Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL), Vol. 14, No. 2, September 2011, 31-61

Teacher Efficacy, Burnout, Teaching Style, and Emotional Intelligence: Possible Relationships and Differences

Ramin Akbari [a]
Assistant Professor, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Kobra Tavassoli [b]
PhD Candidate, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Received 14 June 2011; revised 21 June 2011; accepted 22 July 2011

Abstract

Nowadays, teachers are receiving more attention in the studies done in mainstream education since it is believed that they play the most important role in educational settings, and therefore their different aspects, such as teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence, have received great attention. Moreover, demographic characteristics of teachers are more examined these days since they are thought to play major roles in teachers' performance in the classroom. Despite great attention to different aspects of teachers and their demographics in mainstream education, such studies are rare in the English Language Teaching field. This study was therefore designed to explore possible relationships among English language teachers' sense of efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence on the one hand, and to document probable differences among them with respect to teachers' gender, degree, and experience on the other

[a] *Email address:* Akbari_r@modares.ac.ir
Corresponding address: English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Chamran Expressway, Tehran, Iran

[b] *Email address:* k.tavassoli@modares.ac.ir

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

hand. To this end, four different instruments, one for each of the variables, were administered among 264 Iranian English language teachers. The findings showed significant even though not high correlations among some of the components of teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence, as well as significant differences among some the components of these variables with respect to teachers' gender, degree, and experience. The results of this study can help teacher educators in dealing with different teachers since they will know about the variations among teachers' performances in the classroom and the problems any teacher with certain characteristics may have.

Keywords: Teacher efficacy; Burnout; Teaching style; Emotional intelligence; Demographics; ELT

Introduction

In the course of the past few decades, teachers have increasingly become the focus of attention in mainstream education, since they play one of the most significant roles in teaching contexts. According to Wright, Hom, and Sanders (1997, p. 63), "more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor". Nevertheless, this has not been the case in the English Language Teaching (ELT) field, and unfortunately, English language teachers have not received adequate attention even though their significant role has been acknowledged in the field (Brown, 2001; Harmer, 2001).

One of the best ways to take notice of English language teachers is doing more research on different variables related to them. Therefore, the present study was carried out in this regard to investigate the relationships among four different aspects of English language teachers that are shown to be influential in teachers' performance in the classroom , i.e., efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000), teaching style (Grasha, 2002), and emotional intelligence (Schutte et al., 1998).

The main purpose of the present study was to explore possible relationships among teachers' efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence, while documenting the differences among them with respect to English language teachers' demographics gender, degree, and experience. More specifically, the following research questions were addressed in the present study.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

1) Is there any significant relationship among teachers' efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence?
2) Is there any significant difference among teachers' efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence with respect to their gender, degree, and experience?

Review of Literature

Teacher Efficacy

Efficacy refers to people's beliefs about their capacity to perform at a given level of achievement (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). These beliefs influence how much effort people make, how long they continue in the face of problems, how much they tolerate failures, and how much stress they experience in coping with demanding situations (Bandura, 1977).

Recently, efficacy has become the focus of attention in the field of teaching because it is believed that teachers' sense of efficacy has a significant impact on both schools and the lives of their students. Teacher efficacy is defined as the extent to which a teacher believes he or she can affect student performance (Berman et al., 1977). In other words, it is a teacher's belief about his/her ability to organize and accomplish action to successfully perform a specific teaching task in a particular context (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Teachers' sense of efficacy is a powerful construct, influencing teachers' behavior in the classroom. It affects the amount of effort teachers put into teaching, the goals they set, and their level of aspiration. Teachers with a higher sense of efficacy show more enthusiasm for teaching, have greater commitment to teaching, and are more likely to stay as teachers (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy). A strong sense of efficacy is one of the best characteristics of effective teachers as it is related to a variety of positive teaching behaviors and student outcomes (Henson, Kogan, & Vacha-Haase, 2001). A teacher with a high efficacy level has more planning and organization, is more enthusiastic towards new ideas, and is more concerned about student needs (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Highly efficacious teachers persist in the face of troubling and unmotivated students and positively influence their academic development by effective teaching (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), are open to new experiments, methods, and materials (Guskey, 1988), and are more professionally committed (Coladarci, 1992). In contrast,

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

teachers with low efficacy think they have no or little influence on their students' learning outcomes (Bandura, 1997).

To better explain the concept of teacher efficacy, different models have been developed in the literature (Ashton et al., 1982; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The most widely used of these models is that of Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, which was also used in this study. In this model, teacher efficacy consists of three components of instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. Instructional strategies refer to teachers' beliefs in their ability to recruit new or alternative strategies in the classroom; classroom management deals with teachers' beliefs in their ability to control disruptive behavior of students; and student engagement refers to teachers' beliefs in being able to involve students' in classroom activities.

In spite of the rich literature on both theoretical and research-based aspects of teacher efficacy in mainstream education (Dellinger et al., 2008; Enochs & Riggs, 1990; Gurvitch & Metzler, 2009; Henson, 2001; Labone, 2004; Liaw, 2009; Shidler, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Wheatley, 2002, 2005), there have been few studies on teacher efficacy in the ELT field (Abednia, 2006; Atay, 2007; Chacon, 2005; Moradkhani, 2009).

