

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v2i2.230

## Administrational Factors as Predictors of Teacher Burnout across Iranian and Turkish EFL Teachers

Ebrahim KHEZERLOU\*

### Abstract

The study aimed at measuring the perceived burnout levels of Iranian (N= 230) and Turkish (N=156) EFL teachers and determining the role of four administrative factors (i.e., Teacher Autonomy, Reward Adequacy, Fairness, and Fringe Benefits) in predicting EE, DP and PA burnout processes across Iranian and Turkish EFL teachers. The MBI-ES was used to measure the perceived burnout levels of the participants, and a four-dimension scale (41 items) was developed based on the literature study to measure the participants' perceptions in these four areas. The average internal consistency reliability of the 41-item scale was  $r = 0.703$ . The results of t-tests analyses showed that there was a slight significant difference between Iranian and Turkish groups only in EE burnout processes. Moreover, the results of regression analyses showed that EE, DP, and PA subscales were better predicted by Fairness factor among Iranian teachers, while by Teacher Autonomy among Turkish teachers. Finally, the contrasted results also revealed that Teacher Autonomy, Reward Adequacy, and Fairness factors had cross-culturally discriminatory roles, while Fringe Benefits factor did not have.

**Keywords:** Burnout, MBI-ES, Teacher Autonomy, Reward Adequacy, Fairness, Fringe Benefits, EFL Teachers, Iran, Turkey

---

\* Assist. Prof English Department, Faculty of Education, Mevlana University.

## **1. Introduction**

Burnout was characterized as “a work-related syndrome that stems from an individual’s perception of a significant discrepancy between effort (input) and reward (output)” (Farber, 1991, p. 24). Maslach and Jackson (1981) introduced the most widely accepted conceptualization of burnout that has three dimensions: emotional exhaustion (EE) referring to feelings of being emotionally drained by intense contact with other people, depersonalization (DP) referring to negative attitudes or callous responses toward people, and reduced personal accomplishment (PA) referring to a decline in one’s sense of competence and of successful achievement in working with people (Soderfelt and Soderfelt, 1995; Maslach and Leiter, 1997; Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter, 2001).

In the same vein, teacher burnout refers to decline in one’s well-being that is caused by long term stress in the workplace. Burned-out teachers in the conceptualization of Maslach and Jackson (1981) usually feel that they are emotionally exhausted with their work. They also may develop cynical attitudes towards their students or the school community and less interact with them. Moreover, teachers in a state of burnout may evaluate their accomplishments at work negatively. The results of the emotional exhaustion, negative feelings to others, and negative self-evaluation are a sense of personal distress, a feeling of demoralization, dissatisfaction with one’s work, poor performance on the job, poor health, family problems, intention to quit one’s job, and failure in life (Brenninkmeijer et al., 2001; Fivesa et al., 2007).

There are a lot of studies showing that teachers are dissatisfied with their profession. For instance, Friedman and Farber (1992) estimated that 30 to 35% of American teachers are strongly dissatisfied with their profession and 5 to 20% are truly burned out. Furthermore, Ewing and Smith (2003) reported that between 25% and 40% of beginning teachers in western countries are leaving teaching profession. Finally, in a study of European teachers, it was found out that 60% to 70% of the participants were under frequent stress, and a minimum of 30% had distinct symptoms attributed to burnout (Ozdemir, 2007).

Taking these reasons into account, we think it is significant to study burnout and its consequences in ELT contexts of Iran and Turkey. Specifically, the study tries to determine the role of administrative factors (referring to those conditions that are imposed on individuals by the administration or system) in burnout processes of ELT teachers. Moreover, recent studies also indicate the organizational structure as one of the main causes of burnout (Pick and Leiter, 1991, Maslach and Leiter, 1997, Schaufeli and Enzmann, 1998). The organizational characteristics that lead to burnout are impossible goals, countless layers of bureaucracy, stupid policies and procedures, lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities, cloudy and confusing goals, endless and pointless meetings, focusing on people as functions while leaving the ‘human element’ out of the equation, etc. Accordingly, people may begin to experience burnout at work when there is no honest or logical rationale for conducting a

business, when people feel they'll never achieve the expected end no matter how long and how hard they keep working, when they perceive themselves in a no-win situation and so on (Schaufeli and Enzmann, 1998).

