

THE INVESTIGATION OF THE PREDICTIVE ROLES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' SELF-EFFICACY LEVELS ON THEIR JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB BURNOUT LEVELS**Soner ARIK***Dr, Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University, sarik38sarikmail.com**ORCID: 0000-0002-5338-9238**Received: 05.05.2019 Accepted: 03.10.2019***ABSTRACT**

Schools play a key role in the upbringing and education of individuals who build communities. The main tasks of the administrators of these institutions are to use the available resources economically and effectively in order to achieve the objectives of the school and to find new resources when necessary. School administrators need to be physically, mentally and emotionally healthy to perform these tasks. Because, when exposed to negative situations in the workplace for a long time, they react to these distressing and stressful negativities. Therefore, it is important to investigate the factors that may cause school administrators to fall into such situations. In this study, it is aimed to examine the predictor roles of self-efficacy and job satisfaction levels of school administrators on their levels of job burnout. The data were collected through; (1) 'Burnout Scale' developed by Pines and Aranson (1988) and adapted into Turkish by Çapri (2006), (2) 'General Self-Efficacy Scale' developed by Sherer et al. (1982), restructured by Bosscher and Smit (1998) and adapted into Turkish by Tarakçı (2009), (3) 'Job Satisfaction Scale' developed by Çetinkanat (2000) and (4) a 'Personal Profile Form' prepared by the researcher. According to the results, self-efficacy does not have a predictive role on job satisfaction or job burnout. On the other hand, it was revealed that job satisfaction predicts job burnout. The study was designed in structural equation model. The findings of the study were discussed within literature and recommendations were made in accordance with the results.

Keywords: School administrator, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, job burnout.

INTRODUCTION

Education, which is seen as a process of deliberate and desired changes in the behaviour of individuals on behalf of the society and through their own lives, starts first in the family. However, education in the family may not be based on a specific plan and program because not all families have professional trainers. The necessity of eliminating this deficiency and providing information and culture to individuals with systematic and scientific methods brings the 'school' institution together. The school can be defined as an information, skill acquisition and behaviour change institution that has the task of educating individuals in a multidimensional way (Nural, 2002).

The school, which undertakes such a fundamental task in the upbringing and education of individuals and therefore of societies, consists of various subsystems. One of these subsystems is administrators. The duties of the educational administrators, consisting of the school principals and school vice-principals, are to use the existing resources in the most economical and effective way to reach the goals of the school and to find new resources when necessary (Sapre, 2002). Their duties can be briefly summarized as keeping the school in line with the objectives of the educational programs (Nural, 2002).

School administrators need to be able to communicate well with their subordinates and superiors in order to fulfil these tasks. For this, they must be physically, mentally and emotionally healthy. Long-term discontent and negative situations in their jobs may affect the performance of school administrators' work negatively by preventing the dedication of them like everyone else (Pines, 2002; Dorman, 2003). School administrators who are exposed to negative situations in the workplace for a long time react to these adversities that cause stress and distress over time.

The reaction may occur in a variety of ways, such as excessive fatigue and disability, which may adversely affect the manager's business life. Such negative situations will not only affect the lives of the administrators' themselves, whose duty is to lead the educational institution to perform its functions, but will also negatively affect the quality of the school administration and the education provided in the school. Therefore, it is important to investigate the factors that may cause school administrators to fall into such situations.

Theoretical Background

Job burnout (JB)

Burnout is a long-term, negative and complex psychological experience in which people react as a result of work-related distress, stress and similar negative factors (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Goddard, Goddard & O'Brien, 2006). Demerouti et al. (2003) describe burnout as a state of extreme exhaustion as a result of intense physical, affective and cognitive stress stemming from long-term exposure to certain working conditions. Burnout, which

may arise from professional or organizational factors, is a situation that can cause quite negative problems for both individuals and organizations (Ari & Bal, 2008)

Job burnout (JB) consists of 3 factors. These are: (a) emotional burnout, which can be defined as a sense of greater responsibility for work and responsibility, (b) low personal accomplishment, which can be defined as finding oneself as less competent and successful in occupational issues and (c) depersonalization, which is the equivalent of negative attitudes and emotions against the profession (Alvarez & Grayson, 2008). The reasons for burnout, which can be observed in three different ways, are very diverse.