Abednia (2006) tried to develop a teacher efficacy instrument for second language contexts. Even though his instrument was a major development in teacher efficacy studies in ELT, it lacks a sound theoretical framework behind it, and its items measure global teacher efficacy rather than teacher efficacy in specific contexts and activities, which is much emphasized in the teacher efficacy literature by Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) and Wheatley (2005). In another study, Chacon (2005) found positive relationships between teachers' sense of efficacy and language proficiency; the more proficient the teachers considered themselves, the higher sense of efficacy they had. The implication of his study was that increasing English language teachers' proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing would lead to building a stronger sense of efficacy. Finally, Moradkhani (2009) also did a research on English language teachers' efficacy, in which he found no significant difference between the efficacy of teachers holding different degrees, while the interaction of teachers' efficacy and their degree showed a significant relationship with their learners' achievements.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Burnout

Burnout is a psychological condition of emotional and mental exhaustion due to extended stressors on the job (Maslach, 1999). It is composed of three factors, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion refers to being emotionally overextended, depersonalization refers to showing negative responses to people, and reduced personal accomplishment refers to having a negative evaluation of oneself (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). In other words, emotional exhaustion is related to feelings of tiredness as one's energy is consumed; depersonalization is the development of negative attitudes towards other people and looking at them as hostiles; and reduced personal accomplishment is related to one's dissatisfaction with his/her achievements (Byrne, 1991).

Burnout is "an issue of particular concern for people-oriented occupations in which (a) the relationship between providers and recipients is central to the work and (b) the provision of education, service, or treatment can be a highly emotional experience" (Maslach, 1999, p. 209). Teaching is therefore one of the professions in which burnout can be widespread. As stated by Huberman and Vandenberghe (1999), the whole burnout process in a school setting is related to different factors such as overload, interpersonal tensions, role conflict, role ambiguity, as well as class size, demographics, heterogeneity of pupils, pupils' aptitudes and socio-cultural backgrounds, and the like.

Brouwers and Tomic (2000) did a longitudinal study of teacher burnout and self-efficacy. In their study, they focused on the direction and timeframe of the relationships between efficacy and burnout among secondary school teachers. Their findings showed that emotional exhaustion had an effect on efficacy while the timeframe was synchronous, whereas efficacy had an effect on depersonalization and personal accomplishment while the timeframe was longitudinal and synchronous respectively. They finally offered some solutions on how to prevent and treat burnout among teachers. In another study, Grayson and Alvarez (2008) focused on the relative contributions of demographic factors, teacher satisfaction, and teacher-rated school climate on teacher burnout. The conclusion was that teacher stressors, which lead to increased levels of burnout, should be reduced so that the school climate can be improved. This way, better conditions can be provided for teachers to work better. Despite the aforementioned

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

studies, which focused on teacher burnout as an influential factor in mainstream education, burnout has not been well researched in the ELT field.

Teaching Style

Teaching style is the expression of the totality of a teacher's beliefs and behaviors (Jarvis, 2004). It refers to "those enduring personal qualities and behaviors that appear in how we conduct our classes. Thus, it is both something that defines us, that guides and directs our instructional processes, and that has effects on students and their ability to learn." (Grasha, 2002, p. 1). Teaching styles are multidimensional and affect how teachers present information, interact with students, manage classroom tasks, supervise course work, socialize students to the field, and guide students. They produce a diverse and rich source of material about how and why teachers teach in particular ways (Grasha).

There are different categorizations of teaching style in the professional literature. However, the most famous classification of teaching style, which was used in this study, is the one in which teaching style is categorized as Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator styles (Riechmann & Grasha, 1982). The expert style refers to possessing knowledge and expertise that students need, whereas the formal authority style is related to possessing status among students because of knowledge and role as a faculty member. The personal model style on the other hand refers to believing in teaching by personal example and establishing a model for how to think and behave. The facilitator style emphasizes the personal nature of teacher-student interactions. Finally, the delegator style is concerned with developing students' capacity to function in an autonomous fashion (Grasha, 2002). Each teacher may use some of these styles more often than the other styles.

Teaching style has been well researched in education in general. Examples are Hodges Kulinna and Cothran (2003) who focused on physical education teachers' needs to use different teaching styles, and Provitera and Esendal (2008) who did a research on teaching and learning styles used in management education. In another study, Zhang (2007) tried to understand the issue of style match/mismatch. His findings revealed that students wanted their teachers to teach in styles which were in line with their career personalities. However, teaching style has not received due attention in the field of ELT. One of the few cases in which teaching style has been

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

studied in ELT is a study by Akbari et al. (2008), in which they focused on three teacher characteristics – teaching style, efficacy, and reflectivity – as well as students' achievement outcomes. The results of their study showed different degrees of correlation among components of teaching style, efficacy, and reflectivity with students' achievement. Moreover, they found that all the components of the mentioned three teacher characteristics except one of the components of teaching style, i.e., interpersonal rapport, could predict student achievement.

Emotional Intelligence

Gardner's (1983) concepts of intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences, knowing one's own emotions and understanding other peoples' emotions respectively, led to the rise of emotional intelligence later on. Salovey and Mayer (1990, p. 189) introduced the concept of emotional intelligence as "the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions." Further, Schutte et al. (1998) defined emotional intelligence as viewing the experience and expression of emotions as a manifestation of intelligence.

There are different models of emotional intelligence in the literature. One of the most widely discussed of these models, which was also used in this study, is the one by Schutte, Malouff, and Bhullar (2009), in which emotional intelligence is classified into four components of perception of emotions, managing emotions in the self, managing other people's emotions, and utilizing emotions. Perceiving emotions is defined as the ability to identify emotions in oneself and others; managing emotions is described as the ability to be open to feelings in oneself and others to promote personal understanding and growth; and utilizing emotions refers to the ability to generate, use, and feel emotions to communicate feelings (Brackett & Salovey, 2006).

Whether emotional intelligence is an influential factor in educational settings in general and in ELT in particular is not clear yet since there have been few studies about it. Therefore, it is still ambiguous what role a teacher's emotional intelligence may play on his/her performance in the classroom. One of the studies done on the role of teachers' emotional intelligence is by Momenian (2009). In his

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

study, Momenian examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and burnout among novice, moderately experienced, and highly experienced ELT and non-ELT teachers. His findings showed that there was a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and burnout between both ELT and non-ELT teachers.

