Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 2020, Vol. 35, No. 2, 355-372

https://doi.org/10.33824/PJPR.2020.35.2.19

Burnout and its Predictors: Testing a Model Among Public School Teachers

Faiza Shaheen

University of Education

Nasir Mahmood

Allama Iqbal Open University

The present research assessed the predictors of burnout using a hypothesized model of burnout and its predictors. The sample of 1693 public school teachers from six districts of Punjab was employed. A self-developed instrument Emotional Burnout Scale (EBS; α = .81) was used for assessing burnout rate among teachers with its three dimensions, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment; also authors developed an Institutional Factors Measuring scale to measure predictors of burnout (α = .80). It comprised six school-related factors including personal, administrative, environmental, insecurities, material goods, and training. These factors, along with demographic variables like marital status, experience, qualification, job status, school level were used to predict the three dimensions of burnout. The results showed paths in predicted direction among proposed model; the personal factor strongly predicted emotional exhaustion whereas environmental factor was found to be a strong predictor for depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment in teachers. Implications for practice are discussed.

Keywords. Burnout model, dimensions of burnout, school factors, teachers, predictors

Burnout is a gradual condition of stress under hard working environment where staff members feel emotionally drained or exhausted. Burnout syndrome is a cumulative concept comprising three closely related sub-constructs named as emotional exhaustion

Faiza Shaheen, University of Education, Faisalabad Campus, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

Nasir Mahmood, Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Teacher Education, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Faiza Shaheen, University of Education, Faisalabad Campus, Faisalabad, Pakistan. Email: fizjanjua@gmail.com

(EE), depersonalization (DP), and reduced personal accomplishment (PA). Emotional exhaustion is the extent to that teachers feel emotionally drained by becoming exhausted, low, or frustrated. Depersonalization is such a state that teachers become distant from students and act in dehumanized and angry ways. Lack of personal accomplishment is the state of creating self-doubt and under-estimation of abilities that teachers lack in effectively fulfilling their tasks.

Freudenberger (1974) first introduced the term of burnout empirically. The work done by Maslach (1976) has also a milestone value to add meaning to the phenomenon and making it an academic construct. The continuous interaction with the job recipients and sensitivity towards their needs result in lacking the energy to an observable level. Etzion and Pines (1986) defined burnout as signed by physical exhaustion and weakening conditions that create loss of energy and hope followed by low efficacy and doubtful behavior with people at work. A closer perspective on burnout was given by Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) defining burnout a gradual decline in purpose, sense, and energy on work.

It took long time to take the existing shape the way burnout is meant at present. According to the demands of varied professions, different set of skills are required to progress in certain professions. The helping professionals such as counsellors, teachers, administrators, health care workers, and police officers have the responsibility to deal with bulk of demands of clients under work stressors such as lack of resources, heavy workloads, difficult clients etc. (Maslach & Leiter, 2008). When contrasting the precursors of burnout with teaching profession, many of the causes are found prominent in this profession that make it stressful job (Travers & Cooper, 1993; Schwab, Jackson, & Schuler, 1986). Among the helping professions, teaching has been considered more emotionally tiring job (Innstrand, Langballe, Falkum, & Aasland, 2011; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998; Stoeber & Rennert, 2008) due to being shouldered with the responsibility to fulfill the demands of students, parents and school administration.

Emotions of teachers develop in relation to the interaction with society, culture, and politics (Zembylas, 2003). Teachers work under demanding conditions where they deal with the bulk of requirements of students, colleagues, parents and school administration. Under certain circumstances, they are more prone to burnout (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998).

The chronic stressors at work place cause reduction in energy resultantly the efficiency of the professional suffers. The outcomes of certain state known as burnout become observable in the form of distancing behavior from the recipients and under-estimating self-abilities. The results of burnout jeopardize the performance of teachers as the outcome of it is shared by staff members, students, and institutions at large (Maslach & Jackson, 1986; Pines, 1982). The suffering of burnout lessens the quality of service and care, and ultimately puts students' learning at risk.

