy present different teaching practices, feedback to learners, and flexibility (Wolters & Daugherity, 2007). On the other hand, teachers with low self-efficacy were found to be more prone to emotional exhaustion and burnout syndrome (Wang et al., 2015). In L2 domain, teacher self-efficacy has been found to be closely associated with teacher success (Ghanizadeh & Moafian, 2011) and their emotional well-being (Moafian & Ghanizadeh, 2009).

Motivation

Research on teachers’ motivation has been conducted from the conceptual standpoint of two social cognitive theories of motivation: Rotter’s (1966) social learning theory of internal–external locus of control and Bandura’s (1977, 1997) self-efficacy theory (as cited in Fernet, Austina, & Vallerand, 2012). Studies following these theories represent the significance of competency beliefs. Individuals with intrinsic motivation perform their task because of the pleasure and satisfaction they receive. Extrinsically motivated behaviors are performed as a means to an end. Within this framework, different kinds of extrinsic motivation can be defined along with the self-determination continuum from lower to higher levels of self-determination pointed to as external, introjected, and identified regulations. Individual with External regulation tend to obtain a reward or ignore a constraint when carrying out a task. Individuals exert effort and put pressure on themselves via internal coercion such as anxiety, shame to gain certainty that a particular behavior is acted. Identified regulation is referred to a type of behavior that individuals select according to their own values and goals. The last type of motivation in this framework refers to amotivation which belongs to the lower level of self-determination. Amotivated individuals have no intention of a particular action (Fernet, Austina, & Vallerand, 2012).

Studies on motivational domain of teaching profession represented that there are a number of factors that exert influence on instructors’ motivation such as material perspectives, positive, and altruistic components (Barnes, 2005). Protherough and Atkinson (1991) found out that personal characteristics were more important than knowledge of subject for English teachers. In a study in investigating teachers’ motivation in primary education and primary schools in Turkey, Gokce (2010) found that educational system, gender, and working conditions are among the most motivational factors. Watt and Richardson (2007, 2008) explored pre-service teacher motivation in Australia, and their findings showed that intrinsic value of teaching, social utility value, and perceived teaching ability were on the top of the choice of teaching as a career. Conducting research on teachers’ motivation is of great interest for policy makers because of its effect on teachers’ teaching quality as well as commitment to the profession (de Jesus & Lens, 2005). Klassen, Al-Dhafri, Hannok, and Betts (2011) examined career-choice motivation among 200 pre-service teachers in Canada and Oman. Their results indicated that self-references, expressed higher levels of individual-focused motivation, and social utility value are the main incentives for their teaching profession.

Individuals’ perceptions and beliefs about their capabilities in successful functioning is another antecedent of motivation. Bandura (1997) argued that beliefs in ones’ abilities shape the foundation of personal achievement and motivation and pave the way for future success and well-being by encouraging individuals to put more effort in their assigned tasks. Teacher motivation has also been found to influence professionalism in teaching (Hildebrandt & Eom, 2011) as well as innovative practices (Gorozidis & Papaoannou, 2014).

In the realm of EFL teacher motivation, a recent study by Ghanizadeh and Erfanian (2016) sought to discern the antecedents of teacher motivation and demotivation. Motivating factors included a host of internal and external factors such as, class environment, teaching facilities, intrinsic interest, and student and parents’ perceptions. Demotivating factors encompassed working conditions, payment, students’ inattention, and officials’ conduct.
Burnout

The notion of burnout was proposed by Freudenberger in 1974. He applied this notion to refer to a fixed job-related stress that workers experienced. In this vain, researchers introduced various models to remove burnout. For instance, Shoufeli and Bakker (2004) viewed that work-related factors are composed of two groups: job-demands and job-resources in which the former refers to physical, psychological, social, or organizational perspective of individuals’ profession that need emotional and cognitive attempts. Job-resources refer to physical, psychological, social, or organizational perspective of individual’s career that (1) decrease job demands and the related physiological and psychological costs; (2) are fundamental in paving the way for attaining professional aims, and (3) drive individual grows and learning.

