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Abstract

The review of the literature indicates EFL teachers’ sense of efficacy has been influenced by cognitive and affective factors. Socio-economic factors may also influence EFL teachers’ sense of efficacy directly and their teaching effectiveness indirectly. One of the socioeconomic variables is the quality of work life (QWL). This study was an attempt to investigate the relationship between EFL teachers’ quality of work life and their teaching efficacy. Ninety High school English teachers from Sistan and Baluchestan were selected. The data of the study were collected through two adapted instruments and analyzed through Pearson correlation and linear regression analysis. The results of the study showed that Iranian EFL teachers perceived themselves as having a good level of teaching efficacy. The results also showed that there was a significant correlation between all dimensions of QWL and teachers’ teaching efficacy except for “adequate and fair compensation” is significant at a P value of 0.05, but only one dimension of QWL could predict teachers’ teaching efficacy. Therefore, it could be strongly argued that teachers’ QWL is not the only influential factor in teaching efficacy.
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1. Introduction

A teacher plays a significant role in students’ achievement. According to Adams & Pierce (1999), having many years of experience does not guarantee expert teaching; experience is useful only when teachers continually engage in self-reflection and modify classroom techniques to serve the needs of the students better. Teachers’ good teaching skills, their personal traits, cognitive factors, and socioeconomic variables significantly affect their teaching effectiveness (Thompson, 2008). To teach effectively, teachers need to encourage questions and discussions in the class which brings about the autonomy of the learners and less dependency on the teachers. Therefore, teachers are supposed to be patient and well-prepared for the class.

EFL teachers’ sense of efficacy, or as Bandura (1997) calls it teaching efficacy, i.e. teachers’ beliefs about their ability to influence students’ outcomes, is necessary to improve teacher performance and promote educational reform (Bandura, 2001; Wheatley, 2001). Another factor that was repeatedly mentioned in various studies to be of great influence on teachers’ effectiveness is teachers’ sense of efficacy.

The review of related studies shows that teachers’ efficacy is greatly influenced by some factors such as cognitive, affective, and socioeconomic. One of the socioeconomic variables which might have an impact on teachers’ efficacy directly and effective teaching indirectly is Quality of work life (QWL). Moreover, the work environment which satisfies the personal needs via promotion, recognition, compensation, and development would result in an excellent QWL. Nadler and Lawler (1983) define QWL in terms of job features and work conditions to develop employees’ productivity and well-being.

The relationship between teachers’ sense of efficacy on some variables such as teachers’ teaching effectiveness and teacher burnout has been investigated. It
has also been argued that employees’ job performance can be affected by their own individual affective and socioeconomic factors particularly the quality of work life. Despite a great volume of studies on teachers’ sense of efficacy and the impact of the quality of work life on employees’ performance and EFL teachers’ motivation, it is not yet known whether there is a relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ quality of work life and their teaching efficacy. The present study addresses the following research questions
1. What kind of relationship is between EFL teachers’ quality of work and their teaching efficacy?
2. Which dimension of teachers’ quality of work life can more successfully predict their teaching efficacy?

2. Review of the Related Literature
2.1. Quality of Work Life
Dolan, Garcia, Cabezas, and Tzafrir (2008) argue that the concern for QWL has occupied the minds of social scientists for the past several decades. QWL is a main issue for employees. How organizations attempt to deal with this issue is of much academic and practical significance. Therefore, as Dolan, Saba, Jackson, and Schuler (2007) believe it is not surprising that a large number of studies on the concept of job satisfaction and stress as core concepts have been conducted. QWL and its relationship with employees’ performance and health have become a clear goal for quite many of the human resource policies in developed organizations.

