



Research Article

A Study on the Relationship between Iranian EFL Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Self-Efficacy

Ibrahim Safari *

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, Imam Hossein Comprehensive University, Tehran, Iran

* Email: safariibrahim1@gmail.com

Introduction

Teachers are important actors in the process of improving the quality of education available to students. To be eligible as a teacher, a person must have acquired pedagogical instruction for the purpose of being able to help students in receiving necessary information, abilities, and attitudes (Okeke et al., 2019). In accordance with Njoku et al. (2017), a teacher is an individual who offers

information, knowledge, values, attitudes, and skills to a person or group of people who are supposed to be reasonably unskilled or untrained in a manner that is both pedagogically efficient and morally acceptable. Regarding Offorma (2016), receiving teacher training equips people to become active members of society and to educate younger members who have less life experience. According to Colson et al., (2017), in the classroom, the

teacher is the most important factor in determining the success of each student. From a broader point of view, the extent to which teachers believe they can influence their students' behavior and learning is shown by their level of job satisfaction.

Teachers' job satisfaction is considered as their emotional reaction and mental attitude towards work or teaching role, which refers to the functional relationship between what they expect from teaching and what is offered to them as teachers (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011; Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2004). Job satisfaction is very important in the development of high quality education and has been the focus of attention of various researchers in recent decades (Crossman & Harris, 2006; Duyar et al., 2013; Evans, 2001; Toropova et al., 2021). The high level of teachers' job satisfaction may lead to a favorable classroom and university atmosphere, which significantly contributes to effective relationships between teachers and students, better student learning, and more teachers' participation in quality education (Griffith, 2004; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011). Furthermore, higher job satisfaction of teachers is useful in improving working relationships and better cooperation in order to implement university educational programs and leads to highly effective organizational performance (Griffith, 2004; Torres, 2019).

Many variables in the fields of psychology and sociology are related to teachers' job satisfaction. The influences of teaching experience, gender, motivation to teach, and self-efficacy on teacher job satisfaction are categorized as intrinsic factors (e.g., Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Liu et al., 2023; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014; Watt et al., 2012), whereas school climate, working conditions, leadership patterns, and social culture are classified as extrinsic factors (e.g., Kapa & Gimbert, 2018; Kelchtermans, 2006; Liu et al., 2021; Ozcan, 2021). All these factors form a multidimensional concept in both internal and external environments, which shows that teachers' job satisfaction is influenced both by the teachers themselves and by the university context. With these explanations, it is worth noting that when the internal and external support conditions are inadequate, teachers are likely to be dissatisfied and suffer from job turnover, and in some cases, even

leave the teaching profession completely (Griffith, 2004; Torres, 2019).

In recent years, there has been an increase in the literature on what factors can affect teachers' job satisfaction. However, the existing ones are characterized by conducting a single country sample; transnational comparative studies on the relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and other conditions are limited to a specific region or specific field. From another point of view, although both teachers and university contexts are closely related to job satisfaction, there are few studies that have simultaneously addressed conditions at the teacher and university levels (e.g., Liu et al., 2023; Shen et al., 2012). Typically, teaching is highly valued as an attractive profession in Iran, and employment in this job is considered a highly competitive process (Hargreaves, 2009; Klassen et al., 2010). Consequently, the comparative study of various factors affecting the job satisfaction of teachers in Iranian universities is reasonable and appropriate.

Another factor related to EFL teachers that has been widely discussed in the literature and is expected to influence their career success is self-efficacy. According to Klassen, and Chiu (2010), TSE influences the way they teach and the success and motivation of their students. On the other hand, Fives (2003) stated that persistent problems in measuring efficacy beliefs remained an issue for many years. Bandura (1997) claims that when evaluating teachers' self-efficacy, the evaluation should show a specific functional domain instead of measuring a general function. As stated by Klassen and Chiu (2010), teachers' ability to teach is included in a general measure of teacher self-efficacy, while their skill is assessed in a specific domain. In this area, it is crucial to understand the factors that contribute to teachers' self-efficacy and influence their approach to teaching and classroom management.

The term 'self-efficacy' was coined by Albert Bandura (1997), who is credited with being the pioneer of its introduction. All anticipated outcomes and performance affect each individual's behavior (Bandura, 1997; Chan et al., 2020). In a given situation, expectations of an outcome based on human moral judgments may produce effects (Chan et al. 2020). He also stated that people

cannot exhibit that behavior unless they believe in their own competence or anticipate success. Teachers' goals and behavior in the classroom are guided by their ideals. Values can also enhance self-efficacy by encouraging well-being. Teachers' self-efficacy is defined as their belief in their ability to successfully perform tasks related to their professional work. According to Barni et al. (2019), self-efficacy of teachers affects important academic outcomes such as students' motivation, achievement, and well-being. Academic outcomes, such as job satisfaction and student motivation, are largely affected by teachers' confidence in their capacity to successfully manage academic demands, obstacles, and commitments compared to professional employment (Barni, et al., 2019). Teachers' goals can be as much as their beliefs about their ability to teach students effectively. According to Bandura's social cognition theory from 1986, individuals' goals are guided by different abilities. These skills contain planning, symbolizing, foresight, taking the other person's point of view, and being introspective. These aptitudes affect people's perception of their capacity to perform a given activity through the environment, actions, and personal factors (Chan et al., 2020).