Demographic Variables in Studies on Teachers

In many cases, demographic variables result in differences in teachers' performance in one way or another. The most widely investigated teachers' demographic variables in various educational settings are gender, degree, and experience (Chacon, 2005; Comerchero, 2008; Grayson & Alvarez, 2008; Gurvitch & Metzler, 2009; Lau, Yuen, & Chan, 2005; Liaw, 2009; Moradkhani, 2009; Saklofske, Austin, & Minski, 2003; Schutte et al., 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2002, 2007).

Numerous studies have been done on the role of gender on teachers' performance in the classroom. Most of the studies on teacher efficacy showed no significant effect of gender on teachers' sense of efficacy (Comerchero, 2008; Moradkhani, 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2002, 2007). As for burnout, Lau, Yuen, and Chan (2005) reported higher levels of depersonalization for men whereas women had higher levels of emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment. However, Comerchero found no significant relationships between gender and burnout dimensions. Considering emotional intelligence, Schutte et al. (1998) found that females are more emotionally intelligent than males. Nevertheless, Saklofske, Austin, and Minski's (2003) study showed that females only scored higher in some of the components of emotional intelligence whereas males scored higher in the other components.

In terms of teaching experience, some researchers found significant relationships between teachers' experience and their sense of efficacy whereas some others found no significant relationships (Chacon, 2005; Gurvitch & Metzler, 2009; Liaw, 2009; Moradkhani, 2009). In addition, Grayson and Alvarez (2008) showed that experience is a strong factor which plays a significant role on teachers' degree of burnout.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

To be in line with the literature on teacher variables in which demographic characteristics play central roles, a number of these demographics, that is, gender, degree, and teaching experience, were also studied in this research.

Methodology

Participants

The participants in this study were 264 English teachers teaching at various proficiency levels in different institutes in Tehran (Safir English Language Academy and Mehrdad Language Academy) and Karaj (Tohid and Apadana English Language Institutes). They were heterogeneous in terms of their gender, degree, and teaching experience (see Table 1 below for more details), and they were selected based on availability sampling (Farhady, 1995), that is, those teachers willing to participate in the study were selected.

Table 1
Demographics of participants

Demographic Variable		**Frequency**
Gender	Male	57
	Female	207
Degree	Diploma	14
	Associate Degree	10
	BA	191
	MA	46
Experience	Novice	103
	Moderately Experienced	62
	Experienced	99
Total		264

As seen in Table 1, the number of female teachers was almost four times more than the number of male teachers (207 to 57), which is a manifestation of the ratio of female to male teachers in the ELT context of Iran. The majority of the teachers held a BA degree (191 teachers), whereas a few held a diploma (14) or an associate degree (10), and some (46) held an MA degree. However, in terms of teaching experience, the participants were more systematically varied as novice (103), moderately experienced (62), and experienced (99) teachers. In this study, teachers having less than 2 years of experience were considered novice, those having between 2 to 4 years of experience as moderately experienced, and those with more

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

than 4 years of experience as experienced teachers. This classification was subjective.

Instruments

Four different questionnaires each on one aspect of teachers, that is, teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence, were used in this study and administered to 264 participants to find answers to the questions of this study. Table 2 shows the characteristics of each of the used instruments.

Table 2
Characteristics of the questionnaires

Questionnaire	Source	Number of Items	Likert-scale	Components
Teacher Efficacy	Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy (2001)	24	9 points	• instructional strategies • classroom management • student engagement
Burnout	Maslach (1993)	22	7 points	• emotional exhaustion • depersonalization • reduced personal achievement
Teaching Style	Grasha (2002)	40	7 points	• expert • formal authority • personal model • facilitator • delegator
Emotional Intelligence	Schutte et al. (1998)	33	5 points	• perception of emotions • managing own emotions • managing others' emotions • utilizing emotions

All the teachers filled in the four teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence questionnaires, which were in English. Each questionnaire was administered to the same teachers in person by one of the researchers or through the supervisor of the institutes, to whom all the necessary explanations

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

were given. The explanations provided to the supervisors and teachers were general and based on the instructions of each questionnaire. In case a participant was more interested in the whole research process, more details of the study were provided to him/her. It should be mentioned that in spite of the encouragements on the part of the researchers and the supervisors of the institutes, some teachers were reluctant to fill in the questionnaires and 89 participants either answered the items in the questionnaires incompletely or left all the items unanswered. Since, all the four questionnaires have been validated in earlier studies (Grasha, 2002; Maslach, 1993; Schutte et al. 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) and they are the most widely used instruments in teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence, they were not piloted in this study.

Results and Discussion

Table 3 below shows the descriptive statistics and reliability indexes of each of the questionnaires used in this study. It should be noted that though the questionnaires were administered among 264 teachers, since 89 participants left several or all the items unanswered in the questionnaires, their responses were excluded from the study, and all the analyses were run on the data provided by 175 participants.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Table 3
Descriptive statistics and reliability indexes of the questionnaires

Questionnaire	Components	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Reliability Index (Cronbach's α)
Teacher Efficacy	instructional strategies	30	72	58.32	8.068	.89
	classroom management	33	72	58.93	8.109	
	student engagement	32	71	54.35	8.132	
	Total	102	214	171.60	22.030	
Burnout	emotional exhaustion	1	44	11.89	7.830	.62
	depersonalization	1	20	4.90	3.576	
	personal achievement	15	48	39.49	6.624	
Teaching Style	expert	18	35	27.24	3.209	.78
	formal authority	17	39	27.71	3.278	
	personal model	19	39	29.67	3.316	
	facilitator	21	40	30.97	3.135	
	delegator	17	39	27.82	3.242	
	Total	108	173	143.02	12.000	
Emotional Intelligence	perception of emotions	23	50	38.94	4.716	.74
	managing own emotions	23	45	36.64	4.088	
	managing others' emotions	22	40	32.57	3.296	
	utilizing emotions	17	30	24.33	2.766	
	Total	104	159	132.48	11.354	

The higher a teacher's score in any of the components or total of teacher efficacy, the higher sense of efficacy he/she has. As shown in Table 3, in all the components of teacher efficacy, instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement, as well as its total, the mean values were closer to the maximum value, which shows that the participants in this study had high levels of sense of efficacy.