2.2. The Meaning and Nature of QWL
QWL is defined as the degree to which work managers can satisfy important basic personal needs, which in turn are satisfied when rewards from the
organization meet their expectations, through their experience (Suttle, 1977; Walton, 1974). However, Singh (2000) argues that, QWL is not based on any specific theory and that pillars of QWL are self-management, reduced supervision, and increased self-regulation. Walton (1974) explains QWL in terms of eight conditions of employment, which make QWL desirable. Those conditions/criteria include:

a. **Adequate and fair compensation**  
This condition refers to whether the pay received completely meets the standards of sufficiency or the recipient’s subjective standard. It also refers to whether the pay received for certain work bear a suitable relationship to pay received for other work (Walton, 1974).

b. **Safe and healthy environment**  
This condition means that employees should not be exposed to working conditions which adversely affect their mental and physical health.

c. **Growth and Security**  
This dimension deals with the employees’ chances for training, professional development, and chance for studying and resignation from the work whenever they like and job security.

d. **Development of human capabilities**  
This dimension refers to the learning opportunities, skills development, performance evaluation, and the importance of the employees’ job.

e. **The total life space**  
A main component of QWL, which is very important for both the employees and the employers, is the relationship between work and home life. In a competitive environment, it is very difficult to separate work life and home. Today, employees today are more likely to express a strong desire to have a harmonious balance among career, family life, and leisure activities.
f. **Constitutionalism**
   This component of QWL deals with what rights the employees have and how they protect these rights. It also refers to the employees’ speech freedom, admirations and respect.

g. **Social integration**
   These dimensions of QWL, as Walton (1974) believes, deal with freedom from prejudice, interpersonal openness, a sense of community, the absence of stratification in the organization, the absence of stratification in the organization, the existence of upward mobility, openness, and the existence of upward mobility.

h. **Social relevance**
   Social relevance deals with the image of the employees’ organization, the policy of human resources, employees’ pride in their career, and the employees’ relevance to society.

### 2.3. Employees’ Quality of Work and Their Job Performance

Many studies have been conducted on the quality of working life and performance. Donald et al. (2005) investigated QWL indicators in six Canadian public health care organizations (HCO) by reviewing documentation relevant to QWL and conducting a focus group or team interviews. They found that employees’ wellbeing and working conditions are important indicators of QWL.

Kheirandish (2009) argues that there is a positive and significant relation between all components of working life quality and employees’ performance. Monfaredniya (2008) also argues that there is a negative relation between the quality of working life and vocational weariness. He also believes that when the working life quality improves, the vocational weariness decreases.
The result of a study done by Lau (2000) revealed that QWL is regarded as a significant factor in determining the companies’ performance level. Besides, the relation between QWL and work pressure and vocational satisfaction of formal authorities in governmental organizations was examined by Hua (2006). He insisted that working life quality has a positive impact on the decrease of vocational pressure and vocational satisfaction.

2.4. EFL Teachers’ Quality of Work Life and Job Motivation

In general, the concept of career motivation applies motivation theory to understanding career plans, behaviors, and decisions. Many researchers (e.g., London, 1983; Pinder, 1998) have theorized about the content of career motivation and the association among career motivation, situational characteristics, and behaviors. Pinder (1998) defines work motivation as ‘a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual’s being, to initiate work-related behavior and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration’ (p.11).

As Flippo (1980) claims, QWL programs will lead to the employees’ development and growth, which not only reduces employees’ complaints and their absences but heightens their optimism and makes them more cooperative.

As Luthans (1998) states, contrary to the previous decades in which the people’s personal life was the focus of attention, nowadays, the concept of QWL is the fashion that encompasses job security, rewarding systems, promotional opportunities, and involvement in decision-making processes. Also, according to Akdere (2006), the researchers are trying to create a balance between work and personal life. Moreover, conditions of work, as Johnstones (2004) mentions, can have positive or negative effects on a foreign/second language teacher education. The working conditions of many second and foreign language teachers are unsatisfactory (Crookes, 1997a, 1997b). In addition, according to Crookes
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(1997b), the working conditions of second and foreign language teachers require more research. Day, Elliot, and Kington (2005) assert that the relationships among teachers’ motivation, efficacy, job satisfaction and commitment and between their commitment and the quality of their work have not been the subject of extensive research.