Teachers' actions and goals in the classroom are guided by their ideals. In addition, values can enhance a person's sense of self-efficacy and mental well-being. Important educational outcomes are significantly affected by TSE, or teachers' perceptions of their capacity to successfully manage the responsibilities, obligations, and obstacles associated with their professional practice (Barni, et al., 2019). Self-efficacy is one of the important psychological characteristics of teachers, which is used to perform specific academic tasks of students. According to Klassen and Tze, (2014), TSE has gradually assumed a more important role in psychology research due to its implications for educational practices, academic learning and student achievement, and teaching effectiveness. Caprara et al. (2003) stated that teachers with high levels of self-efficacy feel more satisfied with their work, experience less stress at work, and have an easier time correcting unruly students.

A body of new research shows that teacher self-efficacy is associated with positive outcomes such as

motivation, enhanced student learning, and achievement. Additionally, research shows that there is a correlation between teachers' self-efficacy and factors such as job satisfaction and job commitment (Caprara et al., 2003). There is evidence demonstrating a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and their job satisfaction. Teachers' self-efficacy is viewed as one of the most important factors affecting their job satisfaction during their teaching years (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007; Wolters & Daugherty, 2007). It has already been mentioned that self-efficacy affects behavior, feelings and thinking of people (Bandura, 1994). Similarly, it is argued that self-efficacy is related to job satisfaction. Hence, solving the problem of job dissatisfaction means improving teachers' self-efficacy. Accordingly, the current concern of this research is to investigate the statistical relationship between job satisfaction and self-efficacy of Iranian EFL teachers in universities in Tehran and Ardabil provinces.

Literature Review

This section reviews the existing literature that has been examined in the subject area of the current research and the studies that have been conducted in relation to it. This is to strengthen the research theoretically and find out what other researchers have found and possibly not, and thus help the current study to fill the gap. The presentation of the literature review is arranged thematically.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is outlined as something that is entertaining and enjoyable which usually creates positive output (Locke, 2001); the degree to which people love their work (Hirschfeld, 2000); happiness and enthusiasm for one's job (Osakwe, 2014); and the degree of satisfaction a person feels towards his or her job (Maharjan, 2019). Okoth (2003) states that job satisfaction is a positive state that results from the evaluation of job experiences; a set of positive beliefs and feelings that people have about their work. Job satisfaction is related to people's perception and evaluation of their job, which is influenced by their unique needs, expectations and values (Sempame et al., 2002). As stated by Armstrong (2006), a positive attitude indicates job satisfaction, while a negative attitude

means job dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction is one of the important characteristics that the employees of a university should have because satisfied employees will be cooperative and motivated while unhappy people will not contribute much to the university (Oshagbemi, 2003).

Importance of Job Satisfaction

The literature shows that job satisfaction of employees is necessary for success in their work because job dissatisfaction may lead to brain drain, apathy, procrastination and low job performance, which will affect organizational effectiveness (Osakwe, 2014). According to Shaju and Subhashini (2016), employees who are satisfied with their jobs have an emotional bond with their organization and are proud of their membership, which is very beneficial for the health of the organization. There is a strong relationship between job satisfaction and employee retention in the workplace. When employees feel that their organization supports them and provides them with a good work-life balance, their job satisfaction increases and this reduces their desire to move (Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007). Furthermore, Ngo et al. (2009) stated that job satisfaction results in an increase in the level of job performance; high levels of employee motivation; positive work values; and lower rates of absenteeism, burnout, and turnover. Swamy et al. (2015) believe that satisfied employees are a very important asset for the organization.

Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

There are several studies that evaluate the factors affecting job satisfaction. As Rose (2003), stated, job satisfaction is influenced by the terms of the work situation, work orientation, employment contract, financial rewards, and gender of a person. George and Jones (2008) indicated that the type of job, colleagues, supervision, and payment influence job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is promoted by work standards, adequate authority, fair compensation and good leadership (Bavendum, 2000). Other factors include professional development, professional recognition, job security, favorable working conditions, interpersonal relationships, work efficiency, and job success (Osakwe, 2003; Uddin et al., 2005; You et al., 2017). Greater

personal interest in work, reward for performance, ability to work on initiative and high self-esteem also influence job satisfaction (Rhodes & Hammer, 2000; Stajkovich & Luthans, 1998). In a related study by Saif et al. (2016), It was understood that participation in decision-making, flexible working hours, the attitude of top management, organizational culture, time for family and management style influence job satisfaction. Likewise, a study showed that increasing the level of education and age of employees increased job satisfaction (Meziroğlu, 2005). In accordance with Baron and Greenberg (1990), job satisfaction is influenced by stress levels, self-efficacy, self-monitoring, and seniority. Some of the studies showed that heavy teaching loads and student attitudes contribute to teacher job stress, which leads to negative health outcomes, reduced personal achievement, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lower levels of self-efficacy. (Betoret, 2006; Jepson & Forrest, 2006; Kyriacou, 2001).

