International Journal of Technology in Education and Science

www.ijtes.net

Digital Competence and Burnout in Technology-Mediated Higher Education

Emre Artut [1*], Eda Duruk [2]

[1]School of Foreign Languages, Abdullah Gül University, Turkiye, 0000-0003-0642-2784
[2] Department of English Language Teaching, Pamukkale University, Turkiye, 0000-0001-8564-2456
* Corresponding author: Emre Artut (emreartut95@gmail.com)

Article Info

Article History

Received:
9 March 2026

Revised:
16 May 2026

Accepted:
10 June 2026

Published:
15 June 2026

Keywords

EFL instructors
Teacher self-efficacy
Digital competence
Burnout
Turkish higher education
Job demands-resources

Abstract

Teacher burnout is a persistent concern in higher education, particularly as instructors strive to maintain effective teaching in technology-intensive work environments. This quantitative correlational study examined the relationships among teacher self-efficacy, digital competence, and burnout among 43 EFL instructors at two Turkish state universities. Participants completed an online survey measuring all three constructs via validated instruments. Pearson correlations and multiple regression were used to test associations and to model the simultaneous contributions of self-efficacy and digital competence to burnout variance. Instructors reported high self-efficacy, moderate-to-high digital competence, and moderate burnout. Self-efficacy was positively associated with burnout, whereas digital competence was negatively associated with it. The two predictors were not significantly correlated with each other. In the regression model, both predictors were independently significant and jointly accounted for 36.6% of the variance in burnout ($R^2 = .366$). The positive self-efficacy-burnout association, which runs counter to the general literature, may reflect role overload in technology-demanding environments or a mismatch between the general teaching self-efficacy measure and technology-specific demands. Digital competence appeared to function as a buffering resource consistent with job demands-resources (JD-R) predictions. Findings suggest that higher education institutions should consider targeted digital professional development and workload management as complementary strategies for supporting instructor well-being.

Citation: Artut, E. & Duruk, E. (2026). Digital competence and burnout in technology-mediated higher education. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science (IJTES), 10*(4), 816-829. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijtes.7951

ISSN: 2651-5369 / © International Journal of Technology in Education and Science (IJTES).

Introduction

Technology-rich higher education increasingly relies on learning management systems (LMS), digital assessment platforms, and online communication tools. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated this shift, exposing instructors to expanded technology-mediated demands with limited preparation time and support (Pagán-Garbín et al., 2024; Yang & Du, 2024). These conditions have generated sustained concern about teacher well-being and burnout in post-pandemic higher education contexts.

Burnout is defined as a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment resulting from chronic interpersonal stressors at work (Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Maslach et al., 2001). EFL instructors face these stressors while also navigating digital assessment cycles, platform-based reporting, and constant technology updates. In addition to established stressors such as large class sizes and job insecurity (Mahdian Rad & Baleghizadeh, 2025; Zeng et al., 2024), technology-intensive work contributes to technostress, a form of digital burnout arising directly from technology use demands (Pagán-Garbín et al., 2024; Yang & Du, 2024).

Two constructs are central to this study. Digital competence, defined as the confident, critical, and responsible use of information and communication technology (ICT) for teaching, learning, and professional development (Redecker, 2017), is treated as the primary technology-related variable. Teacher self-efficacy, defined as the belief in one's ability to organize and execute the actions required to produce desired instructional outcomes (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), is considered a supporting psychological construct. Although research examines these variables separately (Fathi et al., 2021; Ma et al., 2025), evidence on how digital competence and teaching self-efficacy jointly relate to burnout in a single model remains limited, particularly in EFL higher education contexts.

Theoretical Contribution

This study makes a focused theoretical contribution by testing digital competence and teaching self-efficacy as simultaneous predictors of burnout within a job demands-resources (JD-R) framework (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). JD-R theory proposes that job demands are the primary drivers of exhaustion and that job resources buffer against that strain. Prior studies have applied JD-R to teacher burnout, but typically test resources one at a time. Testing two resources simultaneously in the same model allows estimation of their unique contributions when they co-occur, and tests whether they operate independently or suppress each other. Single-predictor designs cannot address that question.