Javadi and Khatib (2014) reported the connection of reflective teaching with burnout. It indicates that burnout is not only associated with certain fixed variables. The tendency to become emotionally exhausted and detached has been rooted to an array of reasons. Creativity, confidence, competencies of teachers are the qualities that are considered primarily vital and are kept opposite outcome among professionals those are not burnout. Similarly the people possessing positive characteristics are less likely to burnout as their performance is an evidence of full involvement (Howard & Johnson, 2004). It is hard to estimate the occurrence of burnout on the base of a small number of variables.

Aligning the phenomenon of burnout with its theoretical basis, the study of workplace conditions and stressors lie at the core of understanding it. The contribution of work factors in development of burnout among teachers produced the knowledge regarding precursors of burnout. When teachers exhaust from the stressful job they work low in classroom, simultaneously their performance depends on the level of their interest, which reduces. Yong and Yue (2007) descried that teacher erosion increases majorly due to emotional and physical consequences of burnout. Certain conditions cause instability in students' learning career; the foremost damage to the students' is in the form of getting a lack of emotional support from teacher.

The link of school factors with the degree of involvement of teachers has been established while looking at the multiple roles of teachers. The chances to become disengaged and lowering the involvement on performing job tasks becomes more prevalent among teachers. Teachers are expected in many cases to not only instruct the students, but also work for their students as a guide, mentor, counselor, and social worker (Boyle, Borg, Falzon, & Baglioni, 1995). Some students at early school level seek attention and concentration that they lack at homes. Certain bulk of expectations increases the chances of burnout among teachers.

A comparison of high and low resourced school was made in a study concluding on the presence of balanced pupil ratio, handsome pay, and small class size in schools with equipped resources. The low facilities were noticed as having poor salary, pupil difficulty, and meager amenities in schools (Jackson & Rothman, 2005).

There prevails a lack of data available at national level that shares the ratio of attrition or burnout of teachers. It is worthy remediated in the national context, where the availability of physical facilities is victimized by insufficient resources. By determining the connection between institutional factors and teacher burnout, several cascading effects that cause discrepancies in the system will be estimated. The trend of studying burnout with some background variables has been evidenced by research findings. The studies with the purpose of prediction of burnout on the basis of demographic characteristics and school variables establish the need to study it in national context here. The prevalence of burnout in its varied dimensions has to be remediated when it is studied in association with institutional variables (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006). The study of psycho-social variables with burnout has also been conducted but the need of studying burnout with the variables within school must be focused as far as initiatives to upgrade schools are observed and technological growth is concerned.

It is emphasized that when work environment of service providing workers is improved, they perform better. These professionals are more prone to burnout (Barutçu & Serinkan, 2008). The reasons are not only attached with the feelings of stress, the study of school factors is something ahead from individual stressful feelings, its strictness with students or estimating the level of detachment at work.

The current study has value to deepen the investigation on factors that prevail within the workplace of teachers causing them undergo varied states of burnout. The ways to overcome burnout can be guided to teachers according to their personality characteristics (Farber, 2000) and by upgrading schools. This research is also significant in the backdrop of the current education reforms in Pakistan that were made to upgrade the education system in general, and also workable to improve the working conditions for teachers.

The painstaking efforts of government are yielding low observable outcomes. Several reasons can be drawn that lower the engagement level of teachers on job and cause them feel fatigued or tired. While studying the school as workplace of teachers, some factors were identified those ranged from personal choices to the

administrative settings and environmental factors. School environment is a determinant to agitate teachers for their full internal involvement. The degree to which the detachment can occur on job is determined by the level of ease and facilities of school. The favorable school factors correspond to the extent of burnout among teachers.

Theoretical Frame of Current Study

The theoretical framework of current study was drawn with the help of literature review. It helped in extraction of school level variables and exploring their link with varied tendencies of emotional burnout among teachers. The workplace factors cause different levels of burnout was kept to represent the backup of theory (Maslach et al., 2001). It is reported that the factors of work environment are linked with the states of burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Stress taking and coping strategies differ at personal levels of individuals but the unified set of facilities were put together to see the level of burnout.

