EFL Teachers’ Classroom Management Orientation, Self-Efficacy, Burnout, and Students’ L2 Achievement

Orientación de gestión del aula, autoeficacia y agotamiento de los profesores de inglés y rendimiento de sus alumnos en L2

Mohammad Hadi Mahmoodi
Shiva Hosseiniyar
Negin Samoudi
Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran

This correlational study examined the relationship among some English teachers’ characteristics and their students’ foreign language learning. Eighty-two Iranian high school teachers who taught English completed a battery of questionnaires. The scores of the teachers’ students on their final exam were collected as indicators of their English achievement. The results revealed that there was a positive relationship between the teachers’ self-efficacy, classroom management orientations, personal accomplishments (a subscale of burnout), and students’ L2 performance. However, the correlations between emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (two subcomponents of burnout) and students’ English learning were negative. Furthermore, the findings indicated that the teachers’ self-efficacy was the strongest predictor of learners’ English learning. These findings highlight the importance of such teachers’ characteristics for their learners’ L2 learning.
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Este estudio correlacional examina la relación entre algunas características de profesores de inglés y el rendimiento de sus alumnos en L2. Con este fin, 82 profesores iraníes de lengua inglesa de secundaria completaron una batería de cuestionarios. Las puntuaciones de los alumnos en su examen final se recopilaron como indicador de su rendimiento en L2. Hubo una relación positiva entre la autoeficacia, las orientaciones de gestión del aula y el logro personal (una subescala de agotamiento) de los profesores y el desempeño de los alumnos en L2, pero una relación negativa entre los subcomponentes del agotamiento y el rendimiento de los alumnos. Además, la autoeficacia de los profesores fue el vaticinador más fuerte del rendimiento de L2 de los estudiantes.
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Introduction

Learners’ achievement and performance is influenced by the critical role of teachers (Lasley et al., 2006). Teachers are the ones who set the standards and create the conditions for students. Teachers deliver a plethora of information to enhance learners’ achievements. However, as Akbari et al. (2008) point out, less attention has been directed to teachers than learners in English language teaching (ELT) research. Whereas, in order for any educational system to be successful, teachers should be given adequate attention (Scheopner, 2010).

One of the most central psychological mechanisms that affects action, in general, and teaching in particular, is one’s self-perceptions of one’s capabilities, which is termed “self-efficacy” (Bandura, 1997). In other words, a teacher’s level of self-efficacy is the extent to which he or she believes that he or she can enhance students’ outcome. In recent years, it has been proven that teachers’ self-efficacy could have a deep influence even on the daily lives of teachers and students (Klassen et al., 2009). In the same vein, previous studies have provided empirical evidence supporting the effective dimensions of the teachers’ sense of self-efficacy in educational contexts (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001).

Teachers’ sense of burnout is another factor which has proven to have a critical role on teachers’ action. Researchers such as Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010) believe that burnout is created through long-term occupational stress, particularly among those who have jobs providing services to other people. Although most of the teachers deal successfully with such senses of stress, the sense of burnout is often the endpoint and the last step of dealing unsuccessfully with stress (Jennett et al., 2003).

Another commonly voiced issue which may contribute to successful teaching and learning is classroom management ability (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Classroom management refers to the exercises that aim to compose and guide classes so as to accomplish particular objectives. Barton et al. (1998) also indicated that in order to make the atmosphere conducive to learning some degree of classroom discipline is needed. Otherwise, the process of learning and teaching and the effectiveness of even the most carefully planned lessons will be ruined by students’ misbehavior.

Although the literature attests to the contribution of teachers’ self-efficacy, burnout, and classroom management strategies to English as a foreign language (EFL) learners’ L2 achievement, scant attention has been paid to the relationship between them in the Iranian context. Therefore, this study aimed at capturing a more contextualized picture of such L2 teachers’ characteristics and learners’ achievements and sought to determine a probable correlation between the aforementioned variables.