As for burnout, it was not possible to calculate the total because its components are not in line with each other, that is, whereas increase in emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are manifestations of burnout in a teacher, decrease in personal achievement is its other sign. This also explains the low minimum and mean scores of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, because the closer the

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

scores to the lower bound, the less burnout they show. The participants in this study showed low levels of burnout, i.e., low emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and high personal achievement.

The five components of teaching style show different dominant styles in teachers. Any teacher has a dominant teaching style of expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, or delegator. However, this does not mean that when one of these styles is dominant in a teacher, the other styles are not present. This is only the matter of dominance among all present styles. The mean scores of the participants' teaching styles showed presence of all the five teaching styles among them.

For emotional intelligence, the four components, perception of emotions, managing own emotions, managing others' emotions, and utilization of emotions, in addition to the total also resulted in mean scores closer to the maximum score, which shows that the participants of this study had high levels of emotional intelligence.

The participants' high scores on teacher efficacy, teaching style, and emotional intelligence as well as low scores on burnout can be attributed to either their satisfaction of their job and being good teachers or their tendency to provide socially acceptable answers.

Table 3 also shows the Cronbach's α reliability indexes of the four instruments of this study. The reliability of teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence questionnaires are .89, .62, .78, and .74 respectively. Among these, the highest reliability index is the one for teacher efficacy questionnaire. The reason can be related to its good internal consistency, and homogeneity of items, which made it easy for the participants to answer them with no trouble. On the other hand, the lowest reliability index is related to the burnout questionnaire, which may be due to the different underlying nature of the items in the three components of burnout since as emotional exhaustion and depersonalization increase burnout, personal accomplishment decreases it. Another reason may be the small number of items, only 22, in this questionnaire.

Next, to answer the research questions proposed for the purposes of this study, different kinds of data analyses including correlations and MANOVAs were run.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

The purpose was to find out the possible relationships among teachers' efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence on the one hand, and the probable differences among these variables with respect to teachers' gender, degree, and experience on the other hand.

To answer the first research question of this study, which stated, "is there any significant relationship among teachers' efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence", correlation was run among different components and total of these variables tapped through the questionnaires (see Table 4).

Table 4
Correlations among different components and total of each variable

		Teacher Efficacy (TE)				**Burnout (B)**		
		IS	**CM**	**SE**	**Total**	**EE**	**D**	**PA**
TE	**IS**	1	.79*	.75*	.91*	-.14*	-.18*	.33*
	CM		1	.71*	.90*	-.21*	-.24*	.37*
	SE			1	.90*	-.20*	-.26*	.41*
	Total				1	-.20*	-.25*	.41*
B	**EE**					1	.41*	-.15*
	D						1	-.24*
	PA							1
TS	**E**							
	FA							
	PM							
	F							
	D							
	Total							
EI	**PE**							
	ME							
	MOE							
	UE							
	Total							

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Table 4 (Continued)

		Teaching Style (TS)						Emotional Intelligence (EI)				
		E	**FA**	**PM**	**F**	**D**	**Total**	**PE**	**ME**	**MOE**	**UE**	**Total**
TE	**IS**	.09	.07	.14*	.24*	.19*	.18*	.20*	.05	.14*	.11	.17*
	CM	.06	.12*	.09	.24*	.23*	.20*	.25*	.09	.19*	.14*	.23*
	SE	.09	.08	.16*	.32*	.26*	.24*	.16*	.10	.14*	.08	.16*
	Total	.09	.10	.14*	.29*	.25*	.23*	.23*	.09	.17*	.12*	.21*
B	**EE**	.06	.04	.08	-.07	-.06	.00	-.07	-.13*	-.04	-.08	-.11
	D	-.04	.17*	-.04	-.08	-.03	.00	-.02	-.01	-.05	-.01	-.03
	PA	.04	.02	.08	.15*	.16*	.14*	.10	.04	.12	.06	.11
TS	**E**	1	.48*	.54*	.35*	.32*	.74*	.00	.02	-.07	.01	-.01
	FA		1	.56*	.28*	.25*	.71*	.05	.15*	-.04	.12*	.09
	PM			1	.51*	.33*	.82*	.15*	.16*	.11	.06	.17*
	F				1	.51*	.71*	.09	.01	.05	.08	.11
	D					1	.67*	.09	.16*	.05	.17*	.15*
	Total						1	.01	.14*	-.02	.09	.11
EI	**PE**							1	.45*	.48*	.33*	.80*
	ME								1	.46*	.43*	.79*
	MOE									1	.44*	.76*
	UE										1	.66*
	Total											1

As revealed in Table 4, the significant correlations varied from low to moderate to high among different components and totals of the variables. Different components and total of teacher efficacy showed high significant correlations with each other. Significant correlations could also be seen among components and total of teaching style, as well as emotional intelligence, though the correlations were moderate in these two variables. Nevertheless, components of burnout showed low though significant correlations with each other; whereas emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were positively significantly correlated with each other, they were negatively correlated with personal achievement.

There were weak even though significant correlations between teacher efficacy and burnout components. This seems contradictory to one's expectations as based on their definitions, there should be a strong negative relationship between these two variables. The results of Brouwers and Tomic's (2000) study showed that emotional exhaustion influenced teacher efficacy while efficacy influenced

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

depersonalization and personal accomplishment. Moreover, Eghtesadi (2011), in a study on the relationship between efficacy and burnout among ELT teachers, found a strong negative relationship between efficacy and personal accomplishment component of burnout. However, the results of this study did not demonstrate such strong relationships, even though personal accomplishment component of burnout was significantly correlated with all the components and total of teacher efficacy. This may be because teachers in this study, who showed high levels of efficacy, did not suffer greatly from burnout. Correlations between teacher efficacy and teaching style components were also weak even though in some cases significant. The weak correlations among the components of these two variables may be because of their underlying differences. It seems that no matter what teaching style a teacher uses, it does not seem to be related to his/her degree of efficacy. These results are to some extent in line with the findings of Akbari et al. (2008) who found no significant correlations between teacher efficacy and interpersonal rapport (one of the two components of teaching style in the instrument they used), even though not very congruent with Karimi Allvar's (2009) findings which showed high correlations between efficacy and interpersonal rapport and intellectual excitement, the two components of teaching style in his study. Very weak significant correlations also existed between teacher efficacy and emotional intelligence components. This may be because of the participants' unfamiliarity with emotional intelligence since they do not know how it is related to their performance in the classroom. Almost no research has been done on the relationship between teacher efficacy and emotional intelligence to crosscheck the results of this study.

