

**Haigazian University
Libraries**



0 0 0 0 3 8 9 7 1



EX LIBRIS HAIGAZIAN UNIVERSITY

BARSUMIAN LIBRARY

T
0068

HAIGAZIAN UNIVERSITY

PERCEIVED-TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY AS A PREDICTOR OF JOB BURNOUT AMONG A SAMPLE OF LEBANESE TEACHERS

by
Manal Sinno

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
to the Department of Education
of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
at the Haigazian University

Beirut, Lebanon
May 2010

HAIGAZIAN UNIVERSITY

THESIS RELEASE FORM

**PERCEIVED-TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY AS A
PREDICTOR OF JOB BURNOUT AMONG A SAMPLE
OF LEBANESE TEACHERS**

by
Manal Sinno

Approved by:

Hanine Hout, Ed.D.

Dr. Hanine Hout

Advisor

[Signature]

Dr. David Tawil

Member of Committee

Daizy S. Warren, Ed.D.

Dr. Daizy Warren

Member of Committee

HAIGAZIAN UNIVERSITY

THESIS RELEASE FORM

I, Manal Sinno

☒ authorize the Haigazian University to supply copies of my thesis to libraries or individuals.

☐ do not authorize the Haigazian University to supply copies of my thesis to libraries or individuals for a period of two years starting with the date of the thesis defense.

Manal Sinno

Signature

1/7/2010

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am heartily thankful to my supervisor, **Dr. Hanine Hout**, whose encouragement, guidance, and support from the initial level enabled me to develop an understanding of the subject.

I offer special thanks to the committee members **Dr. David Tawil** and **Dr. Daizy Warren** for their precious comments.

I offer my regards and blessings to all those who supported me in any aspect during the completion of the thesis.

I owe special thanks to my dearest **mom**, my wonderful **husband**, and my loving **children** who were always beside me and supported me throughout my educational journey.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my kidnapped **father** whom I miss a lot and who would definitely be proud of what I have achieved so far.

Finally, an honorable mention goes to **Aunt Dr. Samar Sinno** who led the way for me; and to my friends for their understandings and supports for completing this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study	5
Hypotheses	5
Significance of the Study	6
Nature of the Study	7
Definition of Terms	7
Delimitations	8
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Burnout	9
The Development of Burnout in Teachers	11
The Consequences of Burnout	12
Stress and Burnout	13
The Consequences of stress	13
Importance of Self-Efficacy among Teachers	15
Sources of Self-Efficacy	17
Effects of Self-Efficacy on Motivation and Performance	18
Hypotheses	21
METHOD	22
Setting	22

Participants	22
Materials	23
Procedure	26
RESULT	28
DISCUSSION	32
Conclusion	39
REFERENCES	41
APPENDICES	50
A Letters to the Administrators	50
B Letters to the Teachers	51
C Demographic Information	52
D Burnout Scale	54
E General Self-Efficacy Scale	58
Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale	59
Arabic Version of Demographic Information and Scales	60

ABSTRACT

The present study examined the relationship of teacher self-efficacy and general self-efficacy to burnout on a sample of school teachers (N=112) in Beirut. The study relied on self-report measures where participants were asked to provide demographic work-related information and fill three questionnaires: Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE), and Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSE). Results were computed using analyses of correlations and regression. The results of the study showed that Teacher Self-Efficacy and General Self-efficacy are positively and significantly correlated; whereas there was no significant relationship with general or with teacher self-efficacy. Further analysis showed that the number of absent days, among all other demographic variables, is the highest predictor of burnout.

PERCEIVED-TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY AS A PREDICTOR OF JOB BURNOUT AMONG A SAMPLE OF LEBANESE TEACHERS

The purpose of this chapter is to brief the reader on the contents and the setting of the current research study. Certain key issues will serve to provide this information. The title of the thesis is one. An overview of the purposes that lie behind the initiation of the study, that is, the significance of the study is another. The background against which the study was researched (limitations pertinent to the setting of the study) is yet another. After a brief discussion of each issue, the presentation of the organization of the chapters will serve to introduce the reader to the themes (objectives) of the research as arranged under the main parts of the thesis.

The investigator has chosen "Perceived-Teacher Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Job Burnout" as a title for the present thesis to refer to the correlation between self efficacy and burnout. As the title indicates, the purpose of the current research is to attempt to examine the reciprocal influence of self efficacy and burnout that teachers in Lebanon experience daily at the workplace.

Statement of the Problem

Work-related burnout has been the center of increased research interest in recent years. Research on burnout has chiefly focused on people-oriented professionals, like teachers, social workers, nurses, doctors; yet, burnout may influence any kind of occupation (Cordes, Dougherty, & Blum, 1997). The work of people-oriented professionals demands a great deal of emotional, cognitive and physical energy. These

overloading and conflicting burdens may lead to emotional weariness, mental exhaustion and physical weakness, which are commonly labeled as burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Shirom, 2002).

According to Maslach and Jackson (1981), burnout is a disorder with three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, reduced personal accomplishment, and depersonalization. Emotional exhaustion, which is the feeling of being worn-out of one's emotional resources, is viewed as the crucial individual stress component of the syndrome (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Reduced personal accomplishment signifies a tendency to assess oneself negatively with regard to one's competency and efficiency and a lowered sense of self-efficacy. Depersonalization refers to pessimistic, cynical or extremely detached responses to other people at work. According to Maslach et al.'s personalized idea, depersonalization was renamed cynicism; reduced personal accomplishment was re-labeled reduced efficacy or ineffectiveness (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001).

A review of the literature on burnout shows that burnout is a result of one's experience of continual job stress (Maslach, Schaufeli, Leiter, 2001; Shirom, 2002; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998; Burke & Richardsen, 2000). Qualitative and quantitative burden, role conflict and ambiguity, lack of control over one's work, and lack of social support are the stressors that may lead to burnout (Shirom, 2002; Lee & Ashforth, 1996).

The research about job results from perceptions of organizational unfairness, which indicates that individuals regard the outcome of their work (e.g., salary, status, appreciation) as uneven to their input into work (e.g., time, attention, effort) (Dierendonck, Schaufelli, & Buunk, 2001; Bakker, Schaufeli, Demerouti, Janssen, Hulst,

& Brouwer, 2000). Several studies confirmed the relationship between depressions, anxiety, and personally reported health-related problems and burnout, including circulatory and heart problems, musculoskeletal pains, gastrointestinal problems, sleep disorder and recurring headaches (Kahill 1988; Appels & Mulder, 1989; Van Diest & Appels, 1991). In addition, a number of studies showed that burnout has been related to some negative organizational outcomes, including increased turnover and absenteeism (Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986; Parker & Kulik 1995), lower organizational commitment (Shirom, 2002), and self-reported use of violence (Kop, Euwema, & Schaufeli, 1999). It has been stressed that unpleasant organizational conditions are more important in the etiology of burnout than personality factors like negative affectivity and low self-esteem (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Shirom, 2002). Given these negative results of burnout, it is not astonishing that a number of interventions to fight this dangerous phenomenon have been developed.

Perceived self-efficacy is explained as one's confidence in one's own abilities to generate specific degrees of work that affect actions which influence their lives (Bandura, 1994). Self-efficacy views decide how individuals believe, feel, motivate themselves, and act. Such views generate these different influences through four main means: cognitive, motivational, affective and selection means (Bandura, 1999).

A strong feeling of efficacy improves human achievement and personal interests in many ways. On one hand, individuals with lofty confidence in their abilities deal with hard responsibilities as challenges to be controlled rather than as dangers to escape from. Such an effective attitude promotes intrinsic concern in profound concentration in activities. For example, they set difficult objectives for themselves and sustain great

dedication to them. They also intensify and maintain their attempts to overcome failure. They rapidly improve their feeling of efficacy after collapse or failure. In addition, they relate failure to inadequate attempt or lacking of understanding and proficiency which are developed. They deal with threatening conditions with guarantee that they can manage them. Consequently, such an effective outlook yield personal accomplishments, decreases stress, and reduces susceptibility to depression (Bandura, 1999).

On the other hand, those who distrust their abilities withdraw from hard responsibilities which they consider as personal threats. They have low ambitions and feeble dedication to the objectives they desire to achieve. When confronted with hard jobs, they keep thinking about their personal inadequacy, on the difficulties they will face, and all types of unfavorable consequences, instead of focus on how to achieve efficaciously. They also slacken their attempts to surrender immediately in the face of troubles. They are slow to improve their feeling of efficacy after breakdowns or setbacks. Because they consider inadequate functioning as poor ability, it does not entail much disappointment for them to lose confidence in their abilities. That is why they fall easy target to stress and despair (Bandura, 1999).

Schwarzer & Hallum (2008) discussed the relationships between self efficacy, job stress, and burnout. They mentioned that the construct of self-efficacy implies a positive effect on teacher's ability to cope with adverse situations. Hence, teachers who believe in their ability to deal with obstacles and challenges have greater motivation to improvise solutions to their problems. Moreover, teachers with high self-efficacy regard every job demand as a new challenge to overcome rather than a threat that could jeopardize their sense of security and assurance. Therefore, when teachers succeed in adapting to stressful

instances, such as new job demands, they would prevent themselves from reaching the burnout stage. Hence, it is the lack of self-efficacy that would obviously foreshadow the burnout stage (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008).

Purpose of the Study

The reasons for choosing this particular topic emanate from the fact that at a time when some teachers cannot conceal the signs of weariness and fatigue they encounter, other teachers never show any sign of exhaustion or tiredness. However, most teachers admit that they have their ups and downs in teaching. In order to find out the reasons that lurk behind this status quo, the researcher has decided to investigate this issue thoroughly.

Hypotheses

In light of the above research, the purpose of the study was to discover the relationship between job burnout and teacher self-efficacy as well as general self-efficacy among Lebanese teachers. In particular, the following research hypotheses were examined:

1. There is a positive relationship between teacher self-efficacy and general self-efficacy.
2. There is a negative relationship between teacher self-efficacy and burnout.
3. There is a negative relationship between general self-efficacy and burnout.