Literature Review

Teachers’ Self-Efficacy

Over the last decades, self-efficacy has remained a deep-seated and important construct of social cognitive theory (Barros et al., 2010). As stated by Schunk and Pajares (2005), self-efficacy is the staple of all human behaviors influenced by individuals’ vicarious experiences, mastery of experiences, and social persuasion. According to Bandura’s (1994) social cognitive theory, self-efficacy can predict human motivation precisely. Based on this theory, an individual’s working is correlated with his or her cognitive, behavioral, personal, and environmental factors. In research, in relation to teachers, the role of self-efficacy in instruction has been investigated with respect to the extent to which teachers are sure that they have the ability to develop learning and engagement of their students (Tschannen-Moran & McMaister, 2009).

In addition, Bandura (1994) indicated that a teacher’s self-efficacy is related to instructional strategies, classroom organization, levels of task persistence, degree of risk-taking, innovation, techniques of questioning, teacher feedback to students, and also management of learners’ on-task time. Usher and Pajares (2006) also believe that teachers’ self-efficacy may be effective on students’ sense of self-efficacy, their efforts in facing
difficulties, and, as a result, fostering their involvement in classroom activities (Ross, 1998).

Akbari et al. (2008) studied the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and students’ achievement. In the study, 30 Iranian EFL teachers teaching in high schools participated in the research and answered the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001). As the dependent variable, students’ final-exam scores were collected. The results revealed a significant relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their students’ L2 achievement.

Another study done by Mojavezi and Poodineh-Tamiz (2012) investigated the impact of teachers’ self-efficacy on students’ motivation and achievement. To do so, 80 senior high school teachers and 150 senior high school students were asked to answer two different questionnaires of Teacher’s Self-Efficacy and Students’ Motivation. The findings of the study indicated that teachers’ self-efficacy has a positive association with students’ motivation and achievement.

Hassan (2019) also carried out a quantitative ex post facto study to probe the effect of teachers’ self-efficacy on learners’ achievement scores. In this study, multilingual instructions were used for students’ success on a randomly selected sample of 300 secondary school teachers and 800 students. The obtained data from teachers were collected by conducting the complete form of the Teachers’ Self-Efficacy Scale, and learners’ achievement scores were obtained from the Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education in Lahore, Pakistan. Findings depicted that overall, teachers’ self-efficacy accounted for 65% of students’ achievement scores.

Classroom Management Strategy

Classroom management is the heart of teaching and learning in any educational setting (Saghir et al., 2017). Teachers have reported that classroom management is the most formidable responsibility to cope with and master for new and, sometimes, even for experienced teachers (Wolfgang, 2005). In fact, classroom management is a broad umbrella term that describes a teacher’s attempts to oversee classroom activities such as students’ behavior, learning, and social interaction (Martin et al., 1998). Evertson and Weinstein (2006, as cited in Mahmoodi et al., 2015) define class management as the actions that teachers take to create an environment that supports and facilitates emotional, social, and academic learning. In all fields, teachers have always reported classroom management as one of their common and enduring challenges in the classroom (Manning & Bucher, 2003).

According to Wolfgang (2005), classroom management models are classified into three levels. First, the interventionist model according to which students’ appropriate behaviors will improve as they receive feedback in the form of rewards or punishment from their teachers. Second, the non-interventionist model which contends that there is an inner drive within students that needs to find its expression in the classroom. In fact, non-interventionists believe that students should be allowed to exert significant influence in the classroom. Third, the interactionalist model, according to which students’ interaction with the outside world of proper people and objects enhances their appropriate behaviors. In addition, Evertson and Weinstein (2006, as cited in Mahmoodi et al., 2015) have proposed a frequently used framework in studies of classroom management which has introduced six distinct approaches of classroom management strategies: internal control of behavior, external control, classroom ecology, curriculum, discourse, and interpersonal relationships.

