

Vol. 14, No. 1  
pp. 1-33  
March &  
April 2023

## Examining the Role of Active/Passive Motivation in EFL Teachers' Burnout and Efficacy

Seyed Ebrahim Momenzadeh<sup>1</sup> , Reza Pishghadam<sup>\*2</sup> , &  
Elham Naji Meidani<sup>3</sup> 

### Abstract

This study sought to investigate the probable relationships among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' active/passive motivation, their sense of efficacy, and burnout. To this end, the Active/Passive Motivation Scale (APMS), Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), and Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) were administered to 245 Iranian EFL teachers. Next, in order to substantiate the construct validity of the APMS, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted. Moreover, correlational analyses and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) were employed to explore the relationships among the variables. The results indicated significant relationships between active/passive motivation and all subconstructs of TSES, between active motivation and all subconstructs of burnout, and between passive motivation and two burnout subscales, namely emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. Additionally, while no significant relationship was found between age and the three constructs, the results demonstrated that teaching experience and teacher's sense of efficacy were positively correlated. Female teachers were also found to be less likely to feel depersonalized. Moreover, mediated by active motivation, teacher efficacy was a significant negative predictor of teacher burnout. Finally, the implications of the study for administrators and teachers were discussed and suggestions were made for further research.

**Keywords:** active motivation, passive motivation, teacher burnout, teacher efficacy.

<sup>1</sup> PhD Candidate, English Department, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad; Email: [ebrahimmomenzadeh@yahoo.com](mailto:ebrahimmomenzadeh@yahoo.com);

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/000000017600695X>

<sup>2</sup> Corresponding Author: Professor of Language Education, English Department, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad;

Email: [pishghadam@um.ac.ir](mailto:pishghadam@um.ac.ir); ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000000168765139>

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, English Department, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad; Email: [elhanaji@um.ac.ir](mailto:elhanaji@um.ac.ir);

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000000181893282>

## 1. Introduction

In any education system, teachers are the most influential members and their productivity, along with student attainment, are the main goal of education. They play a vital role in both educational success and student achievement (Derakhshan, 2022a, 2022b; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020; Shakki, 2022). While rewarding, due to several reasons ranging from legislative mandates to classroom management difficulties, teaching can be a challenging career as well (Ceglie et al., 2022; Eyler, 2018; Hajmalek & Basiri, 2022; Jacobson, 2016; McCarthy et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2022). With innovations in the field of education and, more specifically, language teaching, EFL teachers now have greater responsibilities. Efficacy of a teacher, which is his/her "belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated" (Guskey & Passaro, 1994, p. 4), has proved to be related to both student outcomes such as achievement, motivation, self-efficacy, and teacher outcomes such as teacher's persistence enthusiasm, commitment, instructional behavior (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), psychological well-being (Derakhshan et al., 2022; Fan & Wang, 2022; Fathi et al., 2021; Xiyun et al., 2022) and performance in class (Greenier et al., 2021; Soodmand Afshar & Ghasemi, 2017).

Teacher efficacy is affected by a range of factors such as teacher's experience, level of education, burnout level, professional identity, motivation, and so forth (Fathi & Saeedian, 2020; Han & Wang, 2021; Khany & Malekzadeh, 2015). Burnout, as an important factor influencing teacher efficacy, is defined as "the inability to cope adequately with stresses of one's work or personal life" (Cunningham, 1983). Not only the effectiveness of a teacher, but his/her emotions (Atmaca et al., 2020), well-being and physical health (Capone et al., 2019; Hakanen et al., 2006), and odds of keeping their job (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019) are likely to be jeopardized by experiencing burnout. Therefore, there must be a considerable concern to pinpoint the factors that might be relevant to burnout (Roohani & Dayeri, 2019). It seems that, among the diverse variables, teacher's motivation is an important driving force behind both teacher success and teacher burnout. Yet, more studies are to be conducted to examine the relationships between different dimensions of teacher burnout and teacher motivation (Roohani & Dayeri, 2019; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2020). More specifically, there is a dearth of research on the construct of active/passive motivation (Pishghadam et al., 2019), especially in the context of language education (Pishghadam et al., 2021). Previous studies have shown that

motivation is negatively related to burnout (Den Brok et al., 2017; Fernet et al., 2012; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2020). However, to the best of the researchers' knowledge, only Alami (2020) investigated the relationship among active/passive motivation, foreign language achievement and the level of (de)motivation of learners. Therefore, this study is the first attempt to analyze this construct among teachers.

In this study, the dual continuum model of motivation, which is based on the concept of sensory motivation and comprises four variations of motivation (Naji et al., 2022; Pishghadam et al., 2019), has been used. This model takes into account both the cognition and actions of individuals. One continuum is related to cognition, with engagement at one extreme and disengagement at the other, referring to the presence or absence of thought, respectively. Similarly, the other continuum is related to action and the concept of "emotioncy", which concerns the emotions evoked by senses (Akbari & Pishghadam, 2022; Al-Obaydi et al, 2023; Pishghadam et al., 2015; Pishghadam & Shayesteh, 2017) with involvement at one end and avolvement at the other, signifying the presence or absence of action respectively. Active motivation, as the best case, happens when an individual thinks about an activity and does it. Active demotivation happens when one does an activity but does not think about it. Passive demotivation refers to the condition when an individual neither thinks about nor does a certain activity. Lastly, passive motivation represents the condition when an individual thinks about an activity but, for any reason, has not been able to find an opportunity to do it (Pishghadam et al., 2019). The concept of active/passive motivation is of primary concern in this study, which except for one study regarding student motivation (Pishghadam et al., 2021), it has not been investigated and delved into.

This quantitative study aimed at probing into the relationships among sensory motivation, teacher burnout, and teacher efficacy. More specifically, it sought to investigate whether the level of active/passive motivation was associated with levels of burnout and efficacy. To do so, a questionnaire was designed and validated based on the concept of sensory motivation. In addition, teachers' demographic variables, such as gender, teaching experience, age, level of education, and level of teaching, were examined concerning burnout and efficacy levels.

### **Research Question(s)**

The following research questions were formulated in this study:

1. Does the active/passive motivation scale (Teacher Version) enjoy psychometric properties (reliability and validity)?
2. Are there any significant relationships among EFL teachers' gender, teaching experience, age, level of education, level of teaching, and burnout level?
3. Are there any significant relationships among EFL teachers' gender, teaching experience, age, level of education, level of teaching, and efficacy level?
4. Are there any significant relationships among the components of the Active/Passive Motivation Scale, Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale, and Maslach Burnout Inventory?
5. Is teacher efficacy a significant predictor of teacher burnout, mediated by active/passive motivation?

