

## Construction and Standardization of Teachers' Burnout Scale (Tbs): A Psycho-Educational Perspective

Prof. Madhu Gupta & Dr. Surekha Rani

Dept. of Education, M. D. University, Rohtak (Haryana)

Email: [madhugupta1621@gmail.com](mailto:madhugupta1621@gmail.com)

Dept. of Education, M. D. University, Rohtak (Haryana)

Email: [surekhaedu1982@gmail.com](mailto:surekhaedu1982@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*The present research paper has been designed to construct and standardize the Teachers' Burnout Scale for assessing the level of burnout among teachers. Different steps were followed to develop and standardise this scale as planning and preparation, first try-out, second try-out, scoring, item analysis, reliability, validity, final form of the scale and interpretation of raw scores. Initially, 75 likert-type items written in both languages (English and Hindi) for preliminary form covering the four areas of Teacher's Burnout as Perceived self-efficacy, Students' Disruptive behavior, Collegiality and Institutional climate were given to the 25 experts belonging to the field of Education, Psychology, Sociology and Language for further rating. On the basis of unanimous decision of experts, 61 items were retained for second draft. In order to determine the applicability and homogeneity of the items, the 61 items were administered to a randomly selected sample of 110 teachers teaching in schools & colleges of Haryana State. Final selection of the items was made on the*

*basis of t-test computation. In the final draft 40 items were found significant minimum at 0.05 level of significance. Reliability of the scale was measure by Test-retest method (0.994) and Split-Half method (0.895). The scale was validated against the face, content and construct validity (ranges from 0.660 to 0.900). Z-score norms have been prepared to measure the level of burnout among teachers.*

**Key Words:** Teachers' Burnout, Reliability and Validity

### INTRODUCTION

In the present era of science and technology, the teacher must possess the ability to appreciate and understand the changing needs of the society and must understand the psychological bases of education which influence the education. A teacher has to play a variety of roles during the course of his career. He/she is the topmost academic and professional person in educational pyramid and has to perform multiple activities like teaching, evaluating, communicating,

guiding and counseling the students, organizing co-curricular activities etc. In fact, a teacher has to act as instructor, motivator, examiner, guide and counselor. The teacher apart from preparing for his/her daily schedule, has to work extra hard to gauge the mental and physical aspects of his/her students and decide his/her teaching style so that everybody may learn something.

Our common perception is that teaching is not a stressful occupation, but, worldwide studies have consistently found that work-related stress affects lives of significant numbers of teachers causing psychological, physiological and behavioral impacts. Teaching is complex and demanding work and there is a daily need for teachers to fully engage in that work with not only their heads, but also their hearts (Elliott and Cross well, 2001)<sup>[7]</sup>. Teaching is a very emotional process and involves more than just knowing subject matter and delivering the same in the class. A teacher needs to be sensitive to understand, analyse and handle every student who has his own unique limitations and strengths.

Studies have shown that teaching is a stressful career and this can lead to teachers suffering from burnout (McCarthy, Lambert, O'Donnell, & Melendres, 2009)<sup>[17]</sup>. In some countries, teacher burnout is considered one reason for increasing number of competent teachers who

are leaving the classroom for alternative careers (Cunningham, 1982)<sup>[6]</sup>. Teacher stress not only affects his/her own health but also negatively affects the students' overall development (Forlin et al., 1996)<sup>[9]</sup> and even the organisation (Hayward, 1993)<sup>[13]</sup>. Kyriako (2001)<sup>[14]</sup> explained the major causes of teacher stress which are: a) students showing lack of interest in school, not completing their assignments, and exhibiting high instances of poor behaviours; b) poor relationship among colleagues; c) heavy workloads placed on them; and d) poor ethos in the institution. Fernando (2006)<sup>[8]</sup> revealed that teachers with high level of self-efficacy suffering less stress and burnout than teachers with low level of self-efficacy. Teachers who experienced frustration during their career have experienced burnout (Lee, 2010)<sup>[15]</sup>. Frustration is experienced by both novice and experienced teachers (Bindhu & Sudheesh Kumar, 2006)<sup>[3]</sup>, and creates a teaching climate that can lead to teacher burnout (Betoret, 2010<sup>[2]</sup>; Bosquet, 2012<sup>[5]</sup>). Teachers who have experienced burnout feel overworked, underappreciated, concerns about school safety and also feel as if they work in a negative environment (Blazer, 2010)<sup>[4]</sup>. Nagra and Arora (2013)<sup>[19]</sup> claimed that a stress-free teacher can teach more effectively in the classroom and can provide a better quality environment making the school a challenging and interesting place for students. Antoniou,

Ploumpi and Ntalla (2013)<sup>[1]</sup> found that teachers of Primary Education experience higher levels of stress compared to the teachers of Secondary Education. Hakan and Halis (2014)<sup>[12]</sup> found that there were significant relationships between teacher self-efficacy and burnout.