The construct choices are theoretically motivated. Digital competence is positioned as a technology-specific personal resource: instructors with stronger digital skills experience fewer frictions in platform-based teaching, which JD-R links to lower strain (Hussain et al., 2024). Teaching self-efficacy is positioned as a general personal resource: stronger instructional confidence is typically associated with lower burnout across settings (An & Tao, 2024; Fathi et al., 2021; Zeng et al., 2024). Including both in the same regression model produces a more complete

picture of how these resources function in technology-mediated EFL instruction.

The Turkish higher education context adds a further theoretical dimension. Turkish universities underwent rapid digital transitions during the pandemic and continue to consolidate digital systems. This creates a setting where technology-related demands remain elevated, making it an informative test environment for JD-R predictions. The unexpected positive association between self-efficacy and burnout observed here, which runs counter to the dominant pattern in the literature (An & Tao, 2024; Fathi et al., 2021; Ma et al., 2025), suggests that the resource status of general teaching self-efficacy is not context-invariant. High confidence in general teaching tasks may co-occur with greater role exposure in technology-demanding settings. Consistent with JD-R reasoning, personal resources may function as demands when they increase exposure to high-demand situations (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). This study contributes to that discussion and calls for domain-specific efficacy measurement in future burnout research. Three research questions guide this study:

1. What are the levels of self-efficacy, digital competence, and burnout among EFL instructors?
2. What are the bivariate associations among self-efficacy, digital competence, and burnout?
3. To what extent do self-efficacy and digital competence predict burnout?

Literature Review

This section reviews the theoretical and empirical basis for each construct and its interrelationships. The study is anchored in JD-R theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), in which digital competence and self-efficacy function as personal job resources, and burnout is the strain outcome under elevated technology-mediated demands.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

Teacher self-efficacy refers to educators' belief in their capacity to organize and execute the actions required to achieve desired instructional outcomes (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Bandura (1997) identified four primary sources of efficacy beliefs: enactive mastery experiences, vicarious learning, verbal persuasion, and physiological-affective states. In teaching contexts, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) operationalized self-efficacy through three dimensions: efficacy for student engagement, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for classroom management.

The dominant pattern in the literature is a negative association between self-efficacy and burnout: instructors with higher self-efficacy report lower exhaustion, lower depersonalization, and greater personal accomplishment (An & Tao, 2024; Fathi et al., 2021; Handayanto et al., 2024; Zeng et al., 2024). This pattern holds across EFL and general teaching samples and across different national contexts. The mechanisms proposed include more effective coping with stressors (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008), stronger engagement and motivation (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010), and buffering against the negative effects of demanding work conditions (Zeng et al., 2024).

In this study, self-efficacy is treated as a supporting general personal resource within the JD-R framework, rather than as the central educational technology variable. Its association with burnout is interpreted as a relational rather

than causal one, given the cross-sectional design.

Digital Competence

Digital competence in educational contexts is defined as the confident, critical, and responsible use of ICT for teaching, learning, and professional development (Redecker, 2017). The European Framework for the Digital Competence of Educators (DigCompEdu; Redecker, 2017) organizes this across six areas: (1) professional engagement, (2) digital resources, (3) teaching and learning, (4) assessment, (5) empowering learners, and (6) facilitating learners' digital competence. Kassymova et al. (2023) draw a useful distinction between digital competence in a personal context, using technology for one's own development, and in a pedagogical context, using it to enhance others' learning. The pedagogical dimension is considerably more demanding.