Rahimi and Hosseini-Karkami (2015) investigated the role of EFL teachers’ management strategies on their teaching effectiveness and their learners’ motivation and L2 achievement. Data were collected from a total of 1,408 junior high-school students who were asked to express their perceptions of the strategies their teachers had employed; also, the students evaluated the teaching effectiveness of their teachers by responding to some questionnaires. Then, based on the students’ scores on their final exam, their L2 achievement in English was
determined. The results showed that motivation, teaching effectiveness, and L2 achievement were all associated with discipline strategies.

In another study, Mahmoodi et al. (2015) investigated the relationship between EFL teachers’ classroom management orientations and students’ L2 achievement. To this end, 105 high school EFL teachers were asked to fill out the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory (Martin et al., 1998). Then, their third-year high school students’ (n = 2,673) scores on the English final exam were collected. The results revealed that there was a significant correlation between the teachers’ classroom management strategies and students’ L2 achievement. Their findings also indicated no significant differences between the two genders regarding teacher’s classroom management orientations.

In another study, Talebi et al. (2015) examined the impact of classroom management strategies and academic achievement among English language students. To do so, 410 students in Payamenoor University were selected, and as evaluating tools, the students’ final exam scores and the classroom management questionnaire of Javaher et al. (2014) were used. It was concluded that there was a significant relationship between classroom management and academic achievement of the EFL learners.

In the research done by Saghir et al. (2017) on the relationship of classroom management strategies and students’ academic performance at the college level, a sample of 370 teachers were selected from public colleges of Lahore. The findings of the study showed that there was a positive correlation between teachers’ classroom management orientations and the performance of the students. Estaji and Vafaemehr (2018) also had a study on the effects of EFL teachers’ reflection on their sense of classroom administration; the findings of which attested that more reflective teachers applied various types of management strategies to cope with their students’ social, emotional, and behavioral problems in comparison with their low reflective counterparts. However, in the study conducted by Zamanian and Soleimani-Pouya (2017), which examined the relationship among novice and experienced teachers’ classroom management strategies and different styles of teaching, an overall relationship among the teaching styles of each group of the teachers and their classroom management strategies were not evidenced.

**Teachers' Burnout**

The American psychiatrist of German birth, Freudenberger (1974), first coined the term “burnout” to describe the depletion of emotions, losing motivation, as well as reduction in commitment that was experienced by human service workers after prolonged stressful conditions. Several researchers as Freudenberger (1974), Maslach (1976), and Maslach and Jackson (1981) construed burnout as a psychological syndrome that involves three subscales: (a) emotional exhaustion which refers to the sense of being emotionally drained by some serious contact with other people; (b) depersonalization, referring to the negative attitudes towards people; and (c) reduction in personal accomplishment, which refers to a reduction in the people’s sense of competence and successful achievement in working with others (Maslach et al., 2001). As elaborated by some researchers (e.g., Maslach, 2003; Maslach et al., 2001), the importance of the burnout issue is due to the impact it can have on the individual’s physical and mental health, behavior, and attitudes because it is an index of individuals’ weak performance in the workplace.

According to various research studies (e.g., Abel & Sewell, 1999; van Dick & Wagner, 2001), teacher burnout can be triggered by different sorts of characteristics such as working conditions, lack of social support, professional recognition or prestige expenditure, number of students, lack of resources, level of specialization, poverty, student disruptive behavior, and relationship with colleagues. Besides, Pyhältö et al. (2020) claim that previous studies on teacher burnout have declared workload and years of teaching experience as main antecedents of teachers’ burnout.
In the study done by Rostami et al. (2015), the external factors that affect second language learning motivation were investigated. In their study, 120 EFL teachers along with 1,270 of their students participated and Dornyei’s L2 Motivation Self-System Scale for students and the educator version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI-ES) were used for data collection purposes. The results showed that teachers’ burnout significantly influenced learners’ motivation and attitudes towards learning English in a negative way.