### **NEED FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCALE**

Various existing inventories and scales related to burnout among students and employees i.e. Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (1996)<sup>[16]</sup> and Mishra Burnout Inventory (2012)<sup>[18]</sup> were reviewed. MBI inventory has been developed especially for educational institutions and is used to provide a self-assessment of each teacher's perceived burnout level. The MBI have three dimensions namely: (a) Emotional exhaustion, (b) Depersonalization and (c) Personal accomplishment. Mishra Burnout Inventory (2012) consists eight dimensions i.e. (a) Non-accomplishment, (b) Depersonalization, (c) Emotional exhaustion, (d) Friction, (e) Task avoidance, (f) Distancing, (g) Neglecting and (h) Easy Going. Despite the fact that there are numerous studies on burnout, very limited attention has been paid to the measurement of the construct. In most studies, burnout was measured by adapting the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS; Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach, & Jackson, 1996)<sup>[16]</sup>. A major drawback of this approach is that it was

automatically assumed that the concept of burnout was equivalent across employees and students. Also, very few inventories and scales have been developed in India as well as in Foreign to measure burnout among teachers. Thus, the investigators decided to develop a scale on teacher's burnout taking four dimensions i.e. Perceived Self-Efficacy, Student's Disruptive Behaviour, Collegiality and Institutional Climate.

### **OBJECTIVE OF THE SCALE**

The present scale was constructed for the purpose of analyzing the level of burnout and the role of various factors i.e. perceived self-efficacy, student's disruptive behaviour, collegiality and institutional climate in enhancing burnout among teachers.

### **PROCEDURE FOR SCALE DEVELOPMENT & DATA ANALYSIS**

To achieve the objective of the scale, different steps were followed to construct and standardize the scale: Planning and Preparation, First try-out, Second try-out, Item analysis, Final draft, Reliability, Validity and Interpretation of raw scores shown below:

### **PLANNING AND PREPARATION OF THE SCALE**

It was planned to write statements in both (English & Hindi) languages and administer to

the teachers (male & female) teaching in secondary & senior secondary schools and UG colleges. It is a Likert-type 5-point scale i.e. the responses of the items were expressed in terms of the following categories: Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely and Never. Items related to burnout among teachers were identified and

selected after scanning various inventories and scales developed by foreigner and Indian authors. Keeping in mind the area of burnout, 75 items were written in preliminary form covering the following areas as dimensions given below and presented in the table-1.

**Table-1**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Operational Definitions</b>	<b>Items</b>
1.	<b>Perceived Self-efficacy</b>	It means the ability of teachers to effectively handle various tasks, obligations, and challenges related to their professional responsibility.	<b>18</b>
2.	<b>Students' Disruptive Behaviour</b>	It has been defined as an activity that causes distress for teachers, interrupts the learning process and leads teachers to make continual comments to the student (Houghton et al., 1988).	<b>20</b>
3.	<b>Collegiality</b>	It describes a work environment where responsibility and authority is shared equally by colleagues. It is seen as a key aspect of a teacher's professional development and a vehicle to increase teacher knowledge.	<b>20</b>
4.	<b>Institutional Climate</b>	It is defined as a psychological state strongly affected by institutional conditions, such as systems, structure and administrative behavior.	<b>17</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>75</b>

### **FIRST TRY-OUT**

Keeping in mind the above four dimensions of burnout, it was decided to write 15-20 items under each dimension. Initially, 75 items (Both in English and Hindi Language) were written for the entire scale. The first draft of 75 items was

given to the 25 experts belonging to the field of Education, Psychology, Sociology and Language for further rating. On the basis of unanimous decision of experts, 61 items were retained for second draft as shown in Table-2.