As it is inferred from the statements of previous paragraph, there are a variety of administrative factors leading teachers to burnout, but four of these factors playing more salient roles in teacher burnout processes of secondary EFL teachers were selected for the study. In fact, the study tries to explore how Iranian and Turkish secondary EFL teachers' burnout perception levels are related to (a) *Teacher Autonomy* referring to the degree to which a teacher is allowed to take responsibility for his/her teaching (Aoki, 2000; Smith, 2000; Benson, 2000), (b) *Reward Adequacy* denoting to extrinsic rewards that increase the frequency of a positive response (Otto and Arnold, 2005; Romanowski, 2006), (c) *Fairness* referring to administrative justice in outcomes, procedures and interactions (Konovsky, 2000; Cropanzano et al., 2007), and (d) *Fringe Benefits* denoting to various non-wage compensations provided to employees in addition to their normal wages or salaries (Stanford, 2008; Malveaux, 2010). Hence, the paper aims at finding answers to the following research questions:

1. What is the perceived level of job burnout for Iranian and Turkish secondary EFL teachers in reference to the three-factor structure of the MBI-ES (i.e. EE, DP, and PA subscales)?
2. Are there any significant relationships between Iranian and Turkish EFL teachers' EE, DP and PA burnout levels while taking into account their nationality?
3. Which of the administrative factors better predicts the EE, DP, and PA burnout subscales among both Iranian and Turkish EFL teachers?
4. Which of the administrative factors plays a cross-cultural role in EE, DP and PA processes of Iranian and Turkish EFL teachers?

## **2. Methodology**

The participants were Iranian (N=230) and Turkish (N=156) teachers teaching English as a foreign language in state high schools during 2011-2012 academic year. The data for the study were collected from North West provinces of Iran (East Azerbaijan, West Azerbaijan, Erdebil, Zanjan, Kazvin, and Tehran) and four city regions of Ankara (Mamak, Çankaya, Altındağ, and Balgat) in Turkey. The Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES) was employed to measure self-perceived burnout levels of the participants through 22 items in three dimensions of EE, DP and PA. The average internal reliability of these dimensions was ( $\alpha= 0.783$ ). Additionally, a four-dimension scale (41items) was developed based on the literature study to measure the participants' perceptions about the conditions of their administration in the areas of (1) Teacher Autonomy, (2) Reward Adequacy, (3) Fairness, and (4) Fringe Benefits. The average internal reliability of these dimensions was ( $\alpha= 0.703$ ). The collected data were entered into the SPSS version 17.0 for Windows for analysis. Descriptive and inferential statistics such as per cent, mean, t-test, and standard multiple regression were used for determining and explaining burnout levels of Iranian and Turkish Teachers.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. General burnout perceptions of Iranian and Turkish teachers

Maslach, Jackson, and Leiter (1996) suggested three score cut-off points for each burnout subscale, where high scores for EE and DP subscales along with low scores for PA subscale indicate greater feelings of burnout (See Table 1). Based on this model, the results of descriptive statistics for burnout perceptions of Iranian teachers in the three subscales of EE, DP and PA were as: EE (Low=50.0%, Moderate=21.3%, and High= 28.7%), DP (Low=56.5%, Moderate= 22.2%, and High= 21.3%), and PA (Low= 29.1%, Moderate=27.0 %, and High= 43.9 %), while for Turkish teachers they were as: EE (Low= 28.8 %, Moderate=32.7%, and High= 38.5%), DP (Low= 44.9%, Moderate=34.0 %, and High= 21.2%), and PA (Low=27.6%, Moderate=32.7%, and High= 39.7%). See Table 2.