Noh, Shin, and Lee (2013) pointed out to two main theoretical models of burnout. The first model in burnout was proposed by Leiter and Maslach (1988). They stated that interchange with demanding customers produced emotional exhaustion and these emotionally exhausted workers were not willing to attach to undesirable customers psychologically. These professional used dis-attachment from the perceived customers as a kind of strategy to manage their emotional exhaustion increase cynical as well as depersonalization. Golembiewski and Manzenrider (1984) added a relative range to burnout models and created an eight-step form (i.e., from I: low depersonalization, low personal achievement, and low emotional exhaustion, to VII: High depersonalization, high personal accomplishment). Deriving from this model, depersonalization happens when professionals suffer from their work stresses and as the result depersonalization diminishes their personal achievement. When depersonalization increases, personal accomplishment decreases and individuals experience feelings of emotional exhaustion.

The second model, a dual-process model was proposed by Lee and Ashforth (1993). In this model emotional exhaustion resulted in depersonalization and emotional exhaustion has an effect on reduced personal accomplishment that is detached from the role of depersonalization.

Although burnout has been defined in a variety of ways, the most widely-used definition of teacher burnout was proposed by Maslach (1982). Maslach defined teaching burnout as comprising three dimensions: feelings of exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment. These three dimensions of are generally used as the basis for any discussion on teacher burnout, along with the educator version of the MBI (Maslach Burnout Inventory) as the standard measurement tool (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996, as cited in Ghanizadeh & Royaei, 2015). Emotional Exhaustion occurs when teachers feel their emotional resources are depleted and overextended by the contact with other people, particularly, their students. Depersonalization refers to impersonal and even dehumanized perception of others. Reduced personal accomplishment refers to a decline in professional competence and effectiveness (Bibou-Nakou, Stogiannidou, & Kiosseoglou, 1999).

Individuals experience burnout due to suffering from some factors rather than only one clear cause so its treatment should be done on several dimensions (Carod-Artal & Vázquez-Cabrera, 2013). Individual’s characteristics such as self-confidence, self-management, and self-care are crucial elements of burnout predictors (Carod-Artal & Vázquez-Cabrera, 2013). Self-confidence refers to peoples’ beliefs towards their own capabilities on performing the required tasks successfully. People with lack of self-confidence usually perceive their work difficulties more than what they are in reality and they show little tolerance. On the contrary, people with high self-confidence can apply more coping strategies in stressful situations. Self-management refers to particular instructions, skills, and strategies that using them offer burnout individuals how to remove this mental disease. For burnout individuals employing self-care strategies has the advantage of developing their physical and mental well-being. Other influential factors include teacher attribution of their success and failure (Ghanizadeh & Ghonsooly, 2014).

In educational field, psychological studies identified various sources of stress, such as learners’ misbehavior, time pressure, lack of motivation for job performance, and criticisms from learners’ parents (Chan, 2010). Teachers’ reactions to these aforementioned stressors and many others have been found to be diverse. Kelchtermass and Strittmatter (1999, as cited in Chan, 2010) stated that teachers’ professional development, their sense of efficacy, and their positive conceptions toward their job achievement can diminish teachers’ burnout experiences. Seligman and his colleagues are pioneers in positive psychology movement. They turned the world attention toward concepts such as positive features, positive emotions, positive organization and individual, community, and social norms that enhance individual performance and lead to a flourished life (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, as cited in Chan, 2010).

To the researchers’ best knowledge no study to date has investigated the interplay between motivation, self-efficacy, and burnout in a single framework among EFL teachers; therefore, the researchers of the current study formulated the following research questions:

1. Does EFL teachers’ job motivation influence their burnout?
2. Does EFL teachers’ burnout influence their self-efficacy?
3. Does EFL teachers’ self-efficacy influence their job motivation?

Method

Participants

Participants were N = 142 (92 female and 50 male) EFL teachers from 18 foreign language institutes selected based on convenience sampling from Mashhad and Tehran, two cities in Iran. Their teaching experiences varied from 7 to 18 years. Their age ranged from 29 to 44 years old. Among these participants, 49 teachers were teaching in elementary levels, 52 teachers were teaching in intermediate levels, and 41 teachers were teaching in
advanced levels. Sixty five of the teachers held a Bachelor qualification, 55 held a Master qualification, and only 22 held a Ph.D. qualification.