The few significant correlations between burnout and teaching style components were also weak. This may also be due to the fact that no matter what teaching style a teacher uses in his/her classes, it is not related to his/her degree of burnout or vice versa. Again here, no studies have been done to find out possible relationships between these two variables and therefore no cross-comparisons could be done. As for the correlations between burnout and emotional intelligence components, almost no significant correlations could be seen. This is in contrast to Momenian's (2009) findings in which he found significant negative correlations between the components of these two variables for both ELT and non-ELT teachers.

Finally, some very weak significant correlations could be seen between teaching style and emotional intelligence components. As research findings are rare about

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

the relationship between these two variables, the results of this study could not be compared with that of others. The very low correlations among emotional intelligence and other variables may be because of the insignificance of emotional intelligence in teachers' performance in the classroom.

The largest number of significant correlations in this study went to the correlations between teacher efficacy and other variables whereas both burnout and emotional intelligence showed only a number of low correlations with other variables. In addition, in most cases, the correlations among burnout and other variables were negative, which is quite logical as burnout is in contrast with efficacy, teaching style, and emotional intelligence.

The results of the correlations in this study showed that there are a number of significant relationships among the components of teachers' efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence. However, in spite of the existence of these significant correlations among some of the components and totals of the four variables of this study, most of these correlations were low. Therefore, no strong claims can be made about the relationships among these variables. Some of the reasons behind these low correlations have been mentioned in the above paragraphs. Even though research findings are rare about the relationships among the teacher variables of this study, the few available studies showed significant correlations, which led the researchers to predict the existence of such relationships. In spite of this, strong correlations were not found in this study. Some of the reasons may be the participants' careless answers, their unfamiliarity with some of the variables, or their tendency to provide socially acceptable answers.

To answer the second research question of this study, which stated, "is there any significant difference among teachers' efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence with respect to their gender, degree, and experience", a series of multivariate analysis of variances (MANOVAs) were run on different components of the variables in this study. Due to the large number of the MANOVAs and to save space, Table 5 shows only the significant results.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Table 5
Significant MANOVAs on different components of each variable

Source	Dependent Variable	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Gender	teacher efficacy instructional strategies	302.407	1	302.407	5.219	.024*
	teacher efficacy classroom management	256.175	1	256.175	4.317	.039*
	teacher efficacy student engagement	496.579	1	496.579	8.717	.004*
	teaching style facilitator	48.752	1	48.752	5.442	.021*
Degree	teacher efficacy instructional strategies	487.117	3	162.372	2.802	.042*
Experience	teacher efficacy instructional strategies	435.280	2	217.640	3.756	.026*
	teacher efficacy classroom management	635.115	2	317.558	5.351	.006*
Gender * Degree	teacher efficacy classroom management	616.222	3	205.407	3.461	.018*
	teacher efficacy student engagement	564.781	3	188.260	3.305	.022*
	emotional intelligence perception of emotions	198.478	3	66.159	3.193	.025*
Gender * Experience	burnout emotional exhaustion	382.187	2	191.094	3.309	.039*
	teaching style expert	84.997	2	42.499	3.784	.025*
	teaching style personal model	69.597	2	34.798	3.603	.030*
	teaching style facilitator	72.395	2	36.198	4.041	.019*
	teaching style delegator	73.570	2	36.785	3.436	.035*
Degree * Experience	teacher efficacy instructional strategies	1266.479	6	211.080	3.643	.002*

As it can be observed in the above table, gender, degree, experience, and their interactions showed significant mean differences on some of the components of the variables of the study. Among the three demographics, gender showed the highest

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

number of significant differences, i.e. four, on all the three components of teacher efficacy as well as the facilitator component of teaching style. Degree resulted in differences in only the instructional strategies component of teacher efficacy. Finally, teaching experience demonstrated significant differences in only two components of teacher efficacy, instructional strategies and classroom management.

Moreover, the interactions of these demographics resulted in some significant differences in the teachers' performances on the questionnaires. The interaction of gender and degree showed significant differences on classroom management and student engagement components of teacher efficacy in addition to the perception of emotions component of emotional intelligence. The highest number of significant differences goes to the interaction of gender and experience, which resulted in differences in emotional exhaustion component of burnout, as well as expert, personal model, facilitator, and delegator components of teaching style. Finally, the interaction of degree and experience demonstrated only one significant difference on the teachers' performance in instructional strategies component of teacher efficacy. It should also be mentioned that the interaction of gender, degree, and experience did not result in any significant differences in any of the components of the four variables.

Tables 6 to 11 indicate exactly where these significant differences, due to teachers' gender, degree, experience, and the interactions of these demographics were among the components of teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence.