Moreover, there is another study conducted by Sham-safrouz and Haghverdi (2015) on the effect of burnout and, more specifically, its three subcomponents on the teaching performance of EFL teachers teaching in private language institutes in Iran. The participants of this study consisted of 30 English teachers and their L2 learners (n = 150). The data were collected via the Maslach Burnout Inventory and the Characteristics of Successful Iranian EFL Teachers Questionnaire developed by Moafian and Pishghadam (2009). The results showed that burnout did not influence the teachers’ performance significantly and there were no significant differences between male and female teachers regarding their level of burnout.

In a mixed-methods study conducted by Roohani and Dayeri (2019) on the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ burnout and motivation, however, it was found that a majority of the 115 participants, in general, did not report a high level of burnout. Also, the qualitative analysis indicated that both organizational and personal factors had contributed to the observed minor burnout experience among the EFL teachers. The main factors included conflict, lack of support in administration, lack of job security, demotivation, lack of autonomy, and students’ impropriety in the classroom.

There is another research done by Shirazizadeh et al. (2019) who examined the relationship as regards perfectionism, reflection, and burnout among 156 Iranian EFL teachers. The findings showed that teachers’ reflection had a significant negative correlation with burnout, but there was no significant relationship between the aspects of teachers’ perfectionism and burnout; their further analysis of two path models which considered their primary findings, revealed that components of perfectionism affected reflection positively, which, in turn, affected teachers’ burnout negatively.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

In the light of current understanding of the crucial role of the abovementioned teachers’ characteristics in the academic success of students, this research was done. Accordingly, the following research questions are addressed:

1. Is there any statistically significant relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ use of classroom management strategies and their students’ L2 achievement?

2. Is there any statistically significant relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ self-efficacy and their students’ L2 achievement?

3. Is there any statistically significant relationship between different components of teachers’ burnout (emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, depersonalization) and their students’ L2 achievement?

4. Among Iranian EFL teachers’ classroom management strategies, self-efficacy, and burnout components, which one is the stronger predictor of their students’ L2 achievement?

**Method**

**Participants**

The participants included 82 Iranian EFL teachers (39 men and 43 women) from Hamadan and their students (1,932). Teachers’ age ranged from 20 to 45. All of the teachers had a BA or an MA degree either in English translation or in the teaching of English as a foreign language. They were all third-year high school teachers of public and private schools and were...
recruited from the government’s in-service teacher training programs. Moreover, students’ scores on the English final exam were used as indicators of their L2 achievement. The sampling strategy for selection was convenience sampling because of the accessibility of the participants to the researchers. The gender was not considered as a moderator variable in this study.

Materials and Instruments

The following instruments were used in this study:

**Maslach Burnout Inventory: Educator’s Survey (MBI-ES)**

This instrument was developed by Maslach et al. (1996) as a Likert scale questionnaire with 22 self-reported items. This instrument includes three components, of emotional exhaustion (EE), depersonalization (DP), and personal accomplishment (PA) and is used to measure teachers’ burnout. Higher scores on the EE and DP subcomponents and low scores on the PA subscale indicate burnout in the participants. Iwanicki and Schwab (1981) estimated Cronbach’s alpha for each subscale of the questionnaire. The reported reliabilities are: $\alpha = .76$, for EE; $\alpha = .76$, for DP; and $\alpha = .76$, for PA. Also, this questionnaire has been used and validated in different studies in the context of Iran (e.g., Mahmoodi & Ghaslani, 2014; Pishghadam & Sahebjam, 2012). In this study, its reliability was calculated through Cronbach’s Alpha consistency estimation ($\alpha = .74$).

**Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory (ABCC Inventory)**

The Likert scale ABCC Inventory was developed and validated by Martin et al. (1998) to measure teachers’ classroom management strategies. It has 26 items divided into three broad dimensions addressing components of classroom management. That is, 14 items for instructional management, eight items for people management, and four items of behavior management. Also, the questionnaire’s validity was estimated by Mahmoodi et al. (2015). In the present study, its reliability ($\alpha = .714$) was established via Cronbach’s Alpha consistency estimation.