The focus of current study was to test a model comprising the independent variables (six institutional factors and five demographic variables which makes a total of eleven predictor variables) that predict the prevalence of burnout in its three states such as (EE), (DP), and (PA).

Method

Sample

The public school teachers from the 36 districts of the Punjab were the population of this study (Public schools = 59012, Teachers = 342653).

The sample employed in this study consisted of 1693 public school teachers from the province of Punjab by using multistage sampling technique. Proportionate random sampling (1:3:2) was used to select districts from region wise distribution. Locale (Urban = 704, Rural = 984) and gender (Male = 957, female = 731) wise stratification was employed in later stages of sampling. Respondents were ensured of remaining safe by declaring on the provision of school facilities as the data is only for the use of research purposes.

Instruments

Emotional Burnout Scale. Burnout was measured by using a self-developed instrument, Emotional Burnout Scale, whose reliability was found to be .81. It is a 31 item scale that contain three sub-factors; the emotional exhaustion (EE) had 18 items with factor loadings

ranging from .45-.70; depersonalization (DP) had 8 items with factor loadings ranging from .52-.66; and lack of personal accomplishment (PA) had 7 items with factor loadings ranging from .46-.72. All the items are rated on a 5-point likert-type scale ranged from 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*.

Institutional Factors Measuring Scale. A self-developed scale was used to measure predictors of burnout. It comprises six school-related factors that might contribute to burnout. The scales chronbach alpha was .80. It comprised 26 statements, addressing the six factors. The Personal factor comprised 4 items with factors loadings ranging from .41 to .55; the Administrative factor contained 8 items with factor loadings ranging from .42 to .62; the Environmental included 7 items with factor loadings ranging from .47 to .62; the next factor, Insecurities comprised 3 items with factor loadings ranging from .44 to .57; the Material Goods factor contained two items with factor loadings of .5 and .8; and the last factor was Training. It contained two items with factor loadings ranging from .56 to .61.

Procedure

The sample was collected from different schools of the province of Punjab, Pakistan; 36 districts, including northern, southern and central Punjab were chosen. Both urban and rural schools were included in the sampling frame. At stage one of the sampling, at least three schools were selected from each district. At stage two, urban and rural schools were selected taking care to select two urban schools to match one rural school. At the third stage, equal representation of male and female teachers was sought. Then schools were selected by using random sampling techniques from each district, resulting in selection of 800-1600 teachers as a sample of the study.

Results

Data was analyzed by using LISREL. The results of structure model are presented in the portion of predictive analysis through conducting SEM along the values of fit indices (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998; Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Table 1 shows relationship between burnout and its sub-factors among teachers. The results indicate that is a strong relationship between EE and DP. Thus, as teachers feel exhausted, they tend to depersonalise information. The relationship between DP and PA and DP and EE was weak. The relationships should have been weak, but

for the current sample, the direction was positive. Table 2 shows inter-factor correlation of the total and sub-factors of institutional measures.

Table 1

Inter-Factor Correlation of the Burnout and its Sub-Factors Among Teachers (N = 1693)

Dimensions of Burnout	1	2	3
1. Emotional Exhaustion	-		
2. Depersonalization	.82**	-	
3. Personal Accomplishment	.18**	.18**	-

** p <.01.

Table 2

Inter-Factor Correlation of the Total and Sub-Factors of Institutional Measures (N=1693)

Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Personal	-						
2. Administrative	.29**	-					
3. Environmental	.27**	.61**	-				
4. Insecurities	.35**	.30**	.34**	-			
5. Material Goods	.09**	.20**	.23**	.10	-		
6. Training	.04	.30**	.35**	.14**	.04	-	
7. Total Institutional Factors	.34**	.62**	.64**	.37**	.20**	.32**	-

* p < .01.

Typically, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) produces results on two components such as measurement model and structure model. A mixture of exploratory factor analysis and multiple regression analysis comprise SEM (Ullman, 2001). The SEM is used more for confirmatory analysis but it is also used for exploratory purpose that results in emergence of new factors. It produces results on predicting link among variables those are theoretically supported and tested later. CFA is also known as measurement model that tells about factor loadings. It helps to estimate the link among variables prior to testing structural model.

