Abstract

This paper aims to recognize the factors that hamper the motivation among teaching staff of public sector universities in Quetta. The study was conducted by surveying 303 people who were a part of the teaching sector. The questionnaire was administered to all the participants and respondents recognized three main factors that are barriers to motivation such as burnout, workaholism, career stagnation and with the inclusion of mediating variable (self-efficacy). Two major tests were applied, such as; multiple regression to compute the effect of one variable on other variable and bootstrapping was applied to compute mediation indirect effect. The results indicated a significant negative effect of burnout, workaholism and career stagnation on motivation. The results also stated the significant indirect effect of mediating variable; however, educational institutions handling with motivational factors should pay particularly close attention to variables that hamper one’s motivation. Deciding to aid, an educational institution should be preceded by an in-depth analysis of what the teaching faculty perceive to be the barriers to their motivation.
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Introduction

Moti is the root word of motivation. It has been derived from the Latin word “Movere” which means to move (Yukseloglu & Karaguven, 2013). Motivation is being defined as; “Make someone willing and eager to get into action” (Açıksöz, 2008). There are certain factors that are creating hurdles for the employees to be motivated and then to perform their task effectively and efficiently. Due to the rapid growth of technology, on average, the employees are experiencing barriers to their motivation to work (Bentea, 2017). There are various factors that encounter as barriers to motivation that demotivates employees, factors that are identified form previous studies are; lack of communication, burnout, lack of support, workaholism, career stagnation, low self-efficacy, lack of appreciation, unclear roles and responsibilities and many other factors that create a conflict and problem for employees to work and then it gives a negative impact on employee’s motivation (Hedges, 2014). There is a great and high impact of motivation on employees which encourage the employees to work harder. Specifically, the motivation for teachers at all level of educational institutions, motivation plays a mandatory role which helps to overcome turnover rate, retaining key employees, and to improve productivity (Can, 2015).

This study has mainly focused on the core barriers to motivation, and mainly the main focused barriers which were identified from the previous studies were; burnout, workaholism and career stagnation according to previous studies that have been conducted in different states such as; Turkey, Germany, Surabaya and a study of Gallup has found two-third of employees burned out their workplace due to long working hours, the other study was conducted in China and results showed 85% of employees were the victim of workaholism and has negatively affected the motivation of employees who were working in 9 different corporate organization (Stoner, 2017).
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Those employees who are workaholic can invest long working hours, but they have low work enjoyment, and less motivation and study examined 6300 employees working in U.S, Europe and Australia reported in 2015 that working for 55 hours per week doubles the risk of heart attack and increases stroke (Stoner, 2017). Japan is one of the countries with a long tradition of punishing working hours, people who are working 100 hours per week have heart attacks at the office and is termed as Karoshi which means death by overwork there are around 2300 official Karoshi deaths each year (Schou, 2014).

The actual barriers to motivation have been neglected; there is a need of time to investigate and examine the actual barriers that hamper motivation. There have been many studies conducted on different corporate sectors, but there is little evidence of investigating the problems and barriers that demotivate teachers of higher educational institutions (Wilkesmann & lauer, 2018). This study is aimed to determine the impact of job burnout, workaholism, career stagnation and mediating role of self-efficacy on the motivation of higher education teachers of public sector universities in Quetta in order to reduce the level of demotivation among employees for the purpose of initiating effective motivational environment to work with motivation for quality performance and productive outcome.

Research Questions
- Does burnout have any effect on the motivation of teaching faculty in a higher education institution?
- Does workaholism have any effect on the motivation of teaching faculty in a higher education institution?
- Does career stagnation have any effect on the motivation of teaching faculty in a higher education institution?
- Does self-efficacy serve as a mediator for the motivation of teaching faculty in a higher education institution?

Research Objectives
To examine the effect of workaholism, burnout and career stagnation on motivation among faculty of public sector universities of Quetta city.
To find out the relationship of self-efficacy and motivation among faculty of public sector universities of Quetta city.

The first initial step to working enthusiastically at workplace comes up with the motivation there have been many studies on motivation, but core barriers to motivation have been neglected in the past studies moreover, fewer studies were conducted on barriers to motivation in the context of higher education teachers. It has been examined from the study that core barriers should be studied from teachers’ perspective as they are directly associated with the achievement of students. Teachers are those who prepare the students to be competent enough to accomplish markets’ need and demand to move towards development (Schaper & Michael, 2017).