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is defined as people's belief in their own capacity to master the motivational, cognitive and behavioral resources needed for their performance in a specific situation (Bandura, 1997). In other words, self-efficacy is a belief of competence in a particular situation. According to Fitzgerald and Schutte (2010), self-efficacy is considered as a cognitive process through which people judge their own ability to perform a given task. Researchers also stated that as a situation-specific competence belief, self-efficacy affects a person's internal and external behaviors. In recent decades, self-efficacy has been considered one of the widely studied variables in the fields of psychology, education and organizational sciences. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate and behave (Bandura, 1994). As stated by Diseth (2011), low self-efficacy beliefs have a negative effect on a person's abilities, while high self-efficacy beliefs have a positive effect on a person's performance. People with high self-efficacy beliefs are able to perform challenging tasks; they are stable and persistent against negativity; they can restore their self-efficacy beliefs after failure; and associate their failure with

insufficient effort and acquired skills (Bandura, 1994). In other words, people with low self-efficacy beliefs avoid difficult tasks; they reduce the efforts they show when faced with a challenge; they give up easily, and explain the reason for their failure with their incapacity (Bandura, 1994).

Importance of Self-Efficacy

During the past decades, self-efficacy has become one of the widely studied variables in psychology, educational sciences, and organization. A study shows a positive correlation between self-efficacy and effective, motivational, and behavioral outcomes in organizational settings (Bandura, 1986). Moreover, Heuven et al., (2006) stated that people with high self-efficacy beliefs can achieve internal satisfaction from their jobs, perform their tasks successfully, set more challenging goals for themselves, and do better in overcoming unsuccessful experiences. According to Boyd and Vozikis (1994), self-efficacy is also one of the most important components of organizational motivation, because if it is low, it affects the person's performance. In a similar study, Bandura (1997) points out that people's beliefs about their capacities to perform their job affect their motivation to seek or avoid particular tasks.

Factors Affecting Self-Efficacy

The literature emphasized several factors that influence self-efficacy. According to Shaukat et al. (2019), characteristics such as academic education, age and teaching experience had a significant effect on self-efficacy beliefs. In addition, other factors are related to self-efficacy. These factors include a supportive school environment which improves self-efficacy (Lee et al., 2019) and stress and burnout, which decrease self-efficacy (Zhu et al., 2006). The study also represents other factors that increase self-efficacy such as teaching (Eden & Aviram, 1993); positive feedback (Beattie et al., 2015); social support and role model (Levan, 2010); positive engagement (Bakker, 2009); and high self-esteem (Afari, 2012).

Job Satisfaction and Self-Efficacy

Some studies have represented a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and self-efficacy (Balghaizadeh & Jola 2024; Judge et al., 2001; Luthans et al., 2006; Türkoğlu et al., 2017).

Balghaizadeh and Jola (2024) studied the power of predicting the feeling of self-efficacy in the job satisfaction of Iranian EFL teachers from private language institutions. The results showed that there is a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. According to Luthans et al. (2006), people with high self-efficacy can overcome problems more effectively and are more likely to achieve valuable results through persistence that leads to job satisfaction. As Pinguart et al. (2003) stated, people with high self-efficacy experience higher levels of job satisfaction and are less likely to be unemployed and more satisfied with their jobs. In a similar study, Muhammet et al. (2017) indicated self-efficacy as a significant predictor of job satisfaction. High levels of self-efficacy promote people's behaviors and attitudes, which leads to job satisfaction (Bargsted et al., 2019). People with high levels of self-efficacy beliefs have higher job satisfaction because they consecrate their task (Judge et al., 2001); obtain more hopeful thoughts (Salanova et al., 2005); and are proficient in completing the work (Judge & Bono, 2001). Self-efficacy guides employees' efforts and promotes their persistence, which leads to job satisfaction (Stajkovich & Luthans, 1998).

Theoretical Framework

This research used Bandura's self-efficacy theory as a theoretical framework (Bandura, 1977). In accordance with this theory, self-efficacy influences an individual's motivation, thinking, and behavior. People with self-efficacy are efficient in performing their tasks. Despite some research showing that having knowledge and skills is necessary for success, Bandura (1997) has indicated that having low self-esteem can also reduce personal success. Regarding Bandura (1994), four major sources influence a person's self-efficacy: mastery of experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and emotional states in judging one's abilities. Among these sources, mastery experiences are the most effective sources of self-efficacy. Mastery experiences occur when people succeed in performing tasks. Vicarious experiences include modeling people and their success. Social persuasion affects people's self-efficacy if it has positive encouragement. Finally, emotional states are judgments about one's abilities on how one

reacts to various situations such as health performance, coping with stressors, and physical achievements (Bandura, 1997). Reducing stress is likely to increase self-efficacy and, as a result, job satisfaction. Teaching is one of the most challenging jobs in the world. Despite the fact that researchers have made an important contribution in finding the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction with other variables, little research has been done to investigate the relationship between these two variables among English language teachers. Therefore, it is important to understand the current level and the relationship between job satisfaction and teachers' self-efficacy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study was to examine the nature of job satisfaction and self-efficacy among Iranian EFL teachers of the universities in Tehran and Ardabil provinces. The main objectives of the empirical section of this research were:

1. What are Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs about their job satisfaction?
2. What are Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs about their self-efficacy?
3. Is there a statistical relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and self-efficacy?