The analysis of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) by demographic variables was also run separately to measure the predictability of demographic variables. It helped in determining the only predictive value of five demographic variables namely marital status, experience, qualification, job status, school level on the three dimensions of burnout.

The Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) by LISREL analysis of the model revealed a sound fit to the data collected in the present study (see Table 3). All paths other than the 5 below mentioned were statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Table 3

Summary of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Analyses for Teacher Demographic Variables Predicting Sub-Factors of Teachers' Burnout (N=1693)

	B	S.E	*B*
Effect of demographic factors on Emotional Exhaustion			
Marital status	0.199	0.053	0.132***
Experience	-0.125	0.023	-0.191***
Qualification	-0.063	0.037	-0.055
Job status	0.262	0.055	0.154***
School level	-0.015	0.020	-0.023
R^2	0.05		
Effect of demographic factors on Depersonalization			
Marital status	0.187	0.064	0.098***
Experience	-0.145	0.031	-0.176***
Qualification	-0.143	0.051	-0.097***
Job status	0.304	0.068	0.141***
School level	-0.013	0.027	-0.015
R^2	0.04		
Effect of demographic factors on Personal Accomplishment			
Marital status	0.042	0.047	0.028
Experience	-0.065	0.023	-0.100***
Qualification	0.000	0.039	0.000
Job status	0.127	0.555	0.075*
School level	-0.056	0.022	-0.085***
R^2	0.01		

Note. CFI =0.883; TLI = 0.873; RMSEA =0.041; SRMR =0.038; Chi-Square=1957.257.

*p <.05; **p <.01; ***p <.00.

The direction of these paths was plausible. For example, marital status and job status were weak and positive predictors of emotional exhaustion (β=.132, β = .154 respectively) and depersonalization (β = 0.98, β = 0.141), job status was weak predictor of personal accomplishment (β = 0.075), whereas experience was negatively related to emotional exhaustion (β = -0.191), depersonalization (β= -0.176), and personal accomplishment (β =- 0.100). Similarly, school level was weakly and negatively related to personal accomplishment (β = - 0.075).

The values of model fit indices revealed five statistically non-significant paths on the three dimensions of burnout respectively such as qualification and school level to emotional exhaustion (β = -0.55, p = .092 and β = -0.023, p = .43), school level to depersonalization (β = -0.015, p = 0.64, and marital status and qualification to personal accomplishment (β = 0.028, p = .36 and β = 0.000, p = 0.99). The model fitted data with the reported indices values including RMSEA, SRMR, TLI, Chi-square, and CFI.

The squared multiple correlation coefficient for the prediction of emotional exhaustion (R^2) was computed to be 0.05 which indicates that 5% of the total variance in emotional exhaustion is explained by teachers' marital status, experience, qualification, job status, school level. Similarly, teachers' marital status, experience, qualification, job status, and school level accounted for (R^2 = 0.40) 4% of variance in depersonalization, and (R^2 = 0.10) 1% of variance in personal accomplishment was attributable to teachers' marital status, experience, qualification, job status, school level. Holistically, it can be concluded that demographic variables were weak predictors of the dimensions of burnout.

Table 4

Summary of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Analyses for Teacher Demographic Variables and School Variables Predicting Teachers' Burnout (N=1693)

	B	S.E	*B*	*p*
Model 1: Effect of Institutional and Demographic Factors on EE				
Marital status	0.125***	0.037	0.084***	.000
Experience	-0.049**	0.016	-0.075**	.003
Qualification	-0.062*	0.026	-0.054*	.018
Job status	0.162***	0.039	0.096***	.000
School level	-0.011	0.014	-0.017	.443
Personal Factors (F1)	0.44***	0.064	0.538***	.000
Administrative Factors(F2)	-0.109	0.092	-0.122	.238
Environmental Factors(F3)	0.322***	0.079	0.437***	.000
Insecurities (F4)	0.119	0.069	0.122	.077
Material Goods (F5)	-0.174***	0.034	-0.222***	.000
Training (F6)	-0.105**	0.039	-0.130**	.008
R^2	0.747			