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Motivation**

Motivation, as one of the most researched constructs in the field of psychology, has been considered an essential element for success in language learning with a great impact on the efficiency and productivity of English language teaching (Brown & Lee, 2015; Deci & Ryan, 2014; Jin, 2014). Recent research suggests that students' motivation and success are also dependent on teacher's motivation and work satisfaction (Banerjee et al., 2017; Claeys, 2011; Dicke et al., 2020; Herman et al., 2018; Paulick et al., 2013; Shen et al., 2017), highlighting the importance of attending to teacher motivation (Trinidad, 2021).

Gardner and Lambert (1972) proposed two types of motivation, namely instrumental and integrative. Instrumental motivation refers to the benefits that are gained through learning a language, while integrative motivation, as a social psychological construct, is related to the interest in learning about the people and culture of the target language. In Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model, emphasis was placed on the importance of integrative motivation. Instrumental motivation, however, as a construct that works in conjunction with rather than in opposition to integrative motivation, can be influential. Overall, it appears that, compared with integrative motivation, instrumental motivation plays a less important role in successful language learning (Ellis, 2008).

Deci and Ryan (1985) proposed Self-Determination Theory (SDT), in which motivation is categorized based on goals that cause an action. The primary focus of SDT is on psychological innate needs of competence, autonomy, and relatedness. One basic categorization is that of the dichotomy of intrinsic/extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation refers to “doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable” and extrinsic motivation “refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcome” (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Another important development in the investigation of motivation has been the identification of its temporal, dynamic aspect since motivation can change throughout L2 learning (Ellis, 2008).

Previous research indicates that motivation and burnout are negatively correlated (Hakanen et al., 2006; Roohani & Dayeri, 2019). Also, some studies found that burnout correlated with motivation to quit among teachers and school principals (Federici & Skaalvik, 2012; Leung & Lee, 2006). However, there is a paucity of research on the effect of motivation on burnout among L2 instructors (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Fernet et al., 2012). Therefore, examining motivation in relation to burnout might contribute to the EFL context.

Moreover, reviewing the literature on motivation shows that the research conducted into it has mainly investigated the overt indication (i.e., individual’s performance) of this construct. However, Pishghadam et al. (2019) proposed a dual continuum model, which captures a hidden aspect of motivation called passive motivation, standing against active motivation (Pishghadam et al., 2019).


### *2.1.1. The Dual Continuum Model of Motivation*

Pishghadam et al. (2019) developed a dual continuum model of motivation with engagement as one continuum and involvement as a separate one. Engagement is related to thinking as mental activity and is investigated in terms of presence or absence (i.e., engagement and disengagement). Involvement is related to doing (physical activity) and is investigated in terms of sensory involvement. At the involvement level, one has a limited experience of a concept, while in involvement, he/she is completely involved and has fully internalized the concept (Pishghadam, 2015). In addition, the passive and active dimensions of motivation were addressed in this model. The model is thus composed of 4 slices (Figure 1), namely active motivation, active demotivation, passive motivation, and passive demotivation. Active motivation, as the ideal case, occurs when an individual is fully engaged and involved. The absence of engagement

or lack of thinking, however, results in active demotivation, which is a mechanical behavior. Passive motivation represents the condition when one does not find the opportunity to put their thoughts and preferences into action but keeps thinking about them. Finally, passive demotivation refers to the absence of both thinking about and doing an activity. (Pishghadam et al., 2019).

**Figure 1**

*The Dual Continuum Model of Motivation* (Adapted from Pishghadam et al., 2019)



## 2.2 Burnout

The term burnout was first introduced by Freudenberger in 1974 and is defined as “a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced professional accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity” (Maslach et al., 1996).

According to Durak and Saritepeci (2019) and Lizano (2015), in professions dealing with people, burnout is more prevalent and is especially the case for teaching (Brasfield et al., 2019; Hiver & Dörnyei, 2017). It is a prolonged response to emotional and interpersonal job stressors (Maslach et al., 2001), and teachers, as social helpers, are particularly affected by it (Brasfield et al., 2019; Hiver & Dörnyei, 2017; Rudow, 1999).

Given its detrimental effect on the whole system of education (Al Badi & Khan, 2022; Fathi et al., 2021), numerous studies have been conducted on burnout correlates and its sources and effects. For example, in his literature review of teacher burnout, Cunningham (1983) stated that burnout can lead to reduced pupil-teacher rapport, teacher warmth, teacher satisfaction, pupil motivation and ultimately, teaching effectiveness. With regards to the role of individual and contextual factors, burnout was examined in relation to the teaching style and emotional intelligence of teachers (Akbari & Tavassoli, 2014; Fiorilli et al., 2019), absenteeism and job demand (Schaufeli et al., 2009), emotional regulation (Brackett et al., 2010), creativity (Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2016), job stressors (Aflakseir & Nemati, 2018; Khani & Mirzaee, 2015), teacher efficacy (Fathi & Saeedian, 2020; Fathi & Savad Rostami, 2018; Sariçam & Sakız, 2014; Seifalian & Derakhshan, 2018; Shoji et al., 2015; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017; Ventura et al., 2015), resilience (Fathi & Saeedian, 2020; Karimi & Adam, 2018, Richards et al., 2016) and so forth.

Even though the reasons may vary, all educators may encounter stress in their occupation (Jennett et al., 2003). Most educators adapt effectively to such pressure. Nonetheless, burnout might be the endpoint of unsuccessful adaptation to constant pressure (Jennett et al., 2003). One significant factor influencing how teachers cope with stress is their efficacy beliefs (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008).

### **2.3 Teacher Efficacy**

Within the educational domain, teacher efficacy can be defined as the instructors' beliefs in their capabilities to bring about change in student's achievement (Mok & Moore, 2019). EFL teachers' beliefs impact their efficiency considerably (Greenier et al., 2021; Soodmand Afshar & Ghasemi, 2017). The concept of self-efficacy has drawn widespread attention within the last 40 years (Zee & Koomen, 2016). Teacher efficacy happens to be strongly associated with various meaningful academic outcomes, such as students' performance (Piniel & Csizér, 2013) and teacher's job satisfaction and performance (Fathi & Savadi Rostami, 2018). Educators whose sense of efficacy is solid tend to demonstrate more prominent levels of planning, organization and commitment in their profession (Allinder, 1994; Klassen & Chiu, 2011). Teachers with higher self-efficacy have been reported to better deal with troublesome students, be more caring, persistent, and open to new ideas (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), and function more effectively (Klassen & Tze, 2014).

Taking a glance at the review of the related literature demonstrates that motivation plays a crucial role in teacher burnout and teacher efficacy. However, to the best of the researchers' knowledge, there is a paucity of research on the role of active/passive motivation. Moreover, despite the bulk of research on teacher efficacy and burnout in the educational field, studies in the EFL context are insufficient (Fathi & Saeedian, 2020).