Three consistent predictors of digital competence development have been identified in the literature. ICT self-efficacy, a teacher's domain-specific belief in their technology ability, is a strong positive predictor (beta = 0.43) across multiple samples (Dai, 2023; Hoang, 2024). Facilitating conditions, including institutional infrastructure and support, also predict digital competence positively (Hoang, 2024; Wang & Chu, 2023). Collegial collaboration shows a similarly strong effect (Dai, 2023; Hoang, 2024). These predictors are relevant here because the Digital Competence Scale used in this study (Arık Güngör et al., 2025) covers all six DigCompEdu areas and was validated in the Turkish higher education context.

From a JD-R perspective, digital competence functions as a personal job resource. Instructors with stronger digital skills navigate platform complexity, digital assessment workloads, and rapid tool changes with less friction. This is associated with lower technostress and emotional exhaustion in technology-mediated teaching (Chen, Wu, et al., 2024; Hussain et al., 2024). Hussain et al. (2024) found that digital competence moderated the link between personality traits and burnout among allied health educators, supporting a buffering interpretation.

Teacher Burnout

Burnout is a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors at work, characterized by exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy (Maslach et al., 2001). Maslach and Leiter (2016) describe these three dimensions as follows: emotional exhaustion involves feeling depleted and drained of psychological resources; depersonalization involves a detached, cynical orientation toward students and work; and reduced personal accomplishment involves negative self-evaluation of one's effectiveness and professional contribution.

In technology-mediated teaching, a related concern is technostress, defined as occupational stress arising directly from technology use (Pagán-Garbín et al., 2024). Technology-related demands include platform complexity, digital assessment workload, constant connectivity expectations, rapid tool updates, and duplicated reporting requirements. During rapid transitions to online teaching, limited digital competence has been linked to increased technostress and digital burnout (Chen, Wu, et al., 2024; Yang & Du, 2024). This makes digital competence particularly salient in post-pandemic higher education contexts.

The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI; Demerouti & Bakker, 2008) used in this study differs from the Maslach Burnout Inventory in two important ways. First, it measures exhaustion and disengagement (rather than exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced accomplishment), which aligns well with the OLBI's design as a general-occupation measure. Second, the OLBI includes both positively and negatively worded items, which reduces acquiescence bias. In this study, OLBI scores index the strain experienced within a technology-mediated teaching work context.

Interactions Among the Three Constructs

Self-efficacy and burnout. The dominant finding across studies is a negative correlation: higher self-efficacy co-occurs with lower exhaustion, lower depersonalization, and greater personal accomplishment (An & Tao, 2024; Fathi et al., 2021; Handayanto et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2025). Zeng et al. (2024) reported that self-efficacy mediated associations between school context factors and burnout dimensions among EFL teachers in developing regions. Yang & Du (2024) found that self-efficacy mediated the link between online pedagogical and content knowledge and digital burnout, with emotion regulation functioning as an additional mediator in the same model. However, the direction and magnitude of the self-efficacy-burnout association may be context-sensitive. Under high workload or limited institutional support, the protective function of self-efficacy may be attenuated or reversed (Chen, Lin, & Lin, 2024; Mahdian Rad & Baleghizadeh, 2025).

Digital competence and self-efficacy. A positive correlation between digital competence and general or ICT self-efficacy is well-documented. ICT self-efficacy is a strong predictor of digital competence (beta = 0.43; Dai, 2023; Hoang, 2024). Digital competence may in turn function as a mastery experience that sustains self-efficacy (Shi et al., 2025; Wang & Chu, 2023). However, general teaching self-efficacy, as measured by the TSES, is conceptually distinct from ICT self-efficacy. The TSES does not assess confidence in technology use; therefore, its correlation with digital competence cannot be assumed. This distinction is important for interpreting the near-zero correlation between self-efficacy and digital competence observed in this sample.