Methodology

Context and Participants

The participants in this study were 248 Iranian EFL teachers (117 males and 131 females) working in different universities in Tehran and Ardabil provinces. It should be noted that two questionnaires were distributed among the main set of participants through email, social networks and on paper. As mentioned earlier, 248 EFL teachers completed the questionnaires without problems, which were the main data of the study. These participants were categorized into two novice and experienced teachers with active working years between 5 and 35 years. Their ages ranged from 25 to 65 years and most of the teachers were between 26 and 35 years old. When distributing the questionnaires, all teachers were informed about the confidentiality of the findings so that they could participate in this research more confidently. The demographic characteristics of the teachers are represented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants of the Study

Variables		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Gender	Male	117	47.17	47.17
	Female	131	52.82	52.82
Age Group (Year)	26-35	102	41.12	41.12
	36-45	75	30.24	30.24
	46-55	49	19.75	19.75
	56-65	22	8.87	8.87
Year of Teaching gp.	6-15	133	53.62	53.62
	16-25	89	35.88	35.88
	26-35	26	10.48	10.48
Total		248	100.0	100.0

According to Table 1, more than half of the participants (52.82 %) were female teachers. Most of the participants were aged between 26 and 45 years (71.36 %), representing that the majority of the teachers were young, while only 8.87 percent of the teachers were between 56 and 65 years.

It should be noted that this study was done only by teachers whose teaching experience was between 6 and 35 years. Given that the predominant age group was 26-45, it is quite reasonable that the majority of participants had less teaching experience. According to Table 1, the highest teaching experience was between 6-15 years and 16-25 years, while only 10.48% of the participants had teaching experience between 26-35 years.

In this quantitative method, a non-random selection of participants was used. This study applied such an approach to measure objectives such as job satisfaction and self-efficacy of EFL teachers in Iran. This research used statistical methods that contained correlational designs to reduce bias and objectively indicate the findings (Cronbach, 1975; Powdermaker, 1966). It measured the different perspectives on job satisfaction and self-efficacy of Iranian EFL teachers in Tehran and Ardabil provinces.

Instrumentation

To collect the data, two questionnaires were applied, namely, (1) Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and, (2) Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES).

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was prepared

by Spector (1985). It had 36 items with 9 sub-scales containing pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Each sub-scale contained four items. The instrument was a six-point Likert scale providing six possible responses (1 = disagree very much, 2 = disagree moderately, 3 = disagree slightly, 4 = agree slightly, 5 = agree moderately, and 6 = agree strongly). The designer of the instrument represented that a mean score of 4 or more indicates satisfaction, 3 or less indicates dissatisfaction, and between 3 and 4 indicates ambivalence. The coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) represented reliability as it was .91 for the instrument, .75 for pay, .73 for promotion, .82 for supervision, .73 for fringe benefits, .76 for contingent rewards, .62 for operating, .60 for coworkers, .78 for nature of work, and .71 for communication. Before this research, the experimental instrument was tested with 105 EFL teachers and the alpha coefficient indicating its reliability was .89.

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) was designed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). This instrument had 24 items with three sub-scales containing efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. Each sub-scale contained eight items. The instrument was a 9-point Likert scale preparing 9 possible responses (1 and 2 = nothing, 3 and 4 = very little, 5 and 6 = some influence, 7 and 8 = quite a bit, and 9 = a great deal). The reliability of this instrument and its sub-scales was evaluated. The coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) represented reliability as it was .94 for the instrument, .87 for efficacy in student engagement, .91 for efficacy in instructional strategies, and .90 for efficacy in classroom management. Prior to this research, the experimental tool was tested with 105 EFL teachers and the alpha coefficient represented a reliability of .87.

Data Collection Procedure

After the test implementation of the questionnaires with a group of 26 people, slight changes were made in the expressions of some items in order to improve their comprehensibility. Likewise, the obtained scores were entered into

SPSS and Cronbach's alpha was calculated for the scales to ensure sufficient reliability of the scales. It should be noted that a group of colleagues in Tehran and Ardabil universities were contacted and asked to provide the questionnaires to EFL teachers and request their cooperation. As noted earlier, questionnaires were sent to 153 teachers in person and 134 copies were sent via email or social networks. Overall, out of 287 teachers who were contacted, 248 teachers answered the questionnaires and returned them. These questionnaires were scored, and the data was entered into SPSS software. It should be noted that the negative items were reverse coded and necessary preliminary calculations were done to prepare them for the data analysis process.

Data Analysis Procedure

Participants in this research answered questions in two surveys. After data collection, the data set was imported into SPSS for analysis. The data were analyzed on the basis of means, standard deviations, the results of paired samples *t*-tests and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Paired samples *t*-tests were applied to investigate the mean differences in job satisfaction and self-efficacy of EFL teachers in Iran. Furthermore, the correlation between teachers' job satisfaction and self-efficacy was examined by Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Then the results of data analysis were analyzed based on job satisfaction and self-efficacy of Iranian EFL teachers.

Results

The research results are presented in order to investigate the statistical relationship between job satisfaction and self-efficacy beliefs of Iranian EFL teachers. Table 2 shows the mean difference in JSS.

Table 2.