Accordingly, Baleghizadeh and Gordani (2012) investigated the relationship between quality of work life and teacher motivation among 160 secondary school English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers in Tehran, Iran. The results of their study revealed that the participants enjoyed a medium level of quality of work life and experienced a medium-to-low level of motivation. In addition, they argued that there was a significant relationship between motivation and quality of work life categories. They also identified the subscales of the quality of work life that best predicted teacher motivation. They claimed that the findings of their study have implications for teacher educators and educational decision-makers in bringing about higher levels of motivation and quality of work life among English language teachers.

In the same vein, Asgari, Nojbaee, and Rahnama (2012) determined the relationship between the quality of work life (fair and sufficient payment, secure and sanitary working environment, supplying growth opportunity and continuous security, law observance in organizations, social attachment of working life, general atmosphere of work life, social union and integrity in the work and the development of human capabilities) with the performance of guidance school teachers in Tonekabon. The results of their study showed that the relationship between teachers’ quality of work life and teachers’ performance is significant.

i. Teachers’ Efficacy

Bandura (1993) developed a social cognitive theory to explain that efficacy beliefs strongly influence the control which human beings exercise over their
lives through agentive actions. Teacher efficacy is defined as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of actions to influence the students’ achievements under specific situations” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). According to Goodard & Goodard (2001) and Ross (1992) teachers’ perception of efficacy plays a significant role in students’ achievements.

The review of the previous studies (Coladric, 1992; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Riggs & Enchos, 1990) on teachers’ self-efficacy indicates that the teachers perceived efficacy has two different dimensions: Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) – a teacher’s belief that he or she can influence student learning, and Teaching Efficacy- a teacher’s belief about the changes that the teaching profession can result in for students.

Bandura (1977, 1993) argues that four sources of information: inactive mastery experiences, vicarious learning experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological arousal shape the individuals’ self-efficacy. In line with Bandura’s conceptualization of self-efficacy, it has been suggested that teacher efficacy is multidimensional and subject-matter specific; therefore, it varies across various tasks (Emmer & Hickman, 1991). In order to investigate the effects of teachers’ teaching efficacy on their teaching methods, many studies have been done. According to Gibson and Dembo (1984), there are high and low efficacious teachers. Those with higher efficacy use their time in a better way and are more effective in guiding their students; however, teachers with lower efficacy are less effective in guiding their students.

Mashhady, Falah, and Lotfi Gaskaree (2012) argued that that self-efficacy is negatively correlated with burnout, and it could be a potent predictor of burnout among EFL teachers. They also found that age and teaching experience significantly correlate with self-efficacy and burnout. Further, their findings indicated significant differences in teachers’ self-efficacy and burnout with respect to marital status.
Furthermore, Coladric (1992) points out personal and general teaching efficacies as the predictors of teaching commitment. Also, Guskey (1988) believes that greater personal efficacy will lead to positive attitudes towards teaching, and teachers with a higher level of confidence in their abilities are open to the application of new practices. Moreover, Emadzadeh, Khorasani, and Nematizadeh (2012) studied the quality of work life of primary school teachers in Isfahan city and found that their quality of work life is less than average. However, their motivation was high despite dissatisfaction with salaries paid to them.

Shahrashoob (2006) examined the relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment of the teachers in Gonbad-e-Kavus city-Iran, using Walton's eight components of QWL. He concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment.