**Instruments**

*Maslach’s Burnout Inventory (MBI)*

To measure teachers’ level of burnout, the Maslach’s Burnout Inventory (MBI) designed and validated by Maslach and Jackson (1986) was applied in this study. This test consists of 22 items: 9 items to measure “emotional exhaustion”, 8 items for “reduced personal accomplishment” and 5 to assess “depersonalization”. The items are scored in two ways: according to the frequency in which the participants’ burnout levels are scored on a 7-point frequency scale ranging from (0) “never” to (6) “everyday”. The English teachers participating in this study were required to complete the inventory based on this 7-point scale. The second way is based on the intensity in which the items are scored on 8-point scale ranging from (0) “none” to (8) “very much”. The higher values in both frequency and intensity ways show that the teachers experience the burnout factors. In this study, the first way of scoring (frequency model) was used. Maslach and Jackson (1981) argued that the frequency way of scoring is better than intensity one. In this study, the total reliability of this questionnaire, estimated via Cronbach’s alpha, was 0.92.

*Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (OSTES long form)*

The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (long form), designed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001), was used in this study, due to its comprehensiveness, integrity and ease of administration. It seeks to capture the multi-faceted nature of teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs in a concise manner, without becoming too specific or too general. It is also known as the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES). The long form comprises 24 items, grouped into three subscales: (a) efficacy in student engagement; (b) efficacy in instructional strategies; and (c) efficacy in classroom management. Each subscale loads equally from eight items, and each item is measured on a nine-point Likert scale from ‘nothing’ (1) to ‘a great deal’ (9). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) report Cronbach’s alpha statistics for the reliability of the questionaire as a whole (0.94) and for each individual factor (respectively, 0.87, 0.91 and 0.90). In the present study, the reliability computed via Cronbach’s alpha was 0.90.

*Job Motivation*

The measurement of job motivation among current participants was carried out via the *Work Tasks Motivation Scale for Teachers* (WTMST) adopted from Fernet, Senécal, Guay, Marsh, and Dowson (2008). In this scale, participants were required to provide answers to the following question “Why are you engaged in this profession?” by rating 15 items which were classified into five three-item subscales: Intrinsic Motivation (the sample item is “Because it is pleasant to carry out this task”), Identified Regulation (the example is “Because I find this task important for the academic success of my students”), Introjected Regulation (the sample item is “Because I would feel guilty not doing it”), External Regulation (an example item is “Because my work demands it”), and Amotivation (the sample item is “I don’t know, I don’t always see the relevance of carrying out this task”). Items were scored on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (does not correspond at all) to 7 (corresponds completely). In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha was identified to be .78.

**Procedure**

The sample for this comprised 142 EFL teachers selected according to convenience sampling among EFL teachers teaching English in Language Institutes in Mashhad and Tehran. Yet, endeavor was made to include teachers from various age groups, with different years of teaching experience, and of both genders to ensure generalizibility. Furthermore, population was not confined to teachers of any specific level, but teachers teaching English at primary, intermediate, and advanced levels were included. The researchers of the present study were teaching or had already taught in the institutes of Mashhad from which the participants were drawn (about 102 out of 144). As colleagues, she benefited from a cooperative attitude on the part of participants. Furthermore, a colleague of the researchers studying and teaching in Tehran kindly undertook collecting the data from the rest of the participants. There were no requirements other than that the participants be currently teaching an English course at the period of data collection. They were distributed the battery of three questionnaires and were asked to complete them anonymously and provide demographic information.

In the current study, the relationship between self-efficacy, job motivation, and burnout was explored via multiple Pearson-product-moment correlations. In order to test the causal relationship between these constructs, structural equation modeling (SEM) approach was applied. The best fitting model indicating the aforementioned relationships was found. In this model, the goodness of fit was investigated by means of the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the comparative fit index (CFI), the normed fit index (NFI), and the good fit index (GFI).

**Results**

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics of EFL teachers’ job motivation and its comprising factor. In this table, M1 stands for intrinsic motivation, M2 for identified regulation, M3 for introjected regulation, M4 for external regulation, and M5 for amotivation. As the table indicates, among the five subscales of job motivation, M1 (M = 15.21, SD = 1.64) and M2 receive the highest means (M = 15.17, SD = 1.87) and M5 obtains the lowest mean (M = 10.45, SD = 3.00).