Summary of Ranges, Means, and Standard Deviations on Dispositions of JSS

Group	N	Min-Max	M	SD
Pay	248	2.00-5.00	3.53	.57
Promotion	248	1.75-5.25	3.62	.56
Supervision	248	1.75-5.50	4.39	.59
Fringe Benefits	248	1.00-5.50	4.29	.59
Rewards	248	2.00-5.75	3.99	.64
Operating Conditions	248	1.50-5.00	3.48	.57

Group	N	Min-Max	M	SD
Coworkers	248	2.25-5.50	3.86	.54
Nature of Work	248	2.25-5.50	3.61	.50
Communication	248	2.25-4.75	3.86	.50

Note. JSS = Job Satisfaction Survey.

A

According to Table 2, the mean values on the sub-scales – pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication – of JSS instruments represent that most sub-scales had different mean scores. Teachers received the highest mean score on supervision (M = 4.39, SD = .59) and the lowest mean score on operating conditions (M = 3.48, SD = .57). They had the same mean values for both coworkers (M = 3.86, SD = .54) and communication (M = 3.86, SD = .50). EFL teachers scored higher on fringe benefits (M = 4.29, SD = .59), then rewards (M = 3.99, SD = .64), promotion (M = 3.62, SD = .56), nature of work (M = 3.61, SD = .50), and pay (M = 3.53, SD = .57). Table 3 also shows the mean difference in TSES.

Table 3. Summary of Ranges, Means, and Standard Deviations on Dispositions of TSES

Group	N	Min-Max	M	SD
Student Engagement	248	2.00-7.25	4.33	1.06
Instructional Strategies	248	2.50-8.87	4.62	1.02
Classroom Management	248	2.50-8.25	4.78	1.15

Note. TSES = Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale.

As represented in Table 3, EFL teachers had similar mean values for student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. They had the highest mean values in classroom management (M = 4.78, SD = 1.15). Teachers scored higher on instructional strategies (M = 4.62, SD = 1.02) than student engagement (M = 4.33, SD = 1.06).

According to Table 4, after data analysis on job

satisfaction and self-efficacy beliefs of EFL teachers, paired samples of *t*-test results represented significant results between the two constructs. The results of the study represented that teachers had higher mean scores on overall self-efficacy beliefs (M = 4.58, SD = .80) than the beliefs on overall job satisfaction (M = 3.85, SD = .24) with conditions, $t(207) = -12.47, p < .01$.

Table 4. Paired Samples T-Test Results on Mean Scores between JSS and TSES

Group	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Job Satisfaction	248	3.85	.24	-12.47	.00
Teacher Efficacy	248	4.58	.80		

Note. JSS = Job Satisfaction Survey. TSES = Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale.

As Table 5 represents, the Pearson’s correlation analysis was used to investigate the relationship between EFL teachers’ job satisfaction and self-efficacy. Results of the study showed a significant and positive relationship between overall job satisfaction and overall self-efficacy beliefs ($r = .01$). The relationship between job satisfaction and student engagement ($r = .02$), instructional strategies ($r = .02$), and classroom management ($r = .03$) was positive. As a sub-scale of self-efficacy, student engagement was related to any of the job satisfaction sub-scales. Even so, there was a significant relationship between instructional strategies and operating conditions ($r = .18$). Moreover, the results showed meaningful relationships between classroom management and operating conditions ($r = .17$). Then, there was a significant relationship between overall teacher self-efficacy and operating conditions ($r = .15$). In final, results represented that there was a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction and self-efficacy of EFL teachers.

Table 5. Correlation Matrix between Job Satisfaction and Sense of Self-Efficacy of Teachers

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Pay	1.00													
Promotion	.34**	1.00												
Supervision	.08	.21**	1.00											
Fringe Benefits	.07	.10	.24**	1.00										

Rewards	.18**	.02	.19**	.32**	1.00									
Operating Conditions	.12	.04	.10	.19**	.27**	1.00								
Coworkers	.07	.04	.06	.13*	.06	.10	1.00							
Nature of Work	.03	.02	.03	.07	.05	.04	.03	1.00						
Communication	.04	.11	.02	.09	.02	.04	.04	.16*	1.00					
Student Engagement	.02	.07	.04	.02	.06	.07	.05	.04	.06	1.00				
Instructional Strategies	.11	.10	.03	.04	.03	.18**	.03	.02	.03	.28**	1.00			
Classroom Management	.08	.08	.02	.08	.13	.17**	.04	.04	.13	.20**	.54**	1.00		
Job Satisfaction	.48**	.40**	.51**	.53**	.57**	.47**	.34**	.19**	.21**	.02	.02	.03	1.00	
Teacher Efficacy	.04	.04	.04	.06	.09	.15*	.01	.03	.04	.65**	.80**	.79**	.01	1.00

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); * . Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and self-efficacy and to investigate the difference in job satisfaction and self-efficacy of EFL teachers working in universities in Tehran and Ardabil provinces. This research investigated the sense of self-efficacy beliefs of Iranian EFL teachers and stated that teachers' beliefs were high about their own student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. In a similar study, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007) indicated that self-efficacy affects instructional strategies of teachers. In another related investigation, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) proposed that low levels of teachers' self-efficacy may have a negative effect on students' behavior and engagement. According to the results of current study, it is critical for leaders of the university to make essential efforts in order to increase teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, as such beliefs may cause a considerable involvement in teachers' classroom management and teaching strategies and students' engagement in learning tasks.