Table 1. Score Categories of Burnout Subscales

Subscales	Range	Low	Moderate	High
Emotional Exhaustion (EE)	0-54	0 – 16	17 – 26	27 and over
Depersonalization (DP)	0-30	0 – 6	7 – 12	13 and over
Personal Accomplishment (PA)*	0-48	39 and over	32 – 38	0 - 31

\*Indicating the positively-worded subscale

The summative burnout scores of the participants were also computed here. Scores were considered ‘high’ if they were within the 25% of high scores of the total range (0-132), ‘moderate’ if they were within the 50% of middle scores of the total range, and ‘low’ if they were within the 25% of low scores of the total range. Based on this self-developed cut-off points, the results of Iranian teachers’ overall burnout were as: (Low=38.3 %, Moderate=60.0 % and High= 1.7 %) and for Turkish teachers were as (Low=23.7 %, Moderate= 74.4 % and High= 1.9 %). See Table 2.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage of Iranian and Turkish Teachers’ Burnout Perceptions

Subscales	Observed Ranges		Low				Moderate				High			
	Ir.	Tr.	Ir.		Tr.		Ir.		Tr.		Ir.		Tr.	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
EE	0-48	2-53	115	50.0	45	28.8	49	21.3	51	32.7	66	28.7	60	38.5
DP	0-27	0-24	130	56.5	70	44.9	51	22.2	53	34.0	49	21.3	33	21.2
PA*	10-48	13-48	67	29.1	43	27.6	62	27.0	51	32.7	101	43.9	62	39.7
Overall Burnout**	1-99	7-104	88	38.3	37	23.7	138	60.0	116	74.4	4	1.7	3	1.9

\*The scores of this subscale were reversed to calculate the summative score of burnout.

\*\* The cut-off points belong to the researcher (Low= 0-32, Moderate= 33-87, High= 88-132).

#### 3.2. Nationality and teacher burnout

There was statistically a significant difference between Iranian (N = 230; 59.6 %) and Turkish (N = 156; 40.4 %) EFL teachers’ perceptions on burnout only in the subscale of EE ( $t = -3.36; P = 0.001, P < 0.05$ ). However, no significant differences were observed between the

groups in the subscales of DP ( $t = -1.00$ ;  $P = 0.316$ ,  $P > 0.05$ ) and PA ( $t = -.42$ ;  $P = 0.674$ ,  $P > 0.05$ ). See Table 3.

Table 3. Nationality and Teacher Burnout

Burnout Subscales	Group statistics			t-test			
	Nationality	N	Mean	t	df	Sig.	$\eta^2$
1. EE	Iranian	230	19.53	-3.365	359.79	.001	0.0286
	Turkish	156	23.57				
2. DP	Iranian	230	7.42	-1.004	366.25	.316	-
	Turkish	156	8.02				
3. PA	Iranian	230	32.76	-.421	360.96	.674	-
	Turkish	156	33.10				

Moreover, the ‘Effect Size’ statistics based on the ‘Eta Square’ value ( $\eta^2$ ) of Cohen (1988) indicated a slight significant difference between Iranian and Turkish groups in the EE subscale ( $\eta^2 = 0.0286$ ;  $\eta^2 < 0.059$ ). Cohen’s (1988) effect size indexes for the ratio of variance between the dependent and independent variables are as: small = 0.01 to 0.059, medium = 0.06 to 0.139 and large = 0.14 to 1. It is computed through the ‘ $\eta^2 = t^2/t^2 + (N_1 + N_2 - 2)$ ’ formula for t-tests. See Table 3.

### 3.3. Administrative factors as predictors of teacher burnout

The analyses of this part focus on determining the potential predictive relationship between the four administrative factors and the three burnout subscales of EE, DP, and PA while (a) Iranian and Turkish groups were considered as a unique group and (b) the groups were contemplated as separate for comparative purposes.