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Participants and Settings

The participants of this study were 245 Iranian language teachers, 73 males (29.7%) and 172 females (70.3%), teaching English at four levels of pre-intermediate, intermediate, high intermediate, and advanced. Their age ranged from 17 to 57 years ( $M = 28.46$ ,  $SD = 6.71$ ). The participants held various degrees: 133 held BA or BS (Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Sciences) degrees, 91 held MA or MS (Master of Arts or Master of Science) degrees, four held Ph.D. (Doctor of Philosophy) degrees, and 17 held other degrees. They were all teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) at different private schools or institutes in different cities in Iran. Moreover, they were chosen based on convenience sampling and were reassured regarding the study's confidentiality.

#### 3.2 Instrumentation

##### 3.2.1. Active/Passive Motivation Measurement Scale (Teacher Version)

The Active/Passive Motivation Scale (APMS), which is based on the Dual Continuum Model of Motivation (Pishghadam et al., 2019), was designed and validated in this study (see Appendix A for sample items). It consists of four subconstructs: cognitive active motivation, cognitive passive motivation, socio-emotional active motivation, and socio-emotional passive motivation. Each subconstruct contained four items. Overall, after the removal of a few items to improve the model fit, the scale included 16 items. The Cronbach alpha estimated for this scale was .81, confirming the reliability of the scale.

To develop the scale, the researchers first interviewed 14 EFL teachers to find the answers to two questions:



1. What are the activities that you liked to do with respect to language teaching and professional development language learning and you've done them?
2. What are the activities that you'd like to do with respect to language teaching and professional development language learning but you have not had the chance to do them?

The interviews continued until a level of saturation was reached. Then, 30 items were extracted and designed based on the participants' responses. Furthermore, four EFL teachers were asked to read the items carefully and identify any ambiguities. Finally, the participants filled out the five-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

### 3.2.2. *Maslach Burnout Inventory*

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996) is recognized as the leading measure of burnout and is the most commonly used tool to self-assess whether one is at risk of burnout. Three components are addressed within the MBI: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal achievement. This instrument comprises 22 items; nine items load onto Emotional exhaustion (EE), five items on Depersonalization (DP), and eight items on Personal Accomplishment (PA). The EE component measures the feelings of being exhausted at work. The DP component is related to impersonal behavior towards the recipients of the service and finally, the PA scale measures the feelings of success and accomplishment at work (see Appendix B for sample items). To ensure participants' comprehension, the Persian (participants' mother tongue) adaptation of the MBI developed and validated by Badri Gargari (1995) was used. The calculated Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the questionnaire in the current study was 0.90.

### 3.2.3. *Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale*

The Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) which is also known as the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran et al., 2001), was designed to be completed by teachers as a type of self-assessment to gain a better understanding of the difficulties they encounter in their school activities. There are two forms: a long one with 24 items and a short form with 12 items. Both forms contain three teacher

efficacy subscales: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. The short form was used in our study (see Appendix C for sample items).

For better comprehension and since the other two questionnaires used in this study were in the participants' mother tongue, the TSES was also translated into Persian. The translated version was administered to five EFL teachers to check out its comprehensibility. Eventually, two experts in the field verified the maximum accuracy of the scale translation. Furthermore, the Cronbach's of the Persian version of the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale was .93, confirming the reliability of this scale. The scale was also validated in this study through Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

### 3.3 Procedure

Through convenience sampling, 245 Iranian EFL teachers working in the private sector, i.e., private schools and language institutes, were selected and requested to respond to the online Google Docs version of the three questionnaires. Participants were also expected to provide their level of education, years of teaching experience, age, and gender. They all participated voluntarily and were not required to write their names. Hence, they were aware that their responses would remain anonymous. The data collection was conducted between September and November of 2021. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was employed to investigate the differences across gender and educational degree through t-tests. and the Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) software was used to validate the APMS and TSES through CFA and to check the fitness of the proposed models through SEM.


## 4. Results

### 4.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)


In order to substantiate the construct validity of the APMS and Persian version of the TSES, CFA was run (Figures 2 & 3). Prior to the CFA, Harman's single factor test was conducted. The results indicated that the first factor accounted for 20.76% and 48.12% of the variance in APMS and TSES, respectively, confirming the constructs' multidimensionality. Goodness-of-fit indices are reported in Table 1. In the present study,  $\chi^2/df$  should be less than 3 (Ullman, 2001), TLI and CFI should be over .90, and RMSEA and SRMR should be less than .08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). Based on

the obtained results (Table 1), the models fit the data adequately, hence confirming the structure of the APMS and TSES.

**Figure 2**  
Measurement Model for the APMS



**Figure 3**  
Measurement Model for the Persian Version of the TSES



**Table 1**  
Goodness of Fit Indices for the CFA Models

Models	$\chi^2/df$	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
APMS	1.55	91	.92	.90	.04	.05
TSES	2.49	51	.95	.94	.07	.03

#### 4.2 Correlational Analyses

Table 2 demonstrates the correlational analyses done in the study. As can be seen, some variables are significantly correlated with one another. In particular, while there is no significant correlation between age and other variables of the study, there exist significant relationships between teaching experience, TSE ( $r = .14, p < .05$ ), and some of its subconstructs (i.e., instructional strategies ( $r = .18, p < .01$ ) and classroom management ( $r = .17, p < .01$ )). Moreover, Active Motivation (AM) and Passive Motivation (PM) are positively correlated with TSE and all its subconstructs. While AM is negatively correlated with teacher burnout and all its subconstructs, PM is only correlated with two of the subconstructs of MBI (i.e., EE ( $r = -.19, p < .01$ ) and PA ( $r = -.26, p < .01$ )).

**Table 2**  
Correlational Analyses of the Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. AM	1																
2. PM	.49**	1															
3. Cognitive AM	.87**	.41**	1														
4. Cognitive PM	.40**	.84**	.33**	1													
5. Socio-Emotional AM	.81**	.42**	.44**	.35**	1												
6. Socio-Emotional PM	.43**	.84**	.37**	.43**	.36**	1											
7. Overall A/PM	.79**	.91**	.69**	.77**	.66**	.78**	1										
8. SE	.44**	.37**	.37**	.32**	.38**	.30**	.46**	1									
9. IS	.37**	.24**	.36**	.25**	.27**	.16*	.34**	.75**	1								
10. CM	.30**	.22**	.29**	.31**	.21**	.07	.29**	.64**	.74**	1							
11. Overall TSE	.41**	.31**	.38**	.33**	.32**	.19**	.40**	.88**	.92**	.89**	1						
12. EE	-.25**	-.19**	-.26**	-.21**	-.16**	-.12	-.25**	-.32**	-.26**	-.27**	-.32**	1					
13. DP	-.33**	-.11	-.28**	-.10	-.27**	-.08	-.22**	-.31**	-.23**	-.19**	-.27**	-.65**	1				
14. PA	-.39**	-.29**	-.31**	-.26**	-.37**	-.23**	-.38**	-.47**	-.39**	-.40**	-.47**	-.46**	-.41**	1			
15. Overall Teacher Burnout	-.39**	-.26**	-.34**	-.25**	-.31**	-.19**	-.36**	-.45**	-.37**	-.36**	-.44**	-.89**	-.76**	-.78**	1		
16. Teaching Experience	.03	-.05	.04	-.03	-.00	-.06	-.02	.02	.18**	.17**	.14*	.06	.11	-.11	.00	1	
17. Age	.00	-.03	.00	.00	.00	-.05	-.01	-.05	.07	.06	.03	.03	.06	-.09	-.01	.76**	1