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics of teacher burnout and its three subscales: B1 (emotional exhaustion), B2 (depersonalization), and B3 (reduced accomplishment). Among the subscales, the mean score of B2 (M = 25.95, SD = 5.12) has the highest mean score in comparison with the other scales.
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Motivation and its Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Motivation</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>68.04</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Burnout and its Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>25.95</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>69.39</td>
<td>18.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Self-efficacy and its Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>37.11</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>35.53</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>139.00</td>
<td>111.29</td>
<td>12.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 represents descriptive statistics of teacher self-efficacy and its three subscales as follows: S1 (efficacy in student engagement), S2 (efficacy in instructional strategies), and S3 (efficacy in classroom management). As the table indicates, among the subscales, S3 obtains the highest mean ($M = 38.85, SD = 4.71$).

To examine the structural relations, the proposed model was tested using the LISREL 8.50 statistical package. A number of fit indices were examined to evaluate the model fit: the chi-square magnitude which shouldn’t be significant, Chi-square/df ratio which should be lower than 2 or 3, the normed fit index (NFI), the good fit index (GFI), and the comparative fit index (CFI) with the cut value greater than .90, and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of about .06 or .07 (Schreiber et al., 2006).

As demonstrated by Figure 1, the chi-square value (128.62), the chi-square/df ratio (1.97), the RMSEA (.077), the NFI (.90), GFI (.88), and CFI (.91) all reached the acceptable fit thresholds. It implies that the model had a good fit with the empirical data.

To check the strengths of the causal relationships among the variables, the $t$-values and standardized estimates were examined. As indicated in Figure 1, two estimates were displayed on the paths. The first one is the standardized coefficient ($\beta$) which explains the predictive

Figure 1. The schematic representation of the relationships among teacher motivation, self-efficacy and burnout

$\chi^2 = 128.62$, df = 67, RMSEA = .077, GFI = .88, NFI = .90, CFI = .91

power of the independent variable and presents an easily grasped picture of effect size. The closer the magnitude to 1.0, the higher the correlation and the greater the predictive power of the variable is. The second measure is the $t$-value (t); when it is higher than 2 (+ or -) we call the result statistically significant.

The results demonstrated that teacher motivation negatively predicts teacher burnout ($\beta = -.46$, $t = -5.02$). Teacher self-efficacy is a positive and significant predictor of motivation ($\beta = .62$, $t = 6.68$). It was also found that teacher burnout significantly but negatively influenced teacher self-efficacy ($\beta = -.56$, $t = -5.41$).

The correlation coefficients among EFL teachers’ job motivation, self-efficacy, and burnout are presented in Table 4. As it can be seen, job motivation correlates significantly and positively with teacher self-efficacy ($r = .529$, $p < .05$). It is associated with teacher burnout in a negative direction ($r = -.473$, $p < .05$). Furthermore, self-efficacy and burnout have negative correlation with each other ($r = -.584$, $p < .05$). As it can be seen, among the three variables, the correlation between efficacy and burnout has the highest magnitude, albeit in a negative direction.

Table 4. The Correlation Coefficients among Job Motivation, Burnout, and Self-efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>-.473**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.529**</td>
<td>-.584**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the level of .05

The present study also aimed at exploring the possible associations between the subscales of job motivation (intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, external regulation, and amotivation) and teacher burnout. To do this, SPSS was run. The results are displayed in Table 5. As it can be seen, the highest correlations were found between burnout and M1 ($r = -.328$, $p < .05$), M2 ($r = -.332$, $p < .05$) and M3 ($r = -.333$, $p < .05$).

Table 5. The Results of Correlation between Subscales of Job Motivation and Teacher Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>-.328**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>-.332**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>-.333**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>-.280**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>-.272**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the level of .05

Identical analysis was performed for the subscales of job motivation and teacher self-efficacy. The results are presented in Table 6. As the table demonstrates, the highest correlation was obtained between self-efficacy and M1 ($r = .511$, $p < .05$), followed by the correlation between self-efficacy and M2 ($r = -.467$, $p < .05$).

Table 6. The Results of Correlation between Subscales of Job Motivation and Teacher Self-efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>.511**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>.476**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>.434**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>.183*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>.205*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the level of .05