#### 3.3.1. Iranian and Turkish teachers in a unique group

The results of multiple stepwise-method regression analyses for determining the role of the four administrative factors in predicting the three burnout subscales among both Iranian and Turkish teachers revealed that EE and PA had significant linear relationship with the administrative factors of *Teacher Autonomy* (EE  $\blacktriangleright t = -2.629$ ;  $P = 0.009$ ,  $P < 0.05$  and PA  $\blacktriangleright t = 4.878$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ), *Reward Adequacy* (EE  $\blacktriangleright t = -3.835$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$  and PA  $\blacktriangleright t = 2.641$ ;  $P = 0.009$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) and *Fairness* (EE  $\blacktriangleright t = 3.580$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$  and PA  $\blacktriangleright t = -4.162$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ), while DP with the factors of *Teacher Autonomy* ( $t = -3.414$ ;  $P = 0.001$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) and *Fairness* ( $t = 4.222$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ). See Table 4.

The results also disclosed that the predictive factors of EE, DP, and PA accounted for 6.8, 5.1, and 9.00 percent of total prediction variance of the subscales, respectively. Moreover, *Fairness* was the strongest predictor of EE, DP and PA subscales (EE  $\blacktriangleright t = 3.580$ , Beta = 0.327; DP  $\blacktriangleright t = 4.222$ , Beta = 0.310; PA  $\blacktriangleright t = -4.162$ , Beta = -.376). See Table 4.

Table 4. Coefficients of EE, DP and PA and Administrative Factors among both Ir. & Tr. Groups

Subscales	EE				DP				PA			
	Beta	t	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>	Beta	t	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>	Beta	t	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>
1. TA	-.194	-2.639	.009	.017	-.251	-3.414	.001	.029	.356	4.878	.000	.057
2. RA	-.315	-3.835	.000	.036	-.086	-1.032	.303	-	.214	2.641	.009	.017
3. F	.327	3.580	.000	.031	.310	4.222	.000	.044	-.376	-4.162	.000	.041
4. FB	.046	.635	.526	-	.108	1.522	.129	-	-.045	-.630	.529	-
All subscales	Total R <sup>2</sup> =.068				Total R <sup>2</sup> =.051				Total R <sup>2</sup> =.090			

TA = Teacher Autonomy, RA = Reward Adequacy, F = Fairness, FB = Fringe Benefits.

### 3.3.2. Comparison between Iranian and Turkish groups

The results of multiple enter- and stepwise-method regression analyses for determining the role of the four administrative factors in predicting the three burnout subscales across Iranian and Turkish teachers revealed that EE had significant linear relationship with the administrative factors of *Reward Adequacy* ( $t = -2.884$ ;  $P = 0.004$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) and *Fairness* ( $t = 1.986$ ;  $P = 0.048$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) in the case of Iranian participants and with the factors of *Teacher Autonomy* ( $t = -3.895$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) and *Reward Adequacy* ( $t = -2.497$ ;  $P = 0.014$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) in the case of Turkish participants. See Table 5.

The results also showed that the predictive factors of EE in the case of Iranian participants accounted for 4.3 per cent of the subscale's variance, while in the case of Turkish participants explained 26.00 per cent. Moreover, *Reward Adequacy* ( $t = -2.884$ , Beta =  $-.291$ ) was the strongest predictor of EE subscale among Iranian teachers, while the strongest predictor of EE among Turkish teachers was *Teacher Autonomy* ( $t = -3.895$ , Beta =  $-.450$ ). See Table 5.