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

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

### 4.3 Mean Differences

In order to check the mean differences between males and females (Table 3) and also between teachers with undergraduate and graduate degrees (Table 4), a series of independent sample t-tests were run. As Table 3 shows, there is a significant difference between males and females with regard to DP ( $t(243) = 3.26, p < .001$ ). That is, female teachers, in comparison with their male counterparts, experienced a lower degree of DP. Moreover, as indicated in Table 4, there is a significant difference between teachers with undergraduate and graduate degrees with regards to DP ( $t(226) = -2.10, p < .05$ ). In other words, teachers with undergraduate degrees, in

comparison with the ones holding graduate degrees, experienced a lower level of DP.

**Table 3**  
*Independent Sample T-test for Gender*

	Subconstructs	Text	N	Mean	SD	df	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
APMS	Cognitive AM	Male	73	17.77	2.13	243	-.91	.35
		Female	172	18.03	2.00			
	Cognitive PM	Male	73	14.93	3.03	243	.49	.61
		Female	172	14.73	2.78			
	Socio-Emotional AM	Male	73	18.63	1.97	243	-1.17	.24
		Female	172	18.91	1.54			
Socio-Emotional PM	Male	73	15.99	2.98	243	-.67	.50	
	Female	172	16.26	2.82				
Overall A/PM	Male	73	67.32	7.72	243	-.62	.53	
	Female	172	67.92	6.67				
TSES	SE	Male	73	28.95	4.72	243	.21	.82
		Female	172	28.80	4.90			
	IS	Male	73	29.74	4.15	243	.50	.61
		Female	172	29.40	5.02			
	CM	Male	73	29.81	5.27	243	1.20	.23
		Female	172	28.91	5.36			
Overall TSE	Male	73	88.49	12.06	243	.73	.46	
	Female	172	87.11	14.03				
MBI	EE	Male	73	15.40	11.12	243	1.22	.22
		Female	172	13.74	9.05			
	DP	Male	73	4.84	5.37	243	3.26	.00
		Female	172	2.88	3.75			
	PA	Male	73	18.97	8.12	243	.00	.995
		Female	172	18.97	8.07			
Overall Teacher Burnout	Male	73	39.21	21.10	243	1.41	.15	
	Female	172	35.58	17.02				
AM	Male	73	36.40	3.51	243	-1.21	.22	
	Female	172	36.94	3.00				
PM	Male	73	30.92	4.94	243	-.10	.91	
	Female	172	30.99	4.83				

**Table 4**  
*Independent Sample T-test for Degree*

	Subconstructs	Text	N	Mean	SD	df	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
APMS	Cognitive AM	Undergraduate	133	17.86	2.21	226	-.48	.62
		Graduate	95	18.00	1.81			
	Cognitive PM	Undergraduate	133	14.68	2.97	226	-.82	.40
		Graduate	95	15.00	2.63			
	Socio-Emotional AM	Undergraduate	133	18.83	1.70	226	.20	.84
		Graduate	95	18.79	1.60			


	Subconstructs	Text	N	Mean	SD	df	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
TSES	Socio-Emotional PM	Undergraduate	133	16.19	2.88	226	.21	.83
		Graduate	95	16.11	2.85			
	Overall A/PM	Undergraduate	133	67.57	7.35	226	-.34	.73
		Graduate	95	67.89	6.47			
	SE	Undergraduate	133	29.26	4.78	226	1.83	.06
		Graduate	95	28.09	4.65			
	IS	Undergraduate	133	29.20	4.80	226	-.82	.41
		Graduate	95	29.72	4.37			
	CM	Undergraduate	133	29.04	5.51	226	-.39	.69
		Graduate	95	29.32	4.85			
	Overall TSE	Undergraduate	133	87.50	13.56	226	.21	.83
		Graduate	95	87.13	12.34			
	EE	Undergraduate	133	13.81	8.95	226	-1.12	.26
		Graduate	95	15.29	10.99			
MBI	DP	Undergraduate	133	3.05	4.07	226	-2.10	.03
		Graduate	95	4.31	4.90			
	PA	Undergraduate	133	18.97	8.17	226	-.60	.54
		Graduate	95	19.62	7.93			
	Overall Teacher Burnout	Undergraduate	133	35.83	17.19	226	-1.36	.17
		Graduate	95	39.22	20.01			
	AM	Undergraduate	133	36.70	3.33	226	-.212	.83
		Graduate	95	36.79	2.92			
	PM	Undergraduate	133	30.87	4.98	226	-.35	.72
		Graduate	95	31.11	4.71			

#### 4.4. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

To check the predictive power of teachers' sense of efficacy (TSE) and its subconstructs as the independent variables, SEM was conducted. Two models were proposed for the prediction of teacher burnout and its subconstructs (see Figures 4 & 5). The first model verifies the predictive power of TSE. As Figure 4 illustrates, TSE predicts teacher burnout both directly ( $\beta = -.35, p < 0.001$ ) and mediated by active motivation ( $\beta = -.25, p < 0.001$ ). In both conditions, TSE is a negative predictor of teacher burnout.

**Figure 4**


*The Schematic Representation of the Relationships among TSES, Active and Passive Motivation, and MBI*



The second model investigates the predictive power of the subconstructs of TSE (i.e., SE, IS, and CM). As Figure 5 shows, SE mediated by active motivation is a negative predictor of EE ( $\beta = -.21, p < 0.001$ ), DP ( $\beta = -.36, p < 0.001$ ), and PA ( $\beta = -.34, p < 0.001$ ). Moreover, SE mediated by passive motivation is a negative predictor of PA ( $\beta = -.14, p < 0.01$ ).

**Figure 5**

*The Schematic Representation of the Relationships among Subconstructs of the TSES, Active and Passive Motivation, and Subconstructs of MBI*



## 5. Discussion

Investigation of burnout among language teachers is of high importance as it is associated with low job performance (Leung & Lee, 2006; Martin et al., 2012; Rudow, 1999; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011; Van Droogenbroeck et al., 2014). Burnout



can be caused by different organizational and personal factors (Leiter & Maslach, 2016). As a personal factor, little research has been conducted on motivation and, more specifically, active/passive motivation. Therefore, this study sought to examine the mediating role of active/passive motivation in teacher burnout and teacher efficacy. The role that demographic variables such as age, gender, teaching experience, academic degree, and level of teaching played in the above-mentioned constructs (i.e., teacher burnout, teacher efficacy, and active/passive motivation) were also investigated.