**Table-2**  
*Dimensions of Teacher’s Burnout Scale and Number of items in First and Second Draft*

Dimensions	Number of items in First Draft	Number of items in Second Draft
Perceived Self-efficacy	18	15
Students’ Disruptive Behaviour	20	17
Collegiality	20	15
Institutional Climate	17	14
<b>Total Number of items</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>61</b>

### SECOND TRY OUT

In order to determine the applicability and homogeneity of the items, the 61 items were administered to a randomly selected 110 teachers teaching in schools & colleges of Haryana State. The participants were requested to respond each item on the basis of their truthful impulse. Each item was rated on five-point scale i.e. Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely and Never ranging from 4 to 0.

### ITEM ANALYSIS

Based on the scoring, all the 110 responded sheets were arranged in descending order from upper to lower. Then 27% Upper group (top 30 teachers) and 27% Lower group (bottom 30 teachers) were taken into consideration. The data were analysed using Mean, S.D. and t-test. Only those items were retained which were found significant either at 0.05 or 0.01 level. The significant difference between 27% upper and 27% lower groups of each item is shown in Table-3.

**Table-3**  
*Item Analysis on the Basis of Mean Differences between Upper & Lower Groups*

Items	Groups	Means	‘t’ value	Items	Groups	Means	‘t’ value	Items	Groups	Means	‘t’ value
1.	Upper	2.1333	3.43**	22.	Upper	1.6333	5.29**	43.	Upper	0.9000	3.70**
	Lower	0.6333			Lower	0.5000			Lower	0.8667	
2.	Upper	2.0667	10.69**	23.	Upper	2.9000	1.01(NS)	44.	Upper	2.0667	1.71 (NS)
	Lower	0.7667			Lower	1.4333			Lower	0.6667	
3.	Upper	1.6667	2.33*	24.	Upper	1.9667	7.22**	45.	Upper	1.4000	3.515**
	Lower	0.9333			Lower	0.6333			Lower	0.5000	
4.	Upper	2.0000	1.57(NS)	25.	Upper	2.2333	2.67*	46.	Upper	2.0000	1.605(NS)
	Lower	0.9310			Lower	0.8333			Lower	0.9333	

5.	Upper	1.5333	2.25*	26.	Upper	1.7000	2.15*	47.	Upper	2.6000	4.43**
	Lower	0.9000			Lower	0.9667			Lower	0.5333	
6.	Upper	2.2667	0.106(NS)	27.	Upper	2.2333	1.03(NS)	48.	Upper	2.8333	5.14**
	Lower	1.2000			Lower	1.0333			Lower	0.4333	
7.	Upper	1.3000	5.08**	28.	Upper	1.3000	6.96**	49.	Upper	1.4000	3.42**
	Lower	0.3000			Lower	0.2000			Lower	0.6667	
8.	Upper	2.2000	1.52(NS)	29.	Upper	2.5667	1.34(NS)	50.	Upper	2.2333	1.91 (NS)
	Lower	0.8333			Lower	0.7333			Lower	0.7667	
9.	Upper	1.7667	4.84**	30.	Upper	2.2667	3.29**	51.	Upper	1.6000	6.76**
	Lower	0.6000			Lower	1.1000			Lower	0.2333	
10.	Upper	2.2667	1.61(NS)	31.	Upper	1.1667	2.029*	52.	Upper	2.0333	1.81 (NS)
	Lower	1.1000			Lower	0.7000			Lower	0.9333	
11.	Upper	1.7333	7.31**	32.	Upper	2.1000	0.60(NS)	53.	Upper	1.8333	4.22**
	Lower	0.2333			Lower	0.9000			Lower	0.4333	
12.	Upper	2.5000	4.06**	33.	Upper	1.7333	2.88**	54.	Upper	1.9000	0.448(NS)
	Lower	0.6667			Lower	0.8333			Lower	1.0667	
13.	Upper	1.7000	5.64**	34.	Upper	1.8000	0.94(NS)	55.	Upper	1.3333	4.33**
	Lower	0.5667			Lower	1.0000			Lower	0.5000	
14.	Upper	1.9000	1.58(NS)	35.	Upper	1.4667	4.608**	56.	Upper	2.2000	1.33 (NS)
	Lower	1.2333			Lower	0.5000			Lower	0.8333	
15.	Upper	2.1333	3.68**	36.	Upper	2.0000	1.98(NS)	57.	Upper	1.3667	5.303**
	Lower	0.4000			Lower	0.8000			Lower	0.9000	
16.	Upper	2.1000	6.66**	37.	Upper	1.8667	3.19**	58.	Upper	1.3667	2.75**
	Lower	0.1333			Lower	0.6667			Lower	0.9000	
17.	Upper	2.5667	2.51*	38.	Upper	1.5333	4.59**	59.	Upper	1.5333	3.21**
	Lower	1.4333			Lower	0.7333			Lower	0.7667	
18.	Upper	1.6000	4.61**	39.	Upper	1.3667	1.44(NS)	60.	Upper	2.3333	0.959(NS)
	Lower	0.3333			Lower	1.0000			Lower	1.2667	
19.	Upper	2.2667	1.74(NS)	40.	Upper	1.8333	5.18**	61.	Upper	2.0333	2.91**
	Lower	1.3667			Lower	0.5333			Lower	0.9667	
20.	Upper	2.1000	5.41**	41.	Upper	1.9000	1.85(NS)				
	Lower	0.7667			Lower	0.7667					
21.	Upper	2.1000	6.87**	42.	Upper	2.2667	4.87**				
	Lower	0.5333			Lower	0.2333					