Table 5. Coefficients of EE and Administrative Factors across Ir. & Tr. Groups

Subscales	Ir.				Tr.			
	Beta	t	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>	Beta	t	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>
1. TA	-.026	-.302	.763	-	-.450	-3.895	.000	.075
2. RA	-.291	-2.884	.004	.035	-.298	-2.497	.014	.031
3. F	.242	1.986	.048	.017	.254	1.847	.067	-
4. FB	-.056	-.596	.552	-	-.028	-.319	.750	-
All subscales	Total R <sup>2</sup> =.043				Total R <sup>2</sup> =.260			

Additionally, the scrutiny of values for DP subscale revealed that there was significant linear relationships between the DP subscale and the administrative factor of *Fairness* ( $t = 6.025$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) in the case of Iranian participants, and between the DP subscale and the administrative factor of *Teacher Autonomy* ( $t = -4.655$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) in the case of Turkish participants. See Table 6.

The results also demonstrated that the predictive factors of DP in the case of Iranian and Turkish participants explained 13.7 and 12.3 per cent of the subscale's total prediction

variance, respectively. Moreover, *Fairness* ( $t = 6.025$ ,  $Beta = 0.371$ ) was the strongest predictor of DP among Iranian teachers, while the strongest predictor of DP subscale among Turkish teachers was *Teacher Autonomy* ( $t = -4.655$ ,  $Beta = -.351$ ). See Table 6.

Table 6. Coefficients of DP and Administrative Factors across Ir. & Tr. Groups

Subscales	Ir.				Tr.			
	Beta	t	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>	Beta	t	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>
1. TA	-.152	-1.880	.061	-	-.351	-4.655	.000	.123
2. RA	-.174	-1.875	.062	-	-.050	-.473	.637	-
3. F	.371	6.025	.000	.137	-.074	-.626	.532	-
4. FB	.036	.408	.683	-	.045	.552	.582	-
All subscales	Total R <sup>2</sup> = .137				Total R <sup>2</sup> = .123			

At last, the scrutiny of values for PA subscale showed that there was significant linear relationship between the PA subscale and the administrative factors of *Teacher Autonomy* ( $t = 3.432$ ;  $P = 0.001$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ), *Reward Adequacy* ( $t = 3.557$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) and *Fairness* ( $t = -4.591$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) in the case of Iranian participants and between the PA subscale and the administrative factor of *Teacher Autonomy* ( $t = 4.128$ ;  $P = 0.000$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) in the case of Turkish participants. See Table 7.

The results also disclosed that the predictive factors of PA in the case of Iranian participants explained 11.4 percent of the subscale's prediction variance, whereas the predictive factor of PA in the case of Turkish participants accounted for 10.0 percent of the subscale's prediction variance. Furthermore, *Fairness* ( $t = -4.591$ ,  $Beta = -.479$ ) was the strongest predictor of PA among Iranian teachers, while the strongest predictor of PA subscale among Turkish teachers was *Teacher Autonomy* ( $t = 4.128$ ,  $Beta = 0.316$ ). See Table 7.

Table 7. Coefficients of PA and Administrative Factors across Ir. & Tr. Groups

Subscales	Ir.				Tr.			
	Beta	t	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>	Beta	t	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>
1. TA	.287	3.432	.001	.046	.316	4.128	.000	.100
2. RA	.342	3.557	.000	.052	-.104	-.979	.329	-
3. F	-.479	-4.591	.000	.082	-.132	-1.104	.271	-
4. FB	-.089	-.993	.322	-	-.004	-.053	.957	-
All subscales	Total R <sup>2</sup> = .114				Total R <sup>2</sup> = .100			

#### 4. Discussion

The significant findings are discussed here to find answers to the four research questions which were the objectives of this study. The percentage scores of EE, DP and PA subscales revealed that Turkish teachers perceive more EE burnout than Iranian teachers (High Level ► Ir. = 28.7 %; High ► Tr. = 38.5 %), Iranian teachers perceive more PA than

Turkish teachers (High Level ► Ir. = 43.9 %; High ► Tr. = 39.7 %), and Iranian and Turkish teachers perceive DP burnout almost equally (High Level ► Ir. = 21.3 %; High Level ► Tr. = 21.2 %) (See Table 2). This implies that Turkish teachers feel more drained from their job emotionally than Iranian teachers because of feeling emotional exhaustion, Iranian teachers sense more competence than Turkish teachers and also achieve more successful results from working with their students, but they feel cynical toward their students almost equally (Research question one).