Table 6
Significant differences due to gender

Dependent Variable	**Gender**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**
Teacher efficacy instructional strategies	Male	55.45	8.503	40
	Female	58.18	8.461	135
Teacher efficacy classroom management	Male	57.05	8.803	40
	Female	58.44	8.158	135
Teacher efficacy student engagement	Male	51.90	7.847	40
	Female	53.60	8.090	135
Teaching style Facilitator	Male	30.22	3.142	40
	Female	30.82	3.017	135

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Table 6 shows that in all of the components of teacher efficacy, along with the facilitator component of teaching style, female teachers outperformed male teachers. This means that efficacy of female teachers is significantly higher than the efficacy of male teachers, whereas only their facilitator teaching style, not any other kind of teaching style, is significantly higher than that of their male counterparts. Therefore, it can be said that female teachers are more efficacious than their male counterparts are in the aforementioned components, and their facilitator teaching style is more dominant than their other teaching styles. These results are in line with Comerchero's (2008) findings where she reported higher levels of efficacy for female teachers.

Table 7
Post hoc results of significant differences due to degree

Dependent Variable	**Degree**	**Mean Difference**	**Sig.**
Teacher efficacy instructional strategies	Diploma and BA	-7.74*	.017*
	Diploma and MA	-8.03*	.030*

As shown in the above table (Table 7), teachers who held a BA or an MA degree performed significantly better than those who held a diploma on the instructional strategies component of teacher efficacy. This means that teachers with a BA or an MA degree are more efficacious than teachers with a diploma degree on only this component of teacher efficacy. This is logical since as a teacher's academic degree increases, so should his/her efficacy in using a variety of instructional strategies. These findings are in contrast with the results of Moradkhani's (2009) research where he found no significant differences in teachers' efficacy levels regarding their academic degree.

Table 8
Post hoc results of significant differences due to experience

Dependent Variable	**Experience**	**Mean Difference**	**Sig.**
Teacher efficacy instructional strategies	Novice and experienced	-6.24*	.000*
	Moderate and experienced	-4.07*	.027*
Teacher efficacy classroom management	Novice and experienced	-6.64*	.000*
	Moderate and experienced	-3.97*	.034*

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Based on Table 8, experienced teachers performed significantly better than both novice and moderately experienced teachers in both instructional strategies and classroom management components of teacher efficacy. This shows that experienced teachers are more efficacious than other teachers are, at least on these two components of teacher efficacy. This is again reasonable and what was expected.

Table 9

Significant differences due to the interaction of gender and degree

Dependent Variable	**Gender**	**Degree**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**
Teacher efficacy classroom management	Male	Diploma	47.50	10.504	4
		Associate Degree	53.00	15.556	2
		BA	57.48	7.741	25
		MA	61.00	7.649	9
	Female	Diploma	58.57	6.828	7
		Associate Degree	60.71	8.883	7
		BA	58.85	8.072	97
		MA	56.08	8.657	24
Teacher efficacy student engagement	Male	Diploma	41.75	3.862	4
		Associate Degree	44.00	.000	2
		BA	53.24	8.017	25
		MA	54.44	4.667	9
	Female	Diploma	50.43	11.193	7
		Associate Degree	54.71	11.398	7
		BA	53.89	7.544	97
		MA	53.04	8.549	24
Emotional intelligence perception of emotions	Male	Diploma	35.50	3.109	4
		Associate Degree	44.50	2.121	2
		BA	40.04	5.690	25
		MA	41.56	3.127	9
	Female	Diploma	41.86	3.078	7
		Associate Degree	38.43	4.791	7
		BA	38.86	4.090	97
		MA	36.96	5.320	24

Results of the significant differences due to the interaction of gender and degree are shown in Table 9. Significant differences were found only in classroom management and student engagement components of teacher efficacy and

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

perception of emotions component of emotional intelligence. Even though male teachers' scores on classroom management increased as their degree went higher, this was not the case in female teachers. Although increase in classroom management was seen from female diploma holders to associate degree holders, it decreased among BA holders and was even lower among MA holders. This is a bit strange since improvement in teachers' efficacy levels was expected as their degree increased regardless of their gender. However, this was not seen in the results of this study. The same pattern of difference among male and female teachers holding different degrees could be seen in student engagement component of teacher efficacy. Table 9 shows that male teachers' efficacy level increased as their degree went higher whereas female teachers' efficacy level did not rise as they got higher degrees. The real reasons behind this are not clear at this stage and more research is needed to find the factors influential on the efficacy levels of female teachers holding different degrees.

Regarding the perception of emotions component of emotional intelligence, no coherent pattern could be seen. Though it increased from male diploma holders to associate degree holders, it decreased among BAs and again slightly increased among MAs. For female teachers, this pattern was the reverse. It decreased from diploma to associate degree holders, then slightly increased among BAs, and again decreased among MAs. It seems that this component of emotional intelligence did not follow a systematic decrease or increase pattern with respect to degree in either male or female teachers. This may be because of English teachers' unfamiliarity with emotional intelligence or because of its insignificance in teaching contexts.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Table 10
Significant differences due to the interaction of gender and experience

Dependent Variable	Gender	Experience	Mean	SD	N
Burnout emotional exhaustion	Male	Novice	16.40	10.676	15
		Moderate	14.64	8.189	11
		Experienced	8.50	4.274	14
	Female	Novice	11.17	7.154	53
		Moderate	11.58	6.666	33
		Experienced	12.69	7.909	49
Teaching style expert	Male	Novice	27.73	2.890	15
		Moderate	29.00	3.066	11
		Experienced	26.79	3.262	14
	Female	Novice	26.87	3.175	53
		Moderate	26.64	3.229	33
		Experienced	27.24	3.838	49
Teaching style personal model	Male	Novice	30.60	2.720	15
		Moderate	30.09	2.625	11
		Experienced	29.00	2.828	14
	Female	Novice	28.62	3.218	53
		Moderate	29.24	3.491	33
		Experienced	29.92	2.835	49
Teaching style facilitator	Male	Novice	30.60	2.165	15
		Moderate	30.45	4.009	11
		Experienced	29.64	3.411	14
	Female	Novice	30.72	3.171	53
		Moderate	30.73	3.065	33
		Experienced	31.00	2.865	49
Teaching style delegator	Male	Novice	27.60	3.776	15
		Moderate	28.91	3.590	11
		Experienced	26.64	3.734	14
	Female	Novice	27.45	2.700	53
		Moderate	27.42	2.937	33
		Experienced	27.90	3.664	49

Table 10 shows significant differences regarding the interaction of gender and experience in emotional exhaustion component of burnout, and four out of the five components of teaching style, i.e., expert, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. Even though emotional exhaustion decreased as male teachers' experience increased, this pattern was not seen in female teachers. Among females,

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

emotional exhaustion increased as their years of teaching experience increased. This shows how different male and female teachers are regarding their burnout status. This difference in the performance of male and female teachers having different teaching experiences may be due to better job conditions for male teachers and because of female teachers' different responsibilities, which lead them to reach burnout sooner, after only some years of teaching.