**Summary of the Related Studies**
The review of related studies shows that EFL teachers in Iran have an average quality of work life, and teachers’ quality of work is significantly related to different variables such as organizational commitment, motivation, and attitude. Whereas, it is negatively related to negative factors such as burnout, stress, and demotivation. The research design of the majority of the reviewed studies was correlational and the participants were non-TEFL teachers. As teachers of English as a foreign language might have a different job condition, it is necessary to replicate the study using EFL teachers. Moreover, the relationship between QWL as a socioeconomic variable and teaching efficacy as a socio-cognitive variable also needs further exploration.
3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

For the purpose of this study, 90 teachers of English as a foreign language from Sistan and Baluchestan were selected via the cluster sampling procedure. Only five or more-year- experienced teachers were invited to take part in the study. All the participants were teaching at high schools in Zabol, Khash, Iranshahr, Zahedan, and Saravan. They were all aware of the purpose of the study and willingly took part in the study. Fifty of the participants were female and the rest were male. Sixty of the participants were holders of Bachelor of Art (BA) in English language teaching and 30 were students of Masters of Arts (MA) in the teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL).

3.2. Instruments

Two instruments were used to collect the data. The first instrument was teaching efficacy, and the second questionnaire was Walton instrument of QWL. Each is explained in detail.

3.2.1. Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (long form)

Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale1 (long form) developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2007) was used to estimate the participants’ sense of efficacy. It consists of 24 items. It also consists of three subscales: efficacy in student engagement (8 items), efficacy in instructional strategies: 8 items, and efficacy in classroom management (8 items). The reliability of this scale was estimated through Cronbach alpha. The alpha value of the total instrument and its subscales are given in the next chapter.
On the Relationship between Iranian EFL Teachers’ Quality…

3.2.2. Walton’s (1973) Quality of Work Life Questionnaire

This 26 item questionnaire includes eight sub-scales: adequate and fair compensation (3 items), safe and healthy working conditions (3 items), chance of growth (3 items), constitutionalism in the work organization (4 items), the social relevance of work life (3 items), total life space (4 items), social integration in the work organization (3 items), and human progress capabilities (3 items). A 1 to 5 point scale was used to examine the quality of work life. The internal consistency of the instrument was estimated through Cronbach alpha. The Cronbach value for the total QWL instrument and its components were all acceptable (see 4.1).

3.3. Data Collection and Analysis

The questionnaires were administered during in-service training sessions held by the educational office of each district, which provided opportunities for all EFL teachers of that district to get together to develop their profession. Before the questionnaires were administered, the researcher provided the participants with an explanation of the purpose of the study and assured them that the given responses were treated as confidential, and the institutions in which they are employed would not have access to the obtained information. The questionnaires were administered to the teachers during the break time of their in-service training program. The participants were also encouraged to ask questions and seek clarification if needed.

After the teachers’ responses to the questionnaires were codified, quantitative analyses were conducted on the completed instruments. First, descriptive statistics were applied to quantify the teachers’ teaching efficacy and the quality of their work lives. Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted to determine the relationship between quality of work life aspects
(dependent variable) and teachers’ teaching efficacy (independent variable). Moreover, a step-by-step regression was carried out to find out about the effects of the quality of work life factors on teaching efficacy.

4. Results

4.1. Results of Reliability Analyses

Although the reliability of both questionnaires had already been reported in different studies, it was still important to verify the reliability, especially as the two instruments were originally developed in the contexts which are culturally different from the context of the present study. The Cronbach’s alpha was used to estimate the internal reliability of items within each factor for the two instruments (results are presented in Table 1 and Table 2). An acceptable value for Cronbach’s alpha is between 0.70 and 0.80, and values substantially lower indicate an unreliable scale (Field, 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Results of Reliability Analysis of TSES</th>
<th>alpha</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSES</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Student Engagement</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Classroom Management</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on each factor’s Cronbach’s alpha presented in Table 1, it was determined that all factors included within the teachers’ sense of efficacy had strong internal reliability. The internal consistency indices for the three components of the efficacy instrument were 0.88, 0.89, and 0.90. Moreover, as Table 2 shows, the internal consistency of all factors of the QWL instrument exceeded 0.75, which could be regarded as acceptable internal consistency (Kline, 1999).