Continued…

	B	S.E	*B*	*p*
Model 2: Effect of Institutional and Demographic Factors on DP				
Marital status	0.104*	0.045	0.055*	.020
Experience	-0.051*	0.023	-0.062*	.029
Qualification	-0.137***	0.037	-0.094***	.000
Job status	0.178***	0.050	0.083***	.000
School level	-0.006	0.020	-0.007	.779
Personal Factors (F1)	0.366***	0.074	0.354***	.000
Administrative Factors(F2)	-0.099	0.120	-0.087	.410
Environmental Factors(F3)	0.380***	0.100	0.408***	.000
Insecurities (F4)	0.300***	0.092	0.244***	.000
Material Goods (F5)	-0.168***	0.40	-0.170***	.000
Training (F6)	-0.186***	0.052	-0.181***	.000
R^2	0.707			
Model 3: Effect of Institutional and Demographic Factors on PA				
Marital status	0.011	0.037	0.007	.767
Experience	-0.009	0.018	-0.013	.629
Qualification	0.005	0.031	0.004	.886
Job status	0.053	0.044	0.031	.235
School level	-0.051**	0.018	-0.076**	.004
Personal Factors (F1)	0.034	0.05	0.041	.545
Administrative Factors(F2)	0.164	0.101	0.182	.090
Environmental Factors(F3)	0.293***	0.080	0.396***	.000
Insecurities (F4)	0.089	0.069	0.091	.197
Material Goods (F5)	-0.081*	0.032	-0.103*	.020
Training (F6)	-0.133**	0.044	-0.163**	.002
R^2	0.520			

Note. CFI = 0.829; TLI = 0.819; RMSEA = 0.038; SRMR = 0.04; Chi-Square = 23179.262.

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .00$.

Model 1: Emotional Exhaustion (EE) as Criterion

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis produced results on eleven predictor variables by employing the sample of 1693 school teachers. The results show that the marital status of teachers is significant predictor of emotional exhaustion among teachers (β = 0.084, p = .000), experience of teachers is significant predictor of emotional exhaustion among teachers (β = -0.075, p = .003), qualification of teachers is non-significant on predicting emotional exhaustion of teacher (β = -0.054, p = .018), job status of teachers is significant predictor of emotional exhaustion among teachers

(β = 0.096, p = .000), and the level of school of teachers is non-significant predictor of emotional exhaustion of teachers (β = -0.017, p = .443).

Further it was found that factor 1 personal factor positively predict teachers' emotional exhaustion (β= 0.54, p= .000); factor 2 administrative factor was non-significant on predicting emotional exhaustion of teachers with negative value (β= -0.122, p = .238);factor 3 environmental factors strongly and positively predict (β= 0.44, p = .000) emotional exhaustion of teachers; factor 4insecurities factor weakly but positively predict (β = 0.122, p = .077) emotional exhaustion of teachers, factor 5 material goods significantly predict emotional exhaustion of teachers (β = -0.222, p = .000), and factor 6training also significantly predict emotional exhaustion of teachers (β = -0.130, p = .008).

The six institutional factors 1= personal, 2= administrative, 3 = environmental, 4 = teachers' insecurities, 5= material goods, and 6 = training along five teachers' demographic variables such as marital status, experience, qualification, job status, and school level cumulatively eleven variables explained 74% of the total variance in predicting emotional exhaustion of teachers.

Model 2: Depersonalization (DP) as Criterion

The results show that the marital status of teachers is significant predictor of depersonalization among teachers (β = 0.055, p = .020), experience of teachers is significant predictor of depersonalization among teachers (β = -0.062, p = .029), qualification of teachers is a significant predictor of depersonalization of teachers (β = -0.094, p = .000), job status of teachers is significant predictor of depersonalization among teachers (β = -0.083, p = .000), and school level of teachers is non-significant predictor of depersonalization among teachers (β = -0.007, p = .779).