\* Significant at 0.05 level      \*\*Significant at 0.01 level      NS = Not Significant

### FINAL DRAFT OF THE SCALE

In the final draft, out of 61 items, 40 items were found significant either at 0.01 or 0.05 level of significance. 21 items (item no. 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 19, 23, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, 39, 41, 44, 46, 50, 52,

54, 56, 60) were found not significant and removed from the scale and remaining 40 items were retained for the final form. In the final form, 40 items under four dimensions and the distribution of items for each dimension is given in the Table-4.

**Table-4**

***Dimensions of Teacher's Burnout Scale along with their Item Numbers***

Sr. No.	Dimensions	Item Numbers	Total Items
1.	Perceived Self-efficacy	1, 4, 8, 12,16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, 38	11
2.	Students' Disruptive Behaviour	5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, 39, 40	10
3.	Collegiality	2, 6, 11, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34, 37	10
4.	Institutional Climate	3, 7, 10, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31, 35	9
		<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>

### ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCALE

The scale is a self-administrating scale. It can be administered to one individual or a group of individuals. After establishing the rapport, subjects are provided the scale and requested them to fill the information first. Assure the subjects that their responses will be kept in strict confidence and will be used for research purpose only. It should be duly emphasized that all statements have to be responded and no statement should be left unanswered. They should be assured that there is no right or wrong answer and asked to respond one of the five alternatives as Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely and Never. Though there is no time limit, but the subjects should be asked to accomplish it

in 30 minutes approximately. Finally, Collect all the booklets from subjects at the end and be sure that all the booklets have been returned and each item is responded positively.

### SCORING PROCEDURE

The scale is a self-administering and self-reporting five point scale. Each item of the scale is followed by five alternatives. The responded has to tick one of the five alternatives against each statement. The options Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely and Never carries scores 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0 respectively. The minimum and maximum range of the score is 0-160. Higher the score, higher the level of burnout among teachers and vice-versa. The scoring procedure of the scale is given in table -5.

**Table-5**  
*Scoring Procedure*

Responses	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Score	4	3	2	1	0

### STANDARDIZATION OF THE SCALE

The final draft of the scale with 40 items was administered on a randomly selected sample of

400 teachers, both male and female teaching in secondary and senior secondary schools and UG colleges located in Haryana State.

### STATISTICAL RESULTS

The statistical results are given in Table-6:

**Table-6**

N	Mean	SD
400	83.98	27.91

### RELIABILITY

The reliability of the scale was established by two methods:

- (1) **Split-Half Reliability:** Split-Half Reliability was calculated by dividing the items on odd-even serial number of the items and forming two equal groups. The scale has 40 items, as such, both odd and even serial number items' group had 20 items each. The correlation between these groups was calculated by Spearman Brown formula and it was 0.895 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance.

- (2) **Test-Retest Method:** For finding out Reliability by Test-retest method, a fresh sample of 100 teachers was selected and the scale was administered to this sample. This scale was again administered on the same sample after an interval of 21 days. The coefficient of correlation calculated between the pre & post test results was 0.994 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance.