Some core strategies should be implemented in order to overcome the barriers to motivation which in results will provide an effective and productive outcome to educational institutions to work in the most effective manner with motivation to work.

Literature Review
Motivation is associated with encouragement and energizing the individuals in order to accomplish the targets productively. Motivation influences an individual to desire to work and to perform the required job well. It is a set of experiences, opinions, expectations, wishes, beliefs, and fear that engages the individual to perform his or her job in the most efficient way as required within the dimension of being motivated. There are not a certain set of factors that are applied to each individual for motivation. It is not easy to determine the key factors based on human behaviour which is most difficult (Cristina-Corina, 2012).

Majid, Jelas, Azman, & Rahman (2010), explained that Educational development and the progress of students are the two major factors that are linked with the motivation of teachers. Teachers can be more motivated towards intrinsic than extrinsic rewards. Studies have shown the positive relationship of teacher’s motivation with the gender, age, teaching experience, and responsibility level (Salifu, 2014). The social cognitive
theory was initiated as the social learning theory in the 1960s by Stanford psychologist named as Albert Bandura. He elaborated that learning occurs in the social context with effective interaction with people, environment, and behaviour. Individuals are driven by social motivation and seek observational learning they learn from others and implement the same to perform the task at the workplace (Bentea, 2017).

The demotivation has been increasing rapidly among the employee’s barriers are creating a negative impact on employees’ motivation and which is destroying the productivity of the organization. The most common factors are burnout, workaholism and career stagnation.

Burnout

H1: Burnout has a Significant Negative Effect on Faculty Motivation:

Burnout is being defined as “A state of emotional, physical, and mental exhaustion caused by excessive and prolonged stress” (Prentice, 2019). A recent study on Gallup on 7500 employees reported that 23% of employees were being found in a state of feeling burned out at work very often or always. 44% of employees were being found as feeling burned out sometimes. Approximately two-thirds of full-time workers experience burnout on the job; burnout has become a part of the job those employees who have been experiencing burnout at the workplace are two times more likely to be agreed that the level of working hours their jobs consume make it difficult to fulfil their family responsibilities (Živilė, 2019). When employees find themselves to be a part of burnout, then they do not trust their managers, teammates, or leaders. It directly causes the break down the psychological bond and demotivates employees to work (Alizadegani, Zaini, & Delavari, 2014).

Furthermore, if managers are not supportive and do not communicate for executing the demanded task to be done on time perfectly, it will enforce an employee to experience burnout and will be unable to meet the consistent demands of the organization (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). A study was conducted on higher education teachers of Surabaya through random sampling. Data were collected both from male and female 355 respondents filled the questionnaire with 5 Likert scales. Results showed the negative impact of burnout on teachers’ motivation (Lawrence, 2018). Another research was conducted on teachers of Surabaya through random sampling 98 respondents filled the questionnaire with 5 Likert scales, and as a result, 95% of the teachers were facing the burnout issue and agreed that this has a negative impact on employees (Skaalvik, 2010).

Workaholism

H2: Workaholism has a Significant Negative Effect on Faculty Motivation:

There are certainly other factors that hamper the motivation and decline the effective performance of employees’ workaholism is another factor that has a negative impact on the motivation of employees. Workaholism is being defined as “The compulsion or the uncontrollable need to work incessantly” (Oates, 1971). It is also defined as “An addiction to work” (Feldman, 2007). However, it is also being constructed and elaborated as “High work involvement and low work enjoyment” (Aziz & Zickar, 2006). A quantitative study was conducted in China, and nine organizations were selected, 383 questionnaires were collected with random sampling, and 375 suitable responses were collected. Data were analyzed through multiple regression, and 85% of responded agreed that workaholism has a negative impact on motivation (Clark, 2016). Workaholism has a negative outcome for an individual a strong negative relationship has been found between workaholism and employee motivation. There are two major components of workaholism such as; working excessively and working impulsively it has a huge negative impact on health as workaholic employees do not get enough time to recover from illness (Scabia, 2014). According to several researches, workaholism is both found as positive and negative, but it has been researched that workaholic employees are not being found as productive and it does not assist any positive association with employees’ motivation rather it hampers the motivation as they get tired of long working hours and never-ending assigned tasks (Korunka, Kubicek, Paškvan, & Ulferts, 2015). Workaholism is actually driven by negative feelings about work, and it is related to guilt, anxiety, anger, and disappointment at work and home. However, workaholism is not only dangerous to work, health, and social life. It can cause even sudden death (Taris & Van, 2008). In contrast, workaholism is not being concerned with negative aspects it does have a positive impact in many of the researches as those employees who are workaholics contain and acquire high score, highly engrossed
in work, high on work drive but as it is associated with term employee motivation, it has a negative impact because those who are workaholic have low work enjoyment (Stoner, 2017).