These reasons can be classified primarily as institutional reasons that include lack of opportunities for personal development, ever-changing educational policies and training practices and job insecurity (Pillay, Goddard & Wills, 2005), discretion or not being rewarded (Unterbrink et al., 2007), bureaucracy, conflicts with colleagues, inability to take an active role in the decisions, the lack of support and assistance from the management, low salary (Dolunay & Piyal, 2003), different and excessive work obligations (Friedman, 2003), poor working conditions (Maslanka, 1996), cultural structure in schools, classroom environment, reputation and work pressure (Akçamete, 2001), lack of in-service training, resources or materials (Sarı, 2000; Eripek, 2001; Ataman 2001) and students' bad behaviours and disciplinary problems in the classroom (Bham & Hastings, 2003). Other reasons that can be called individual reasons include age, educational status, gender, demographic factors, health status, personality, ability to cope with stress (Dolunay & Piyal, 2003; Teven, 2007), low self-efficacy (SEF) (Schmitz & Schwarzer, 2000; Yoon 2002), negative mood, low spirituality (Mearns & Cain, 2003), job satisfaction (JB) and lack of autonomy (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2009).

The purpose of this study is to investigate the predictive and mediator roles of SEF (tendency of feeling efficient and successful on job-related issues) and JS (attitudes and feelings towards occupation), which are accepted by Alvarez and Grayson (2008) as the indicators of JB and claimed to be directly linked to each other (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010), on JB. SEF has a critical effect on JS (Schunk & Usher, 2012) and higher SEF results in higher motivation (Williams & Rhodes, 2016; Özyılmaz, Erdoğan & Karaeminoğulları, 2018). It is claimed that the SEF and JS levels of school administrators that increase in direct proportion to each other will also increase their power and ability to cope with stressful and difficult events and help them avoid feeling JB (Caprara et al., 2003).

Job satisfaction (JS)

Erigüç (2000) considered JS as the sum of the feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction resulting from the evaluation made by the employee about their job. Mental satisfaction means that the employee is in good physical and mental condition (Oshagbemi, 2000). The more the job provides the variables to which an individual gives importance, the more that individual will be satisfied (Keser, 2007). Therefore, it is normal for each employee to have different JS levels.

The theories related to the concept of JS are also referred to as motivation theories in the literature. JS and motivation are inextricably linked to each other because managers can motivate employees to progress only when they are happy and satisfied with their work (Bush & Middlewood, 2005). The dissatisfaction experienced in the professional context can also lead to negative motivation and result in such consequences as dismissal and aggressive behaviours (Mwanwenda 1995). In this context, motivation is the sum of the powers that drive the individual to a certain direction or purpose and to engage in a particular behaviour. These powers may be internal (cognitive-emotional) or external (environmental) (Bilgin, 2003). In terms of education, it can be stated that the motivation levels of school administrators are particularly important. Because school administrators, as individuals responsible for the overall functioning of the school, are the ones who have the closest (Bush & Middlewood, 2005) and highest (Hutchings et al., 2000) level of influence on the motivation of teachers, who are agents of change.

Job burnout and job satisfaction

When the relationship between JS and JB was examined, it was found that the emotional burnout dimension of the Maslach burnout inventory was inversely correlated with the whole and all subscales of the Job Descriptive Scale, which was developed to test JS level. This result is quite usual because an employee who is experiencing professional burnout cannot be expected to be happy with his/her job; on the contrary, they experience job dissatisfaction. Professional burnout is already a function of dissatisfaction with work. Not all employees who experience job dissatisfaction experience JB. However, it can be stated that every employee who experience JB is also dissatisfied with their jobs (Ertürk and Keçecioglu, 2012). The findings of the study by Koustelios and Tsigilis (2005) also supports the fact that job dissatisfaction and JB are related to each other. Similarly, Çetin et al. (2008) also revealed that the relationship between JS and burnout was statistically significant.