Significance of the Study

As it is the concern of every successful establishment to ensure the well-being of its staff members, managers, supervisors, principals, and all those in positions of authority have to recognize all the factors that could hinder the growth and productivity of their organizations. Studies done in the field of psychiatry have come to realize the new silent, yet most devastating, disease that has fed on our intense need to achieve more goals in minimum, mainly stress. Clichés such as the fast track of life, running out of time, deadlines, and red tapes, have shaped the contours of our modern professions. On the top of the list of these professions, researchers have found out that the teaching profession has come in the first track (Cherniss, 1995; Gugliemi & Tatrow, 1998).

As the various effects of stress and the ways to fight it or even reduce it have been dealt with on various occasions, it was the researcher's concern to shed some light upon an extended and more intense evolution of stress; it is in fact stress in its highest phases which is burnout. Here, the conflict gets out of hand since with stress, people can still adjust and control their behavior, whereas with burnout, not only the person's conduct is affected, but also his psyche, emotions, and outcomes (Maslach, Schaufelli & Leiter, 2001).

Because burnout is a syndrome that numerous teachers suffer from, including Lebanese teachers, the researcher found that self efficacy and burnout are crucial issues to investigate. The research on this issue can serve as a basis for educators and decision-makers to initiate actions for diminishing this syndrome. Such actions may include improvising resolutions that may help teachers work on improving their self efficacy to avoid burnout.

Nature of the Study

The current research employed the quantitative method of statistical analysis to measure variables by using correlational and regression analyses in addition to the tests of comparison of means. It depended on self-report measures where participants were asked to present demographic and work-related information, and answer three questionnaires: the General Self-Efficacy scale (GSE), the Teacher Self-Efficacy scale (TSE), and the Maslach Burnout Inventory scale (MBI). One hundred and twelve teachers of different school levels from distinct schools-participated in the study.

Definition of Terms

Burnout: has been defined as “a syndrome of Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Reduced Accomplishment which is a special risk for individuals who work with other people in some capacity” (Leiter & Maslach, 1998).

Emotional Exhaustion: is a stress element. It refers to feelings of being emotionally over exhausted and worn-out of one’s emotional resources. (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Depersonalization: is an alteration in the perception or experience of the self so that one feels detached from, and as if one is an outside observer of, one’s mental processes or body. (glossary of psychiatric terminology)

Reduced Personal Accomplishment: is the “self-evaluation component” and is equated with reduced professional efficacy, productivity or potential, low spirits, and an incapability to manage with job burden. It represents a turn down in one’s outlook of fitness and success at work. Insufficient coping responses to the demanding encounters may lead to Emotional Exhaustion. In order to stay away from becoming more and more

worn out, people depart from their customers and start focusing on their personal life instead of on their professional life. Separation of oneself from one's job can lead to lowered achievement on the job Bakker, (Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007); Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001); Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

General self-efficacy: is an extensive and constant sense of personal ability to deal efficiently with a diversity of stressful situations

Teacher self efficacy: is the teacher's faith in his/her abilities to carry on positive effects on students learning.

Perceived self-efficacy: refers to "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997)

Delimitations

This study is to be interpreted with the following delimitations in mind:

This is a convenient sample consisting of ten private and public schools. All the schools were located in Beirut. Therefore, the results obtained may not be entirely generalized to other regions in Lebanon.

The questionnaire was distributed at the end of the year when most of the teachers were supposed to be worn out. Different results may appear if the questionnaire was filled by the teachers at the beginning of the school year or even at the end of the first term.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Many research articles and empirical studies have examined burnout among teachers, discussed its effects on the teachers' professional life, and considered its critical factors. The relationship between self-efficacy and burnout among teachers has received rather little attention from researches compared to the vast attention and concern they showed about teacher burnout due to the commonality of this syndrome. In addition, research has investigated the effect of self-efficacy on the teacher's performance.

Burnout

Several studies have connected either teacher self-efficacy or general self-efficacy in teachers to burnout (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008; Mede, 2009). The means in which stress and personal efficacy are related has been a controversial issue. In some cases, self-efficacy is considered to operate as an enabling aspect, not only protecting against burnout, but also increasing flexibility and allowing teachers to develop and prosper in their profession (Ross & Bruce, 2007; Van Dick & Wagner, 2001). In other cases, burnout and stress, mainly in beginning teachers, are seen to grow from the gap between expected levels of efficacy and observed levels of performance (Friedman, 2000). Hence, for new teachers with "high expectations, knowledge of current pedagogy, and a heightened desire to meet the needs of students and the demands of fellow teachers and supervisors", the realism of a deficiency of support, encouragement and being exposed to haste judgment can be mainly harmful (Fives, Hamman, & Olivarez). The consequences of these are often "feelings of ineffectiveness or un-accomplishment that are

accompanied by a growing sense of inadequacy. [Thus], the world seems to plan against efforts to make progress [which leads beginning teachers to] lose confidence in their ability to make a difference professionally” (Friedman, 2000).

Ever since the revolutionary researches about burnout (Freudenberger, 1974; Maslach & Jackson, 1981) up to this time, research into this topic has become more intense. Several studies have related the harmful effects of the burnout disorder to work efficacy, work absence, poor health, and psychopathology, in addition to a significant decline produced in social and family interactions (Dick & Wagner, 2001).

In the educational domain, studies of work-related stress and burnout have found facts that rouse alarm and gave good reason for the need to go on with research (Borg, Riding, & Falzon, 1991; Capel, 1991; Kyriacou, 2001). This is depicted in the research findings that indicate high percentage of teachers (between 30% and 75%) who are conscious of an average to intense level of stress in their work (Borg et al., 1991; Capel, 1991). Stress leads teachers to express in a noteworthy way the distinctive characteristics of this disorder (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, 1986): problems in personal accomplishment, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

Burnout within the teaching career has repeatedly been investigated and the fact has been documented as being challenging for teachers globally (Cherniss, 1995; Gugliemi & Tatrow, 1998). Nevertheless within this important body of research, there is a remarkable rareness of investigations that spotlight the relationship between self-efficacy and burnout in teachers. Why do a number of teachers succeed in being first-rate teachers, in constantly reinforcing students' achievements, and in assigning and carrying

on high aims for themselves, whereas others cannot meet expectations imposed on them and have a tendency to fail under the load of everyday stress? One cause lies in a teacher's perceived self-efficacy as a job-specific nature. On the one hand, teacher commitment is positively linked with individual coping resources, while teacher burnout is specified by a number of negative personality characteristics, as well as low levels of self-efficacy. On the other hand, teacher burnout is seen as a product of job tension that, given the burden of the work, hits in particular those who are short of the proper coping resources (Brief & Weiss, 2002; Guglielmi & Tatrow, 1998; Klusmann, Kunter, Trautwein, Ludtke, & Baumert, 2008; Schwartz & Greenglass, 1999; Vandenberghe & Huberman, 1999).

The Development of Burnout in Teachers

The aforementioned considerations may not influence teachers at the same level or at the same time. Huberman (1989) discusses that approximately everybody encounters times of uncertainty on whether or not they should stay in the teaching occupation, mainly after a period of attempt and investment.

Veninga and Spradley (1981, as cited in Hamann & Gordon, 2000) recognized the burnout cycle as a five-step model. At the first level, called the "honeymoon stage", a slow but sure loss of contentment, power and eagerness begins. The researchers assure that most teachers undergo this level as a minimum once a year and that it can be cured if detected early.

Symptoms of inadequacy, disappointment, exhaustion and insomnia typify the second, still curable level. It is at the third level where departure and attitude change start as continual fatigue changes back into anger, despair, and bodily sickness. At the fourth

level, identified as the catastrophe stage, the troubles preoccupy teachers as anger and ill health infuriate; lastly, at the final level called the “hit- on- the wall”, professional ineffectiveness beside bodily and emotional dysfunction govern.

According to Farber (1984, as cited in Adams et al., 1999), burnout is an important reason for departure; this, however, is the crucial stage and may not at all be reached by the mainstream of teachers who, although torment from the daily stresses of teaching, stay in the occupation and endure destructive consequences with dangerous effects for both themselves and their kids.

The Consequences of Burnout

For Maslach et al. (2001) the effects of burnout are linked with problems related to job performance and health; concerning one’s job performance, burnout has been related to forms of withdrawal namely “absenteeism, intention to leave, and turnover”; in cases where persons choose to stay in the work, the consequences consist of inefficiency or inefficacy that may, in turn, result in low job satisfaction or dedication to the business. Concerning the mental health, burnout is associated with problems like: neuroticism; decline in one’s self esteem; nervousness and despair as well as restlessness, anxiety and headaches. Spanoil & Caputo, 1979 as cited in Cunningham, 1983) also sustain this difference between organizational and individual outcomes, while Burke & Greenglass (2001, as cited in Maslach et al., 2001) also emphasizes on the fact that this disorder has a harmful spill effect on home life.

Stress and Burnout

Similar to burnout, stress is a complex matter including sources and symptoms relatively comparable to the ones caused by burnout. For many investigators, burnout is considered as a reaction to persistent stress (Cunningham, 1983; Kyriacou, 1989; Capel, 1989; Dorman, 2003; Kokkinos, 2005). According to a study done by Farber (1984, as cited in Millicent & Sewel, 1999), job related stress plays a significant part in the etiology of burnout, as extended stress is linked with the destruction of one's social, emotional, mental, and technical resources and results in burnout. Smylie (1989) also quotes that, originally, work related stress causes different levels of emotional anxiety and dissatisfaction and then, in its extreme form, to job burnout.

Concerning its signs, Gill (1979 as cited in Doohan, 1982) acknowledged the related signs of stress and burnout which consist of loss of interest, enthusiasm, as well as motivation. It also consists of decrease of energy, disturbances of sleep and appetite, changes of mood, feelings of guilt, shame, and worthlessness. In addition, it is also characterized by other symptoms such as physiological disorders, unexpected behavior, and difficulty in focus and concentration.