Considering data, results about job satisfaction revealed that EFL teachers showed satisfaction in all sub-scales of job satisfaction. As stated by Judge and Bono (2001), EFL teachers who are satisfied with their jobs may be more productive while teaching. Moreover, Chaplain (2008) proposed that many teachers have represented satisfaction in their jobs. Cockburn and Haydn (2004) in their study revealed that seeing students' progress, working with supportive colleagues, and the overall atmosphere

in universities are important factors that can affect teachers' job satisfaction. Accordingly, Liu and Ramsey (2008) suggested that managers should be aware of the factors that affect teachers' job satisfaction, because indicators such as bad working conditions and a negative university atmosphere may reduce teachers' performance and create job stress.

Similar to the findings of Betoret (2006), this study showed that there is a significant relationship between the mean scores between overall job satisfaction and the overall sense of efficacy of English language teachers. In addition, many investigations stated that the sense of self-efficacy beliefs of teachers is one of the most important factors influencing teachers' job satisfaction (Balghaizadeh & Jola 2024; Bargsted et al., 2019; Judge and Bono, 2001; Luthans et al., 2006; Muhammet et al., 2017; Pinquart et al., 2003; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007; Türkoğlu et al., 2017; Wolters & Daugherty, 2007). After examining the relationship between EFL teachers' job satisfaction and self-efficacy beliefs, the results showed that there is a positive correlation between overall job satisfaction and overall self-efficacy beliefs.

Conclusions and Implications

The conclusion part of this research shows that, considering that the results of some studies mentioned in the previous section indicated the existence of a positive relationship between job satisfaction and self-efficacy, the findings of the current research also indicate the existence of a

positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and EFL teachers' self-efficacy. The findings revealed that teachers' self-efficacy is high in all sub-scales: student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. At the same time, EFL teachers represented satisfaction with their jobs in all the sub-scales of job satisfaction. According to the results, it is critical for university managers to consider taking certain steps in order to enhance teachers' job satisfaction and self-efficacy. As the results obtained in this research showed, teachers who have a higher level of job satisfaction and self-efficacy beliefs strengthen their work motivation and can provide more effective educational approaches for students' learning.

This research has different limitations that should be kept in mind for the interpretation of the findings. First, it is important to note that because the sample consisted of EFL teachers from specific regions, it is impossible to generalize the findings to other teachers. As a second limitation, the present study did not consider the differences between cultures, religious beliefs, and their educational independence. It is recommended to study the previously mentioned aspects of EFL teachers for more accurate conclusions. Despite the limitations, the findings have provided new insights that deserve further study.

Further research can be done to deeply study other factors related to job satisfaction and self-efficacy. New studies could investigate whether the fact that Iranian EFL teachers usually work at more than one university can also affect job satisfaction. More studies can be done in the field of determining the statistical relationship between job satisfaction and self-efficacy with other variables such as commitment, burnout, professional development, participation, leadership, etc. Developing and extending this study may involve a greater sample size, involving various types of educational workplaces and demographic examples. Development and expansion of this research may include larger sample sizes, different types of educational workplaces, and demographic samples.

References

Afari, E. (2012). Global self-esteem and self-efficacy correlates: Relation of academic achievement and self-

esteem among Emirati students. *International Education Studies*, 5(2), 49-57.

Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice* (10th ed.). Kogan Page.

Bakker, A.J. (2009). *Building engagement in the workplace*. Erasmus University Rotterdam. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.395.2276&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>

Baleghizadeh, S., & Jula, A. (2024). Sense of self-efficacy and emotional intelligence as predictors of job satisfaction among Iranian EFL teachers. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, doi: 10.22049/jalda.2024.29316.1645

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V.S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, 4, 71-81.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.

Bargsted, M., Ramírez-Vielma, R. & Yeves, J. (2019). Professional self-efficacy and job satisfaction: The mediator role of work design. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35, 157 - 163.

Barni, D., Danioni, F., Benevene, P. (2019). Teachers' self-efficacy: The role of personal values and motivations for teaching. *Front. Psychol.*, 10, 16-45.

Baron, R.A., & Greenberg, J. (1990). *Behavior in organization: Understanding and managing the human side of work* (3rd ed.). Allyn and Bacon.

Bavendum, J. (2000). *Managing job satisfaction*. New York Research Inc.

Beattie, S., Woodman, T., Fakehy, M., & Dempsey, C. (2015). *The role of performance feedback on the self-efficacy-performance relationship*. American Psychological Association. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/features/spy-spy0000051.pdf> <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/features/spy-spy0000051.pdf>

Betoret, F.D. (2006). Stressors, self-efficacy, coping resources, and burnout among secondary school teachers in Spain. *Educational Psychology*, 26, 519-539.

Boyd, N.G., & Vozikis, G.S. (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 63-77.

Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., & Steca, P. (2003). Efficacy beliefs as determinants of

teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 821-832.

Chan, E., Ho, S., Ip, F. & Wong, M. (2020). *Self-efficacy, work engagement, and job satisfaction among teaching assistants in Hong Kong's inclusive education*. SAGE Open, 10, 2158244020941008.

Chaplain, R.P. (2008). Stress and psychological distress among trainee secondary teachers in England. *Educational Psychology*, 28, 195-209.

Cockburn, A.D., & Haydn, T. (2004). *Recruiting and retaining teachers: Understanding why teachers teach*. London, England: Routledge Falmer.