### VALIDITY

The validity of Teachers' Burnout Scale was tested on the basis of face validity and content



validity. All the 40 items were given to eight experts for their opinions and the items were found consistent with burnout among teachers. The unanimity of experts about the items was taken as an indicator of face validity of the scale. Besides face validity, the scale has high content validity. It is evident from the assessment of experts that items of the scale were directly

related to the concept of burnout among teachers. The inter-dimensional coefficients of correlation (r) of the scale have been found to be significantly high. The coefficients of correlation (r) between the dimensions of Teacher’s Burnout Scale ranged from 0.660 to 0.900. The obtained ‘r’ values indicate high construct validity of the scale as given in Table-7.

**Table - 7**  
*Inter Correlation among the Dimensions of Teacher’s Burnout Scale*

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Perceived Self-efficacy</b>	<b>Student Disruptive Behaviour</b>	<b>Collegiality</b>	<b>Institutional Climate</b>
<b>Perceived Self-efficacy</b>	-----			
<b>Student’s Disruptive Behaviour</b>	0.757529**	-----		
<b>Collegiality</b>	0.675434**	0.729344**	-----	
<b>Institutional Climate</b>	0.660792**	0.699121**	0.746546**	-----
<b>Total</b>	0.881216**	0.900516**	0.675434**	0.87104**

\*\* Significant at 0.01 level

### **NORMS**

On the basis of statistical results, z-score norms have been developed by using the formula of  $\left(\frac{X-M}{\sigma}\right)$  and the same are being presented in

Table-8. The norms for interpretation of z-scores and the range of raw scores to measure the level of burnout among teachers have been presented in Table-9.

**Table-8**  
**Raw Score & Z-Score Norms for Teacher's Burnout Scale**  
Mean: 83.98      SD: 27.91      N: 400

Raw Score	z-Score	Raw Score	z-Score	Raw Score	z-Score	Raw Score	z-Score
27	-2.04	56	-1.00	85	+0.03	114	+1.07
28	-2.00	57	-0.96	86	+0.07	115	+1.11
29	-1.97	58	-0.93	87	+0.10	116	+1.14
30	-1.93	59	-0.89	88	+0.14	117	+1.18
31	-1.89	60	-0.86	89	+0.17	118	+1.21
32	-1.86	61	-0.82	90	+0.21	119	+1.25
33	-1.82	62	-0.78	91	+0.25	120	+1.29
34	-1.79	63	-0.75	92	+0.28	121	+1.32
35	-1.75	64	-0.71	93	+0.32	122	+1.36
36	-1.72	65	-0.68	94	+0.35	123	+1.39
37	-1.68	66	-0.64	95	+0.39	124	+1.43
38	-1.64	67	-0.60	96	+0.43	125	+1.46
39	-1.61	68	-0.57	97	+0.46	126	+1.50
40	-1.57	69	-0.53	98	+0.50	127	+1.54
41	-1.54	70	-0.50	99	+0.53	128	+1.57
42	-1.50	71	-0.46	100	+0.57	129	+1.61
43	-1.46	72	-0.43	101	+0.60	130	+1.64
44	-1.43	73	-0.39	102	+0.64	131	+1.68
45	-1.39	74	-0.35	103	+0.68	132	+1.72
46	-1.36	75	-0.32	104	+0.71	133	+1.75
47	-1.32	76	-0.28	105	+0.75	134	+1.79
48	-1.29	77	-0.25	106	+0.78	135	+1.82
49	-1.25	78	-0.21	107	+0.82	136	+1.86
50	-1.21	79	-0.17	108	+0.86	137	+1.89
51	-1.18	80	-0.14	109	+0.89	138	+1.93
52	-1.14	81	-0.10	110	+0.93	139	+1.97
53	-1.11	82	-0.07	111	+0.96	140	+2.00

54	-1.07	83	-0.03	112	+1.00	141	+2.04
55	-1.03	84	±0.00	113	+1.03		

**Table-9**  
*Norms for Interpretation of the Level of Burnout among Teachers*

Sr. No.	Range of z-Scores	Range of Raw Scores	Interpretation
1.	+2.01 and above	141 and above	Extremely High Level of Burnout
2.	+1.26 to +2.00	120-140	High Level of Burnout
3.	+0.51 to +1.25	99-119	Above Average Level of Burnout
4.	-0.50 to + 0.50	70-98	Average Level of Burnout
5.	-1.25 to -0.51	49-69	Below Average Level of Burnout
6.	-2.00 to -1.26	28-48	Low Level of Burnout
7.	-2.01 and below	27 and below	Extremely Low Level of Burnout