To answer the first research question regarding the psychometric properties of the designed questionnaire, CFA was run. Regarding the active/passive motivation measurement scale, the results showed that the construct is multidimensional. The subconstructs included Cognitive Active Motivation, Cognitive Passive Motivation, Socio-Emotional Active Motivation, and Socio-Emotional Passive Motivation, indicating that there are cognitive, social, and emotional aspects to a teacher's motivation. In other words, how a teacher perceives himself and what is happening around him, the type of interaction he has with his environment, including colleagues and students, and the intensity of his emotions about his surroundings can all be influential in his level of motivation. The reliability of this scale was also satisfactory. Therefore, the Teacher Active/Passive Motivation Measurement Scale enjoyed psychometric properties. This scale originally had 30 items; however, to improve the model fit and relevant indices, including CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR, 14 items were deleted. Moreover, concerning the validity and reliability of the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale, results of CFA and Cronbach's alpha revealed that the translated version of this questionnaire also enjoyed psychometric properties. The subscales included Student Engagement, Instructional Strategies, and Classroom Management.

As regards the role of demographic variables, referring to the second and third research questions, no significant relationship was found between age and the other two constructs, i.e., teacher efficacy and burnout. Bandura (1994) proposed that age is not likely to be associated with efficacy because people at any point in their lives face different opportunities, and this matter influences how efficaciously they handle their lives. In line with this finding, Imants and De Brabander (1996) found no significant differences in age or gender. Coladarci and Breton (1997), however, found that age and personal teaching efficacy are not strongly but significantly and positively correlated. Regarding burnout, the finding of this study is in contrast with those of previous studies. According to Maslach et al. (2001), age has been a quite consistent

variable in that most studies have reported that individuals over 30 or 40 years of age, compared to younger ones, are less likely to experience burnout. Concerning the relationship between gender and burnout, previous studies have reported inconsistent results (Maslach et al., 2001; Ozdemir, 2007; Jamshidirad et al., 2012). In this study, however, it was found that only regarding the depersonalization subscale of teacher burnout, gender was an influential factor, with females experiencing a lower degree of depersonalization. That is, female teachers seemed to care more about their students, had a more positive attitude toward them, and treated them in a friendlier manner. In the case of teacher efficacy and active/passive motivation, gender appeared to play no role.

Concerning the level of education, this study showed that language teachers who were undergraduates experienced lower levels of burnout, which was, to some extent, in line with the study of Maslach et al. (2001). They showed that educated individuals were more prone to burnout. Regarding the role of teaching experience, it was found that language teachers who had been teaching English for a longer period were more self-efficacious. That is, a teacher's belief in his/her capabilities grew as they became more experienced. Bandura (1997) mentioned that expertise and gaining experience through watching others are important sources of efficacy beliefs. Tsui (1995) described teaching experience as a significant factor in forming a teacher's feelings of efficacy. It is not surprising that experienced teachers have more control over disruptive behavior, can get students to follow classroom rules, are better at calming down noisy students, and are able to create an effective management system. They can also implement more effective Instructional Strategies. For instance, they can craft suitable questions for their students, make use of different evaluation strategies, can easily clarify and enlighten learners in case there is confusion or misunderstanding. However, Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) found a weak correlation between teacher self-efficacy and experience in teaching.

Regarding the relationship between teachers' active/passive motivation and their sense of efficacy, it was found that those who were motivated, either actively or passively, performed more efficiently and could tackle the difficulties in their class activities. Similarly, Fernet et al. (2012) indicated that a teacher's perception of disruptive behavior in the classroom is negatively associated with autonomous motivation. It stands to reason that an actively motivated teacher, whose aims are to develop him/herself professionally and improve the quality of his/her classes, and also takes measures to fulfill them, is more likely to succeed in dealing with hardships occurring in their classes. On the other hand, a passively motivated teacher who has

not yet found the opportunity to put into action his/her intentions also seems to be efficacious. One plausible explanation is that despite their unfulfilled wishes, they have not abandoned hope and still aspire to thrive. Hence, they do everything in their power to make their instructions as effective as possible.

Moreover, teachers with higher levels of active/passive motivation were reported to experience burnout to a lesser extent. According to Fernet et al. (2012), a teacher with autonomous motivation possesses higher levels of self-efficacy, and this, in turn negatively predicts changes in the three burnout components. The negative relationship between self-efficacy and burnout is highlighted by a large body of research (Fathi et al., 2021; Fathi & Saedian, 2020; Khani & Mirzaee, 2015; Sarçam & Sakız, 2014; Skaalvik & Skaalvik 2014, 2017; Smetackova, 2017; Ventura et al., 2014). Based on the Active/Passive Motivation Scale (APMS), a socio-emotionally actively motivated language teacher enjoys maintaining a friendly relationship with learners as well as learning social skills such as effective communication and a sense of humor. Evidently, this teacher is less likely to feel depersonalized, i.e., he/she would neither treat students as impersonal objects nor become callous toward them since their active motivation has turned them into caring teachers. This finding is in line with previous studies, which demonstrated that agreeableness is negatively correlated with depersonalization (Cano-Garcia et al., 2005; Fontana & Abousaarie, 1993; Pishghadam & Sahebjam, 2012).

With respect to Personal Accomplishment, a burned-out teacher might feel that he/she has not accomplished anything significant in his career or think that he/she is not capable of creating a relaxed atmosphere for learners, whereas an actively motivated teacher enjoys creating sense of trust, security, mental calmness and confidence within their learners. Such teachers also enjoy encouraging students to participate actively in class discussion, enjoy teaching them how to take advantage of learning tools, including dictionaries and different software, and enjoy taking extra instructional materials to the class, such as video clips, collocations, and expressions, PowerPoint presentations, photos, and so forth. Therefore, actively motivated teachers consider themselves efficient and know that there is so much they can do for their learners. It seems that, however, in the mind of a socio-emotionally passively motivated EFL teacher, there exist ideas and wishes, such as holding classes in various interesting locations like parks, cafés, or attending international conferences on EFL issues, and meeting key figures in the field of language education. The presence of such intentions pertains to the fact that these language teachers, despite the existing limitations, are still motivated enough to promote themselves and the quality of their instruction. Hence, it

is highly unlikely that they feel their job is a dead-end or that they are unable to help their students with their problems.