**Teacher’s Self-Efficacy Scale**

This scale was developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) and contains 24 nine-point Likert type items. The validity and reliability of the questionnaire have been examined in the study by Soodmand-Afshar et al. (2015), who found the Cronbach’s internal consistency of the questionnaire to be: $\alpha = .94$. To estimate its reliability in this study, the Cronbach’s Alpha consistency estimation was deployed ($\alpha = .823$).

**English Test**

The final English exam in the third year of high schools in Iran is a nationwide achievement test. It is prepared by the professional test developers in the Assessment and Control Center of the Ministry of Education in Iran. The test measures overall English achievement of the students and has both multiple-choice and essay-type items. The same version of the test is administered to all high school third year students and is scored anonymously by two teachers (in case of significant difference between the scores assigned by the two raters, a senior rater scores the exam once more). The content validity of the exam is ensured via review by some experienced third year teachers and its reliability is estimated via inter-rater method.

**Procedure**

First, the purpose of the study was explained to the participating teachers. Then, the questionnaires were administered to them in three consecutive sessions. Finally, the scores obtained by the students ($N = 1,932$) of the participating teachers in their English course were collected from the registrars’ offices of the high schools as the measure of their L2 achievement. It is helpful to note that the third-year high school teachers were chosen as the participants for this study because the English exam for the Iranian students at this level is a nation-wide test. Therefore, the items and the scoring procedure are the same for all the students across the country.
Data Analysis
To answer research questions 1, 2, and 3, the Pearson correlation coefficient was used. In order not to violate “the paired observations assumption” for computing correlation, the mean score of the students’ L2 achievement in each class was computed and matched with the teachers’ scores on the questionnaires (82 mean scores for 82 teachers). To answer the fourth research question, multiple regression was used.

Design of the study
This is an exploratory pure research project which deploys the non-experimental quantitative design of correlational studies. Teachers’ classroom management orientation, self-efficacy, and burnout (its subcomponents) are the predictor variables and students’ English achievement is arbitrarily the criterion variable.

Results
First, the descriptive statistics of participants’ scores on the abovementioned variables were calculated (see Table 1). It is vital to mention that the scores for the subscales of burnout (i.e., emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, and depersonalization) must be considered separately and a single score cannot be calculated for burnout (Maslach et al., 1996).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the Variables (N = 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>27.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal accomplishment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>80.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>17.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>76.52</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>142.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher self-efficacy</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>184.27</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>381.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ L2 achievement</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Correlation Coefficients Between Teacher Characteristics and Students L2 Achievement (N = 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students L2 Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>Pearson correlation -.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal accomplishment</td>
<td>Pearson correlation .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Pearson correlation -.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>Pearson correlation .23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher self-efficacy</td>
<td>Pearson correlation .37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
In order to answer the first three research questions, Pearson Product Moment correlations were used, the results of which are summarized in Table 2.

As Table 2 indicates, the correlation between teachers’ classroom management and students’ L2 achievement \( (r = .23) \) is significant at the .05 level \( (p = .03 < .05, N = 82) \). Thus, there is a strong, positive, and significant correlation between these two variables. Moreover, there is a strong, positive, and statistically significant correlation between teachers’ self-efficacy and students’ L2 achievement \( (r = .37, p = .00 < .05, N = 82) \). Therefore, these two variables are also significantly correlated with each other.

Regarding burnout components, as can be seen in Table 2, the correlation between teachers’ emotional exhaustion and students’ L2 achievement \( (r = -.19) \) is weak and negative \( (p = .07 > .05, N = 82) \), suggesting that in our sample, teachers’ emotional exhaustion and their students’ L2 achievement are negatively correlated with each other. However, the correlation between teachers’ personal accomplishment and students’ L2 achievement is weak and positive \( (r = .07, p = .50 > .05) \). The correlation between teachers’ depersonalization, as another component of burnout, and students’ L2 achievement \( (r = -.06) \), is also weak and negative \( (p = .53 > .05, N = 82) \). Therefore, the correlations between the components of teachers’ burnout and students’ L2 achievement were not statistically significant.