4.2 Descriptive Statistics for Teachers’ self-efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Student Engagement</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Classroom Management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Self Efficacy Scale (Total)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table. 3 shows that the mean score for the Teacher Self Efficacy among the participants was 6, with a standard deviation of 1.3. It amounted to saying that the participants perceived themselves as having a good level of teaching efficacy. The participants reported the highest level of teaching efficacy in instructional strategies (M=6.25, SD=1.7) and the lowest level in the category of efficacy in student engagement (M=5.77, SD=1.4).

4.3 Descriptive Statistics for Teachers’ QWL Scale

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of the Participants’ Scores in QWL Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adequate and fair compensation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Safe and healthy environment</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of human capacities</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Growth and security</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social integration</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Constitutionalism</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The total life space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social relevance</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. 4 shows that the mean score for the QWL among the participants was 2.8, with a standard deviation of 1.2. It amounted to saying that the participants perceived themselves as having a medium level of quality of work life. The participants reported the highest level of quality of their work life in the category of development of human capacities (M=3.6, SD=1.1); whereas, they had the lowest level in the category of Adequate and fair compensation (M=2, SD=1.1).
4.4 Correlation between Teachers’ QWL and Teaching Efficacy

Table 5. *Pearson Product Moment Correlation between Quality of Work Life Categories and Teacher Efficacy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Work Life Categories</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and fair compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and healthy environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of human capacities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The total life space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work life (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that there was a significant positive correlation between participants’ quality of work life and their sense of efficacy (p=0.004/<0.01, r=.54). The results also show that there was no correlation between participants’ scores on the first category of QWL (adequate and fair compensation) and their sense of efficacy (p=325/>0.05, r=.197). However, there was a significant positive correlation between participants' scores on the
other seven dimensions of quality of work life and their sense of efficacy (p=0.01/<0.05).

4.5. **Research Question Two**

The results of the regression analysis are shown in the following tables:

**Table 6. ANOVA Output Of Regression Analysis**

<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>Regression</td>
<td>13802</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1725.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>12155</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>675.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25957</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), F1, F2, F13, F4, F5, F6, F7, F8

b. Dependent Variable: TSES

As it can be seen from Table 6, the regression model is significant at p=0.05 (F=2.5, df=8, p=0.047<0.05). That is, at least one of the predictors (constant variables) significantly predicts the learners' scores on the dependent variable (teachers' sense of efficacy).

**Table 7. Regression Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.729*</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen in Table 7, the adjusted R square is .324. That is, 32 percent of the variance of teachers' efficacy is predicted by the dimensions of quality of work life.
As it can be seen in Table 8, the regression model is significant ($F_{8, 89} = 2.5, p < 0.05$. Adjusted $R^2 = .324$. Significant variables are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitutionalism</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>0.04 &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen, constitutionalism (see 2.2) contributed to the model (Beta=0.587, $p=0.04 < 0.05$), but the other dimensions do not contribute, although there is a significant correlation between each component of QWL and teachers’ efficacy. The Beta value shows that each added point on the constitutionalism increases the teaching efficacy by 0.587.

5. Discussion

The main objective of the present study was to explore the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ quality of work life and their teaching efficacy. The findings showed that Iranian EFL teachers perceived themselves as having a good level of teaching efficacy (Mean = 6). This finding is consistent with Akbari
(2011) findings, who argued that Iranian EFL has a positive perception about their teaching efficacy. The results also showed that, in general, Iranian EFL teachers perceived themselves to have a medium level of quality of work life. This finding is consistent with Jofreh, Yasini, Faraji Dehsorkhi, and Hayat (2013) findings since they argued that those Iranian EFL teachers have a medium to low level of QWL. The finding is also in agreement with Baleghzadeh and Godian (2012), who argued that the total QWL of Iranian EFL teachers is medium, but some components are low, some are medium, and some are high. Viewing the separate components of QWL, the results of the present study showed that the participants reported the highest level of quality of their work life in the category of development of human capacities (M=3.6) and the lowest level in the category of adequate and fair compensation (M=2). Therefore, it could be strongly argued low and unfair payment has always been a great concern for teachers in Iran. Teachers feel that they are not paid what they deserve. Most of them are forced to work longer extra hours, (Sometimes for more than 48 hours a week) to be able to afford their family life. This will obviously have a negative effect on the quality of the work they do.