Digital competence and burnout. Digital competence has been conceptualized as a personal resource that buffers against technology-related stressors (Hussain et al., 2024). Greater ICT proficiency is associated with lower emotional exhaustion (Chen, Wu, et al., 2024) and more manageable workloads in technology-mediated teaching (Handayanto et al., 2024). Limited digital skills are associated with higher technostress dimensions such as techno-overload and techno-complexity (Pagán-Garbín et al., 2024). These patterns consistently support a negative association between digital competence and burnout across educational contexts.

Method

Research Design

This study used a non-experimental, cross-sectional correlational survey design. This design is appropriate for examining associations among self-efficacy, digital competence, and burnout without experimental manipulation (Cohen et al., 2003). Descriptive statistics summarized construct levels. Pearson correlations assessed bivariate

relationships. Multiple linear regression modeled burnout as the outcome with self-efficacy and digital competence entered simultaneously as predictors.

Participants

The target population was EFL instructors employed at two Turkish state universities during the Fall 2025-2026 academic year. Participants were recruited via voluntary response and nonprobability sampling. The final sample comprised N = 43 instructors who responded within the defined collection period. The initial target was approximately 100 respondents; the reduced number limits statistical power and generalizability (see Limitations). The findings are exploratory and context-specific and do not support population-level generalization.

Among the 43 respondents, 21 identified as male and 22 as female. Age was distributed as follows: 27 participants were aged 29-39, and 16 were aged 40 or above. By teaching experience, 9 had 1-9 years, 30 had 10-19 years, and 4 had 20 or more years. By highest degree, 14 held a bachelor's, 21 a master's, and 8 a doctoral degree.

Instruments

Participants completed a demographic questionnaire and three validated scales:

The Digital Competence Scale (Arık Güngör et al., 2025) was developed and validated for use with Turkish teachers and covers six subdomains aligned with DigCompEdu (Redecker, 2017): Empowering Students, Developing Students' Digital Competence, Managing the Teaching-Learning Process, Using Digital Resources, Ensuring Professional Engagement, and Ability to Evaluate and Assess. In this sample, overall Cronbach's alpha was .82, indicating acceptable internal consistency.

The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI; Demerouti & Bakker, 2008) measures burnout through exhaustion and disengagement subscales. The OLBI is a widely used and validated general burnout measure. In this study, OLBI scores index the strain experienced within technology-mediated teaching conditions. Overall alpha was .80.

The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale Short Form (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) includes 12 items across three subscales: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) report strong psychometric properties across multiple samples. In this study, the overall alpha was .72.

Procedure

Following ethical approval from Pamukkale University, an online survey was created in Google Forms and distributed electronically. The first page presented an informed consent statement and described the procedures for anonymity and confidentiality. After data collection, responses were imported into SPSS 27. Assumption checks, including Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, Q-Q plots, and skewness and kurtosis indices, confirmed that the

distributions were approximately normal prior to inferential testing.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (M, SD) were reported for all three focal constructs and their subscales. Pearson correlations examined associations among self-efficacy, digital competence, and burnout. Following Cohen's (1992) conventions, correlations of .10-.29 are small, .30-.49 are medium, and .50 or above are large. Multiple regression modeled burnout as the dependent variable with both predictors entered simultaneously. All parametric assumptions were verified before inferential testing.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents means and standard deviations for all constructs and subscales.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Constructs

Variable	M	SD
Self-Efficacy (Total)	7.03	0.45
Student Engagement	6.59	0.56
Instructional Strategies	7.64	0.67
Classroom Management	6.86	1.11
Digital Competence (Total)	3.69	0.35
Empowering Students	3.68	0.57
Developing Students' DC	3.69	0.59
Managing Teaching-Learning Process	4.09	0.51
Using Digital Resources	4.11	0.73
Ensuring Professional Engagement	3.36	0.37
Ability to Evaluate and Assess	3.48	0.41
Burnout (Total)	2.35	0.37
Disengagement	2.34	0.38
Exhaustion	2.37	0.47

Note. N = 43. Self-efficacy measured on a 9-point scale; Digital Competence and Burnout on 5-point and 4-point scales, respectively.