Colson, T., Sparks, K., Berridge, G., Frimming, R., & Willis, C. (2017). Pre-service teachers and self-efficacy: A study in contrast. *Discourse Commun. Sustain. Educ.*, 8, 66-76.

Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.

Cronbach, L.J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologist*, 30, 116-127.

Crossman, A. & Harris, P. (2006) Job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 34, 29-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1741143206059538>

Diseth, A. (2011). Self-efficacy, goal orientations and learning strategies as mediators between preceding and subsequent academic achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21(2), 191-195.

Duyar, I., Gumus, S., & Sukru Bellibas, M. (2013). Multilevel analysis of teacher work attitudes: The influence of principal leadership and teacher collaboration. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(7), 700-719.

Eden, D., & Avirma, A. (1993). Self-efficacy training to speed reemployment: Helping people help themselves. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 352-360.

Evans, L. (2001). Delving deeper into morale, job satisfaction, and motivation among education professionals. *Educational Management and Administration*, 29, 291-306.

Fitzgerald, S., & Schutte, N. (2010). Increasing Transformational Leadership through Enhancing Self-efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(5): 495-505

Fives, H. (2003). *What Is Teacher Efficacy and How Does It Relate to Teachers' Knowledge? A Theoretical Review*. In American Educational Research Association Annual Conference; The University of Maryland: Chicago, IL, USA, 1-59.

Forsyth, S., & Polzer-Debruyne, A. (2007). The organisational pay-offs for perceived work-life balance

support. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 45(1), 113-123.

George, J.M., & Jones, G.R. (2008). Understanding and managing organizational behaviour (5th ed.) Prentice Hall.

Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 333-356. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230410534667>

Hargreaves, L. (2009). *The status and prestige of teachers and teaching*. In L. J. Saha & A. G. Dworkin (Eds.), Springer international handbooks of education, vol. 21: International handbook of research on teachers and teaching, 217-229. Springer.

Heuven, E., Bakker, A.B., Schaufeli, W.B., & Huisman, N. (2006). The role of self-efficacy in performing emotion work. *J VocatBehav*; 69(2), 222-235.

Hirschfeld, R.R. (2000). Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic sub-scales of the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire short form makes a difference? *Educational Psychological Measures*, 60(2), 255-270.

Jepson, E., & Forrest, S. (2006). Individual contributory factors in teacher stress: The role of achievement striving and occupational commitment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 183-197.

Judge, T.A., & Bono, J.E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 80-92.

Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 376-407.

Kapa, R., & Gimbert, B. (2018). Job satisfaction, school rule enforcement, and teacher victimization. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 29(1), 150-168.

Kelchtermans, G. (2006). Teacher collaboration and collegiality as workplace conditions: A review. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 52(2), 220-237.

Klassen, R.M., & Chiu, M.M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *J. Educ. Psychol.*, 102, 741-756.

Klassen, R.M. & Tze, V.M. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Educ. Res. Rev.*, 12, 59-76.

Klassen, R.M., Bong, M., Usher, E.L., Chong, W.H., Huan, V.S., Wong, I.Y., & Georgiou, T. (2010). Exploring the validity of the Teachers' Self-Efficacy

Scale in five countries. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 34*, 67-76.

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review, 53*, 27-35.

Lee, S., Mogle, J.A., Jackson, C.L., & Buxton, O.M. (2019). What's not fair about work keeps me up: Perceived unfairness about work impairs sleep through negative work-to-family spillover. *Soc. Sci. Res., 81*, 23-31.

Levan, A.J. (2010). *If you think you can't think again: The sway of self-efficacy.* [https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/flourish/201002/if-you-think-you-can-t-think-again-the-sway-self-efficacy.](https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/flourish/201002/if-you-think-you-can-t-think-again-the-sway-self-efficacy)

Liu, X.S., & Ramsey, J. (2008). Teachers' job satisfaction: Analyses of the Teacher Follow-Up Survey in the United States for 2000-2001. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1173-1184.

Liu, S.J., Keeley, J.W., Sui, Y.Y., & Sang, L. (2021). *Impact of distributed leadership on teacher job satisfaction in China: The mediating roles of teacher autonomy and teacher collaboration.* *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 71*, 101099. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101099>

Liu, S.J., Keeley, J.W., & Sui, Y.Y. (2023). Multi-level analysis of factors influencing teacher job satisfaction in China: Evidence from the TALIS 2018. *Educational Studies, 49(2)*, 239-259.

Locke, E. (2001). Motivation by goal setting. *Handbook of Organizational Behaviour, 2*, 43-54.

Luthans, F., Zhu, W., & Avolio, J.B. (2006). The impact of efficacy on work attitudes across cultures. *Journal of World Business, 41(2)*, 121-132.

Maharjan, R. (2019). Job satisfaction, gender and salary: A study on correlation. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 5(1)*, 59-69.

Meziroğlu, M. (2005). *Measurement of primary school teachers and junior high school teachers' job satisfaction (Unpublished Master Thesis).* Zonguldak Karaelmas University, Institute of Social Sciences, Zonguldak.

Muhammet, E.T., Ramazan, C., & Hanif, P. (2017). Examining relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5(5)*, 765-772.

Ngo, H.Y., Foley, S., & Loi, R. (2009). Family friendly work practices, organizational climate, and performance: A study of multinational corporations in Hong Kong. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30(5)*, 665-680.