Discussion

The findings of the current research exploring the relationships between motivation, self-efficacy, and burnout among Iranian EFL instructors in language institutes revealed a significant negative link between motivation and burnout and also a significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and burnout. Research hypotheses for the relationship were confirmed and were in line with theoretical standpoints and empirical studies. With regard to the first research question, the findings indicated that EFL teachers with higher scores on motivation particularly intrinsic interest had lower level of burnout. According to self-determination theory, autonomous motivation is viewed as a fundamental component for individual optimal functioning (Fernet et al., 2012). Teachers have autonomous motivation when they teach because of the intrinsic value of acquiring meaningful and interesting aims or because they individually understand the value of their professional performance. Also, self-determination theory proposed that job motivation changes based on work-place conditions (Fernet et al., 2012). Fernet et al. (2012) found that workers whose supervisors behaved them in an autonomy-supportive way had more job satisfaction and well-being than their colleagues who felt they were controlled by their supervisors. Based on self-determination theory, work environment exerts influence on workers’ energy and quality of motivation, which is the indicator of both adaptive and maladaptive functioning. In this vain, Weiss (1999) contended that when teachers perceive their educational environment as supportive, they display more motivation in their job. When teachers view their work conditioning as a site for their professional development, for instance, they have good interaction with their colleagues they experience burnout far ahead (Breminkmeijer, Vanyperen, & Buunk, 2001).

The above finding is in line with previous empirical research. For instance, Schaufeli and Salanova (2007) found a negative relation between burnout and motivation. Leung and Lee (2006) also reported that that the exhaustion
dimensions of burnout predicted teachers’ decline in motivation leading to leaving the profession.

Regarding the second research question, investigating the link between burnout and self-efficacy, the findings supported this relationship statistically. In other words, EFL teachers who experienced less burnout in their profession enjoyed higher levels of self-efficacy. This finding is in line with theoretical viewpoint of self-efficacy. Bandura (1997) argued that beliefs in one’s abilities constitute the foundation of personal achievement and motivation and signals future success and well-being by encouraging individuals to put more effort in their assigned tasks. Furthermore, teacher self-efficacy is regarded as a dynamic factor that is cyclical in nature. The proficiency of a performance contributes to a new mastery experience that offers teachers a new source of self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Self-efficacy is a motivational component related to individuals’ willingness to put attempts new practices, persistence, and resilience in the face of setbacks (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

All of these attributes would diminish if individuals feel emotionally exhausted or if they are under stress, so that cynicism and ineffectiveness emerge.

Scrutinizing burnout dimensions, we can plausibly argue that decline in professional competence and effectiveness – referred to as reduced personal accomplishments – can have detrimental effects on their mastery experience. This in turn can degrade individuals’ beliefs in their capabilities to perform their required tasks successfully given that the main source of self-efficacy is prior successful functioning.

Consistent with this finding, a number of studies demonstrated a negative relationship between teacher burnout and their self-efficacy (Evers, Brouwers, & Tomic, 2002; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). These studies conclusively demonstrated a negative relationship between the two constructs. Leiter (1992) asserted that burnout causes crisis in self-efficacy and Cherniss (1993) highlighted the role of self-efficacy in the burnout amelioration and etiology.

With respect to the third research question, investigating the contribution of efficacy to motivation, the findings indicated a positive significant relationship between teachers’ sense of efficacy and job motivation. In other words, teachers who feel efficacious in their teaching display high motivation toward their profession. It seems evident that the more teachers feel efficacious in their professional performance, the better they can manage the instructional and learning situations. These teachers seem to find the best options as well as strategies to reach the ultimate level in their teaching. Accordingly, they put more efforts in enriching their professional performance. In other words, they adopt a goal-directed rout to develop their learners’ learning quality. These characteristics (management strategies and goal-setting) are all manifestations of motivational disposition given that Zimmerman (2000) contended self-regulatory strategies develop when motivational level is optimal.

Conclusions

In this study, we postulated that highly motivated instructors tended to experience lower level of burnout and their motivational disposition is molded by their self-efficacy beliefs. The findings of this study corroborated this contention and attested to Fernet et al.’s (2012) finding that emotion exhaustion of teachers have detrimental impact on their motivation and self-concept. Based on the findings of the present study, it seems plausible to expect the outcome of classes conducted by motivated teachers would be highly satisfactory as these teachers are intensely attentive to their instructional practices. Pervious study showed that teachers’ instructional behavior exert great impact on learners’ behaviors (Becker, Goetz, Morger, & Ranellucci, 2014). Domènech Betoret and Gómez Artiga (2010) noted that teachers’ high motivational beliefs such as sense of efficacy have substantial influences on their teaching practices such as creating and employing new strategies, applying various management skills in their classrooms; these improvements in turn contribute to students’ achievement and in fact, these achievements are indicator of teachers’ high performance career.
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