Self-efficacy (SEF)

SEF is defined as one's perceived capabilities for learning or performing actions at designated levels (Bandura, 1997) or "people's beliefs about their ability to produce desired outcomes through their own actions" (Maddux, 2016). It is "a theoretically and empirically robust motivation belief that has been shown to play an important role in the learning and development of new skills and knowledge" (Klassen & Klassen, 2018). Unrau et. al. (2018) describe SEF as "as a personal belief about what an individual is capable of learning or doing by means of organizing and carrying out actions that lead to a successful outcome". According to Bandura (1997), SEF results from four major reasons such as mastery experiences, vicarious experience, verbal and social persuasion, and emotional and physiological states. Black and Deci (2000) regard autonomy, or SEF, as a basic psychological need. Deprivation of autonomy may cause teachers to use teaching methods that they do not believe in and to head towards goals that they normally do not give priority to. This may lead to low personal achievement and low SEF. Personal achievements is related to the self-assessment of the individual about itself. Low SEF is directly proportional to low productivity, low morale and inability to meet business requirements and it can occur as

desensitization, pessimism, loss of idealism and ways of being insensitive to the respondents (Alvarez & Grayson, 2008). SEF is considered as a major factor that affects individuals' activities and performances (Bandura & Locke, 2003). Also, considering malleable nature of SEF (Bandura, 1997) and its direct relation with JS, finding out the interrelations among SEF, JS and JB will offer recommendations to reduce JB levels of school administrators, thus improving their job performances.

Job burnout and self-efficacy

In terms of teachers and school administrators, school interlocutors are composed of different groups. These groups can be summarized as students, parents, other employees of the school, community and administrators (Cenkseven, Önder & Sarı, 2009). The teacher and the school administrator not only deal with these groups, but also have responsibilities such as the annual program and curriculum (Pillay, Goddard & Wills, 2005), acquiring new knowledge skills and following technological innovations (Cenkseven, Önder & Sarı, 2009).

With so many different groups and issues to deal with, teaching and educational administration can be considered as a very stressful profession (Kokkinos, 2007). In fact, it can be said that teachers and educational administrators are among people who are exposed to the highest level of stress (Stoeber & Rennert, 2008). However, students need adults who are mentally and physically healthy and fit to guide them in preparing for life (Brouwers, Tomic & Will, 2004). To meet this need, teachers and school administrators need both personal and professional development to become healthy individuals and achieve their goals without feeling exhaustion, which affects individuals' physical, academic and social performance directly (Karademir et al., 2009; Sears, Urizar & Evans, 2000). The motivation of teachers and administrators, who have increased their 'SEF as healthy and educated individuals, will increase their power to handle stressful and difficult events (Caprara et al., 2003).

The term SEF mentioned above can be defined as a person's ability to cope and deal with a wide variety of difficult situations, or belief in his/her ability in this sense (Kurbanoğlu, 2004). The inefficacy of individuals' knowledge and skills required to fulfil their duties and responsibilities are considered among the factors causing stress and burnout (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2016). Dönmez, Özer and Cömert (2009) revealed that there is a negative and moderate relationship between the levels of SEF and professional burnout of school principals. SEF has a protective effect when trying to cope with difficult situations (Caprara et al., 2003) and individuals with high SEF set higher goals and adhere to them (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008; Klassen & Usher, 2010).

Individuals with low SEF perception start to experience feelings of insecurity, helplessness and pessimism (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008) and then experience feelings of unhappiness and dissatisfaction (Çapri & Kan, 2007). This may bring about a sense of burnout, which can also be defined as loss of idealism and purpose (Tümkiye & Türker, 2010). Teachers and administrators who have a sense of burnout can adversely affect themselves, their students and the education system (Hughes, 2001).