## 6. Conclusion

Given the novelty of the concept of active/passive motivation and the significant role it plays in teacher burnout and teacher efficacy, this study can have a number of implications for both language teachers and administrators. An actively motivated teacher would like to improve him/herself professionally by taking part in national and international conferences and attending different workshops on language teaching, such as creativity in language teaching, continuous professional development (CPD) courses, and how to teach effectively using technology and so forth. Institute managers and administrators can prepare the ground for such workshops and events in order to benefit from the efficiency of an actively motivated teacher. In addition, passively motivated teachers are interested in sharing experiences with their colleagues regarding what effective strategies they implement in their classes and what difficulties they face in order to learn from one another. They would also like to hold their classes outdoors, for instance, in a café or a park now and then. In that regard, academic supervisors of language institutes can foster dialogue among teachers through regularly holding sessions where teachers gather together to talk about their points of strengths and weaknesses. Supervisors can also make the necessary arrangements for some of the classes to be held outside the institutes. The findings of this study can be beneficial to language teachers as well, in that they can get acquainted with the qualities of teachers with a high level of active/passive motivation, and this is especially the case for novice teachers. The questionnaire designed in this study lists a number of activities language teachers enjoy doing. For example, actively motivated teachers enjoy taking extra instructional material, such as video clips, relevant collocations, etc., to their class or they enjoy introducing language learning applications and software to learners and teaching them cognitive and metacognitive activities on how to learn vocabulary or master structures. Reading the characteristics of motivated language teachers can provide novice teachers with a deeper understanding of how they can teach more efficiently.

As for the implications of the study for the more general context of language teaching, the significantly negative relationship between teachers' active motivation and the three subconstructs of burnout, as well as the significant prediction of teacher burnout and mediated by active motivation reveals that in comparison with passive

motivation, teachers' active motivation is associated with fewer levels of burnout and higher levels of efficacy. Thus, being fully engaged and involved in teaching practices, and both reflecting upon one's teaching practices and carrying out what one desires, is more effective in feeling less burnout and more efficacy than simply wishing for better circumstances. Thus, teacher education should focus on both physical and cognitive aspects of motivation.

This study is the first attempt that examined the mediating role of active/passive motivation in teacher burnout and teacher efficacy. A noteworthy limitation of this study is that the scale designed pertains to the Iranian EFL context and thus, not all the items may be generalizable to other contexts. Therefore, this study must be replicated in other regions as well; since sociocultural issues, perspectives toward language teachers, and institution rules might vary from one place to another. Moreover, considering that the concept of active/passive motivation has been recently introduced, a new line of research can be initiated to discuss and investigate the relationship between this construct and other variables, such as teachers' sense of metapathy (Pishghadam et al., 2022), personality types, emotional intelligence, and learner efficacy and so forth.

## References

- Aflakseir, A., & Nemati, O. (2018). Association between work-related stress and burnout among a group of the elementary and high school teachers in Zarrin-Dasht-Fars. *International Journal of School Health*, 5(2), 1–4.
- Akbari, M., & Pishghadam, R. (2022). Developing new software to analyze the emosensory load of language. *Journal of Business, Communication and Technology*, 1(1), 1-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.56632/bct.2022.1101>
- Akbari, R., & Tavassoli, K. (2014). Developing an ELT context-specific teacher efficacy instrument. *RELC Journal*, 45(1), 27–50.
- Alami, M. (2020). Examining the mediating role of active/passive motivation in Iranian EFL learners' language learning de(motivation) and self-identity changes and their relation with foreign language achievement [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ferdowsi University of Mashhad.
- Al Badi, A. H., & Khan, A. (2022). Enterprise resource planning systems development in Omani higher education institutions from the perspectives of software project managers and developers. *Journal of Business, Communication & Technology*, 1(1), 14-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.56632/bct.2022.1102>
- Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 17(2), 86–95.
- Al-Obaydi, L. H., Shakki, F., Tawafak, R. M., Pikhart, M., & Ugla, R. L. (2023). What I know, what I want to know, what I learned: Activating EFL college students' cognitive, behavioral, and emotional engagement through structured feedback in an online environment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1083673. <https://doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1083673>
- Atmaca, Ç., Rızaoğlu, F., Türkdoğan, T., & Yaylı, D. (2020). An emotion focused approach in predicting teacher burnout and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103025>
- Badri Gargari, R. (1995). Psychological syndromes in teacher burnout and coping mechanisms [Unpublished master's thesis]. Tarbiat Modarres University.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of*

*human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71–81). Academic Press.

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191–215.
- Banerjee, N., Stearns, E., Moller, S., & Mickelson, R. A. (2016). Teacher job satisfaction and student achievement: the roles of teacher professional community and teacher collaboration in schools. *American Journal of Education*, *123*(2), 203–241.
- Billingsley, B., & Bettini, E. (2019). Special education teacher attrition and retention: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *89*(5), 697–744. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319862495>
- Brackett, M. A., Palomera, R., Mojsa-Kaja, J., Reyes, M. R., & Salovey, P. (2010). Emotion regulation ability, burnout, and job satisfaction among British secondary-school teachers. *Psychology in the Schools*, *47*(4), 406–417.
- Brasfield, M. W., Lancaster, C., & Xu, Y. J. (2019). Wellness as a mitigating factor for teacher burnout. *Journal of Education*, *199*(3), 166–178.
- Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Longman.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136–162). Sage.
- Cano-Garcia, F. J., Padilla-Munoz, E. M., & Carrasco-Ortiz, M.A. (2005). Personality and contextual variables in teacher burnout. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*, 929–940.
- Capone, V., Joshanloo, M., & Park, M. S. A. (2019). Burnout, depression, efficacy beliefs, and work-related variables among school teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *95*, 97–108.
- Ceglie, R. J., Black, G., & Saunders, S. (2022). COVID-19's impact on teachers and the teaching profession. In *Schoolchildren of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Impact and Opportunities* (pp. 59–81). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Claeys, L. (2011). *Teacher motivation to teach and to remain teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students*. The University of Texas at San Antonio.

- Coladarci, T., & Breton, W. A. (1997). Teacher efficacy, supervision, and the special education resource-room teacher. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 90(4), 230–239.
- Cunningham, W. G. (1983). Teacher burnout—Solutions for the 1980s: A review of the literature. *The Urban Review*, 15(1), 37–51.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2014). Autonomy and need satisfaction in close relationships: Relationships motivation theory. In N. Weinstein (Ed.), *Human motivation and interpersonal relationships: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 53–73). Springer Science + Business Media. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8542-6\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8542-6_3)
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.
- Den Brok, P., Wubbles, T., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2017). Exploring beginning teachers' attrition in the Netherlands. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 23(8), 881–895. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2017.1360859>.
- Derakhshan, A. (2022a). *The “5Cs” positive teacher interpersonal behaviors: Implications for learner empowerment and and Learning in an L2 Context*. Springer. <https://link.springer.com/book/9783031165276>.
- Derakhshan, A. (2022b). Revisiting research on positive psychology in second and foreign language education: Trends and directions. *Language Related Research*, 13(5), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.52547/LRR.13.5.1>
- Derakhshan, A., Dewaele, J-M, & Azari Noughabi, M. (2022). Modeling the contribution of resilience, well-being, and L2 grit to foreign language teaching enjoyment among Iranian English language teachers. *System*, 109, 102890. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102890>
- Dicke, T., Marsh, H. W., Parker, P. D., Guo, J., Riley, P., & Waldeyer, J. (2020). Job satisfaction of teachers and their principals in relation to climate and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(5), 1061–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000409>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.