Furthermore, the results of t-test analyses for determining significant differences between Iranian and Turkish teachers' burnout levels in reference to the three-factor structure of the MBI-ES revealed that there was statistically slight significant difference between the groups only in the subscale of EE, but not in the subscales of DP and PA. The mean scores of Iranian (Mean= 20.45) and Turkish (Mean= 23.70) teachers showed that the Turkish teachers' scores were greater than that of Iranian ones (See Table 3). As with the percentage results, it implies that Turkish teachers feel emotionally drained from their job and are unable to give of themselves psychologically more than that of Iranian teachers. This may be attributed to the demanding EFL programs in Turkish context or Turkish teachers' lack of seriousness in taking responsibility for the work they do because Turkish teachers offer 15-hour obligatory teaching per week, while Iranian teachers offer 24-hour obligatory teaching per week with a low amount of salary than that of Turkish teachers (Research question two).

With regard to which factors better predict the EE, DP, and PA burnout processes among both Iranian and Turkish EFL teachers, the findings demonstrated that EE, DP, and PA subscales were better predicted by *Fairness* (EE ►  $t = 3.580$ , Beta = 0.327; DP ►  $t = 4.222$ , Beta = 0.310; PA ►  $t = -4.162$ , Beta = -.376). This means that Iranian and Turkish teachers are suffering from EE and DP burnout associated with administrative factors mainly due to unfair situation in their administration, and their work accomplishment has also been affected when there is the question of fairness.

When the Beta values were summed for the EE, DP, and PA subscales in the four factors, the results showed that the value of PA (Beta Sum = .991) was greater than that of EE and DP; and when the Beta values were summed for the four factors in the EE, DP and PA processes, they revealed that the value of *Fairness* (Beta Sum= 1.013) was greater than that of the other factors (See Table 8). This implies that Iranian and Turkish teachers are generally suffering from EE and DP burnout, especially EE (Beta Sum= 0.882), and *Fairness* is the strongest predictive factor of these processes. However, to deal with EE, DP, and PA burnout associated with the selected administrative factors among both Iranian and Turkish EFL teachers, allocations should mainly be distributed fairly among all members of the administration (Research question three).



Table 8. Summary of Significant and Insignificant Factors in Burnout Processes

Factors	EE		DP		PA		Beta Sum
	Sig.	Beta Rank	Sig.	Beta Rank	Sig.	Beta Rank	
1. TA	+	3	+	2	+	2	0.801
2. RA	+	2	-	4	+	3	0.615
3. F*	+	1	+	1	+	1	1.013
4. FB	-	4	-	3	-	4	0.199
Beta Sum	0.882		0.755		.991		-

\* indicates the strongest predictive factor

Finally, the contrasted results showed that EE, DP, and PA subscales were better predicted by *Reward Adequacy* ( $t = -2.884$ ,  $Beta = -.291$ ), *Fairness* ( $t = 6.025$ ,  $Beta = 0.371$ ), and *Fairness* ( $t = -4.591$ ,  $Beta = -.479$ ) in the case of Iranian, respectively; while by *Teacher Autonomy* (EE ►  $t = -3.895$ ,  $Beta = -.450$ ; DP ►  $t = -4.655$ ,  $Beta = -.351$ ; PA ►  $t = 4.128$ ,  $Beta = 0.316$ ) in the case of Turkish teachers (See Tables 5, 6, and 7). This means that improper distribution of allocations and unfair decisions and procedures cause Iranian teachers to drain from their job emotionally, to depersonalize their students, and to reduce their accomplishment and achievement; whereas, lack of enough autonomy sensation by Turkish teachers depletes them emotionally, causes them to depersonalize their recipients, and affects their accomplishment and achievement.