Related studies in literature

Various researches have been conducted abroad on 'burnout', which has such an important place in education. However, studies on this subject in Turkey started in the 90's. These studies which cover many areas such as health, accounting and hotel management can be grouped under the following headings in terms of their participants:

- University faculty members (Akman, Bilge & Kelecioğlu, 2007; Baysal, 1994; Murat, 2003)
- Research assistants (Ağaoğlu et al., 2004)
- Teachers (Girgin, 1995; Sucuoğlu & Kuloğlu, 1996; Güneri & Özdemir, 2003; Sünbül, 2003; Gündüz, 2005; Cemaloğlu & Erdemoğlu, 2007; Otacioğlu, 2008; Yılmaz, 2009)
- Pre-school teachers (Tuğrul & Çelik, 2003; Deniz & Öztürk, 2008)
- Technical teachers (Avşaroğlu, Deniz & Kahraman, 2005)
- Boarding school administrators and teachers (Dağlı & Gündüz, 2008)
- Private school administrators and teachers (Sarı, 2004)
- School administrators (Babaoğlu, 2004; Dönmez, Özer & Cömert, 2009)

In the study of Dağlı and Gündüz (2008), which is one of the studies including school administrators, a questionnaire was applied to 47 school administrators and 210 teachers working in 14 regional primary schools. According to the results of the questionnaire, it was seen that 31.9% had low level of emotional exhaustion, 23.4% had medium level and 44.7% had high level of burnout according to their perceptions. Regarding the "depersonalization" dimension, it was determined that 21.3% had low level, 42.6% had moderate level and 36.2% had high level of burnout. As a third dimension, 31.9% had low level, 23.4% had medium level and 44.7% had high level of burnout.

In the study of Sarı (2004), which also included school administrators and teachers, a vocational satisfaction questionnaire and Maslach Burnout Scale were administered to 295 individuals, 262 of whom were private school teachers and 33 of whom were private school administrators. As a result of the study, it was determined that school administrators felt less 'personal achievement' than teachers. There was no significant difference between 'emotional exhaustion', 'depersonalization' and 'professional satisfaction'.

Babaoğlu (2004) conducted another study for school administrators in Düzce in the 2003-2004 Academic Year. In this study, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, personal failure and total burnout of primary school administrators were examined. The sample of the study consisted of 204 principals and vice-principals working in primary schools in Düzce. Maslak Burnout Scale was applied to these managers and the following results were reached;

- In terms of gender, women experience more burnout than men.
- In terms of marital status, singles experience more burnout than married people.
- In terms of depersonalization and total burnout, childless managers experience more burnout than managers with children.
- In the depersonalization dimension, managers with high professional seniority, but in the emotional burnout dimension, managers with lower professional seniority experience more feelings of burnout.

Another study was conducted by Dönmez, Özer and Cömert (2009) in Malatya. The aim of the study was to determine the relationship between school principals' SEF and burnout levels. As a result of the research, it was found out that school principals' SEF perceptions differ according to their seniority and the number of teachers in the school. Burnout levels differ according to the number of students and teachers in the school. Another finding revealed that there is a negative and moderate relationship between the levels of SEF and professional burnout of the principals.

As it turns out, the related literature focused on teachers more while studies on school administrators were relatively less. In this sense, this research focuses on school principals and school vice-principals as educational administrators.

The purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to focus on the feeling of burnout among the managers who are relatively under-examined in the field. In this research, burnout levels, occupational satisfaction levels and SEF levels of administrators; school principals and school vice-principals, working in the primary and secondary schools in Niğde province were investigated. In addition, the predictive roles of SEF levels on JB and JS levels, and that of JS on JB were also examined. The research questions to be answered for this purpose are as following:

Do school principals' and school vice-principals';

- a. SEF levels predict their JS levels?
- b. SEF levels predict their JB levels?
- c. JS levels predict their JB levels?

The significance of the study

It is thought that the data collected by the research will primarily serve to reduce the lack of studies on the burnout levels, SEF and JS of school administrators. It is also believed that the results of this research conducted in Niğde will enable a generalization for Central Anatolia Region specifically and Turkey in general. In addition, the findings obtained in this study will be useful in determining the causes of possible burnout feelings in primary and secondary school principals and vice-principals in Niğde province. It is hoped that the research will serve to

shed light on probable reasons that result in JB, which will enable the authorities at the Provincial Directorate of National Education to take measures to reduce the feelings of burnout among the school administrators in Niğde.