To determine which one of the teachers’ variables is the best predictor of students’ L2 achievement (Question 4), a sequential (hierarchical) multiple regression analysis was run. The results are shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5.

The multiple correlation coefficient, the adjusted and unadjusted \( r \) square of teachers’ self-efficacy, classroom management strategy, and components of burnout, which were entered as predictors of the students’ L2 achievement via five models, are presented in Table 3.

As can be seen in Table 3, \( r \) square for teacher self-efficacy (Model 1) is .144, which means that this variable can account for 14.4 percent of the variation of the dependent variable (the students’ L2 scores). We can see the effect of adding the other predictors in the other models. \( r \) square for Model 5, which examines the predictive power of all independent variables, is .18. Therefore, it attests that 18.9 percent of the variance of participants’ L2 achievement can be predicted from the combination of teachers’ classroom management strategy, self-efficacy, and burnout components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Adjusted ( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. error of the estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent variable: Students’ L2 achievement.

\(^a\) Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy. \(^b\) Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy, classroom management. \(^c\) Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy, classroom management, emotional exhaustion. \(^d\) Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy, classroom management, emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment. \(^e\) Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy, classroom management, emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, depersonalization.

In order to examine whether the combination of the predictors, that is, teachers’ characteristics (i.e., classroom management strategy, self-efficacy, and burnout components) significantly predicted their students’ L2 achievement, an ANOVA was run, the results of which are presented in Table 4.

Examining the \( F \) value and significance level for the models in Table 4 shows that self-efficacy can significantly predict the students’ L2 scores, \( F (1, 80) = 13.43, p = .00 < .05 \). The combination of teachers’ variables can also predict students’ L2 achievement, \( F (1, 80) = 3.53, p = .00 < .05 \).
Table 4. ANOVA for Sequential Regression for the Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>87.64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>85.97</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>85.18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>83.60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>83.03</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent variable: Students’ L2 achievement.

* Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy.
* Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy, classroom management.
* Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy, classroom management, emotional exhaustion.
* Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy, classroom management, emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment.
* Predictors: (constant), teacher self-efficacy, classroom management, emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, depersonalization.

Table 5. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher self-efficacy</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher self-efficacy</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher self-efficacy</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The amount of contribution of each of the independent variables (classroom management strategy, self-efficacy, and burnout components) to the dependent variable (L2 achievement) is presented in Table 5.

Based on the results presented in Table 5, the standardized coefficients Beta (.37) and the t value (3.67) indicates that teachers’ self-efficacy (sig. = .00) is the strongest predictor of students’ L2 achievement. But the other independent variables, that is, classroom management and components of burnout, by themselves, do not significantly contribute to the prediction of the dependent variable (students’ L2 achievement).

**Discussion**

This study contributes to the rather scarce literature on the association between EFL teachers’ classroom management orientations, self-efficacy, and burnout components and learners’ L2 learning in the context of Iran. Moreover, the extent of the probable contribution of each of the teacher’s characteristics to their students’ L2 achievement has been examined. Overall, the findings of the statistical analyses indicated that the teacher classroom management strategies and self-efficacy were significantly related to the dependent variable (students’ L2 achievement). Nevertheless, all the components of burnout did not have a significant relationship with learners’ L2 development.

As the teachers’ classroom management orientation is concerned, the findings of this study corroborate with the results of a number of studies which also reported a positive significant relationship between classroom management and students’ achievement (e.g., Rahimi & Hosseini-Karkami, 2015; Saghir et al., 2017; Talebi et al., 2015). We found that there was a strong relationship between teachers’ management orientations and students’ L2 enhancement. It confirms the idea that classroom management builds a situation that facilitates and supports both academic and social emotional learning.
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(Evertson & Weinstein, 2006, as cited in Mahmoodi et al., 2015). However, this finding is in contrast with those of Mahmoodi et al. (2015), who found a significant negative correlation between third-year EFL teachers’ classroom management orientations and their students’ L2 achievement. This result also consolidates the idea that classroom management is a setup through which teachers build up and keep up conditions to empower learners in accomplishing educational destinations productively (Barnabas et al., 2010).