The Consequences of Stress

Kyriacou (1987 as cited in Millicent & Sewell, 1999) stated that the central harmful effects resulting from certain job qualities are anxiety and frustration. Moreover, Cooper and Payne (1988 as cited in Travers and Cooper, 1998) classified the indicators of stress that may lead to burnout into three groups. In the first group are the physiological indicators which are related to aspects of energy and exhaustion. Also,

Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1978 as cited in Hintont and Rotheiler, 1998) recognized heart troubles, headaches, blood pressure, and indigestion. Dunham (1980 as cited in Hintont and Rotheiler, 1998), who made researches on secondary teachers in Europe and West Germany, presented additional signals like sleeplessness, back pain, ulcer, and skin irritation. The second group of behavioral indicators is related to the aspects of absenteeism, submission, and early retirement. These distressing effects may, for Farber (1984 as cited in Geving, 2007), cause a catastrophe in education if we think about the financial cost of sick leaves, the distraction of the school year, the teachers' private anguish, and the outcomes on students' skill. The third group refers to the affective indication of stress such as the teachers' low self-efficacy, along with the signs of discontent, and nervousness. These indicators, as Quick and Quick (1984 as cited in Brown and Ralph, 1998) say, also influence the teachers' performance and decision.

In recent years, studies confirm the strong relationships between perceived self-efficacy and burnout (Brouwers, Evers & Tomic, 2000; Schmitz, 2000; Grau, Salanova & Peiró, 2001). Perceived self-efficacy has been defined as the person's confidence in his or her ability to systemize and carry out the means necessary to attain goals (Bandura, 1997). People with a stronger sense of perceived self-efficacy encounter low stress in difficult or challenging situations, and consider situations as less stressful due to the confidence in their ability to handle.

Grau, Salanova & Peiró (2001) discovered that self-efficacy might cause work-related stress in the sense that low levels of self-efficacy are linked with high levels of job-related stress. Professional self-efficacy is considered to be positively related to personal achievement, and negatively related to depersonalization and emotional

exhaustion. Schmitz (2000) recognized that experiencing persistent work-related stressors, with low sense of efficacy to handle job burden increases susceptibility to burnout. In a similar study, Brouwers et al. (2000) inquire the course and time of the relationship between perceived self-efficacy in classroom running and burnout for school teachers. They found out that teacher efficacy has an apparent effect on depersonalization and simultaneous effect on personal accomplishment.

Importance of Self Efficacy among Teachers

The issue of self has always tricked and puzzled human beings for centuries, and the studies that have concentrated on this subject have been numerous. According to Bandura (1999), the study of self development has overcome different domains of psychology because most exterior effects do not affect human performance straightforwardly, but through 'intermediary self processes'. Moreover, he added that private factors are very much concerned in "regulating intentional processes, schematic processing of experience, memory representation and reconstruction, cognitively based motivation, emotion activation, psychobiological functioning and the efficacy with which cognitive and behavioral competencies are executed in the transaction of everyday life" (Bandura, 1999).

Teachers have a very important role in the success or failure of each educational organization. Galluzzo (2005) said that the quality of the teacher is one of the most essential factors contributing to student learning. Also, according to Sanders & Horn (1998) the teachers' effects on students' achievements are "additive and cumulative with little evidence those subsequent effective teachers can offset the effects of ineffective

ones". In addition, they continued that "regardless of race, students who are assigned disproportionately to ineffective teachers will be severely academically handicapped relative to students with other teacher assignment patterns". Consequently, they concluded that to serve its primary purpose, educational assessment has to address the teacher effectiveness.

Teacher efficacy is one of the essential factors that have proved to be "powerfully related to many meaningful educational outcomes such as teacher persistence, enthusiasm, commitment and instructional behavior, as well as student outcomes such as achievement, motivation, and self efficacy belief" (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Furthermore, discussing the major role of school environment as an organization for refining students' cognitive self-efficacy, Bandura (1994) continued that "the task of creating learning environment conducive to the development of cognitive skills rests heavily on the talents and self-efficacy of teachers". Teachers who have a well-built sense of efficacy about their competency can motivate their students and progress their cognitive development. In contrast, those who have a low sense of efficacy support a "custodial orientation that relies heavily on negative sanctions to get students to study".

As the effects of teacher efficacy on their performance in the classroom have been well documented, few studies in the literature have investigated the relationship between teacher efficacy and their feeling of burnout. The present study is going to address this issue by investigating the relationship among teacher self-efficacy, stress, and burnout.

Bandura (1994) has defined perceived self-efficacy as "people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives". Besides, he considers that through four major processes

which are cognitive, motivational, and affective and selective ones, self efficacy affects how people feel, think, sense, imagine, motivate themselves, reflect, and behave. In 1999, he noted that efficacy beliefs form the basis of human activity. Hence, people who don't have confidence in the fact that they can give desired results by their behaviors will have little motivation to work or to persist in the face of obstacles.

Sources of Efficacy

According to Bandura (1994, 1999), self-efficacy beliefs are formed from four major sources of data. The first is the primary way of constructing a sturdy sense of efficacy via "mastery experience". "This can be achieved by tackling problems in successive, attainable steps. Consequently, success builds a robust belief in one's efficacy, whereas failures undermine it, especially in earlier phases of self-development" (Bandura, 1999). The second favorable way of increasing and intensifying our personal efficacy beliefs is what Bandura named it "vicarious experiences". Thus, viewing others carry out a behavior leading to undesirable consequences may cause us to trust our own abilities, but witnessing other people failing to carry out a particular behavior regardless of serious attempts discourages us and lessens our belief in our own efficacy (Bandura, 1999). The third method of intensifying people's confidence in their efficacy is "social persuasion". Hence, "if people are persuaded that they have what it takes to succeed, they exert more effort and are more perseverant than if they harbor self-doubts and dwell on personal deficiencies when problems arise" (Bandura, 1999). Finally, people depend on their physical and emotional status to evaluate their abilities. Physical and emotional conditions affect people's belief of self-efficacy since people depend on these issues to assess their abilities (Bandura, 1999).

Effects of Self-Efficacy on Motivation and Performance

Bandura (1993, 1994, 1997, 1999), stated that personal efficacy beliefs control human performance through cognitive, motivational, emotional and choice procedures. Bandura (1994) mentions that “most courses of action are initially organized in thought. ‘Peoples’ beliefs in their efficacy shape the types of anticipatory scenarios they construct and rehearse.”. A success scenario develops from a positive and constructive outlook concerning one’s efficacy which leads to a clear and positive base and assistance for achievement. However, the one who has acquired a negative, pessimistic, defeatist and doubtful outlook toward the outcome of his deeds would generally envision breakdown and disappointing scenarios. Therefore, this mental state would serve as a halting block to his otherwise attainable aims and achievements.

Bandura (1999) states that the majority of human motivation is produced mentally. Moreover, efficacy beliefs play a vital part in the ‘self regulation’ of motivation. He also discussed three kinds of cognitive motivators specifically, ‘causal attributions’, ‘outcome expectancies’, and ‘cognized goals’, about which many theories have been made. The subsequent theories to these three motivators are attribution theory, expectancy-value theory, and goal theory, correspondingly. People who are very successful mostly associate their errors with either unsuitable situations or their inadequate attempts; whereas those who have a low level of self-efficacy, nearly all of the time attribute their failures to their modest proficiency. Therefore, these unintentional traits affect people’s enthusiasm and performance chiefly through private efficacy viewpoints.

Furthermore, as people begin to act, their achievement is straightforwardly managed by the objectives they have put. The more serious and clear the objective is, the more the enthusiasm is improved and continued. Besides, it is somewhat on the center of efficacy viewpoints that people select “which goal challenges to undertake, how much efforts to invest and how long to persevere in the face of difficulties” (Bandura, 1999). In addition, people’s self-efficacy beliefs affect how much pressure, despair, and worry they experience in intimidating and complex situations. Bandura (1999) assures that efficacy attitudes control affective position “by influencing how threats are cognitively perceived, by supporting coping actions that alter the threats, by exercising control over perturbing thought patterns, and by alleviating aversive affective states”.

The concept of self efficacy holds essential consequences for the teaching occupation. This idea has been defined as teacher’s faith in his/her abilities to carry on positive effects on students learning (Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001). Teacher efficacy consists of two elements: Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) which implies the teacher’s confidence that he/she can convey helpful consequences on students’ learning, and General Teacher Efficacy (GTE) which conveys the teachers’ certainty that the teaching business mainly can result in student change (Chacon, 2005). This idea has shown to be “powerfully related to many meaningful educational outcomes such as teacher persistence, enthusiasm, commitment and instructional behavior, as well as student outcomes such as achievement, motivation, and self efficacy belief” (Tschannen et al., 2001).

Somech & Drach-Zahavy (2000, quote from Ross et al. 1996) saying that “a teacher’s sense of efficacy will determine the amount of effort he or she puts into

teaching, the degree of persistence when confronted with difficulties, and the task choices made.”. Similarly, the outcome of several reviews in the literature has confirmed the influence of teacher efficacy on several aspects of teacher functioning as well. For instance, the results of the studies made by Brouwers & Tomic (2000); Fires, Humman, & Olivarez (2006) assured that teacher efficacy is linked with teacher burnout. Besides, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone (2006), considered the correlation between teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs, their work satisfaction, and students’ scholarly success. Their outcomes indicated that teachers' private efficacy viewpoint influenced their job satisfaction and students' academic achievement. Moreover, Ross (1992) examined the link between student achievement, teacher efficacy, a contact with assigned instructors on a sample of 18 grade 7 and 8 history teachers in 36 classes. The outcome of the study showed that students’ attainment was superior in classrooms of teachers who got more in touch with their teachers, and in classrooms of teachers with greater confidence in the helpfulness of education. Somech & Drach-Zahavy (2000) also discovered that self-efficacy was positively linked with “extra role behavior” toward the group and the institution.

In another review, Ghaith & Shaaban (1999) considered the link between perceptions of teaching interests, teacher efficacy, and selected teacher characteristics on 292 Lebanese teachers. The outcomes of their study showed that starting teachers and those with little sense of personal efficacy were worried about the mission of teaching and the impression they make as teachers more than their exceedingly skilled and more personally effective equivalents.