- Eyler, J. R. (2018). *How humans learn: The science and stories behind effective college teaching*. West Virginia University Press.
- Fan, J. & Wang, Y. (2022). English as a foreign language teachers' professional success in the Chinese context: The effects of well-being and emotion regulation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.952503>.
- Fathi, J., Greenier, V., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). Self-efficacy, reflection, and burnout among Iranian EFL teachers: The mediating role of emotion regulation. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 9(2), 13–37. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2021.121043>
- Fathi, J., & Saeedian, A. (2020). A structural model of teacher self-efficacy, resilience, and burnout among Iranian EFL teachers. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(2), 14–28.
- Fathi, J., & Savadi Rostami, E. (2018). Collective teacher efficacy, teacher self-efficacy, and job satisfaction among Iranian EFL teachers: The mediating role of teaching commitment. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 37(2), 33–64.
- Federici, R. A., & Skaalvik, E. M. (2012). Principal self-efficacy: Relations with burnout, job satisfaction and motivation to quit. *Social Psychology of Education*, 15(3), 295–320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-012-9183-5>
- Fernet, C., Guay, F., Senécal, C., & Austin, S. (2012). Predicting intraindividual changes in teacher burnout: The role of perceived school environment and motivational factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(4), 514–525.
- Fiorilli, C., Benevene, P., De Stasio, S., Buonomo, I., Romano, L., Pepe, A., & Addimando, L. (2019). Teachers' burnout: The role of trait emotional intelligence and social support. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1–9.
- Fontana, D., & Abouserie, R. (1993). Stress levels, gender and personality factors in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 63, 261–270.
- Freudenberger, H. (1974). Staff Burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159–165.
- Friedman, I. A., & Farber, B. A. (1992). Professional self-concept as a predictor of teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86, 28–35.

- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. E. Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Newbury House Publishers.
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2016). EFL teachers' teaching style, creativity, and burnout: A path analysis approach. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1–17.
- Greenglass, E. R., Burke, R. J., & Konarski, R. (1997). The impact of social support on the development of burnout in teachers: Examination of a model. *Work & Stress*, 11(3), 267–278.
- Greenier, V., Derakhshan, A., & Fathi, J. (2021). Emotion regulation and psychological well-being in teacher work engagement: A case of British and Iranian English language teachers. *System*, 97, 102446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102446>
- Guskey, T. R., & Passaro, P. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(3), 627–643. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1163230>
- Hajmalek, M. M., & Basiri, N. (2022). EFL teachers' use of coping strategies in the face of identity tensions. *Language Related Research*, 13(3), 227–254.
- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495–513.
- Han, Y., & Wang, Y. (2021). Investigating the correlation among Chinese EFL teachers' self-efficacy, reflection, and work engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12. 763234. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.763234>.
- Herman, K. C., Hickmon-Rosa, J., & Reinke, W. M. (2018). Empirically derived profiles of teacher stress, burnout, self-efficacy, and coping and associated student outcomes. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 20(2), 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300717732066>
- Hiver, P., & Dörnyei, Z. (2017). Language teacher immunity: A double-edged sword. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(3), 405–423.
- Hoy, W. K. & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organisational health of schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 93, 355–372.
- Imants, J. G. M. & De Brabander, C. J. (1996). Teachers' and principals' sense of

- efficacy in elementary schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12(2), 179–195.
- Jacobson, D. A. (2016). *Causes and effects of teacher burnout* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). <https://search.proquest.com/openview/12ab65eb2916929e1659bef732eb7dfa/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Jamshidirad, M., Mukundan, J., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2012). Language teachers' burnout and gender. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1, 46–52.
- Jennett, H. K., Harris, S. L., & Mesibov, G. B. (2003). Commitment to philosophy, teacher efficacy, and burnout among teachers of children with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 33, 583–593.
- Jin, M. (2014). A case study of non-English major college students' motivation in English language learning. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 4, 252–259.
- Karimi, M. N., & Adam, S. B. (2018). A structural equation modelling analysis of the relationships between perceived occupational stress, burnout, and teacher resilience. *Journal of Second Language Teacher Education*, 1(1), 49–72.
- Khany, R., & Malekzadeh, P. (2015). Associations among EFL teachers' professional identity, professional vitality, and creativity. *Teaching English Language*, 9(2), 37–74. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2015.53724>
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Guilford Press.
- Khani, R., & Mirzaee, A. (2015). How do self-efficacy, contextual variables and stressors affect teacher burnout in an EFL context? *Educational Psychology*, 35(1), 93–109.
- 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, 741–756.
- Klassen, R. M., & Tze, V. M. C. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 12, 59–76.
- Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2016). Latent burnout profiles: A new approach to

- understanding the burnout experience. *Burnout Research*, 3(4), 89–100.
- Leung, D. Y. P., & Lee, W. W. S. (2006). Predicting intention to quit among Chinese teachers: Differential predictability of the components of burnout. *Anxiety Stress and Coping*, 19(2), 129–141.
- Lizano, E. L. (2015). Examining the impact of job burnout on the health and well-being of human service workers: A systematic review and synthesis. *Human Service Organizations Management, Leadership & Governance*, 39(3), 167–181.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). CPP, Inc.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422.
- Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, C. J., Lambert, R. G., Lineback, S., Fitchett, P., & Baddouh, P. G. (2016). Assessing teacher appraisals and stress in the classroom: Review of the classroom appraisal of resources and demands. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(3), 577–603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9322-6>
- Mok, M. M. C., & Moore, P. J. (2019). Teachers & self-efficacy. *Educational Psychology*, 39(1), 1–3.
- Naji Meidani, E., Makiabadi, H., Zabetipour, M., Abbasnejad, H., Firoozian Pooresfehiani, A., & Shayesteh, S. (2022). Emo-sensory communication, emo-sensory intelligence and gender. *Journal of Business, Communication & Technology*, 1(2), 54-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.56632/bct.2022.1206>
- Ozdemir, Y. (2007). The role of classroom management efficacy in predicting teacher burnout. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 2, 257–263.
- Paulick, I., Retelsdorf, J., & Möller, J. (2013). Motivation for choosing teacher education: Associations with teachers' achievement goals and instructional practices. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 61, 60–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2013.04.001>
- Piniel, K., & Csizér, K. (2013). L2 motivation, anxiety and self-efficacy: The interrelationship of individual variables in the secondary school context. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 3(4), 523–550.