METHOD

This research is designed in descriptive survey method. Descriptive survey method is a research approach that aims to describe a past or present condition as it is. In this method, the case, individual or object that is subject to the research is described as it is and within its own situation without an effort to change or affect them (Karasar, 2006). Structural equation model is used to test the predictor and mediator role of SEF on JS and JB, and JS on JB levels of school administrators.

The study group of the research consists of 390 school administrators working at Primary, Secondary and High Schools in Niğde. These school administrators consist of school principals and school vice-principals. Data about the participants are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Data About The Participants

		n	%
Gender	Female	65	16,7
	Male	325	83,3
Appointment	Principal	135	34,6
	Vice-principal	255	65,4
School Level	Primary School	89	22,8
	Secondary School	110	28,2
	High School	191	49,0

The adequate number of sampling is at least 10 participants for every single parameter in any scale (Hair et al. (1998). On the other hand, the number must be at least 250 so that confirmatory factor analysis can be done (Hoyle, 1995). Şimşek (2007) states that the minimum number of sampling in structural equation model must be $k(k-1)/2$ (k =the number of variables). The data in this research were collected from 390 participants and show a normal distribution curve.

Data collection tools

In the research, three scales were used to collect the data. The researcher asked for permission to use the scales for scientific and academic purposes from the researchers who developed them and the permissions were obtained by e-mail.

The data about the burnout levels of the participants were collected through the Burnout Scale which was developed by Pines and Aronson (1988) and adapted into Turkish by Çapri (2006). The original scale was a seven-likert type scale consisting of 21 items. However, 4 items were excluded from the scale after the validity and reliability analysis, and the scale used in this research consists of 17 items.

In order to measure the SEF perceptions of the managers, a 12-item "General SEF Scale" which was developed by Sherer et al. (1982) was used in the research. The scale includes Initiative (items 1-3), Effort (items 4-8) and Persistence (items 9-12) dimensions.

JS Scale developed by Çetinkanat (2000) was used to determine JS. The original scale, which is six-likert type, consisted of 32 items. However, 11 items were excluded after the validity and reliability analysis and the scale used in this research consists of 21 items.

Data analysis

The scales utilized for data collection used in the research were analysed in terms of validity and reliability. Exploratory factor analysis were conducted to examine the construct validity of each scale. Also, confirmatory factor analysis was performed to clarify the structures revealed in exploratory factor analysis.

Cronbach Alpha coefficients were examined to measure the reliability of the scales. All three scales were subjected to the first order structural equation model after validity and reliability analysis, examining the predictive role of SEF on JS and JB, and the predictive role of JS on JB.

FINDINGS (RESULTS)

In this section, the results obtained from the data through several statistical tests are given in tables. Table 2 presents the explanatory factor analysis results for JB Scale.

Table 2. Findings on Explanatory Factor Analysis for JB Scale

Item No	Factor Covariance	Factor-1 Loading	Factor Loadings After Rotation			Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach Alpha
			Factor – 1	Factor – 2	Factor - 3		
JB-1	0,767	0,668	0,858			0,608	.928
JB-2	0,746	0,806	0,766			0,760	
JB-4	0,773	0,731	0,827			0,735	
JB-5	0,678	0,776	0,708			0,816	
JB-7	0,774	0,851	0,730			0,364	
JB-8	0,802	0,870	0,731			0,767	
JB-10	0,274	0,408		0,502		0,651	
JB-13	0,713	0,801		0,672		0,466	
JB-14	0,642	0,690		0,724		0,640	.846
JB-15	0,585	0,515		0,754		0,688	
JB-16	0,534	0,690		0,588		0,609	
JB-17	0,632	0,736		0,605		0,506	
JB-21	0,475	0,655		0,542		0,590	
JB-3	0,724	0,559			0,790	0,684	
JB-6	0,690	0,615			0,785	0,837	.863
JB-19	0,759	0,628			0,831	0,559	
JB-20	0,738	0,647			0,776	0,573	
Cronbach Alpha value for the whole scale is .930							

As a result of the factor analysis for the JB Scale, 4 items that did not take part in any factor or whose factor load value was below .40 were excluded from the scale, and three factors were found in the scale. It was seen that these three factors explain 26.296%, 21.206% and 19.005% of the total variance of the scale respectively. The factor dimensions of the scale in total explain 66.507% of the scale.