Finally, Di Fabio & Taralla (2006) studied the links between teacher self efficacy, social demographic variables (age, years of teaching and type of school), intensity of career involvement, institutional dedication, and organizational contentment. The conclusion of their statistical analysis assured the interconnected characteristic of the self efficacy's concept with the concepts of job contribution, emotional dedication and organizational contentment.

In the light of the above literature review, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between general and teacher self-efficacy, and burnout. More specifically, the study examined the following hypotheses:

1. There is a positive relationship between teacher self-efficacy and general self-efficacy.
2. There is a negative relationship between teacher self-efficacy and burnout.
3. There is a negative relationship between general self-efficacy and burnout.

CHAPTER 3

Method

The educational literature is full of research on teacher self-efficacy and burnout, with most findings concluding that teaching is a very stressful profession (Woods, 1999) and the number one occupation to suffer burnout (Rudow, 1999).

However, research on the relation between self-efficacy and burnout is insufficient. Noticing the significance of self-efficacy and the harmful effects of burnout among teachers is what drove the researcher to study the correlation between self-efficacy and burnout among teachers. In the section that follows the methodology adopted in order to examine the correlation between self-efficacy and burnout in a quantitative study is presented.

Setting

This study took place in the teachers' rooms of the schools from which teachers were selected. Participants were given enough time to fill in the questionnaires. In all ten schools, there were teachers who refused to fill in the questionnaires. The reason for this refusal is totally because of their being busy with school work.

Participants

The sampling procedure used by the researcher was convenience sampling. The participants were restricted to those who had a free period in a regular school day.

The total number of participants was 112. The age range was between 22 and 65 ($M = 37.17$). They were teachers of five public schools and five private schools in Beirut. The gender distribution was 16 males and 96 females. Most of the participants were Lebanese, although there were Palestinians, Syrians, and Lebanese from Armenian Origin. Participants came from diverse Religious and Political backgrounds.

Materials

Participants were handed a booklet which included the demographic and work-related information sheet and three questionnaires.

On the demographic and work-related information sheet, participants were asked to indicate their age, gender, marital status, kind of school, region of school, number of years of teaching in general, and number of years of teaching the same subject matter and in the same school, educational level, workshops and seminars, the health problems they suffer from, and the number of days of absenteeism per school year.

General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE)

The General Self-Efficacy scale assesses a general sense of perceived self efficacy with the aim in mind to predict coping with daily hassles as well as adaptation after experiencing all kinds of stressful life events. GSE has 10 items each of which is rated on a scale of 1 to 4; (1) not at all true, (2) barely true, (3) moderately true, (4) exactly true; with higher scores corresponding to high self-efficacy. The full-scale score thus ranges from 10 to 40 (Matthias Jerusalem & Ralf Schwarzer, 1999).

Reliability and Validity

In samples from 23 nations, Crombach's alphas ranged from .76 to .90, with the majority in the high .80s. The scale is unidimensional. Criterion-related validity is documented in numerous correlation studies where positive coefficients were found with favorable emotions, dispositional optimism, and work satisfaction. Negative coefficients were found with depression, anxiety, stress, burnout, and health complaints.

Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSE)

The Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale was used to measure the teacher's confidence in his/ her abilities to carry on positive effects on students learning. TSE has 10 items each of which is rated on a scale of 1 to 4; (1) not at all true, (2) barely true, (3) moderately true, (4) exactly true; with higher scores corresponding to high teacher self-efficacy. The full-scale score thus ranges from 10 to 40. The TSE scale consists of four steps. The first step is to identify different job skills within the teaching profession. The four major areas in the teacher self-efficacy scale are: (a) job accomplishment, (b) skill development on the job, (c) social interaction with students, parents, and colleagues, and (d) coping with job stress. For each of these four domains, teachers may hold different self-efficacy expectations (Ralf Schwarzer, Gerdamarie S. Schmitz, & Gary T. Daytner, 1999).

Reliability and Validity

A pool of 27 items TSE scale was part of a lengthy questionnaire being administered three times to approximately 300 German teachers within the nationwide field study Self-Efficacious Schools. The aim was to extract a parsimonious instrument of

about 10 items to economically assess efficacy beliefs within the four areas mentioned above. The primary focus during the reduction of the items was on optimizing the validity of the instrument rather than maximizing the internal consistency. Thus, Cronbach's alpha in the three samples was found to be between .76, and .82, test-retest reliability resulted in .67 ($N = 158$), and .76 ($N = 193$) respectively, for the period of one year. For the period of two years it was found to be .65 ($N = 161$).

As expected, the more specific instrument of Teacher Self-Efficacy yielded higher associations with several other personal attitudes than the General Self-Efficacy scale. This can be regarded as a first indication for discriminant validity of the new instrument. Moreover, the time teachers spent voluntarily with their students was strongly associated with their Teacher self-efficacy (Schmitz & Schwarzer, 2000).

Maslach Burnout Inventory

To assess the three burnout dimensions, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996) was administered. The items of the burnout scale are rated on a scale of 0 to 5, (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) quite often, (5) almost always. The full-scale score thus ranges from 42 to 210. MBI has three subscales: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. The leading symptom of the burnout syndrome, Emotional Exhaustion, was assessed with nine items, such as "I feel emotionally drained from my work". The subscale Depersonalization consists of five items, such as "I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects". The third dimension, Reduced Personal Accomplishment, was

assessed with eight items, such as "I have not attained important goals with my work" (Maslach et al., 1996).

Reliability and Validity

Several studies carried out by Iwanicki & Schwab (1981) and Gold (1984) support reliability such as the three-factor structure and internal reliability. Cronbach alpha ratings of 0.90 for emotional exhaustion, 0.76 Depersonalization, and 0.76 for Personal accomplishment were reported by Schwab; very similar ratings were reported by Gold. Time periods of a few weeks, 3 months, and 1 year were used for test-retest reliability. Scores in the few week range were the highest (.60-.82) whereas scores in the year range were the lowest (0.54-0.60).

Procedure

During regular school days, the researcher went to schools to explain the purpose of the study to the administration and to ask the teachers to fill in the questionnaires. In total, 150 questionnaires were handed out, but about 25% of them were not handed back and five of the questionnaires were disregarded because of missing information, leaving 100 questionnaires. After the participants had completed the questionnaires, the researcher scored them and fed the data into the computer.

This study examined the independent variable burnout and its three major symptoms (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal

accomplishment), gender, age, previous experience and the dependent variables general self efficacy and teacher self efficacy.

Results

This study used three scales: General Self-Efficacy (GSE), Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE), and Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). To examine the internal reliability of the used scales, a pilot study was conducted on twenty-five participants. The questionnaires were translated to the Arabic language and then back to the English for reliability purposes. The purpose of the pilot study was to establish the clarity of the items, and to study any difficulties faced by the teachers in answering the questions. The pilot study was given to twenty-five teachers teaching at different grade levels in different schools.

As for the results of the pilot study, the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale's Cronbach's Alpha scored .917, and the General Self-Efficacy Scale's Cronbach's Alpha .912. As for the Maslach Burnout Inventory's three subscales, the emotional exhaustion Cronbach's Alpha scored .862, the depersonalization Cronbach's Alpha scored .548, whereas the personal accomplishment Cronbach's Alpha scored .824. Finally, the total Maslach Burnout Inventory Scale's Cronbach's Alpha showed a total of .907.

For the current study conducted on 112 participants, the internal reliability of each subscale of the MBI as well as the total scales of GSE and TSE were determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha for each scale and subscale. Results showed that each scale and subscale have high internal reliability, which were consistent with previous reliability analysis of these scales (see Table 1).

CHAPTER 4

Results

This study used three scales: General Self-Efficacy (GSE), Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE), and Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). To examine the internal reliability of the used scales, a pilot study was conducted on twenty-five participants. The questionnaires were translated to the Arabic language and then back to the English for reliability purposes. The purpose of the pilot study was to establish the clarity of the items, and to study any difficulties faced by the teachers in answering the questions. The pilot study was given to twenty five teachers teaching at different grade levels in different schools.

As for the results of the pilot study, the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale's Cronbach's Alpha scored .917, and the General Self Efficacy Scale's Cronbach's Alpha .912. As for the Maslach Burnout Inventory's three subscales, the emotional exhaustion Cronbach's Alpha scored .862, the depersonalization Cronbach's Alpha scored .548, whereas the personal accomplishment Cronbach's Alpha scored .824. Finally, the total Maslach Burnout Inventory Scale's Cronbach's Alpha showed a total of .907.

For the current study conducted on 112 participants, the internal reliability of each subscale of the MBI as well as the total scales of GSE and TSE were determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha for each scale and subscale. Results showed that each scale and subscale have high internal reliability, which were consistent with previous reliability analysis of these scales (see Table 1).

Table 1

Cronbach's alpha for the scales

Scale	Previous Cronbach alpha	Current Cronbach alpha
General Self-Efficacy (GSE)	.76 - .90	.846
Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE)	.76 - .82	.876
Emotional exhaustion	.90	.632
Reduced Personal Accomplishment	.76	.633
Total Burnout	.60 - .82	.755

To test the relationship between general self-efficacy and teacher self-efficacy a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed between the participants' scores on the General Self-Efficacy Scale and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale. The result of the correlation $r(112) = .659, p<.000$ showed a significant positive relationship between the variables of general and teacher self-efficacy. This correlation means that participants with high scores on General Self-Efficacy Scale also obtain high scores on the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale. Thus, the hypothesis about the positive relationship between General Self-Efficacy and Teacher Self-Efficacy was not rejected.

To test the relationship between general self-efficacy and burnout a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed between the participants' scores on the General

Self-Efficacy Scale and the Maslach Burnout Scale. The result of the correlation $r(112) = -.084, p < .377$ showed no relationship between the variables of general self-efficacy and burnout. Evidently the predicted relationship between general self-efficacy and burnout was not supported.

To test the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and burnout a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed between the participants' scores on the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale and the Maslach Burnout Scale. The result of the correlation $r(112) = -.133, p < .162$ showed no relationship between the variables of teacher self-efficacy and burnout. The hypothesized relationship between teacher self-efficacy and burnout was not supported in the current study.