The results of the study also showed that the mean score of the population on social integration is 2.6, which can be perceived as average. Therefore, it could be argued that the participants see themselves to be somehow socially integrated with their school community. They have partially good relationships with their colleagues. Such a finding is a little bit different from Jofreh et al. (2013). They argued that Iranian EFL teachers are highly integrated with the school community and have good relationships with their colleagues. Such a minimal distinction might be because of the contexts from which participants were selected. The present study was carried out in a multicultural setting with different religions while the study of Jofreh et al. (2013) was carried out in a mono-cultural setting. The results also showed that Iranian EFL teachers
enjoyed their job in total life space. As Jofreh et al. (2013) argued, they have time for leisure of their families and they are not forced to change geographically.

The results showed that there the correlation between all dimensions of QWL and teachers’ teaching efficacy except for “adequate and fair compensation” is significant at a P-value of 0.05. Although the correlation coefficient between the other dimensions and teachers’ teaching efficacy is significant, the R-value is not the same in all dimensions. For example, the correlation index of the dimension of Constitutionalism is 0.64 which is the highest, and R between social relevance and teaching efficacy is 0.39 which is the lowest. The differences among the correlation coefficients between dimensions of QWL and teaching efficacy might have some psychological, social, and economical justifications which need further exploration by the other researchers interested in the field.

6. Conclusions

The results of the study were interpreted, and in line with the findings, the following conclusions are made:

1. Iranian EFL teachers’ total QWL is medium to somehow high, which seems to be satisfactory.
2. Iranian EFL teachers do not enjoy “Adequate and fair compensation.” Therefore, it could be concluded that that low pay correlates with low teacher efficacy. This means that one’s self-efficacy is greatly influenced and/or mediated by one’s culture. Rather than self-efficacy being completely individualistic (as previously thought), our societal values may play a larger role in establishing teacher efficacy.
3. Social integration of the employees in culture-dependent. That is, teachers in some cities have higher social integration with the school community than EFL teachers in other cities.
4. Almost all teachers in Iran have the same perception of the *total life space* because all the participants were from Iran, there are likely cultural similarities and fewer differences than there might be in a more diverse sample.

5. Although teachers’ teaching efficacy is significantly correlated with all dimensions of QWL but “adequate and fair compensation,” only constitutionalism could significantly predict the teachers’ teaching efficacy. Therefore, it could be concluded that some other variables are influential which needs to be investigated by the other researchers interested in the field.

6. Iranian EFL teachers’ efficacy in instructional strategies is greater than their efficacy in student engagement and efficacy in classroom management.

7. The results of linear regression analysis showed that the regression analysis model was significant, but only one of the variables of the QWL could significantly predict Iranian EFL teachers’ teaching efficacy ($F_{8,89}=2.5$, $p < 0.05$). Therefore, it could be strongly argued that teachers’ QWL is not the only influential factor on teaching efficacy. Several other variables, such as psychological, social, and psychological factors might be influential. It has been argued that teachers’ affective factors such as personality and their academic status significantly affect their sense of efficacy. Therefore, it could be strongly argued that a combination of social, psychological, cognitive, and economical variables influences EFL teachers’ teaching efficacy, which must be properly investigated through replicating the present study using different contexts and research designs.

In line with the results of the present study, it could also be argued that authorities in the Ministry of Education should be aware of the influence of quality of work life factors on teacher teaching efficacy. In this way, they will be in a better position to take measures so that they can overcome local obstacles.
for teachers, such as unfair and inappropriate compensation and social integration, as attested by the findings of this study. They must promote the compensation which teachers receive. Moreover, educational decision makers should foster social integration between and within schools and develop the teachers’ capacities in such a way that they feel they are constantly growing. They should also provide opportunities for teachers to take part in workshops and in-service training programs so that the teacher can develop professionally.
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