Njoku, U.M., Amadi, G.U., & Igbokwe, C.N. (2017). Teachers' classroom discipline and sustainable development in public secondary schools in Imo State. *Int. J. Stud. Educ., 15*, 319-330.

Offorma, G.C. (2016). *The purpose of Teacher Education.* In Teacher Education in Nigeria, Iwovi, U.M.O., Ed., Foremost Educational Services Ltd.: Lagos, Nigeria,

Okeke, F.C., Enyi, C., Agu, P.U., Chigbu, B.C., & Nwankwo, P.P. (2019). Teachers' perceptions on the ethical standard of instructional supervision required of secondary school Principals in Onitsha Education Zone in Anambra State. *Rev. Educ. Inst. Educ. J., 31*, 247-265.

Okoth, L.A. (2003). *A survey of the factors that determine the level of job satisfaction among teachers in top ranking private schools in Nairobi (Unpublished MBA Project),* University of Nairobi.

Osakwe, R.N. (2003). *A comparative study of job satisfaction between public and private secondary school in Delta State. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis of the Faculty of Education,* Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria.

Osakwe, R.N. (2014). Factors affecting motivation and job satisfaction of academic staff of universities in SouthSouth Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria. *International Education Studies, 7(7)*, 43-51.

Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from UK Universities. *International Journal of Social Economics, 30(12)*, 1210-1232.

Ozcan, B. (2021). Cultural dimensions of teacher job satisfaction in a collectivist context. *Journal of Pedagogical Research, 5(2)*, 222-236.

Pinquart, M., Juang, L.P., & Silbereisen, R.K. (2003). Self-efficacy and successful school-to work transition: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63(3)*, 329-346. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(02\)00031-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00031-3)

Powdermaker, H. (1966). *Stranger and friend: The way of the anthropologist.* New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Rhodes, L.D., & Hammer, E. (2000). The relation between job satisfaction and personality similarity in supervisors and subordinates. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research, 5*, 56-59.

Rose, M. (2003). Good deal, bad deal? Job satisfaction in occupations. *Work Employment & Society, 17(3)*, 503-530.

Saif, M., Uddin, M., Haque, A., Rahma, M., & Mamum, M. (2016). Factors affecting job satisfaction of female employees of private commercial banks in Bangladesh: An empirical investigation. *Human Resource Management Research, 6(3)*, 65-72.

Salanova, M., Grau, R.M., & Martínez, I.M. (2005). Demandas laborales conductas de afrontamiento: el rol modulador de la autoeficacia profesional. *Psicothema, 17*, 390-395.

- Sempane, M., Rieger, H., & Roodt, G. (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organizational culture. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28, 23-30.
- Shaju, M., & Subhashini, D. (2016). A study on the impact of job satisfaction on job performance of employees working in automobile industry, Punjab, India. *Journal of Management Research*, 9(1), 117-130.
- Shaukat, S., Vishnumolakala, V.R., & Al Bustami, G. (2019). The impact of teachers' characteristics on their self-efficacy and job satisfaction: A perspective from teachers engaging students with disabilities. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 19(1), 68-76.
- Shen, J.P., Leslie, J.M., Spybrook, J.K., & Ma, X. (2012). Are principal background and school processes related to teacher job satisfaction? A multilevel study using Schools and Staffing Survey 2003-04. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(2), 200-230.
- 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. (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.
- Skaalvik, E.M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports*, 114(1), 68-77.
- Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Stajkovich, A., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240-26.
- Swamy, D.R., Nanjundes, T.S., & Rashmi, S. (2015). Quality of work Life: Scale development and validation. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 8(2), 281-300.
- Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review*, 73(1), 71-97.
- Torres, D.G. (2019). Distributed leadership, professional collaboration, and teachers' job satisfaction in U.S. schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 79, 111-123.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A.W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and teacher education*, 17(7), 783-805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk, H.A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teach. Educ.*, 23, 944-956.
- Türkoğlu, M.E., Cansoy, R., & Parlar, H. (2017). Examining the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(5), 765-772.
- Uddin, L.Q., Kaplan, J.T., Molnar-Szakacs, I., Zaidel, E., & Iacoboni, M. (2005). Self-face recognition activates a frontoparietal "mirror" network in the right hemisphere: An event-related MRI study. *Neuroimage*, 25, 926-935.
- Watt, H.M.G., Richardson, P.W., Klusmann, U., Kunter, M., Beyer, B., Trautwein, U., & Baumert, J. (2012). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: An international comparison using the FIT-Choice scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(6), 791-805.
- Wolters, C.A., & Daugherty, S.G. (2007). Goal structures and teachers' sense of efficacy: Their relation and association to teaching experience and academic level. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99, 181-193.
- You, S., Kim, A.Y., & Lim, S.A. (2017). Job satisfaction among secondary teachers in Korea: Effects of teachers' sense of efficacy and school culture. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(2), 284-297.
- Zembylas, M., & Papanastasiou, E. (2004). Job satisfaction among school teachers in Cyprus. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 357-374.
- Zhu, K., Kraemer, L.K. & Xu, S., (2006). The process of innovation assimilation by firms in different countries: A technology diffusion perspective on e-business. *Management Science*, 52(10), 1557-1576.