Career Stagnation

H3: Career Stagnation has a Significant Negative Effect on Faculty Motivation:

Career stagnation is being defined as “Working in the exact same position or a particular role for years with no progression or development of any kind in your profile is called having a stagnant career” (Hall, 2002). It is a process which is unique to each and every person both for professional and personal life. In a modern era now, career is being associated with the psychological sphere because it is all about the recognition of self-worth which a person derives from the attainment of important life goals personal achievement and happiness. A quantitative study with random sampling was conducted on employees of Murang’a County Government 178 questionnaires were collected, and 84% of employees agreed that career stagnation has a significant negative impact on motivation. The most significant object is subjective and internal rather than objective and external (Ngondi, 2017).

A qualitative study was conducted on a teacher based on purposive sampling 18 teachers were interviewed, and data were collected through the structured questionnaire; as a result, 15 of them answered that they get highly demotivated when they find themselves in a state of career stagnation. According to Friedman (2011), there are various factors that are being associated with career stagnation such as; self-efficacy, career attitude, adaptability, personality, and goals. According to Oplatka & Beck (2013), Career stagnation is also related to some organizational factors such as; lack of socialization, support, and mentoring. These are being related to organizational conditions. Furthermore, it has been explored form the research that the career stagnation has been found as the enemy of employee motivation which is being recognized as the barrier to employee motivation and it does have the negative impact on employee’s motivation. These demotivated employees are usually ignored in the organizations due to which they are unable to get the maximum productive outcome of the performance (Rosenberg, 2013).

Self-Efficacy

H4: Self-Efficacy Significantly Mediates the Relationship between Burnout, Workaholism, Career Stagnation and Teachers’ Motivation

Self-efficacy is being defined as the “one’s ability, willingness, confidence and belief in his or her capacity to perform well” (Bandura, 1977). When employees find themselves in a state of having a lack of self-efficacy, then they tend to feel demotivated, and it creates a negative impact on employees’ motivation (Federici & Skaalvik, 2012). According to Wen & Fan (2015), the most effective way of developing a strong sense of efficacy can be done through the past experiences all those employees who have the previous experience with on the job have more confidence for the purpose of completing the similar task. They will have the high self-efficacy which motivates them to work effectively and efficiently. The other source of self-efficacy is about social persuasion or feedback from others. When managers are confident that their employees can successfully perform a task, they ultimately perform at a higher level (Butler, 2012). A sense of self-efficacy leads to create a belief that an individual can be successed in a particular situation for an organization, it is a major factor that highly contributes to associate positively with the motivation of an employee (Smetackova, 2017). A study was conducted in Turkey among high schools data were collected from students of 344 including 7 points Likert scale (1 = not true at all, 7 = very true) correlation and regression analysis tests were applied and results demonstrated low self-efficacy has a negative impact on motivation; therefore, the study was limited to students where professionals should also be selected to investigate the barriers in order to create and promote better professional in an organization (Guglielmi, 2012). Teaching is a very stressful occupation (Johnson et al, 2005). According to existing studies, teachers encounter stress during their work and decrease their motivation to work which ultimately increases burnout, time pressure, role conflict, career stagnation and relation with a supervisor. As per the social cognitive theory, teachers with low self-efficacy usually have less ability to achieve objectives, and it increases burnout and demotivation among teachers (Tolvanen, 2019). Another study was conducted on 2394 teachers in Grammar
schools, including 7 points Likert scale ranging from “never or almost never to always to almost always”. A negative relationship was found in low self-efficacy with the motivation of teachers in Surabaya. Workaholism feels a sense of competence which is directly linked to their overall sense of self-efficacy and well-being in contrast employees when they invest more time at work it increases their self-efficacy, and if they are not rewarded with the appreciation, it demotivates the employees to work for long hours (Mills, 2011). Another research was conducted on special education teachers in Surabaya and indicated low self-efficacy has a negative effect on motivation, and it reduces work satisfaction among teachers therefore low self-efficacy is core barrier to motivation which increases burnout and career stagnation the most among teachers and demotivates employees to work (Chen & Usber, 2013).