Results regarding the second research question showed that teachers’ self-efficacy had a significant and positive relationship with learners’ L2 achievement. Such a link has been demonstrated through many studies (e.g., Akbari et al., 2008; Good & Brophy, 2003; Hassan, 2019; Mojavezi & Poodineh-Tamiz, 2012). This finding is in line with social cognitive theory that suggests there is a circular relationship between efficacy beliefs and teaching practices (Bandura, 1997). This relationship can be explained by the persistence found in teachers who have high self-efficacy (Good & Brophy, 2003).

As for the results pertinent to the burnout components in this research, depersonalization and emotional exhaustion had a negative correlation with students’ final scores while a positive correlation was observed between the other subcomponent of burnout, that is, personal accomplishment, and the dependent variable. However, all of these correlation coefficients were weak and statistically insignificant. These findings are contrary to most of the research findings to date that suggest a significant correlation exists between burnout and second language achievement (e.g., Rostami et al., 2015; Zhang & Sapp, 2008). One reason for this non-significant relationship might be attributed to the influence that burnout can have on teachers’ grading practices. As a result of burnout, teachers might become more lenient, careless, and arbitrary to avoid further problems and complaints arising from low grades. It can also be assumed as a form of compensation for their inadequate teaching (Arens & Morin, 2016). Another reason might be that in Iranian high schools, third-year students are mostly motivated enough to study English because most of them aim to do well on their coming university entrance examination. Therefore, in comparison with other educational settings, their teachers’ sense of burnout might not have seriously demotivated them so as to reduce their learning efforts. Besides, as Pyhältö et al. (2020) believe, the most important antecedent of teacher burnout is years of experience. Therefore, the other possible reason for this finding may be that the participating teachers in the present study who were in a low range of age (maximum 45), had not yet experienced high levels of burnout to influence students’ learning. Likewise, in the research done by Roohani and Dayeri (2019), low levels of burnout were reported for EFL teachers, for the majority of the participants, and a significant effect on students’ motivation was not observed.

Another possible explanation for the insignificant relationship between teacher burnout and L2 achievement in this study is that based on the results of the research by Arens and Morin (2016), the reductive effect of burnout on L2 learning was shown to be more pronounced when students’ achievement was assessed via standardized achievement tests than when it was measured through school grades. That is, as reported by Madigan and Kim (2021), in a systematic review of the related literature, teachers who suffer from high levels of burnout may not be able to create an appropriate teaching/learning context to help students be successful in standardized achievement tests. Nonetheless, the school grades are assigned based on subjective scoring and mainly depend on teachers’ individual preferences for evaluation and grading (McMillan et al., 2002). As it turns out, school grades are generally less influenced by teachers’ burnout. In addition, teachers’ sense of burnout may cause them to apply stricter assessment practices in order to compensate for their suboptimal teaching and to force learners to rely on more self-initiated learning which does not cause extensive decrease in language
learning. However, the obtained result for the effect of burnout components in the current study supports that of Shamsafrouz and Haghverdi (2015) who similarly did not find a significant relationship between teachers’ burnout and their teaching practices.

Though insignificant, the negative effect of teachers’ burnout on effective teaching found in this research resonates with previous research (e.g., Ghonsooly & Raeesi, 2012; Pishghadam & Sahebjam, 2012). As found by the studies done by Rostami et al. (2015) and Zhang and Saap (2008), one reason for such negative effect of teachers’ burnout on their students’ L2 achievement may be the reductive impact of it on students’ motivation for L2 learning. That is to say, the low immediacy and lack of enthusiasm in teachers who experience burnout can have a negative effect on students’ attitudes towards learning.