## CONCLUSION

In any country, teachers are key players in the achievement of educational goals. Majority of the university teachers (74%) are experiencing moderate and high levels of occupational stress and 86% of teachers have professional burnout (Reddy and Poornima, 2012)<sup>[20]</sup>. Teachers are three times more likely to quit their jobs and even more likely to want to quit their jobs as compared to similarly trained professionals. The present research paper will be helpful for the researchers and scale developers to understand the steps for constructing and standardizing the scale. It will also be helpful in knowing the need for the construction of a scale by reviewing the

previous scales and become careful while writing the statements after selecting appropriate dimensions. This scale can be used in future as a standardized tool for measuring the level of burnout among teachers.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Antoniou, A., Ploumpi, A. & Ntalla, M. (2013). Occupational stress and professional burnout in teachers of primary and secondary education: The role of coping strategies. *Psychology*, 4(3A), 349-355.
- [2] Betoret, F. D. (2010). Self-efficacy, school resources, job stressors and burnout among Spanish primary and secondary school teachers: A structural equation approach. *Educational Psychology*, 29, 45-68.
- [3] Bindhu, C.M., & Sudheesh Kumar, P.K. (2006). *Job satisfaction and stress coping skills of*

primary school teachers. Calicut: Department of Education, Farook Training College.

[4] **Blazer, C. (2010).** *Teacher Burnout: Information Capsule 1003*. Florida, USA: Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

[5] **Bousquet, S. (2012).** Teacher burnout: Causes, cures and prevention. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED534527>

[6] **Cunningham, W.G. (1982).** Teacher burnout: Stylish fad or profound problem. *Planning and Changing*, 12, 219-224.

[7] **Elliott, B., & Crosswell, L. (2001).** Commitment to teaching: Australian perspectives on the interplays of the professional and the personal in teachers' lives. *Paper presented at the International Symposium on Teacher Commitment at the European Conference on Educational Research*, Lille, France.

[8] **Fernando, B.D. (2006).** Stressors, self-efficacy, coping resources, and burnout among secondary school teachers in Spain. *Educational Psychology*, 26(4), 519-539.

[9] **Forlin, C., Douglas, G. & Hattie, J. (1996).** Inclusive practices: How accepting are teachers? *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 43(2), 119- 133.

[10] **Gupta, M. and Nain, I. (2016).** Construction and standardization of teacher's role conflict scale. *ZENITH International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(3), 30-38.

[11] **Gupta, M. and Rani, S. (2014).** Burnout: A serious problem prevalent among teachers in the present times. *BHARTIYAM INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION & RESEARCH: A quarterly peer reviewed International Journal of Research & Education*, 4(1), 1-9.

[12] **Hakan, S. and Halis, S. (2014).** Burnout and teacher self-efficacy among teachers working in special education institutions in Turkey. *Educational Studies*, 40(4), 423-437.

[13] **Hayward, R. (1993).** Teacher stress in the primary school: An identification and description of stressors. *Educational Bulletin*, 37(1), 3-20.

[14] **Kyriako, C. (2001).** Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 53, 28- 35.

[15] **Lee, S. M., Cho, S. H., Kissinger, D., & Ogle, N. T. (2010).** A typology of burnout in professional counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 88, 131- 138.

[16] **Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996).** *Manual of Maslach Burnout Inventory* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

[17] **McCarthy, C. J., Lambert, R. G., O'Donnell, M., & Melendres, L. T. (2009).** The relation of elementary teachers' experience, stress, and coping resources to burnout symptoms. *Elementary School Journal*, 109(3), 282-300.

[18] **Mishra, K.M. (2012).** *Manual of Burnout Inventory*. National Psychological Corporation, Bhargava Bhawan, 4/230, Kacheri Ghat, Agra.

[19] **Nagra, V. & Arora, S. (2013).** Occupational stress and health among teacher educators. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 2(8), 1-13.

[20] **Reddy, G. L. and Poornima, R. (2012).** Occupational stress and professional burnout of university teachers in South India. *International Journal of Educational Planning & Administration*, 2(2), 109-124.