**Research Framework**

**Methodology**

**Study Procedure**

A cross-sectional explanatory study was carried out in July 2020 among all public sector universities of Quetta such as; University of Balochistan, BUITEMS, and Sardar Bahadur Khan Women University. The study was aimed to examine the cause and effect; therefore; this study was based on causal research. Causal research assists in better understanding the problem. We invited and analyzed the responses of 303 teaching faculty. A sample size of 303 was computed with known population from creative research survey system software calculator using a confidence level of 95%, the margin of error 5% and 1439 total population of teaching faculty sample size was computed. The research was completely anonymous in order to guarantee the sincerity of the answers. All the participants were informed about the purpose of this study.

**Methods**

an adapted questionnaire was used for the purpose of this study. 10 item measure survey was used to evaluate workaholism, career stagnation, self-efficacy and motivation. 20 item measure survey was used to evaluate burnout. Several items were used to collect the demographic data such as; gender, age, designation, qualification and working experience. All the items for this survey were composed of closed-ended questions with response format of five-point Likert scale ranging from; 1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree. The participants were required to choose the responses with which they agreed. Data was collected through quota sampling was in the absence of the sampling frame; it is suggested to use quota sampling because it is more reliable to be used rather than using snowball or convenience sampling.
Participants

Total of 303 participants participated in this study. All the participants were associated with teaching faculty of public sector universities of Quetta city. The participants were shared a questionnaire link to attempt, and all the responses were collected online. Respondents were designated as lecturers, assistant professors and professor. Total 136 (44.9%) of females participated, and a total of 167 males (55.1%) participated in the study. We received 117 (38.6%) responses from faculty whose ages were in between 21-30, 116 (38.3%) responses were received from faculty whose ages were in between 31-40 and the 70 (23.1%) responses were collected from those whose ages were 40 and above. 2 of the respondents mentioned their designation as a professor, 6 as an assistant professor, 18 as a lecturer, 6 as other and the remaining 271 respondents did not mention their designation as it was optional.

Data Analysis

In order to analyze data, SPSS software was used first reliability test was analyzed to examine the reliability of the questionnaire. Secondly, descriptive statistics were tested with the values of skewness and kurtosis to check the normal distribution of data third; correlation test was computed to determine the relationship between independent and dependent variable as the study is based on the theoretical framework and it included multiple independent variables; therefore, multiple regression was tested for the purpose of determining the effect of one variable on the value of another variable. Another major test which was used to analyze the mediating effect was bootstrapping this test was conducted by using Hayes process v3.3 macro software to examine the significance of the indirect mediating effect.

Results

In the first step, we attempted to determine the reliability of the questionnaire, which is mandatory to compute in order to proceed on with other tests. All the variables were tested individually to check the reliability of each variable. The below table 1 demonstrates the Cronbach’s Alpha values. Value of 0.7 indicates an acceptable level of reliability, 0.8 or greater value indicates a very good level of reliability, but values higher than 0.95 are not necessarily good since they might be an indication of redundancy. All the variables were reliable, and all the values were higher 0.7, which is an acceptable range of reliability analysis. The Cronbach’s Alpha values are; workaholism = 0.786, burnout = 0.942, career stagnation = 0.911, self-efficacy = 0.789 and motivation = 0.708. Hence, all the values are greater than 0.7; therefore, the scale is statistically reliable.