Moreover, the contrasted findings associated with the chosen administrative factors revealed that there was no difference between Iranian and Turkish groups in *Fringe Benefits* factor because it was not significant in EE, DP, PA processes of both countries, implying that the factor was not cross-culturally discriminatory in the study. On the other hand, there was thorough difference between Iranian and Turkish groups in *Fairness* factor, which was significant in EE, DP, and PA burnout processes of only Iranian participants, not Turkish ones, meaning that the factor is cross-culturally discriminatory and causes Iranian teachers to be depleted emotionally, depersonalize their recipients, and affect their accomplishment and achievement. And, *Teacher Autonomy* was significant in EE, DP, and PA burnout processes of Turkish participants, whereas it was significant only in PA burnout processes of Iranian ones, that is, it plays discriminatory cross-cultural roles in EE and DP processes, while it does not in PA one, also meaning that lack of sensing enough autonomy by Turkish teachers drains them emotionally and causes them to depersonalize their recipients. Finally, *Reward Adequacy* factor was significant in EE and PA processes of Iranian group and only in EE processes of Turkish one, i.e., it plays discriminatory cross-cultural role in PA processes, not in EE and DP processes. This also means reward insufficiency leads to emotional exhaustion and teacher performance deterioration among Iranian teachers, while it leads only to energy depletion among Turkish teachers (See Table 9).

At last, when the Beta values were summed for the EE, DP, and PA subscales in the four factors, the results showed that Iranian teachers' EE (Ir. ► Beta Sum = 0.615; Tr. ► Beta Sum = 1.03) value was less than that of Turkish ones, while their DP (Ir. ► Beta Sum = 0.733; Tr. ► Beta Sum = 0.52) and PA (Ir. ► Beta Sum = 1.197; Tr. ► Beta Sum = 0.556)

values were greater than that of them (See Table 9). This means that Turkish teachers feel more EE and PA burnout than Iranian teachers while taking into account the chosen administrative factors, whereas Iranian teachers feel more DP burnout than Turkish teachers. And, when the Beta values were summed for the four factors in the EE, DP and PA processes, the findings revealed that the value of *Fairness* factor (Beta Sum = 1.092) among Iranian teachers and *Teacher Autonomy* factor (Beta Sum = 1.117) among Turkish teachers was greater than that of the other factors (See Table 9). That is to say, Iranian teachers are suffering from burnout at their workplace mainly as a result of unfair distribution of allocations; whereas, Turkish teachers as a result of not sensing enough autonomy.

In short, to deal with burnout problems at administrative level across Iranian and Turkish EFL teachers, Iranian authorities should mainly offer a fair amount of tangible and intangible rewards to the teachers, provide opportunities to challenge the made decisions, care for their rights, and explain adequately the procedures and decisions determining their outcomes. While, Turkish authorities should mainly develop autonomy perceptions of their teachers through establishing a flexible curriculum, getting rid of more rigid educational rules and procedures restricting teacher performance, allowing for teacher voice, and providing considerable support (Research question four).

Table 9. Summary of Significant and Insignificant Factors in Burnout Processes across Ir. & Tr. Groups

Factor	EE		DP		PA		BS							
	Ir.	Tr.	Ir.	Tr.	Ir.	Tr.	Ir.	Tr.						
	Sig.	BR	Sig.	BR	Sig.	BR	Sig.	BR						
1. TA**	-	3	+	1	-	3	+	1	+	3	+	1	0.465	1.117
2. RA	+	1	+	2	-	2	-	3	+	2	-	3	0.807	0.452
3. F*	+	2	-	3	+	1	-	2	+	1	-	2	1.092	0.46
4. FB	-	4	-	4	-	4	-	4	-	4	-	4	0.181	0.077
BS	0.615		1.03		0.733		0.52		1.197		0.556		-	-

\* (Iran)/\*\* (Turkey) indicates the dominant predictive factor in the group.  
BS = Beta Sum; BR = Beta Rank