In Table 3, the explanatory factor analysis results for JS Scale are shown.

Table 3. Findings on Explanatory Factor Analysis for JS

Item No	Factor Covariance	Factor-1 Loading	Factor Loadings After Rotation				Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach Alpha
			Factor-1	Factor-2	Factor -3	Factor-4		
JS-1	,732	,799	,780				,744	
JS-2	,613	,659	,746				,597	
JS-3	,602	,618	,758				,544	
JS-4	,706	,815	,718				,767	
JS-5	,605	,755	,683				,687	
JS-9	,753	,804	,817				,733	.942
JS-15	,739	,817	,793				,748	
JS-16	,750	,821	,797				,754	
JS-20	,736	,771	,808				,685	
JS-27	,727	,808	,709				,743	
JS-14	,836	,827		,683			,788	
JS-18	,803	,698		,829			,650	
JS-19	,849	,757		,832			,723	
JS-22	,607	,547		,668			,542	.902
JS-23	,780	,788		,730			,772	
JS-28	,602	,517		,635			,512	
JS-30	,834	,472			,888		,456	
JS-31	,870	,531			,892		,528	.842
JS-32	,619	,538			,696		,528	
JS-7	,760	,339				,857	,337	.796
JS-8	,822	,524				,835	,524	

Cronbach Alpha value for the whole scale is .936

As a result of the factor analysis for the JS Scale, 11 items that did not take part in any factor or whose factor load value was below .40 were excluded from the scale, and three factors were found in the scale. These four factors explain 31.878%, 19.448%, 12.287% and 9.461% of the total variance of the scale respectively. The factor dimensions of the scale in total explain 73.074% of the scale.

Table 4 presents the explanatory factor analysis results for SEF Scale.

Table 4. Findings on Explanatory Factor Analysis for SEF

Item No	Factor Covariance	Factor-1 Loading	Factor Loadings After Rotation			Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach Alpha
			Factor -1	Factor-2	Factor-3		
SEF-1	,592	,425	,673			,299	.714
SEF-2	,576	,617	,744			,503	
SEF-3	,585	,702	,701			,558	
SEF-6	,462	,521	,638			,373	
SEF-8	,524	,677	,556			,516	
SEF-4	,539	,333		,701		,234	
SEF-5	,660	,694		,708		,577	
SEF-7	,575	,611		,665		,479	
SEF-9	,344	,360			,583	,279	.661
SEF-10	,516	,417			,700	,326	
SEF-11	,614	,616			,731	,532	
SEF-12	,626	,667			,694	,570	
Cronbach Alpha value for the whole scale is .783							

As a result of the factor analysis for the SEF Scale, no items were excluded from the scale, and three factors were found in the scale. These factors explain 21.884%, 17.172% and 16.029% of the total variance of the scale respectively. The factor dimensions of the scale in total explain 55.086% of the scale.

Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated for the findings about the reliability of the scales. Cronbach Alpha value for the JB Scale in total was found .930 while the values of the three factors were calculated as .928, .846, and .863 respectively. As for the JS Scale, Cronbach Alpha value for the whole scale was found .936 while the values of the four factors in the scale were calculated as .942, .902, .842 and .796 respectively. Regarding the SEF Scale, Cronbach Alpha value for the whole scale was found .783 and the values of the two factors in the scale were calculated as .714, .634 and .661 respectively. Tezbaşaran (1997) states that the sufficient reliability coefficient of a scale must be as close to 1 as possible. Cronbach Alpha values for the JB and JS Scales show that the scales are highly reliable. On the other hand, SEF Scale is reliable. Considering the exploratory factor analysis results and internal consistency coefficients of the JB, JS and SEF Scales, each scale is accepted as valid and reliable.