Table 1. Reliability Statistics

| No | Variables          | Items | Cronbach’s Alpha |
|----|--------------------|-------|------------------|
| 1  | Workaholism        | 10    | .786             |
| 2  | Burnout            | 20    | .942             |
| 3  | Career Stagnation  | 10    | .911             |
| 4  | Self-Efficacy      | 10    | .786             |
| 5  | Motivation         | 10    | .708             |

In the second step of the analysis, the descriptive statistics were applied to the study in order to analyze the minimum and maximum score of response and most importantly to examine the values of skewness and kurtosis for analyzing the data normality. The below table 2 shows the minimum and maximum score and the values of skewness and kurtosis. According to the threshold, the values of the parameter should be between the ranges of +2 or -2; hence all the values are within the range so it can be stated that data is normally distributed.
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

|                  | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|------------------|----|---------|---------|------|----------------|----------|----------|
| Workaholism      | 303| 3       | 5       | 4.17 | .463           | -.456    | -.251    |
| Burnout          | 303| 1       | 5       | 3.32 | .804           | -.984    | .083     |
| Career Stagnation| 303| 1       | 5       | 3.21 | .938           | -.540    | -.423    |
| Self-Efficacy    | 303| 2       | 5       | 3.67 | .583           | -.667    | .578     |
| Motivation       | 303| 2       | 5       | 3.98 | .507           | -.534    | .608     |

In the third step of the analysis, the correlation test was analyzed in order to interpret the correlation analysis. The below table 3 results have shown the negative relationship of burnout, workaholism, and career stagnation with motivation, whereas it has stated the positive relationship of self-efficacy with motivation. The significance of analyses was examined based on the p-values of each variable, which has to be < than 0.05. If workaholism increases, motivation decreases by (0.156) which are significant as p-value is less than 0.005. If burnout increases, motivation decreases by (0.154) and results are significant as p = 0.007. Further, results have also shown a negative relationship between career stagnation and motivation, and if career stagnation increases, motivation decreases by (0.170) significant at a p-value of 0.003. But results have stated that if self-efficacy increases, motivation increases by 0.475 with a p-value of 0.000.

Table 3

| Variables          | Workaholism Pearson Correlation | Burnout Pearson Correlation | Career Stagnation Pearson Correlation | Self-Efficacy Pearson Correlation | Motivation Pearson Correlation |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Workaholism        | 1                               | -.400**                      | -.343**                             | -.159**                          | -.156**                         |
| N                  | 303                             |                              | 303                                 | 303                               | 303                             |
| Burnout            | 1                               | .631**                       | -.213**                             | -.154**                          |                                 |
| N                  | 303                             |                              | 303                                 | 303                               |                                 |
| Career stagnation  | 1                               | -.158**                      | -.170**                             |                                   |                                 |
| N                  | 303                             |                              | 303                                 | 303                               |                                 |
| Self-efficacy      | 1                               |                             | .475**                              |                                   |                                 |
| N                  | 303                             |                              | 303                                 | 303                               |                                 |
| Motivation         | 1                               |                             |                                     |                                   |                                 |
| N                  | 303                             |                              |                                     | 303                               |                                 |

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

In the fourth step of the analysis, the multiple regression analysis was computed in order to determine the effect of one variable due to change in another variable. Below table 4 has explained the effect of all variables and hence, all the values of each individual are significant because the t-value of each variable is greater than 2, and all p-values are less than 0.05. To interpret the below mentioned values, if the workaholism changes by 1 unit, motivation on average decreases by $\beta = (.302)$, $t = -4.566$, $p = .000$. If burnout changes by 1 unit, motivation on average decreases by $\beta = (.102)$, $t = -2.199$, $p = .029$ and if career stagnation changes by 1 unit, on average motivation among teachers decreases by $\beta = (.088)$, $t = -2.287$, $p = .023$. All the results are statistically significant as T-values are greater than 2 and p-values are less than 0.05 which explains that there is a statistically significant negative impact of workaholism, burnout, and career stagnation on teachers’ motivation.
In the last step of the analysis, the test of bootstrapping was applied through Hayes process v3.5 Macro for the purpose of computing the indirect mediating effect. The bootstrapping was computed with a sample of 5000. The software computed total 3 results such as; total effect, direct effect and indirect effect. The below table 5 demonstrates about the indirect effect results and it explained significant indirect mediating effect and the values are; (H4: $\beta = -0.0802$, LL = -.1430, UL = -.0194, H5: $\beta = -0.0624$, LL = -.1008, UL = -.00293, H6: $\beta = -0.0392$, LL = -.0673, UL = -.0135). to ensure the significance of the indirect mediating effect of self-efficacy the values of the lower limit and upper limit were taken into consideration and all the values are negative which means it does not include zero; therefore, it can be stated that there is a statistically significant indirect mediating effect which also ensures that the relationship between variable X and variable Y is full mediated by mediating variable which is self-efficacy in this study.