Overall self-efficacy was M = 7.03 (SD = 0.45), indicating high perceived instructional competence. Instructional Strategies had the highest subscale mean (M = 7.64, SD = 0.67), followed by Classroom Management (M = 6.86, SD = 1.11) and Student Engagement (M = 6.59, SD = 0.56). Overall digital competence was M = 3.69 (SD = 0.35), indicating moderate-to-high proficiency. The highest subscale means were Using Digital Resources (M = 4.11, SD = 0.73) and Managing the Teaching-Learning Process (M = 4.09, SD = 0.51). The lowest were Ensuring Professional Engagement (M = 3.36, SD = 0.37) and Ability to Evaluate and Assess (M = 3.48, SD = 0.41).

Overall burnout was M = 2.35 (SD = 0.37) on a 4-point scale, with Exhaustion (M = 2.37, SD = 0.47) and Disengagement (M = 2.34, SD = 0.38) yielding similar subscale means.

Correlations

Table 2 presents correlations among the three focal constructs.

Table 2. Correlations among Focal Constructs

Variable	1	2	3
1. Self-Efficacy	1		
2. Digital Competence	.075	1	
3. Burnout	.422**	-.401**	1

Note. N = 43. Pearson correlations, two-tailed. ** p < .01.

Self-efficacy showed a medium positive association with burnout (r = .422, p = .005). Digital competence showed a medium negative association with burnout (r = -.401, p = .008). The association between self-efficacy and digital competence was trivial and non-significant (r = .075, p = .631). Tables 3, 4, and 5 present subscale-level correlations.

Table 3. Correlations among Self-efficacy Subscales

Variable	SE Total	Student Engagement	Instructional Strategies	Classroom Management
SE Total	1			
Student Engagement	.515**	1		
Instructional Strategies	.320*	-.033	1	
Classroom Management	.778**	.151	-.195	1

Note. N = 43. ** p < .01; * p < .05.

Table 4. Correlations among Digital Competence Subscales

Variable	DC Total	ES	DSDC	MTLP	UDR	EPE	AEA
DC Total	1						
ES	.816**	1					
DSDC	.442**	.286	1				
MTLP	.854**	.754**	.098	1			
UDR	.806**	.406**	.280	.610**	1		
EPE	.409**	.739**	.045	.507**	-.077	1	
AEA	.730**	.394**	.007	.643**	.771**	-.080	1

Note. N = 43. ** p < .01. ES = Empowering Students; DSDC = Developing Students' Digital Competence; MTLP = Managing Teaching-Learning Process; UDR = Using Digital Resources; EPE = Ensuring Professional Engagement; AEA = Ability to Evaluate and Assess.

Table 5. Correlations among Burnout Subscales

Variable	Burnout Total	Disengagement	Exhaustion
Burnout Total	1		
Disengagement	.832**	1	
Exhaustion	.893**	.494**	1

Note. N = 43. ** p < .01.

Multiple Regression

Multiple linear regression examined whether self-efficacy and digital competence predicted burnout when modeled simultaneously (see Table 6).

Table 6. Multiple Regression Results

Predictor	B	SE	beta	t	p
Constant	1.457	0.847	--	1.719	.093
Self-Efficacy	0.371	0.103	.455	3.604	.001
Digital Competence	-0.462	0.134	-.435	-3.445	.001

Note. R = .605; R2 = .366; Adjusted R2 = .335; F(2, 40) = 11.558, p < .001.

The overall model was significant, $F(2, 40) = 11.558$, $p < .001$, explaining 36.6% of burnout variance ($R^2 = .366$; Adjusted $R^2 = .335$). Self-efficacy had a significant positive regression coefficient (B = 0.371, SE = 0.103, beta = .455, t = 3.60, p = .001). Digital competence had a significant negative regression coefficient (B = -0.462, SE = 0.134, beta = -.435, t = -3.45, p = .001). Opposite signs indicate that the two predictors make distinct, independent contributions to burnout in this model. These coefficients reflect statistical associations and should not be interpreted as causal effects.