- Pishghadam, R. (2015, September). *Emotioncy in language education: From exvovement to involvement*. Paper presented at the 2nd conference on Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language Teaching, Literature, and Translation Studies, Mashhad, Iran.
- Pishghadam, R., Adamson, B., & Shayesteh, S. (2013). Emotion-based language instruction (EBLI) as a new perspective in bilingual education. *Multilingual Education*, 3(9), 1–16.
- Pishghadam, R., Al Abdwani, T., Kolahi Ahari, M., Hasanzadeh, S., & Shayesteh, S. (2022). Introducing Metapathy as a Movement beyond Empathy: A Case of Socioeconomic Status. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 10(2 (Themed Issue on the Socio-Psychology of Language)), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscsl.2022.252360>
- Pishghadam, R., Derakhshan, A., Jajarmi, H., Tabatabaei, S., & Shayesteh, S. (2021). Examining the role of teachers' stroking behaviors in EFL learners' active/passive motivation and teacher success. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(707314), 1–17.
- Pishghadam, R., Makiabadi, H., Shayesteh, S., & Zeynali, S. (2019). Unveiling the passive aspect of motivation: Insights from English language teachers' habitus. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 7(2 (Special Issue on Iranians Views of Cultural Issues)), 15–26.
- Pishghadam, R., & Sahebjam, S. (2012). Personality and emotional intelligence in teacher burnout. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 15(1), 227.
- Pishghadam, R., & Shayesteh, S. (2017). Emo-Sensory expression at the crossroads of emotion, sense, and language: A case of color-emotion associations. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 5(2), 15–25.
- Richards, K. A. R., Levesque-Bristol, C., Templin, T. J., & Graber, K. C. (2016). The impact of resilience on role stressors and burnout in elementary and secondary teachers. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19(3), 511–536.
- Roohani, A., & Dayeri, K. (2019). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' burnout and motivation: A mixed methods study. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 7(1), 77–99.
- Rudow, B. (1999). Stress and burnout in the teaching profession: European studies,

- issues, and research perspectives. In R. Vandenberghe & A. M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international research and practice* (p. 38–58). Cambridge University Press.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54–67.
- Sarıçam, H., & Sakız, H. (2014). Burnout and teacher self-efficacy among teachers working in special education institutions in Turkey. *Educational Studies*, 40(4), 423–437.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International*, 14(2–3), 204–220.
- Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology*, 57, 152–171.
- Seifalian, M., & Derakhshan, A. (2018). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' burnout and self-efficacy across English-related vs. non-English-related academic degrees. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 6(2), 99–110.
- Shakki, F. (2022). Iranian EFL students' L2 engagement: The effects of teacher-student rapport and teacher support. *Language Related Research*, 13(3), 175–198. <https://doi.org/10.52547/LRR.13.3.8>
- Shen, J., Gao, X., & Xia, J. (2017). School as a loosely coupled organization? An empirical examination using national SASS 2003-04 data. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(4), 657–681. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216628533>
- Shoji, K., Cieslak, R., Smoktunowicz, E., Rogala, A., Benight, C. C., & Luszczynska, A. (2015). Associations between job burnout and self-efficacy: a meta-analysis. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 29(4), 367–386.
- 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.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivated for teaching? Associations with school goal structure, teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and emotional

- exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 152–160.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports*, 114, 68–77.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 1029–1038. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.001>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2020). Teacher burnout: Relations between dimensions of burnout, perceived school context, job satisfaction and motivation for teaching. A longitudinal study. *Teachers and Teaching*, 26(7-8), 602–616.
- Smetackova, I. (2017). Self-efficacy and burnout syndrome among teachers. *The European Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences (EJSBS)*, XX. Retrieved from <https://www.futureacademy.org.uk/files/images/upload/ejsbs219.pdf>
- Soodmand Afshar, H., & Ghasemi, Z. (2017). EFL teachers' beliefs and their actual classroom practices: Any difference? *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 9(2), 173–208.
- Trinidad, J. E. (2021). Teacher satisfaction and burnout during COVID-19: what organizational factors help? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.2006795>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783–805.
- Tsui, H. F. (1995). General and resource class teachers' feelings of personal efficacy and attitude towards classroom collaboration. *School Psychology International*, 16(4), 365–377.
- Ullman, J. B. (2001). Structural equation modeling. In B. G. Tabachnick & L. S. Fidell (Eds.), *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed., pp. 653–771). Allyn & Bacon.
- Ventura, M., Salanova, M., & Llorens, S. (2014). Professional self-efficacy as a predictor of burnout and engagement: The role of challenge and hindrance demands. *The Journal of Psychology*, 149(3), 277–302.

- Wang, Y., Derakhshan, A., & Azari Noughabi, M. (2022). The interplay of EFL teachers' immunity, work engagement, and psychological well-being: Evidence from four Asian countries. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2092625>
- Xiyun, S., Fathi, J., Shirbagi, N., & Mohammaddokht, F. (2022). A structural model of teacher self-efficacy, emotion regulation, and psychological well-being among English teachers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.904151>
- Yildiz Durak, H., & Saritepeci, M. (2019). Occupational burnout and cyberloafing among teachers: Analysis of personality traits, individual and occupational status variables as predictors. *The Social Science Journal*, 56(1), 69–87.
- Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 981–1015.

#### About the Authors

**Seyed Ebrahim Momenzadeh** is currently a PhD candidate and language instructor at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. His main research interests include psychology and sociology of language education.

**Reza Pishghadam** has a Ph.D. in ELT. He is now a Professor of language education at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, who teaches neuro -psychological and socio - psychological aspects of language education, and professor by courtesy of educational psychology who teaches courses on social cognition. Over the last years, he has published more than 100 articles and books and has participated in more than 40 national and international conferences.

**Elham Naji Meidani** is an Assistant Professor of language education at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. She has published several articles and coauthored two books in the field of language teaching and learning. Her areas of research mainly include psychology and sociology of language education.



## **Appendices**

### **Appendix A: Sample Items of APMS**

#### *Cognitive Active Motivation*

I enjoy learning English expressions in different contexts.

#### *Socio-emotional Active Motivation*

I enjoy conveying a sense of security, trust, friendship, mental peace and self-confidence to my students.

#### *Cognitive Passive Motivation*

I'd like to take part in advanced courses held out of the country such as CELTA, DELTA, TESOL etc.

#### *Socio-emotional Passive Motivation*

I'd like to have more job security.

### **Appendix B: Sample Items of MBI**

#### *Emotional exhaustion.*

I feel emotionally drained from my work.

#### *Depersonalization*

I do not really care what happens to some students.

#### *Personal accomplishment.*

I deal very effectively with the problems of my students.

### **Appendix C: Sample Items of TSES**

#### *Student engagement*

How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?

#### *Instructional strategies*

To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?

#### *Classroom management*

How much can you do to get students to follow classroom rules?