With respect to the expert style of teaching, no systematic decrease or increase could be seen in either male or female teachers. Whereas the personal model and facilitator styles of teaching showed a slight decrease as male teachers' experience increased, it was the reverse among female teachers. That is, as female teachers' experience increased, so did their personal model and facilitator styles of teaching. These results exemplify that male and female teachers act oppositely regarding the personal model and facilitator components of teaching style. Although female teachers used more of these two styles of teaching as their experience increased, male teachers used them less as their experience increased. This is highly likely because of the differences between male and female teachers regarding the style they choose after years of teaching experience. Female teachers tend more to act like models for their students and to assist their learning whereas this is not seen among male teachers. Lastly, no coherent increase or decrease pattern was seen in either male or female teachers regarding the delegator teaching style.

Table 11
Significant differences due to the interaction of degree and experience

Dependent Variable	Degree	Experience	Mean	SD	N
Teacher efficacy instructional strategies	Diploma	Novice	41.40	9.940	5
		Moderate	58.25	11.442	4
		Experienced	56.50	12.021	2
	Associate degree	Novice	56.50	10.344	4
		Moderate	64.67	2.517	3
		Experienced	48.50	7.778	2
	BA	Novice	55.43	8.283	46
		Moderate	56.52	8.597	29
		Experienced	61.47	6.636	47
	MA	Novice	57.00	6.285	13
		Moderate	54.88	7.039	8
		Experienced	62.00	6.238	12

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Finally, Table 11 shows the significant differences due to the interaction of degree and experience of teachers. The only component on which this interaction of demographics showed significant differences was the instructional strategies component of teacher efficacy. As the table indicates, there was no systematic increase or decrease in this component of teacher efficacy with respect to teachers' years of experience in teaching among either diploma, associate degree, or MA holders. However, an increasing pattern could be seen in the instructional strategies of BA holders. This unexpected result shows that in dealing with efficacy level of teachers, paying attention to only one demographic characteristic of them is not enough. What is essential in such situations is reflecting on all the characteristics of the teachers.

The results of various MANOVAs on different components of teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence with respect to teachers' demographic variables gender, degree, and experience showed some significant mean differences in teachers' performances. Therefore, based on these results, it can be said that there are significant differences among teachers' efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence with respect to their gender, degree, and experience.

Conclusion

The results of this study showed significant relationships among teachers' efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence on the one hand, and significant differences among them with respect to teachers' gender, degree, and experience on the other.

In spite of the significant correlations found among efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence in this study, these correlations ranged from low to moderate. This is probably because each of these variables deals with a unique aspect of teachers, and therefore each aspect needs special attention and treatment regardless of the other aspects. Besides, these low correlations show that not much can be said about different aspects of a teacher having information about his/her other aspects because they are not much correlated with each other. Therefore, in dealing with any side of teachers, special attention is needed on the part of people involved with them, such as supervisors.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

From among the large number of MANOVAs run on different components of the four variables of this study with respect to teachers' gender, degree, and teaching experience, only some showed significant differences. One of the interesting results was the significant differences found regarding gender, which showed outperformance of female teachers to male teachers in all the three components of teacher efficacy in addition to the facilitator component of teaching style. The other notable finding was the significant differences due to degree, which showed that BA and MA degree holders had higher levels of efficacy in instructional strategies than diploma holders. This is quiet illuminating as it shows that as a teacher's academic degree increases so does his/her sense of efficacy in instructional strategies, which is directly related to what a teacher does in the classroom. Almost similar results were found in instructional strategies and classroom management components of efficacy regarding teachers' experience. Experienced teachers outperformed novice and moderately experienced teachers in both of these components. This finding is useful as it shows that as a teacher's experience in teaching increases so does his/her efficacy level in instructional strategies and classroom management, which have a direct role on a teacher's performance in educational settings. However, MANOVA findings related to the differences in teachers' performances due to the interaction of their demographics did not show any coherent or systematic increase and decrease pattern. Because of these variations, no strong claims can be stated about teachers' different performances on the four variables of the study. What is clear is that qualitative studies are needed to find the underlying reasons for these unsystematic variations.

To conclude, the results of this study can be of practical use for teacher educators and supervisors who are directly working with teachers. Knowing how varied teachers are and how these variations result in different performances among teachers can help these two groups to assist both pre-service and in-service teachers to overcome their problems more effectively. Knowing that a teacher who is strong in one aspect is not necessarily strong or weak in another aspect can also shed light on how to help teachers become better teachers and to handle their classes more successfully.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Notes on Contributors:

Ramin Akbari *is an Assistant Professor of TEFL at the English Department of Tarbiat Modares University. He got his PhD in TEFL from Isfahan State University. His research interests are teacher education and critical pedagogy.*

Kobra Tavassoli *is a PhD Student of TEFL at Tarbiat Modares University, and an Instructor at the English Department of Karaj Islamic Azad University.*

References

Abednia, A. (2006). *Developing a language teacher's sense of self-efficacy scale* (Unpublished master's thesis). Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Akbari, R., Kiany, G. R., Imani Naeeni, M., & Karimi Allvar, N. (2008). Teachers' teaching styles, sense of efficacy, and reflectivity as correlates of students' achievement outcomes. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 1-28.