## 5. Conclusions

The aim of the study was to measure the perceived EE, DP, and PA burnout levels of Iranian and Turkish EFL teachers and to explore which of these burnout processes is better predicted by the four administrative factors among and across them. The results revealed that there was a slight difference between Iranian and Turkish teachers only in the EE subscale. Moreover, EE, DP, and PA subscales were better predicted among both Iranian and Turkish teachers by Fairness factor. Finally, the contrasted results showed that Fringe Benefits factor did not have a cross-culturally discriminatory role, whereas Teacher Autonomy, Reward Adequacy, and Fairness factors had. Moreover, Iranian teachers suffered from burnout mainly due to improper distribution of allocations and unfair administrative decisions, and Turkish teachers as a result of insufficiency of autonomy. Therefore, Iranian authorities should be fair enough in rewards distribution to overcome burnout, while Turkish

authorities should develop teacher autonomy perceptions among their employees. However, the findings are especially beneficial to teachers in diagnosing the parameters which affect their performance negatively and policy makers in creating a positive work environment.

## References

- Aoki, N. (2000). *Aspects of Teacher Autonomy: Capacity, Freedom and Responsibility*. Paper presented at 2000 Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Language Centre Conference.
- Benson, P. (2000). Autonomy as a Learners' and Teachers' Right. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.), *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions*. London: Longman.
- Brenninkmeijer, V., VanYperen, N. W., & Buunk, B. P. (2001). Burnout and Depression Are Not Identical Twins: Is Superiority a Distinguishing Feature? *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 873-880.
- Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The Management of Organizational Justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48.
- Ewing, R. A. & Smith, D. L. (2003). Retaining Quality Beginning Teachers in the Profession. *Journal of English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 2(1), 15-32.
- Farber, B. A. (1991). *Crisis in Education: Stress and Burnout in the American Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Fivesa, H., Hammana, D., & Olivarez, A. (2007). Does Burnout Begin with Student-Teaching? Analyzing Efficacy, Burnout, and Support during the Student-teaching Semester. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education* 23, 916-934.
- Friedman, I. A. & Farber, B. A. (1992). Professional Self-concept as a Predictor of Teacher Burnout. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86(1), 28-35.
- Konovsky, M. (2000). Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 489-511.
- Malveaux, J. (2010). *Employee Benefits: Examining Employee Benefits in the Midst of a Recovering Economy*. The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), SHRM Survey Findings. Available from <http://www.shrm.org/surveys>.
- Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. (1981). The Measurement of Experienced Burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

- Maslach, C. & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The Truth about Burnout. How Organizations Cause Personal Stress and What to Do about It*. California, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass publishers.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
- Otto, S. J. & Arnold, M. (2005). A Study of Experienced Special Education Teachers' Perceptions of Administrative Support. *College Student Journal*, 39(2), 253-269.
- Özdemir, Y. (2007). The Role of Classroom Management Efficacy in Predicting Teacher Burnout. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(4), 357-363.
- Pick, D. & Leiter, M. P. (1991). Nurses' Perceptions of the Nature and Causes of Burnout: A Comparison of Self-reports and Standardized Measures. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 23, 33-48.
- Romanowski, M. H. (2006). A Changing Nation: Issues Facing Chinese Teachers. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 42(2), 76-81.
- Schaufeli, W. B. & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The Burnout Companion to Study and Practice: A Critical Analysis*. London, England: Taylor and Francis.
- Smith, R. C. (2000). Starting with Ourselves: Teacher-learner Autonomy in Language Learning. In B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.) *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions*. London: Longman.
- Soderfelt, M. & Soderfelt, B. (1995). Burnout in Social Work. *Journal of Social Work*, 40, 638-647.
- Stanford, J. (2008). Employee Benefits. *The International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board (IPSASB)*. *IPSAS 25*, 1-88. New York, USA. Retrieved from: <http://www.ifac.org/public-sector/projects/employee-benefits>.