Discussion

This study examined digital competence and teaching self-efficacy as simultaneous predictors of burnout among EFL instructors in Turkish higher education. Three core findings emerge. Digital competence was negatively associated with burnout, consistent with JD-R predictions. Self-efficacy was positively associated with burnout, contrary to the dominant pattern in the literature. The two predictors were not significantly correlated, indicating they operate largely independently in this sample.

Digital Competence and Burnout

Digital competence was moderate-to-high overall, with the highest means for Using Digital Resources and Managing the Teaching-Learning Process and the lowest for Ensuring Professional Engagement and Ability to Evaluate and Assess. This subscale pattern is consistent with observations from post-pandemic teaching contexts: instructors have strengthened operational and delivery skills while lagging in assessment-oriented and

professionally collaborative digital practices (Kassymova et al., 2023; Redecker, 2017).

The negative correlation between digital competence and burnout (r = -.401) fits JD-R's prediction that personal resources buffer against strain. Instructors with stronger digital skills likely encounter fewer day-to-day frictions in platform-based teaching, such as technical failures and inefficient digital workflows, and these reductions in daily friction are plausibly associated with lower reported burnout (Pagán-Garbín et al., 2024). In the regression model, digital competence retained a significant negative coefficient after controlling self-efficacy (beta = -.435), indicating a unique statistical association. This aligns with findings that ICT proficiency is linked to lower emotional exhaustion in technology-mediated teaching (Chen, Wu, et al., 2024; Handayanto et al., 2024; Hussain et al., 2024). Because the design is correlational, claims about reducing burnout through competence-building require longitudinal or intervention evidence before they can be made with confidence.

Burnout Levels

Overall burnout fell within a moderate range (M = 2.35 on a 4-point scale). Exhaustion (M = 2.37) and Disengagement (M = 2.34) showed similar subscale means, suggesting neither dimension dominated. Moderate burnout still carries practical significance. Maslach et al. (2001) and Maslach & Leiter (2016) link sustained burnout at this level to reduced occupational functioning and withdrawal from the profession over time. Maslach and Leiter (2016) note that the progression from exhaustion to cynicism and then to reduced accomplishment is gradual, meaning moderate current scores do not preclude deterioration under sustained demand.

Self-Efficacy and Burnout: A Counterintuitive Pattern

Instructors reported high overall teaching self-efficacy (M = 7.03 on a 9-point scale). The positive association between self-efficacy and burnout (r = .422) and the positive regression coefficient (beta = .455) are the most theoretically notable findings in this study. They directly contradict the dominant pattern in the EFL burnout literature, where higher self-efficacy is consistently associated with lower burnout (An & Tao, 2024; Fathi et al., 2021; Ma et al., 2025; Zeng et al., 2024).

Consistent with JD-R reasoning, personal resources may function as demands when they increase exposure to high-demand situations (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). High general teaching confidence may therefore co-occur with greater role exposure and cumulative demands, which is consistent with burnout rather than protection against it. Empirical evidence for the contingent nature of the self-efficacy–burnout relationship comes from EFL-specific studies showing that conditional factors such as emotion regulation and institutional support alter the direction or strength of this association (Chen, Lin, & Lin, 2024; Yang & Du, 2024). A related explanation concerns construct specificity: the TSES measures confidence in general instructional tasks rather than technology-specific competence. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) designed the TSES around student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management, which are pedagogically, not technologically, focused. Instructors highly confident in these traditional domains may still find technology-mediated demands effortful. The near-zero correlation between TSES scores and digital competence in this sample (r = .075) is

consistent with this interpretation.