### Table 5

| Variables          | Coefficient | Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Workaholism        | -0.0802     | -.1430      | -.0194      |
| Burnout            | -0.0624     | -.1008      | -.00293     |
| Career stagnation  | -0.0392     | -.0673      | -.0135      |

**Discussion**

**Burnout has a Significant Negative Effect on Teachers’ Motivation of Public Sector Universities in Quetta**

The results showed that burnout significantly has a negative effect on teachers’ motivation in public sector universities of Quetta. The increase in burnout will decrease motivation among teachers. This finding is in line with the research conducted by Lawrence (2018), which also stated that burnout negatively affects the motivation, and it results in poor performance of an employee. The results are also supported by Mustafa & Oya (2012) who found that burnout does not only affect motivation rather it creates a negative impact and feeling towards work which demotivates employees to work and they get unable to accomplish their desired task productively.

**Workaholism has a Significant Negative Effect on Teachers’ Motivation of Public Sector Universities in Quetta**

The analysis showed that the hypothesis of workaholism has a significant negative effect on teachers’ motivation of public sector universities. The increase in workaholism will decrease the teachers’ motivation to perform the job effectively and efficiently. This hypothesis has been statistically accepted that workaholism has a negative impact on teachers’ motivation. This finding is in line with the research which was being conducted by Clark (2016), and results indicated that 85% of respondents agreed about the negative impact of workaholism on motivation. This finding did not only indicate a negative impact; rather, it also negatively affected the academic progress of a student and demotivated students to study. There have been contradiction that many studied have stated the both negative and positive but its association with motivation turns negative in line with the theory of social cognitive theory (Korunka, Kubicek, Paskvan & Ulferts, 2015). This study has also analyzed the negative effect of workaholism on motivation an employee can be workaholic, but it does produce an effective outcome for any institution or organization.
Career Stagnation has a Significant Negative Effect on Teachers’ Motivation of Public Sector Universities in Quetta

The result of the analysis has shown that career stagnation hypothesis has a negative effect on teachers’ motivation. This means that when career stagnation increases, teachers’ motivation decreases to perform their jobs. However, this finding is in line with the research which was conducted by Ngondi (2017), who found that 84% of employees agreed that career stagnation has a significant negative effect on motivation. Due to career stagnation, an employee does not feel motivated enough to think differently and perform productively.

Burnout, Workaholism and Career Stagnation has an Effect on Teachers’ Motivation with the Inclusion of Mediating Variable (Self-Efficacy)

The result of this research has shown that self-efficacy is positively associated with the motivation that if self-efficacy increases, it increases the motivation among teachers and it increases a higher level of confidence in the ability to perform the responsibility. As far self-efficacy is positively associated with motivation, it showed a strong indirect mediating effect between these constructs. The high level of burnout, workaholism and career stagnation can lead to a low level of self-efficacy, and it then negatively affects motivation. The indirect mediating effect was significant with all negative values of the lower limit and upper limit, which means it did not include any zero, and it was fully mediated. This finding is in line with the research conducted but Guglielmi (2012) and found that self-efficacy has a positive relationship with motivation, but our study has found a new finding after testing career stagnation with the inclusion of intervening variable which is self-efficacy to examine the effect on teachers’ motivation in previous studies the career stagnation was not tested with inclusion of intervening variable of self-efficacy, so our study has found a significant indirect mediating effect of career stagnation on teachers’ motivation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

In our study, we attempted to identify the core factors as barriers that are encountered by teachers for lack of motivation to teach. The results reported that key barriers influence less motivation. There are several barriers that hinder the motivation, but burnout, workaholism, and career stagnation were considered as key barriers, and these obstacles indicated a significant negative effect on teachers’ motivation.

Our study has some practical implications. First of all, educational institutions should consider the motives that inspire and increase teachers’ motivation. Secondly, all educational institutions should take into consideration all the obstacles that hinder one’s motivation so that teachers can perform their required job with motivation. For further research, this study should be conducted through qualitative analysis in order to better analyze the barriers to motivation that teachers experience during their jobs and larger sample size should be taken into account to produce better results.
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