Moreover, in the current study, it was found that teachers’ self-efficacy, in contrast to the other independent variables, was the strongest predictor of learners’ L2 achievement. Based on Ashton and Webb (1986), the reason for this finding can be that teachers with higher self-efficacy tend to show more enthusiasm for their students’ growth, are receptive of student initiative, and are responsive to student needs. In the same vein, Gürbüztürk and Şad (2009) assert that self-efficient teachers persist for a longer time than their peers when confronted with challenges, show more enthusiasm for their job, are more resilient when they are faced with setbacks, and generally are perceived by others as more effective teachers. This finding can be supported with reference to the results of some studies (e.g., Good & Brophy, 2003; Midgley et al., 1989) which have reported the greater influence of a teacher’s sense of self-efficacy on students’ success in contrast to some other teacher characteristics. For example, Listiani et al. (2019) investigated the influence of both teachers’ self-efficacy and classroom management on students’ final exam results and found that not only self-efficacy had effects on students’ better gains, but it also fortified teacher’s management strategies. It was observed that the teachers with a higher level of self-efficacy in teaching led to more classroom management for both authoritarian and authoritative teachers. That is why the teachers who have high self-efficacy are reflective and flexible in the classroom, and always try to find a fun method in teaching. Therefore, those teachers are less likely to experience student misbehavior, demotivation, or failure, which are considered important causes for teachers’ burnout.

Conclusion and Implications

Taken together, the results of the current study put forward the prospect of developing a deeper understanding of EFL teachers’ classroom management orientation, self-efficacy, burnout, and their impact on students’ achievement. Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that the sense of self-efficacy of teachers, as one of the critical teacher variables, should be strengthened so that teachers’ beliefs and perceptions of their competencies will increase in order to yield favorable results. That is to say, educational practitioners who worry about students’ confidence, educational declining level, deficiencies and learning approaches, need to enhance their self-efficacy to overcome the troublesome issues. Theoretically speaking, in order to improve the standards and competencies that EFL teachers are expected to perform, considerations regarding the construct of teachers’ self-efficacy should be further revised.

Moreover, the findings of this study regarding teachers’ management orientation have implications for EFL teacher trainers and syllabus designers for teacher training courses to incorporate necessary programs for EFL teachers to effectively improve classroom management methodologies. On the other hand, teachers should be encouraged to act as directors or facilitators to provide an atmosphere in which students have the opportunities to speak, act, and learn effectively.
In the same token, based on our results concerning teachers’ burnout components, educators and supervisors should know that the burnout felt by teachers can cause depression, frustration, and demotivation for their teaching practice. Accordingly, it is proposed that educational administrators consider the probable causes of teacher burnout and help teachers become equipped with the necessary coping strategies, such as problem-solving techniques, and provide better professional as well as financial support for teachers. Teachers also need to develop realistic expectations about their job requirements and the teaching-learning process. In sum, it seems reasonable to suggest that teacher education programs, and particularly Iranian policy makers, make preservice and in-service teachers aware of the effective teachers’ characteristics and provide them with psychological and social support if the aim is to educate efficient teachers, who, in turn, aim to enhance students’ growth.

As with other studies, this research also has some limitations; here the focus was on third-year high school teachers with mostly a bachelor’s degree in English translation or teaching. Therefore, the findings may not be generalizable to teachers in other areas of education or with higher degrees. Besides, this research was conducted using the ELT context of one city in Iran. Hence, care should be taken in generalizing results for other settings.

The current study provides possible directions for further research. Since each of the teacher characteristics investigated in this study is a multifaceted construct that might have varied effects and presentations across different tasks and settings, it would be beneficial to investigate them through further studies that provide a deeper realization of how these teachers’ characteristics influence learners’ L2 achievement. As another proposal, further mixed-methods research employing a combination of several data collection instruments like observations of teaching performance, questionnaires, and multiple interviews as additive sources of data for exploring teachers’ characteristics is suggested. Last but not least, further studies can probe both personal and environmental factors collectively in explaining EFL teachers’ traits.
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