Findings about the Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Reliability Levels of JB, JS and SEF scales

The confirmatory factor analysis applied to JB Scale after anticipated and theoretically accepted modifications among error terms showed that Chi-Square (χ^2) was 228,634 and degrees of freedom (df) was 89, indicating that the model was statistically significant ($P < 0.01$).

The confirmatory factor analysis for JS Scale after anticipated and theoretically accepted modifications among error terms showed that Chi-Square (χ^2) was 360.896 and degrees of freedom (df) was 124, indicating that the model was statistically significant ($P < 0.01$).

The confirmatory factor analysis, applied to SEF Scale after anticipated and theoretically accepted modifications among error terms, showed that Chi-Square (χ^2) was 76.117 and degrees of freedom (df) was 40, indicating that the model was statistically significant ($P < 0.01$).

First-degree confirmatory factor analyses of the scales are conducted and the goodness fit indexes (gfi) as to the results of the analysis are given in Table 5.

Table 5. The Goodness Fit Index Regarding the Model Constructed in JB, JS and SEF Scales

Fit Measure	Good Fit	Acceptable Fit	JB	JS	SEF
RMSEA	$0 < RMSEA < 0.05$	$0.05 \leq RMSEA \leq 0.10$	0.06	0.070	0.048
NFI	$0.95 \leq NFI \leq 1$	$0.90 \leq NFI \leq 0.95$	0.953	0.950	0.941
CFI	$0.97 \leq CFI \leq 1$	$0.95 \leq CFI \leq 0.97$	0.970	0.966	0.970
GFI	$0.95 \leq GFI \leq 1$	$0.90 \leq GFI \leq 0.95$	0.940	0.927	0.969
AGFI	$0.90 \leq AGFI \leq 1$	$0.85 \leq AGFI \leq 0.90$	0.897	0.864	0.940
χ^2/df	$0 < \chi^2/df < 3$		$228.634/89 = 2,569$	$360.896/124 = 2.910$	$76.117/40 = 1.903$

The value testing the conformity of the model recommended in the confirmatory factor analysis and the sampling included in the analysis is χ^2 value (Lomax & Schumacker, 2004). χ^2 value tests the equivalence of the covariance matrix of the population to the covariance matrix used in the model. However, it is considered more suitable to use χ^2/df value that is corrected by degrees of freedom (df) because χ^2 value is sensitive to the size of sampling and high χ^2 values rise as the number of samplings increases (Bagozzi, 1981). The χ^2/df values for the JB, JS, and SEF Scales in this research are calculated as 2,569, 1,910 and 1,903 respectively. As a result, the model is accepted statistically significant. Besides, the IFI values that do not exist in the table and that take both the size of sampling and the complexity of the model into consideration are found .971 for the JB Scale, .967 for the JS Scale and .971 for the SEF Scale, which refer to a good fit index.

According to the goodness of fit index as to the model given in Table 5, RMSEA, NFI, CFI, GFI and AGFI values for JB Scale are all at acceptable fit index level. Similarly, all these values for JS Scale are at acceptable fit index level except for the CFI level, which is at good fit index level. As for the SEF Scale, it is seen that CFI level is at acceptable fit index level while RMSEA, NFI, GFI and AGFI levels are at good fit index level. These results indicate that the factors obtained from the exploratory factor analysis results of all three scales are also confirmed by the confirmatory factor analysis results.

CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

In this section, the results of the research are presented in line with the findings of the research. In this context, Table 6 shows the goodness fit index values regarding the models constructed in SEF-JS, SEF-JB and JS-JB.