The results show that the personal factors significantly and positively predict depersonalization of teachers (β = 0.354, p= .000), administrative factors are non-significant on predicting depersonalization of teachers (β = -0.087, p = .410), environmental factors positively and significantly predict depersonalization of teachers (β = 0.408, p =.000), the factor of teachers' insecurities positively and significantly predict depersonalization of teachers (β = 0.244, p = .000), material goods significantly predict depersonalization of teachers (β = -0.170, p =.000), and the factor of

training significantly predict the state of depersonalization among teachers (β = -0.180, p = .000).

The six institutional factors personal, administrative, environmental, teachers' insecurities, material goods, and training along five teachers' demographic variables such as marital status, experience, qualification, job status, and school level cumulatively eleven variables explained 70% of the total variance in predicting the state of teachers' depersonalization (DP).

Model 3: Personal Accomplishment (PA) as Criterion

The results of teachers' marital status is a non-significant predictor of reduced personal accomplishment (β = 0.007, p =.767), teachers' experience is non-significant predictor of reduced personal accomplishment (β = -0.013, p = .629), teachers' qualification is also a non-significant predictor of reduced personal accomplishment (β =0.004, p =.886), the job of teachers is a non-significant predictor of reduced personal accomplishment among teachers (β = 0.031, p = .235), and school level at teaching is a significant predictor of reduced personal accomplishment among teachers (β = -0.076, p = .004).

The results show that factor 1 personal factors does not predict the reduced personal accomplishment of teachers (β = 0.041, p = .545), factor 2 administrative factor is also non-significant on predicting the reduced personal accomplishment of teachers (β = 0.182, p = .090), factor 3 environmental factor strongly and positively predict the reduced personal accomplishment of teachers (β = 0.396, p = .000), factor 4insecurities is non-significant on predicting the reduced personal accomplishment of teachers (β = 0.091, p = .197), factor 5 material goods factor significantly predict the reduced personal accomplishment of teachers (β = -0.103, p = .020), and factor 6 training is also a significant predictor of the reduced personal accomplishment of teachers (β = -0.163, p =.002).

The six institutional factors personal, administrative, environmental, teachers' insecurities, material goods, and training along five teachers' demographic variables such as marital status, experience, qualification, job status, and school level as total eleven variables explained 52% of the variance in predicting reduced personal accomplishment of teachers.

The results reported in table 6, indicate that demographic variables including marital status, experience, qualification, job status, and school level explained 5%, 4%, and 1% variance on the

dimensions of burnout i.e. emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment respectively. It shows that rest of the variance on the dimensions of burnout reported each dimension wise is explained by the institutional factors.

Discussion and Conclusion

In order to examine the predictive relation between three subsets of burnout Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment, and identified institutional factors causing emotional burnout among teachers structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis was conducted. A hypothesized model was tested to predict the dimensions of burnout (EE, DP, and PA) on the basis of personal factor (role conflict, WFC), administrative factor (favoritism, job security, management style, heavy workload, and administrative support), environmental factor (class size, school location, collegial behavior), availability of material goods (poor facilities), insecurities factor (fear of violence or rude behavior), and training factor (career growth).

The results of the study will be discussed in two steps. The demographic variables were tested separately as well as in the final model along the six school factors. The findings contribute differently among personality traits and institutional factors.

Burnout was accounted by the institutional factors with taking personal, administrative, environmental, material goods, insecurities, and training factors as well as five demographic variables including marital status, experience, qualification, job status, and school level.

Marital status and job status were positive predictors of the state of emotional exhaustion. Experience was relatively weak and negative predictor of emotional exhaustion. Teachers' qualification and school level at which teaching were not significant predictors of emotional exhaustion. These five demographic variables contributed 5% of variance in the state of becoming emotionally stern, fatigued, and left with low emotional resources. It was found that unmarried and the teachers with permanent job status were more tend to become emotionally exhausted. Teachers' status as married or unmarried was strong predictor. Permanent or temporary job status was positive whereas experience such as early, mid or late in career was negative and weak predictor of emotional exhaustion.

Work Experience was strong and negative predictor of depersonalization. Job status and marital status were strong and positive predictors of depersonalization. Qualification was weak and

negative predictor of depersonalization. School level at teaching was not a predictor of depersonalization. These five demographic variables attributed 4% of variance in the state that teachers become cynical, distant, or dehumanized with their students.