Further analysis of the results displayed some important points. A regression analysis was performed to measure the contribution of the demographic variables on the dependent variable: burnout. The total score of the Burnout scale was regressed on the variables of age, gender, years of teaching in the current school, number of classes taught per week, having health problems, and number of absent days per year. Results showed that the "number of absent days" is the greatest and the only significant predictor of burnout, followed by number of classes taught per week, and the number of years teaching in the same school which are partially significant (see Table 2).

Table 2

Regression analysis of Burnout on demographic variables

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	111.442	8.531		13.063	.000
	sex	5.199	4.082	.125	1.274	.206
	age	-.094	.258	-.064	-.364	.717
	maritalSTATUS	-2.222	2.216	-.102	-1.003	.318
	NUMkids	.160	1.139	.016	.140	.889
	YRSgeneral	-.354	.340	-.207	-1.041	.300
	YRSschool	.551	.299	.313	1.841	.069
	NUMclasses	1.344	.698	.188	1.926	.057
	healthPROB	1.927	3.334	.057	.578	.565
	ABSENTdays	1.321	.475	.268	2.783	.006

a. Dependent Variable: total

R Square = .120, and adjusted R Square = .078

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The present study focused on the relationship between general self-efficacy and teacher self-efficacy, and the effect of general self-efficacy and teacher self-efficacy on teacher burnout. Several remarkable results can be pointed out from this study.

General Self-Efficacy and Teacher Self-Efficacy

The present study hypothesized a positive relationship between general self-efficacy and teacher self-efficacy. Result revealed a positive correlation between general self-efficacy and teacher self-efficacy yielded a positive correlation between the two variables. Consequently, participants with high general self-efficacy had high scores on the teacher self-efficacy scale, while the participants with low general self-efficacy had low scores on the teacher self-efficacy scale.

The above-mentioned result is in line with the study made by Schwarzer (1992). He assures that self-efficacy is usually understood to be “domain-specific”. Explicitly, one may have relatively definite self-beliefs in diverse domains or specific situations of performance. Moreover, there is also a general sense of self-efficacy that denote to total confidence in one’s coping aptitude throughout a wide variety of challenging or new situations. General self-efficacy aims at a wide and firm sense of personal proficiency to deal efficiently with a diversity of demanding situations (Schwarzer, 1992). If self-efficacy is used as a predictor of extensive outcomes, for instance value of life, interests,

or general adaptation and wellbeing, it is necessary to use a correspondingly expansive measure of general self-efficacy.

General Self-Efficacy and Burnout

The current study hypothesized a negative relationship between general self-efficacy and burnout. Obtained correlational results however showed no relationship between general self-efficacy and burnout. This implies that in the schools surveyed there are teachers with low general self-efficacy but are not burnt-out; and there are burnt-out teachers with high general self-efficacy.

Those results can be attributed to cultural factors. The point is that Eastern communities are described as collectivists while Western societies are usually individualistic. Individualism is “the opposite of collectivism; together they form the dimensions of national cultures. Individualism stands for a society in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family only,” (Geert, 1994). On the other hand, collectivism “stands for a society in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong cohesive groups, which throughout people’s lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty,” (Geert, 1994).

Thus, while teachers in the West mainly rely on their individualistic efforts for their well-being, teachers in the orient consider their families as their haven. To them societal relationships are far more important than individual failures. For that reason, the

researcher cannot attribute teacher's burnout to low self-efficacy - which is an individualistic trait – as it is the case in the West.

Other than self-efficacy the researcher found out some factors leading to burnout such as compulsory relocations, remoteness from other grownups, useless bureaucratic procedures and absence of promotion chances. Moreover, the sources of burnout generate from the fact that the teachers' conventional task has altered and social integration places extra load on them as they are expected to recompense for changes in both society and the family.

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Burnout

The current study hypothesized a negative relationship between teacher self-efficacy and burnout. To measure the correlation between teacher self-efficacy and burnout, a booklet with teacher self-efficacy scale together with the three burnout subscales were filled by the participants. The results obtained showed no correlation between the teacher self-efficacy and the burnout variable. This result may be due to the fact that there are multiple causes resulting in teacher burnout other than the teacher's faith in his/her abilities to carry on positive effects on students learning.

These, specifically, contain: (i) demographic features, (ii) personality variables, and (iii) occupational viewpoint. Inquiry on the importance of background factors on teacher burnout has stressed on the following: gender, where researches have shown depersonalization to be higher for male primary and high school teachers (Bibou- Nakou, Stogiannidou & Kiosseoglou, 1999); age, where young teachers were revealed to encounter more emotional exhaustion than elder ones (Byrne, 1999); teaching experience,

with studies revealing that teachers with more than twenty years of experience displayed more intensified stress than their younger coworkers (Byrne, 1999); marital status, with Pierce and Molloy (1990 as cited in Byrne, 1999) finding that married teachers encountered lower depersonalization levels than their childless colleagues; grade of level, with high school teachers discovered to be more vulnerable than elementary ones (Anderson & Iwanicki, 1984 as cited in Byrne, 1999); and, finally, the type of students taught, with special education teachers discovered to be more susceptible to burnout than regular ones (Fore, Martin & Bender, 2002).

Considering personality variables, Byrne (1999) recognized two issues as most likely to affect teacher burnout: the first is the teachers' self-confidence and the second is the locus of control. For Byrne (1999), both are essential in a person's aptitude to endure work stressors.

Huberman (1989), on the other hand, recognized thoughts of routine and of being ensnared in teaching, troubles in personal life, and even philosophical causes such as views on improvement as the central personal variables that cause the occurrence of burnout. Additionally, behavior that includes an aggressive and violent manner has been discovered to correlate with high levels of burnout (Burke & Greenglass, 1995); researchers have also proposed that personal coping plans are significant in affecting levels of burnout (Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1988 as cited in Burke and Greenglass, 1995).

Regarding to the teachers' viewpoints towards their careers, Hofer (1986 as cited in Rudow, 1999) detects burnout after teachers' frustration because of unfulfilled expectations concerning discipline concerns, pupils' thankfulness or aptitude, and their

inspiration to be taught. On the whole, research that deals with individual teachers' characteristics has concluded that it is devoted and dedicated teachers that are susceptible to burnout (Friesen, Prokop & Sarros, 1988; Dinham & Scott, 2000).

In addition to the importance of background variables in interpreting teacher burnout, investigators have recognized work-related, managerial and profession characteristics as probable predictor variables (Byrne, 1999; Maslach, 1999). Byrne (1999) researched the organizational causes that are expected to influence teacher burnout: these consist of factors like (i) role conflict resulting from inconsistent series of stresses; (ii) role uncertainty which conveys lack of precision concerning their responsibilities; (iii) work burden, which teachers have referred to as a chief job stressor and consist of concerns of paperwork, large classes with students of various scholastic levels, compulsory time limits and programs remote from their proficiency; (iv) reduced classroom climate, particularly the one linked with control, in addition to attitudinal and rudeness problems; (v) absence of participation in decision making, and (vi) the deficiency of encouragement from colleagues and administrators.

Concerning work background characteristics, aspects of the job itself like the kind of supervision, the reality distress, and restraints in teachers' managerial situation were recognized as probable burnout predictor variables (Maslach, 1982 as cited in Burke and Greenglass, 1995). Friedman (2003) also defined burnout as the difference between the teachers' expectations as perfect professionals and the actual outcomes of their work.

Regarding work-related characteristics, Farber (1999), recognized irrelevance between the effort teachers exert and the absence of reward, income, and gratitude they receive upon which the core of the issue lies. In an analysis of eighteen studies on the

considerations that cause teacher burnout Leithwood, Menzies, Jantzi & Leithwood (1999) declare that various managerial and personal reasons discussed above may in fact be affected by a new category, specifically the leadership factors.

Demographic Variables

A regression analysis performed to measure the contribution of the demographic variables - age, gender, years of teaching in the current school, number of classes taught per week, having health problems, and number of absent days per year - on the dependent variable - burnout - showed that the “number of absent days” is the greatest and the only significant predictor of burnout, followed by the “number of classes taught per week”, and the “number of years taught in the same school” which are partially significant.

When the teacher is burnt-out, this means that she is suffering from health problems such as severe headaches, digestion disorder, and neurotic pains. Suffering from these problems, the teacher will reside for absenteeism for therapeutic necessities. That is why absenteeism showed the greatest predictor of burnout.

The number of classes taught per week is not less important than the aforementioned predictor of burnout. This is due to the fact that as the number of classes taught per week increases, as the teacher’s work increases, too. The teacher will have to teach a greater number of students, correct more papers, and prepare more lessons and visual aids. In fact, we must not underestimate the teacher’s work, because it requires more physical, mental, and emotional energy in addition to coping strategies.

As for the “years taught in the same school” variable as a predictor of teacher burnout, it is related to several different causes such as the teacher’s suffering from the routine of dealing with the same staff, and maybe teaching the same class levels for several years. The feeling of routine and of being stagnant in the same place “forever” is enough to lead the teacher to burnout.

This result is in line with the literature review which assured that a remarkable consequence of teacher burnout is his/her getting absent frequently. In general, as Kelchtermans & Strittmatter (1999) assure, burnout has sensible consequences on the teachers’ work, dedication, and contentment, on kids’ learning, and, inevitably, on burdening school as a place of work. Clark (1984 as cited in Travers and Cooper, 1998) adds that the disorder lead to deteriorating teaching quality, displaying less praise to students and less acceptance of their thoughts.

Cunningham (1983) classified the signs of burnout according to their causes. The managerial ones consist of features like absenteeism, deterioration in work and reduced interactive relations with both students and colleagues.

According to Seiderman (1978 as cited in Goelman and Guo, 1998) lateness, absenteeism because of ill health, and decline in energy level are the major signs of burnout and are the consequences of teachers’ constant criticism of working circumstances, wages, students’ behavior, and being short of parental contribution; if these elements go on sickening teachers and are followed by bad temper, quarrel, and low personnel morale, teachers ultimately arrive at the final stage which is submission.

Lastly, according to Shirom (2003 as cited in Cinamon, Rich & Westman, 2007), burnout is a result of stress that leads to negative work consequences such as

absenteeism, turnover, little dedication, and diminished mental, emotional, and physical health.