Implications and Future Research Directions

The negative association between digital competence and burnout suggests that digital competence is a practically relevant target for professional development, particularly for subgroups reporting lower competence in the assessment and professional engagement domains. Workshops, peer learning communities, and technology coaching are formats consistent with the literature on effective digital professional development (Redecker, 2017). However, because this study's findings are correlational, the well-being benefits of competence-focused training should be empirically tested through longitudinal or intervention designs before strong prescriptive claims are warranted.

The self-efficacy findings indicate that high confidence in general teaching tasks did not coincide with lower burnout in this technology-mediated context. Institutional monitoring of how responsibilities accumulate among the most capable or most relied-upon staff may help prevent role overload. Professional learning focused on boundary-setting, workload management, and emotion regulation may also be relevant (Yang & Du, 2024). At the measurement level, future studies should include domain-specific technology self-efficacy instruments alongside general teaching self-efficacy scales to distinguish their separate contributions to burnout.

Theoretically, these findings call for further examination of when and why general self-efficacy functions as a resource versus a demand amplifier in technology-mediated environments. Moderation models testing institutional support and emotion regulation as boundary conditions would require larger samples. Longitudinal designs tracking self-efficacy, digital competence, and burnout across an academic year could provide the temporal evidence needed to support directional interpretations and move beyond the correlational limitations of the current study.

Limitations

The sample size ($N = 43$) is the most significant limitation. Regression with two predictors requires a larger sample for adequate statistical power, and the drop from $R^2 = .366$ to adjusted $R^2 = .335$ signals meaningful shrinkage. The voluntary response approach at two Turkish universities introduces self-selection bias: instructors who complete a survey on burnout and digital competence may differ systematically from non-respondents, and the direction of that bias is unknown. The cross-sectional correlational design does not support causal or directional interpretation. The use of a general burnout measure (OLBI) rather than a technology-specific burnout or technostress scale is a further constraint. Larger multisite studies with longitudinal designs are needed before the positive self-efficacy-burnout pattern can be treated as a reliable contextual finding.

Conclusion

This study tested digital competence and general teaching self-efficacy as simultaneous predictors of burnout in

EFL instructors at Turkish higher education institutions. Within a JD-R framework, the study showed that digital competence served as a buffering personal resource, negatively associated with burnout in both bivariate and regression analyses. Teaching self-efficacy showed the opposite pattern: a positive association with burnout, challenging the dominant finding in the EFL burnout literature. This reversal is theoretically interpretable in terms of role overload dynamics and construct specificity, but requires replication in larger, more diverse samples before conclusions can be drawn. Together, the two predictors explained 36.6% of the variance in burnout, indicating that both the psychological and technological dimensions of instructor capacity are relevant to understanding burnout in technology-mediated teaching contexts. Sustaining instructor well-being requires institutional approaches that pair digital upskilling with workload management, boundary-setting support, and fair distribution of responsibilities.

Statements and Declarations

Acknowledgments/Notes: Not applicable.

During the preparation of this article, the authors did not use ChatGPT.

Supplementary Materials: Not applicable.

Author Contributions: Emre Artut led the study design, data collection, analysis, and manuscript preparation. Eda Duruk supervised the study and reviewed drafts. Both authors approved the final version.

Funding: No funding was received for this study.

Data Availability: The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. The data are not publicly deposited due to participant confidentiality commitments made during the informed consent process.

Ethics Approval: The study was approved by the Social and Human Sciences Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Pamukkale University (Approval No: 68282350/2025/16, Meeting Date: 21.11.2025, Meeting No: 16). All methods were performed in accordance with the relevant ethical guidelines and regulations.