The results on reduced personal accomplishment were different than the other two dimensions of teachers' burnout. Experience was negative but strong predictor of personal accomplishment. The school level at teaching was negative whereas job status weakly and positively predicted reduced personal accomplishment. These demographic variables accounted for only 1% of variance in the degree of lack of accomplishment of job tasks among teachers.

It means demographic variables do not conclusively attribute to the degree of burnout among teachers but by adding those in final model contributed some effect. Difference in the model structure of demographic variables was found when analyzed/ processed with all predictors. In the final model, the demographic variables predicted the three dimensions of burnout differently. The results on emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were almost alike whereas the dimension of personal accomplishment was weakly predicted by demographic variables.

Marital status and job status were positive and significant predictors of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Experience and qualification were negative predictors of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. School level was only a weak and negative predictor of reduced personal accomplishment. The profile of teachers can be suggested on the basis of their burnout rate. It may help in the recruitment process.

The results on school factors showed that factor 1 personal factor and factor 3 environmental factors were positive predictors of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Factor 4 insecurities were positive predictor of depersonalization. Factor 2 administrative factor was not a significant predictor of any state of teachers' burnout. The reduced personal accomplishment (PA) was positively predicted by factor 3 environmental factors. Factor 5 material goods and factor 6 training significantly and negatively predicted all three dimensions of burnout (EE, DP, and PA) among teachers.

The institutional factors that impacted on the dimensions of burnout were significant and accounted acceptable variance in all three dimensions of burnout. Among those six institutional factors, the degree of strength on the basis of beta values was used to report at emotionalexhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment one by one.

Factor 1 personal factor was strong predictor of emotional exhaustion then environmental factor was strong and positive predictor of emotional exhaustion. Then factor 5material goods and then factor 6 training negatively predicted emotional exhaustion.

Personal factor measured role conflict and work family conflict that hinders the job involvement of teachers. It was the strongest predictor of emotional exhaustion because the imbalance created through role or family conflict cause exhaustion as an early outcome at job. Among the other school factors, it is dealt and to be kept balanced at personal levels of teachers. It is sensitive towards the emotional withdrawal in the sense that ease at work is a reflection of peace and balance on performing work and family roles. Any imbalance creates the feelings of exhaustion and account on the emotional resources of teachers. The environmental factor was also a positive predictor of emotional exhaustion. The work atmosphere and the collegial and social support have effect on emotional exhaustion. Teachers engage well when given with adequate work environment. The 'material goods' and 'training' were negative and relatively weak predictors of emotional exhaustion. It may be due to the nature of teaching work that training may be considered as adding to the workload of teachers. The administrative factor was not a predictor of any dimension of burnout. The administrative culture of public schools operates upon established rules; further the job security, support, and administrative style work for the system within school, it does not put teachers on burnout. 74% of variance attributed to these eleven predictors on emotional exhaustion. The school factors assessed in current study must be kept balanced for minimizing chances of emotional detachment from job.

The factor Environmental was the strongest predictor of DP, personal and insecurities factors were also positive predictors of DP. The workplace environment plays a vital role in degree to which teachers deal with people at job. The reason of positively predicting depersonalization by personal factor is that teachers behave humanely when playing balanced work and family roles. The factor 'insecurities' measured fear of violence or rude behaviour from parents and students. It is obvious that fears cause stress and ultimately teachers behave cynical towards the students. Depersonalization was accounted by 70% of variance due to the predictors. In order to maintain a healthy interaction, school should be a resourceful place for teaching and learning.

The factor Environmental was also a strong and positive predictor of PA. The extent of lack of personal accomplishment is related to the atmosphere of school. If the environment is conducive, teachers will

be likely having more tasks' fulfilment. Training and material goods were negative predictors of personal accomplishment. 52% of variance was attributed to personal accomplishment. By making school an interesting place for teaching, the level of personal accomplishment of teachers can be increased. Personal accomplishment was attributed with low variance than the states of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, but it is the outcome response of the feelings of burnout among teachers.