Ashton, P. T., Olejnik, S., Crocker, L., & McAuliffe, M. (1982). Measurement problems in the study of teachers' sense of efficacy. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.* New York.

Atay, D. (2007). Beginning teacher efficacy and the practicum in an EFL context. *Teacher Development, 11*, 203-219

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Berman, P., McLaughlin, M., Bass, G., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1977). *Federal programs supporting educational change. Vol. VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation, Report No. R-1589/7-HEW.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 140 432).

Brackett, M. A., & Salovey, P. (2006). Measuring emotional intelligence with the Mayer-Salovery-Caruso emotional intelligence test. *Psicothema, 18,* 34-41.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(2), 239-253.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed.).* New York: Longman.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Byrne, B. M. (1991). *Reexamining the factorial structure of the Maslach burnout inventory for elementary, intermediate, and secondary teachers: A cross-validated confirmatory factor analytic study.* Ottawa, Canada: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 329 589)

Chacon, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(3), 257-272.

Coladarci, T. (1992). Teachers' sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. *Journal of Experimental Education, 60,* 323-337.

Comerchero, V. (2008). *Gender, tenure status, teacher efficacy, perfectionism, and teacher burnout* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Fordham University, New York, USA.

Dellinger, A. B., Bobbett, J. J., Olivier, D. F., & Ellett, C. D. (2008). Measuring teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Development and use of the TEBS-self. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(3), 751-766.

Eghtesadi, A. R. (2011). *Burnout among Iranian EFL teachers: Underlying reasons, influential factors, and effective coping strategies* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Enochs, L. G., & Riggs, I. M. (1990). Further development of an elementary science teaching efficacy belief instrument: A pre-service elementary scale. *School Science and Mathematics, 90,* 694-706.

Farhady, H. (1995). *Research methods in applied linguistics.* Tehran: Payame Noor University

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76,* 569-582.

Grasha, A. F. (2002). *Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles.* San Bernadino, CA: Alliance Publishers.

Grayson, J. L., & Alvarez, H. K. (2008). School climate factors relating to teacher burnout: A mediator model. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(5), 1349-1363.

Gurvitch, R., & Metzler, M. W. (2009). The effects of laboratory-based and field-based practicum experience on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(3), 437-443.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implantation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*(1), 63-69.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching (3rd ed.).* Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.

Henson, R. K. (2001). Teacher self-efficacy: Substantive implications and measurement dilemmas. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Educational Research Exchange.* Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas. Retrieved from www.des.emory.edu/efp/EREkeynote.PDF

Henson, R. K., Kogan, L. R., & Vacha-Haase, T. (2001). A reliability generalization study of the teacher efficacy scale and related instruments. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 61*(3), 404-420.

Hodges Kulinna, P., & Cothran, D. J. (2003). Physical education teachers' self-reported use and perceptions of various teaching styles. *Learning and Instruction, 13,* 597-609.

Huberman, A. M., & Vandenberghe, R. (1999). Introduction: Burnout and the teaching profession. In R. Vandenberghe & A. M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international research and practice* (pp. 1-11). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jarvis, P. (2004). *Adult education and lifelong learning: Theory and practice.* London: Routledge Falmer.

Karimi Allvar, N. (2009). *Developing a typology of second language teachers: Patterning the variations* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Labone, E. (2004). Teacher efficacy: Maturing the construct through research in alternative paradigms. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*(4), 341-359.

Lau, P. S., Yuen, M. T., & Chan, R. M. (2005). Do demographic characteristics make a difference to burnout among Hong Kong secondary school teachers? *Social Indicators Research, 71,* 491-516.

Liaw, E. C. (2009). Teacher efficacy of pre-service teaches in Taiwan: The influence of classroom teaching and group discussions. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(1), 176-180.

Maslach, C. (1993). Burnout: A multidimensional perspective. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach & T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent development in theory and research* (pp. 19-32). Washington, D.C.: Taylor and Francis.

Maslach, C. (1999). Progress in understanding teacher burnout. In R. Vandenberghe & A. M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing*

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international research and practice (pp. 211-222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Momenian, M. (2009). *On the relationship between emotional intelligence and teacher burnout among ELT and non-ELT Teachers* (Unpublished master's thesis). Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Moradkhani, S. (2009). *The effect of novice English teachers' self-efficacy and academic degree on students' achievement* (Unpublished master's thesis). Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Provitera, M. J., & Esendal, E. (2008). Learning and teaching styles in management education: Identifying, analyzing, and facilitating. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 5*(1), 69-78.

Riechmann, S. H., & Grasha, A. F. (1982). The Grasha-Riechmann student learning style scales: Research findings and applications. In J. Keefe (Ed.), *Student learning styles and brain behavior* (pp. 81-86). Reston, VA: NASSP.

Saklofske, D. H., Austin, E. J., & Minski, P. S. (2003). Factor structure and validity of a trait emotional intelligence measure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34,* 707-721.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9,* 185-211.

Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25,* 167-177.

Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., & Bhullar, N. (2009). The assessing emotions scale. In C. Stough, D. H. Saklofske & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *Assessing emotional intelligence* (pp. 119-134). New York: Springer.

Shidler, L. (2008). The impact of time spent coaching for teacher efficacy on student achievement. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 36*(5), 453-460.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2002). The influence of resources and support on teachers' efficacy beliefs. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.* New Orleans, LA.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(6), 944-956.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A. & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68,* 202-248.

Wheatley, K. F. (2002). The potential benefits of teacher efficacy doubts for educational reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*(1), 5-22.

Wheatley, K. F. (2005). The case for re-conceptualizing teacher efficacy research. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(7), 747-766.

Wright, S. P., Hom, S. P., & Sanders, W. L. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personal Evaluation and Education, 11,* 57-67.

Zhang, L. F. (2007). From career personality types to preferences for teachers' teaching styles: A new perspective on style match. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43,* 1863–1874.

[Downloaded from ijal2.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-26]