That is why it would be an overstatement to take for granted that they would desert their careers as it is a fact that their positions are everlasting and they would hardly ever abandon it for a different job.

Conclusion

The result of this study showed that general self-efficacy and teacher self-efficacy are positively correlated; while neither general self-efficacy nor teacher self-efficacy are correlated to burnout. In addition, a regression analysis performed to measure the contribution of the demographic information on the dependent variable - burnout - showed that the “number of absent days” is the greatest and the only significant predictor of burnout.

While previous research indicated the strong relationship between self-efficacy and burnout, the current study found no significant relationship between them. The findings of this study indicate that away from self-efficacy, there are numerous extrinsic factors that lead to teacher burnout. Some delimitations pertinent to this study contributed to the attained results.

For one, the questionnaire was distributed at the end of the year when most of the teachers were most likely to be worn out. Thus different results might appear if the questionnaire was filled by the teachers at the beginning of the school year or even at the end of the first term. Another limitation is related to the sample—ten public and private schools in the Beirut region—was chosen because it was convenient to the researcher

who lives and works in the capital. This sample, however, is not representative of the population of teachers in Lebanon who work under different conditions and who live in other areas. Therefore, the results obtained might not be entirely generalizable.

Despite its limitations, the findings of this study bear several very important recommendations for administrators. The first recommendation is to address intervention strategies at the different stages of the teachers' professional life to keep them safe from any sense of burnout. The current study also recommends that teachers be given training sessions that would help them assimilate any kind of innovation that might take place at school throughout the academic year. Other in-service training sessions would help teachers cope with the factors that might lead to burnout.

This study also suggests reducing the number of teaching hours per week so that teachers would have ample time to prepare and correct and confer with other colleagues, instead of taking everything home where they would be busy doing other types of chores. It also recommends that teachers would participate in workshops and conferences held in Lebanon and abroad that would help them grow professionally. This study also suggests that schools provide daycare centers for the teachers' infants and toddlers. In this way teachers would not have to rush out to nurseries or relatives' homes before going to school.

For future studies, it would be valuable to conduct researches that would include a wider sample, one that is not restricted to a particular region. Other researches would take into consideration the educational and experiential level of principles and coordinators, and the type of supervision applied in the various schools. Other research studies would compare teachers of special education to teachers of non-special education.

References

- Abel, M., & Sewell, J. (1999). Stress and burnout in rural and urban secondary school teachers. *Journal of Educational Research, 92*, 287-299.
- Bakker, A.B., Hakanen, J.J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(2), 274-284.
- Bakker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2000). Burnout contagion process among teachers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 2289-2308.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], *Encyclopedia of mental health*. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998).
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of personality. In Pervn, L., & John, O. (Eds), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 154-196). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Billingsley, B. S., & Cross, L. H. (1992). Predictors of commitment, job satisfaction, and intent to stay in teaching: a comparison of general and special educators. *The Journal of Special Education, 25*, 453-471.
- Borg, M. G., Riding, R. J., & Falzon, J. M. (1991). Towards a model for the determinants of occupational stress among schoolteachers. *European Journal of psychology of Education, 6*, 355-373.
- 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.

- Brief, A.P., & Weiss, H.M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279–307.
- Brouwers, A., Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 239–253.
- Brown, M. & Ralph, S. (1998). The Identification of Stress in Teachers. In J. Dunham & V. Varma (Eds.), *Stress in Teachers. Past, Present and Future* (pp. 37– 56). London: Whurr Publishers.
- Burisch, M. (2002). A longitudinal study of burnout: the relative importance of dispositions and experiences. *Work and stress*, 16, 1–17
- Burke, R.J., Greenglass, E.R., & Schwarzer, R. (1996). Predicting teacher burnout over time: Effects of work stress, social support, and self-doubts on burnout and its consequences. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping*, 9, 261–275.
- Burke RJ, Richardsen AM. Organizational level interventions designed to reduce occupational stressors. In: Dewe P, Leiter M, Cox T, editors. *Coping, health and organizations*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis; 2000. p.191–209.
- Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., & Steca, P. (2003). Efficacy beliefs as determinants of teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 821–832.
- Capel, S. A. (1991). A longitudinal study of burnout in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 61, 36–45.
- Chacon, C. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 257–272.

- Chang, D. (2002). Stress, self-efficacy, social support, and psychological distress among prospective teachers in Hong Kong. *Educational Psychology, 22*, 557-569.
- Cherniss, C. (1995). *Beyond burnout: Helping teachers, nurses, therapists & lawyers recover from stress & disillusionment*. NY: Routledge.
- Cordes CL, Dougherty TW, Blum M. Patterns of burnout among managers and professionals: a comparison of models. *J Organ Behav* 1997;18:685-701.
- Dick, V.R., & Wagner, U. (2001). Stress and strain in teaching: a structural equation approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 71*, 243-259.
- Dierendonck D, Shaufelli WB, Buunk BP. Burnout and inequity among human service professionals: a longitudinal study. *J Occup Health Psychol* 2001;1:43-52.
- Di Fabio, A., Majer, v., Taralla, B. (2006). Correlations of teacher self-efficacy: personal characteristics and attitude toward the job. *Psychologie du travail et des organizations, 12*, 263-277.
- Enzmann, D., & Kleiber, D. (1989). *Helfer-Leiden: Streß und Burnout in psychosozialen Berufen* [Helpers' distress: Stress and burnout in psychosocial jobs]. Heidelberg, Germany: Asanger.
- Farber, B. A. (1999). Inconsequentiality- The Key to Understanding Teacher Burnout. In R. Vandenberghe & A. M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and Preventing Teacher Burnout. A Sourcebook for International Research and Practice* (pp. 159- 165). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fives, H., Hamman, D., & Olivarez, A. (in press). Does burnout begin with student-teaching? Analyzing efficacy, burnout, and support during the student-teaching semester. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.

- Fontana, D., & Abouserie, R. (1993). Stress levels, gender and personality factors in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 63, 261-270.
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). *Staff-Burnout*. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159-165.
- Friedman, I. A. (2000). Burnout in teachers: Shattered dreams of impeccable professional performance. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 56(5), 595-606.
- Friedman, I. A. (2003). Self-efficacy and burnout in teaching: The importance of interpersonal-relations efficacy. *Social Psychology of Education*, 6(3), 191-215.
- Ghaith, Gh. & Shabban, K. (1999). The relationship between perception of teaching concerns, teacher efficacy, and selected teacher characteristics. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 487-496.
- Galluzzo, G. (2005). Performance assessment and reviewing teacher education: the possibilities of NBPTS standards. *Academic Research Library*, 74, 142-145.
- Griffith, J., Steptoe, A., & Cropley, M. (1999). Una investigacion sobre estrategias de afrontamiento asociadas con el estres laboral en maestros. *British Journal Education Psychology*, 69, 517-531.
- Guglielmi, R. S., & Tatrow, K. (1998). Occupational stress, burnout, and health in teachers: A methodological and theoretical analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(1), 61-99.
- Hintont, J. W. & Rotheiler, E. (1998). The Psychophysiology of Stress in Teachers. In J. Dunham & V. Varma (Eds.), *Stress in Teachers* (pp. 95- 119). London: Whurr Publishers.
- Jackson SE, Schwab RL, Schuler RS. Toward an understanding of the burnout phenomenon. *J Applied Psychol* 1986; 71:630-40.
- Kahill S. Symptoms of professional burnout: a review of the empirical evidence. *Canad Psychol* 1988;29:284-97.

- Kalliath TJ, O'Driscoll MP, Gillespie DF, Bluedorn AG. A test of the Maslach Burnout Inventory in 3 samples of healthcare professionals. *Work Stress* 2000;14:35–50.
- Klusmann, U., Kunter, M., Trautwein, U., Lüdtke, O., & Baumert, J. (2008). Engagement and emotional exhaustion in teachers: Does the school context make a difference? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57(Suppl.), 127–151.
- Koeske CF, Koeske RD. Construct validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory: a critical review. *J Applied Behav Sc* 1989;25:131–44.
- Kop N, Euwema M, Schaufeli WB. Burnout, job stress, and violent behavior among Dutch police officers. *Work Stress* 1999;13:326–40.
- Kyriacou, C. T. (1989). The Nature and Prevalence of Teacher Stress. In M. Cole & S. Walker (Eds.), *Teaching and Stress* (pp. 27- 33). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Kyriacou, C. (1998). Teacher Stress: Past and Present. In J. Dunham & V. Varma (Eds.), *Stress in Teachers* (pp. 1- 13). London: Whurr Publishers.
- Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 53, 27-35.
- Lee R, Ashforth BE. A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *J Applied Psychol* 1996;81:123–33.
- Leiter, M.P., & Maslach, C. (1998). Burnout. In H.S. Friedman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of mental health* (Vol. 1, pp. 347–357). New York: Academic Press.
- Luszczynska, A., Scholz, U., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). The general self-efficacy scale: Multicultural validation studies. *The Journal of Psychology*, 139(5), 439–457.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S.E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 1-15.

- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1986). *Maslach burnout inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E., & Leiter, M.P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (3rd edn.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422.
- McElfatrick, S., Carson, J., Cooper, C., Holloway, F., & Kuipers, E. (2000). Assessing coping skills in mental health nurses: is an occupation specific measure better than a generic coping skills scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 965-976.
- Mede,E. (2009). AnAnalysis of Relations among Personal Variables, Perceived Self-Efficacy and Social Support on Burnout among Turkish EFL Teachers. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*. August 2009l Volume. 10, Issue. 2, pp. 39-52.
- Melamed, S., Shirom, A., Toker, S., Berliner, S., & Shapira, I. (2006). Burnout and risk of cardiovascular disease: Evidence, possible causal paths, and promising research directions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(3), 327–353.
- Mills, L., Huebner, E. (1998). A prospective study of personality characteristics, occupational stressors, and burnout among school psychology practitioners. *Journal of School Psychology*, 36, 103-120.
- Moore JE. Why is this happening? A causal attribution approach to work exhaustion consequences. *Acad Manage Rev* 2000; 25:335–49.
- Parker PA, Kulik JA. Burnout, self- and supervisor-related job performance, and absenteeism among nurses. *J Behav Med*1995;18:581–99.
- Peiro, J. M. (1993). *Desencadenantes del estres laboral*. Madrid: Eudema Psicologia.