Limitations & Suggestions

Literature supports the argument that exhaustion and detachment does not occur abruptly, it is somewhat a gradual decline in the form of being left with meager energy and resources at workplace (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011). The school environment should ideally be agitating teachers to work positive that ensures their optimum involvement. The variation causing factors may also include teachers' efficacy, effectiveness, and working hours in school, work pressures or role overload etc. Future study can focus on the other related factors that cause burnout among teachers (You & Conley, 2015). Teachers' knowledge can be updated by conducting seminars or refresher courses to cope with job stress at personal levels.

References

Barutçu, E., & Serinkan, C. (2008). Günümüzün Önemli Sorunlarından Biri Olarak Tükenmişlik Sendromuve Denizli'de Yapılan Bir Araştırma, Ege *Academic Review, 8*(2), 541-561.

Boyle, G. J., Borg, M. G., Falzon, J. M., & Baglioni, A. J. (1995).A structural model of the dimensions of teacher stress. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 65*, 49-67.

Edelwich, J., & Brodsky, A. (1980*). Burn-out. Stage of disillusionment in the helping profession.* London: Human Sciences Press.

Etzion, D., & Pines, A. (1986). Sex and culture in burnout and coping among human service professionals. *Journal of Cross Cultural Research, 17*(2), 191-209.

Farber, B. A. (2000). Treatment strategies for different types of teacher burnout. *Journal of Clinical Psychology/In Session, 56*(5), 675-689.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of Social Issues, 30*(1), 159-165).

Freudenberger, H. J., & Richelson, G. I. (1980). *Burn-out: The high cost of high achievement*. New York: Anchor Press, Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998).*Multivariate data analysis with readings.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006).Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology, 43,* 495-513. doi:10.1016/jsp.2005.11.001

Howard, S., & Johnson, B. (2004). Resilient teachers: Resisting stress and burnout. *School Psychology of Education, 7*, 399-420.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55.

Innstrand, S. T., Langballe, E. M., Falkum, E., & Aasland, O. G. (2011). Exploring within and between gender differences in burnout: 8 different occupational groups. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 84*(7), 813-824.

Jackson, L. T., & Rothman, S. (2005). An adapted model of Burnout for educators in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education, 25*(2), 100-108.

Javadi, F., & Khatib, M. (2014). On the relationship between reflective teaching and teachers' burnout. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 3*(4), 85-96. doi:10.5861/ijrsll.2014.614

Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-Out. *Human Behaviour, 5*, 16-22.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1986). *Maslach Burnout Inventor*y. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(3), 498-512. doi:10.103 7/0021-9010.93.3.498

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annu. Rev. Psychol., 52*, 397-422.

Pines, A. (1982). Helper's motivation and the burnout syndrome. In T. A. Wills (Ed.), *Basic processes in helping relationships* (pp. 453-475). New York: Academic Press.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study and practice: A critical analysis.* Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.

Schwab, R. L., Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1986). Educator burnout: Sources and consequences. *Educational Research Quarterly, 10*(3), 14-30.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1029-1038.

Stoeber, J., & Rennert, D. (2008). Perfectionism in school teachers: Relations with stress appraisal, coping styles, and burnout. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 21*, 37-53.

Travers, C. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1993). Mental health, job satisfaction and occupational stress among UK teachers. *Work and Stress, 7*(3), 203-219.

Ullman, J. B. (2001). Structural equation modeling. In B. G. Tabachnick & L. S. Fidell (Eds.), *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Yong, Z., & Yue, Y. (2007). Causes for burnout among secondary and elementary schoolteachers and preventive strategies. *Chinese Education and Society, 40*(5), 78-85.

You, S., & Conley, S. (2015). Workplace predictors of secondary school teachers' intention to leave: An exploration of career stages. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 43*(4), 561-581. doi:10.1177/1741143214535741

Zembylas, M. (2003). Coping for teacher emotion: Reflections on teacher self-development. *Journal of studies in Philosophy and Education, 22*(3), 103-125.

Received 10th November, 2016

Revision received 9th June, 2020