Informed Consent: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

An, S., & Tao, S. (2024). English as a foreign language teachers' burnout: The predicator powers of self-efficacy and well-being. *Acta Psychologica, 245*, 104226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104226

Arık Güngör, B., Metin, M., & Saraçoğlu, S. (2025). Digital competencies scale for teachers: A validity and reliability study. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science, 9*(3), 374–396. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijtes.629

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

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

Chen, B.-C., Wu, Y.-T., & Chuang, Y.-T. (2024). The impact of teachers' perceived competence in information and communication technology usage, and workplace anxiety on well-being, as mediated by emotional exhaustion. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, 1404575. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1404575

Chen, J., Lin, C., & Lin, F. (2024). The interplay among EFL teachers' emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, and burnout. *Acta Psychologica, 248*, 104364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104364

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dai, W. (2023). An empirical study on English preservice teachers' digital competence regarding ICT self-efficacy, collegial collaboration and infrastructural support. *Heliyon, 9*(9), e19538. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e19538

Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2008). The Oldenburg burnout inventory: A good alternative to measure burnout and engagement. In J. R. B. Halbesleben (Ed.), *Stress and burnout in health care* (pp. 65–78). Nova Science Publishers.

Fathi, J., Greenier, V., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). Self-efficacy, reflection, and burnout among Iranian EFL teachers: The mediating role of emotion regulation. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *9*(2), 13-37. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2021.121043

Handayanto, A., Miyono, N., & Yulianti, P. D. (2024). Self-efficacy, competence in technology information and computers, and burnout: What is the profile for teachers? *Journal An-Nafs: Kajian Penelitian Psikologi, 9*(1), 37–51. https://doi.org/10.33367/psi.v9i1.5169

Hoang, N. H. (2024). Exploring digital competence among Vietnamese EFL preservice teachers: The role of ICT self-efficacy, collegial collaboration, and infrastructural support. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education, 40*(4), 217–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2024.2407327

Hussain, Z., Chenmei, C., Saeed, M., Hassan, N., & Chiragh, F. (2024). Personality and teachers' burnout stress: Exploring the digital competence as personal job resource in allied health institutions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, 1334371. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1334371

Kassymova, G. M., Tulepova, S. B., & Bekturova, M. B. (2023). Perceptions of digital competence in learning and teaching English in the context of online education. *Contemporary Educational Technology, 15*(1), ep396. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/12598

Ma, L., Chee, C. S., Amri, S., Gao, X., Wang, Q., Wang, N., & Liu, P. (2025). Impact of self-efficacy and burnout on professional development of physical education teachers in the digital age: A systematic review. *PeerJ, 13*, e18952. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.18952

Mahdian Rad, H., & Baleghizadeh, S. (2025). EFL teacher burnout: The nexus of emotional intelligence, self-

concept, and self-efficacy. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 13*(2), 167–194. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2025.55087.2649

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry, 15*(2), 103–111. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 397–422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397

Pagán-Garbín, I., Méndez, I., & Martínez-Ramón, J. P. (2024). Exploration of stress, burnout and technostress levels in teachers: Prediction of their resilience levels using an artificial neuronal network. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 148*, 104717. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104717

Redecker, C. (2017). *European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu* (JRC107466). European Commission, Joint Research Centre. https://doi.org/10.2760/159770

Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 57*(Suppl. 1), 152–171. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00359.x

Shi, Q., Xu, X., Zhang, Y., & Hu, B. (2025). Research on psychological resilience, digital competence, and self-efficacy in online TCFL teachers. *Behavioral Sciences, 15*(3), 366. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15030366

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(4), 1059–1069. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783–805. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1

Wang, Z., & Chu, Z. (2023). Examination of higher education teachers' self-perception of digital competence, self-efficacy, and facilitating conditions: An empirical study in the context of China. *Sustainability, 15*(14), 10945. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151410945

Yang, X., & Du, J. (2024). The effect of teacher self-efficacy, online pedagogical and content knowledge, and emotion regulation on teacher digital burnout: A mediation model. *BMC Psychology, 12*(1), 51. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01540-z

Zeng, Y., Liu, Y., & Peng, J. (2024). Noticing the unnoticed: Teacher self-efficacy as a mediator between school context and teacher burnout in developing regions. *Revista de Psicodidáctica, 29*(2), 107–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicoe.2024.02.002