- Ross, J., & Bruce, C. (2007). Professional development effects on teacher efficacy: Results of randomized field trial. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 101, 50-60.
- Rudow, B. (1999). Stress and Burnout in the Teaching Profession: European Studies, Issues and Research Perspectives. In R. Vandenberghe & A. M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and Preventing Teacher Burnout. A Sourcebook for International Research and Practice* (pp. 38-58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sanders, W. and Horn S. P. (1998). Research Findings from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) Database: Implications for Educational Evaluation and Research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12, 247-256.
- Schaufeli, C., Maslach, C., & Mareck, T. (1993). *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315.
- Schaufeli WB, Enzmann D. The burnout companion to study and practice: critical Analysis. Washington, DC, USA: Taylor & Francis; 1998.
- Schwarzer, R. (Ed.) (1992). *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Schwarzer R., & Hallum S. (2008). Perceived Teacher Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Job Stress and Burnout: Mediation Analyses. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 2008,57, 152-171

- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized self-efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio* (pp. 35–38). Windsor: NFER-Nelson.
- Schwarzer, R., Schmitz, G.S., & Daytner, G.T. (1999). *The Teacher Self-Efficacy scale* [On-line publication]. Available at: http://www.fuberlin.de/gesund/skalen/t_se.htm
- Schwarzer, R., Schmitz, G.S., & Tang, C. (2000). Teacher burnout in Hong Kong and Germany: A cross-cultural validation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 13, 309–326.
- Shirom A. Job-related burnout: a review. In: Quick JC, Tetrick LE, editors. Handbook of occupational health psychology. Washington, DC, USA: American Psychological Association; 2002.
- Shirom, A. (1993). Burnout in work organizations. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Mareck (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 25-48). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behavior in schools: the relationships between job satisfactions, sense of efficacy, and teachers' extra-role behavior. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 649-659.
- Travers, C. & Cooper, C. L. (1996). *Teachers under Pressure. Stress in the Teaching Profession*. London: Routledge.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.

- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202–248.
- Vandenberghe, R., & Huberman, A.M. (1999). *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international research and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dick, R., & Wagner, U. (2001). Stress and strain in teaching: A structural equation approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 243-259.
- van Diest R, Appels A. Vital exhaustion and depression: a conceptual study. *J Psychosom Res* 1991;35:535–44.
- Woods, P. (1999). Intensification and Stress in Teaching. In R. Vandenberghe & A.M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and Preventing Teacher Burnout. A Sourcebook for International Research and Practice* (pp. 115- 138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zellars, K., Perrewe, P., & Hochwarter, W. (2000). Burnout in health care: the role of the five factors of personality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 1570-1598.

APPENDIX A

Dear Teacher,

Date: _____

Dear Sir/Madam:

Thank you for allowing me to conduct this research in your school. The following research is a requirement for the completion of a Master's thesis in the field of Education Administration. Teachers of all grades are required to fill out the questionnaire. The results can be helpful to administrators and educators in developing effective techniques to avoid teacher stress and burnout.

I kindly request from all your teachers to fill out this questionnaire. I will pick up the questionnaire two weeks from date of delivery.

I truly appreciate your cooperation.

Thank You,

Manal Sinno

Graduate Student at Haigazian University

APPENDIX B

Dear Teacher,

I truly appreciate your help and participation in conducting this research, which is part of requirement in the completion of my Master’s thesis in Educational Administration. I kindly request you to fill out the questionnaire which will take 10-15 minutes of your time. I really thank you for your cooperation.

Manal Sinno
Graduate Student of Haigazain University

Appendix C

Demographic Information

The following questions are part of the demographic data required for a thorough understanding of the personal factors that might cause teachers feel stressed.

1. SEX: Female Male

2. AGE: (Years old)

3. MARITAL STATUS:

Single Married Divorced

Widower

4. Number of Children:

5. Type of School you are appointed at:

a. Primary

b. Junior High School

c. Senior High School

d. Vocational High School

e. Other:

6. Area School is situated at:

a. Urban

b. Suburban

c. Rural

7. Number of schools you are teaching at this year:

8. Years of Teaching (in general):

9. Years of Teaching in present position:

10. Number of different classes per week:

11. Number of different subjects you are teaching this year:

Specify:

12. Educational Level:

- a. University degree.....
- b. Post Graduate studies in:
- c. Other:

13. Training:

PEK seminars

Other:

14. Health problems you've experienced since the beginning of the school year:

- a. Headaches
- b. Stomach disorders
- c. Sleeplessness
- d. Anxiety
- e. Nervousness

14. Number of days you were absent from work last year due to such problems:

Appendix D

Burnout Scale

- I. The following questions concern your attitudes towards your job and the extent to which you feel drained by it. For each one, circle the corresponding answer to state the frequency at which you experience them.

1= never 2= rarely 3= sometimes 4= quite often 5= almost always

1. _____ I feel I'm respected for my work.
2. _____ I feel my job is valuable as a service to others.
3. _____ I feel my work is appreciated by society.
4. _____ I feel I can count on my students parents' support to tackle problems in class.
5. _____ In the morning, when I think I have to face another day at work, I feel fatigue.
6. _____ I feel stressed from having to work with people all day.
7. _____ When I experience moments of crisis, I consider leaving my job.
8. _____ I feel hypertension by having to face changes in educational policies.
9. _____ I feel overload by having to take work at home.
10. _____ I feel I don't have enough time for planning lessons.
11. _____ I'm satisfied with the promotion chances offered through my job.
12. _____ I have a voice in decision making at my school.
13. _____ I feel I can count on the regional school advisor's professional support.
14. _____ I feel I can discuss problems over with the head teacher.

15. _____ I can spend the same time and effort in solving class problems as when I first entered the job.

II. The following questions concern your feelings towards the people you work with.

For each one, circle the corresponding answer to state the frequency at which you experience them.

1= never 2= rarely 3= sometimes 4= quite often 5= almost always

16. _____ I'm sympathetic to my students' problems.
17. _____ I feel this job has hardened me emotionally.
18. _____ I'm distant to my students.
19. _____ I get easily irritated when I face discipline problems in class.
20. _____ I would rather have better students than those I have now.
21. _____ Difficulties in my private life affect the way I treat my students.
22. _____ I feel my role regarding my obligations as a teacher is ambiguous.
23. _____ I feel my students blame me for their problems.

III. The following questions concern the degree of motivation and satisfaction you experience with your work. For each one, circle the corresponding answer to state the frequency at which you experience them.

1= completely disagree 2= disagree 3= neither agree nor disagree 4= agree 5= completely agree

24. _____ I blame myself for my students' lack of motivation.

25. _____ I feel I might not choose the same job again.
26. _____ I feel my expectations when entering the job are in conflict with the teaching reality I face.
27. _____ I feel the means and resources required to do my job properly are adequate.
28. _____ I feel my teaching performance levels are declining.
29. _____ I experience routine feelings of being trapped in teaching.
30. _____ I can resolve discipline problems arising in class.
31. _____ I'm satisfied with working with children.
32. _____ I feel I can offer my students useful things through teaching.
33. _____ I can create a cozy atmosphere with my students.
34. _____ I feel I can influence my students' lives through my teaching.
35. _____ I feel I can count on my colleagues when I need support with class problems.
36. _____ I feel under pressure by having to cope with different students with learning disabilities.
37. _____ I feel under pressure by having to cope with students from different ethnic backgrounds.
38. _____ I feel I have the same aspirations as when I first entered the job.
39. _____ I feel I have the same level of commitment to promote my students' learning as when I first entered the job.
40. _____ I'm satisfied with the salary offered.
41. _____ My job gives me the opportunity to grow personally.

42. _____ I get many training opportunities through my job.
43. Considering everything, which aspect(s) of your job would you rate as most stressful?

.....

.....

44. Which aspect(s) make(s) you feel it is worth teaching, no matter the difficulties?

1	I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	
2	If I am faced with a problem, I can think of at least one way to get it solved.	
3	It is easy for me to stick to my plans and accomplish my goals.	
4	I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	
5	Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	
6	I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	
7	I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	
8	When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	
9	If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	
10	I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	

Appendix E

General Self-Efficacy Scale

Response format:

(1) *not at all true*, (2) *barely true*, (3) *moderately true*, (4) *exactly true*

1	I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	
2	If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	
3	It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	
4	I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	
5	Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	
6	I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	
7	I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	
8	When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	
9	If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	
10	I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	

Appendix F

Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale

Response format:

(1) *not at all true*, (2) *barely true*, (3) *moderately true*, (4) *exactly true*

1	I am convinced that I am able to teach successfully all relevant subject content to even the most difficult students.	
2	I know that I can maintain a positive relationship with parents, even when tensions arise.	
3	When I try really hard, I am able to reach even the most difficult students.	
4	I am convinced that, as time goes by, I will continue to become more and more capable of helping to address my students' needs.	
5	Even if I am disrupted while teaching, I am confident that I can maintain my composure and continue to teach well.	
6	I am convinced in my ability to be responsive to my students' needs, even if I am having a bad day.	
7	If I try hard enough, I know that I can exert a positive influence on both the personal and academic development of my students.	
8	I am convinced that I can develop creative ways to cope with system constraints (such as budget cuts and other administrative problems) and continue to teach well.	
9	I know that I can motivate my students to participate in innovative projects.	
10	I know that I can carry out innovative projects, even when I am opposed by skeptical colleagues.	

Appendix G

معلومات ديموغرافية

تشكل الأسئلة التالية جزءاً من البيانات الديموغرافية المطلوبة لفهم شامل للعوامل الشخصية التي قد تجعل المعلمين يشعرون بالإجهاد.

- | | | |
|---|---------|------|
| 1. الجنس: | أنثى | ذكر |
| 2. العمر: | (سنوات) | |
| 3. الوضع العائلي: | متأهل | مطلق |
| أعزب | أرمل | |
| 4. عدد الأولاد: | | |
| 5. نوع المدرسة حيث أنت معيّن: | | |
| أ. ابتدائية | | |
| ب. مدرسة ثانوية للصغار | | |
| ج. مدرسة ثانوية عليا | | |
| د. مدرسة ثانوية مهنية | | |
| هـ. غير ذلك: | | |
| 6. المنطقة حيث تقع المدرسة: | | |
| أ. المدينة | | |
| ب. ضواحي | | |
| ج. ريفية | | |
| 7. عدد المدارس حيث تدرس هذه السنة: | | |
| 8. سنوات التدريس (بشكل عام): | | |
| 9. سنوات التدريس في المنصب الحالي: | | |
| 10. عدد مختلف الصفوف في الأسبوع: | | |
| 11. عدد مختلف المواد التي تدرسها هذه السنة: | | |
| حدد: | | |
| 12. المستوى التعليمي: | | |
| أ. شهادة جامعية | | |
| ب. دراسات ما بعد التخرج في: | | |
| ج. غير ذلك: | | |
| 13. التدريب: | | |
| حلقات دراسية | | |
| غير ذلك: | | |
| 14. مشاكل صحية عانيت منها منذ بداية السنة الدراسية: | | |
| أ. صداع | | |
| ب. إضطرابات في المعدة | | |

ج. رهافة

د. قلق

ه. عصبية

15. عدد الأيام التي تغيبت فيها عن العمل السنة الماضية نتيجة مشاكل كهذه:

نموذج الإجابات:

- غير صحيح على الإطلاق، (2) بالكاد صحيح، (3) صحيح، (4) صحيح تماماً

1.	أتدبر أمري دائماً لحلّ المشاكل الصعبة، إذا حاولت جاهداً كفاية.
2.	إذا عارضني أحدهم، أستطيع إيجاد الوسائل والطرق لأحصل على ما أريد.
3.	يسهل عليّ الالتزام بغاياتي وتحقيق أهدافي.
4.	أثق أنني أستطيع التعامل بكفاءة مع الأحداث غير المتوقعة.
5.	بفضل الحيلة التي أتمتع بها، أعرف كيف أتعامل مع الحالات غير المنظورة.
6.	أستطيع حلّ أكثرية المشاكل إن بذلت الجهود الضرورية.
7.	أستطيع البقاء هادئاً عند مواجهة الصعوبات، لأنني أستطيع الاعتماد على قدراتي على التصدي.
8.	عندما أواجه مشكلة، أستطيع عادةً أن أجد العديد من الحلول.
9.	إذا كنت في مأزق، أستطيع عادةً التفكير في حل.
10.	يمكنني عادةً معالجة كل ما يأتي في طريقي.

نموذج الإجابات:

- غير صحيح على الإطلاق، (2) بالكاد صحيح، (3) صحيح، (4) صحيح تماماً

1.	أنا مقتنع بأنني قادر على تدريس بنجاح جميع محتويات المواد حتى إلى الطلاب الأكثر صعوبة.
2.	أعرف أنه يمكنني الحفاظ على علاقة إيجابية مع الأهل، وحتى عند تصاعد التوترات.
3.	عندما أحاول جاهداً فعلاً، أستطيع بلوغ أصعب الطلاب.
4.	أنا مقتنع بأنه مع مرور الوقت سأواصل في أن أكون أكثر فأكثر قدرة على المساعدة على توجيه احتياجات طلابي.
5.	حتى وإن كنت مشوشاً خلال التدريس، أنا واثق بأنه يمكنني المحافظة على رباطة جأشي ومتابعة التدريس جيداً.
6.	أنا مقتنع بقدرتي على تلبية احتياجات طلابي، وإن كنت أمر بيوم سيئ.
7.	إن حاولت جاهداً بما فيه الكفاية، أعلم بأنه يمكنني التأثير إيجابياً على تنمية طلابي الأكاديمي والشخصي.
8.	أنا مقتنع بأنه يمكنني تطوير طرق إبداعية للتعامل مع قيود النظام (ومنها خفض الميزانية وغيرها من المشاكل الإدارية)، ومتابعة التدريس جيداً.
9.	أعرف أنه يمكنني تحفيز طلابي على المشاركة بمشاريع مبتكرة.
10.	أعرف أنه يمكنني تنفيذ مشاريع مبتكرة، حتى وإن عارضني زملاء مشككين.

مقياس إنهاك

I. تتعلق الأسئلة التالية بمواقفك تجاه وظيفتك وإلى أي مدى تشعر بأئك مستنزف بها. لكل سؤال، ضع دائرة حول الجواب المطابق للإشارة إلى تردد مواجهتك مواقف كهذه.

1 = أبداً 2 = نادراً 3 = أحياناً 4 = تماماً في كثير من الأحيان 5 = تقريباً دائماً

1. _____ أشعر بأنني محترم لعملي.
2. _____ أشعر بأنّ وظيفتي قيمة كخدمة للآخرين.
3. _____ أشعر بأنّ عملي مقدّر من المجتمع.
4. _____ أشعر بأنني أستطيع الاعتماد على دهم أهالي طلابي لمعالجة المشاكل في الصف.
5. _____ في الصباح، أشعر بالتعب عندما أفكر بأنّه عليّ مواجهة يوم آخر في العمل.
6. _____ أشعر بالإجهاد لأنني مضطر للعمل مع الناس كلّ يوم.
7. _____ عندما أختبر لحظات من الأزمات، أفكر بترك وظيفتي.
8. _____ أشعر بإتفاع الضغط لأنني مضطر لمواجهة التغيرات في السياسات التعليمية.
9. _____ أشعر بإرهاق لأنني مضطر لأخذ العمل إلى المنزل.
10. _____ أشعر بأنّه ليس لدي الوقت الكافي لتخطيط الدروس.
11. _____ أنا راضٍ عن فرص الترقية المقدمة من خلال وظيفتي.
12. _____ لديّ صوت في عملية صنع القرار في المدرسة.
13. _____ أشعر بأنني أستطيع الاعتماد على الدعم المهني لمستشار المدرسة الإقليمي.
14. _____ أشعر بأنني أستطيع مناقشة المشاكل الكبيرة مع مدير المدرسة.
15. _____ يمكنني أن أقضي الوقت والجهد نفسه في حلّ مشاكل الصف كما كانت الحال عندما دخلت الوظيفة للمرة الأولى.

II. تتعلق الأسئلة التالية بمشاعرك تجاه الأشخاص الذين تعمل معهم. لكل سؤال، ضع دائرة حول الجواب المطابق للإشارة إلى تردد مواجهتك مشاعر كهذه.

1 = أبداً 2 = نادراً 3 = أحياناً 4 = تماماً في كثير من الأحيان 5 = تقريباً دائماً

16. ____ أنا متعاطف مع مشاكل طلابي.
17. ____ أشعر بأن هذه الوظيفة قد زادت من قوتي عاطفياً.
18. ____ أنا بعيد عن طلابي.
19. ____ أغضب بسهولة عندما أواجه مشاكل إنضباط في الصف.
20. ____ كنت أود أن يكون لي طلاب أفضل من أولئك الذين لدي الآن.
21. ____ تؤثر الصعوبات في حياتي الخاصة على الطريقة التي أعامل بها طلابي.
22. ____ أشعر بأن دوري المتعلق بموجباتي كمدرس غامض.
23. ____ أشعر بأن طلابي يلمونني للمشاكل التي يتعرضون إليها.

III. تتعلق الأسئلة التالية بدرجة التحفيز والرضا التي تختبرها في عملك. لكل سؤال، ضع دائرة حول الجواب المطابق للإشارة إلى تردد مواجهتك درجات كهذه.

1 = أعارض تماماً 2 = أعارض 3 = لا أوافق ولا أعارض
4 = أوافق 5 = أوافق تماماً

24. ____ ألوم نفسي لانعدام الحافز لدى طلابي.
25. ____ أشعر بأنني قد لا أختار العمل نفسه مرة أخرى.
26. ____ أشعر بأن توقعاتي عند دخولي الوظيفة تتضارب وواقع التدريس الذي أواجهه.
27. ____ أشعر بأن الوسائل والموارد اللازمة لأقوم بوظيفتي بشكل صحيح ملائمة.

28. ____ أشعر بأنّ مستوياتي في أداء التدريس تتدنى.
29. ____ أختبر مشاعر روتينية بأنني عالق بالتدريس.
30. ____ يمكنني حلّ مشاكل الإنضباط التي تطرأ في الصف.
31. ____ أنا راضٍ بالعمل مع الأطفال.
32. ____ أشعر بأنني أستطيع أن أقدم لطلابي أشياء مفيدة عبر التدريس.
33. ____ يمكنني أن أخلق مناخاً دافئاً مع طلابي.
34. ____ أشعر بأنه يمكنني أن أؤثر على حياة طلابي من خلال تدريسي.
35. ____ أشعر بأنه يمكنني أن أعتد على زملائي عندما أحتاج إلى دعم مع مشاكل الصف.
36. ____ أشعر بأنني تحت ضغط لأنه علي التعامل مع طلاب مختلفين ذوي إعاقات تعليمية.
37. ____ أشعر بأنني تحت ضغط لأنه علي التعامل مع طلاب من خلفيات عرقية مختلفة.
38. ____ أشعر بأنّ لدي التطلعات نفسها كيوم دخلت الوظيفة للمرة الأولى.
39. ____ أشعر بأنّ لدي المستوى نفسه من الإلتزام لتعزيز تعليم طلابي كيوم دخلت الوظيفة للمرة الأولى.
40. ____ أنا راضٍ بالراتب المعروض.
41. ____ تتيح لي وظيفتي الفرصة لأنمو شخصياً.
42. ____ أحصل على فرص تدريب كثيرة من خلال وظيفتي.
43. بالنظر إلى كلّ شيء، أي جانب (جوانب) من وظيفتك تقيمه (ها) على أنه (ها) الأكثر إجهاداً؟

.....

.....

44. أي جانب (جوانب) يجعلك (تجعلك) تشعر أنه من الجدير التدريس، مهما كانت الصعوبات؟

.....

.....