Table 6. The Goodness Fit Index Regarding the Models Constructed in SEF-JS, SEF-JB and JS-JB

Fit Measure	Good Fit*	Acceptable Fit*	SEF→ JS	SEF→ JB	JS→ JB
RMSEA	$0 < \text{RMSEA} < 0.05$	$0.05 \leq \text{RMSEA} \leq 0.10$	0.131	0.176	0.084
NFI	$0.95 \leq \text{NFI} \leq 1$	$0.90 \leq \text{NFI} \leq 0.95$	0.843	0.861	0.944
CFI	$0.97 \leq \text{CFI} \leq 1$	$0.95 \leq \text{CFI} \leq 0.97$	0.859	0.869	0.958
GFI	$0.95 \leq \text{GFI} \leq 1$	$0.90 \leq \text{GFI} \leq 0.95$	0.933	0.921	0.966
AGFI	$0.90 \leq \text{AGFI} \leq 1$	$0.85 \leq \text{AGFI} \leq 0.90$	0.855	0.792	0.928
χ^2/df	$0 < \chi^2/\text{df} < 3$		$100.002/13 = 7.692$	$104.155/8 = 13.019$	$48.263/13 = 3.713$

*Schermelleh-Engel ve Moosbrugger, 2003

According to the finding related to Hypothesis-1, the RMSEA, NFI and CFI values regarding the model about the predictive role of SEF on JS are lower than the acceptable fit values. In this sense, the hypothesis that SEF levels of school principals and vice-principals significantly predict their JS levels is rejected. Similarly, findings about Hypothesis-2 also show that the RMSEA, NFI, CFI and AGFI values about the model for the predictive role of SEF on JB are lower than the acceptable fit values, which means that the hypothesis that SEF levels of school principals and vice-principals significantly predict their JS levels is rejected. On the other hand, as for Hypothesis-3 regarding the predictive role of JS on JB, the findings show that the RMSEA, NFI and CFI values are at acceptable fit while GFI and AGFI values are at good fit. These results support the hypothesis that the JS levels of school principals and vice-principals are predictors of their JB levels.

Table 7. Data About Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Path	Path coefficient	t- value	Results
H1	SEF→ JS	0.187	2.438	Rejected
H2	SEF→ JB	0.579	6.631	Rejected
H3	JS→ JB	0.202	3.169*	Supported

According to the findings in Table-7, Hypothesis-1 and Hypothesis-2 are rejected. In this context, it is seen that there is no significant correlation between the SEF levels of school principals and vice-presidents and their JS or JB levels. However; Hypothesis-3, which claims that school principals' and vice-principals' JS levels predict their JB levels, is supported in the study.

Discussion regarding hypothesis 1

The research results contradict with the hypothesis that SEF level is a significant predictor of JS level, indicating that SEF levels of school principals and school vice-principals predict their JS levels. This result is in contradiction with the claim that SEF is directly proportional to morale and satisfaction (Alvarez and Grayson, 2008). Similarly,

Caprara et al. (2003) state that high SEF results in high motivation and satisfaction. In another study with contradictory results, Çapri and Kan (2007) also claim that low SEF causes dissatisfaction.

Discussion regarding hypothesis 2

The research results are inconsistent with the hypothesis that SEF level is a significant predictor of JB level, which indicates that SEF levels of school principals and school vice-principals predict their JB levels. In contradiction with this result, Alvarez and Grayson (2008) state that low SEF causes desensitization, pessimism and loss of idealism, which are indicators of JB. Similarly, Cordes and Dougherty (1993) claim that low SEF is among the factors that cause burnout, which is another inconsistent result with the result of this research. Caprara et al. (2003) state that high SEF has a protective effect against burnout while Schwarzer and Hallum (2008) claim that people with low SEF feel insecure, helpless and pessimistic. Tümkaya and Türker (2010) also assert that low SEF causes dissatisfaction, resulting in such burnout indicators as loss of idealism and purpose. In another study with contradicting results with this research result, it is stated that there is negative and moderate relation between JB and SEF (Dönmez, Özer and Cömert, 2009).

Discussion regarding hypothesis 3

The hypothesis that JS level is a significant predictor of JB level is supported by the results of the research, which indicates that JS and JB levels of school principals and school vice-principals predict each other. In consistent with this result, Ertürk and Keçecioğlu (2012) state that burnout results in job dissatisfaction. Similarly, Koustelios and Tsigilis (2005) and Çetin et al. (2008) also found out inconsistent results with results of this research and revealed that JB and JS were directly proportional to each other.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the study show that SEF levels of school principals and school vice-principals do not play a predictive role on their JS and JB levels. However, several studies in the related literature claim that SEF directly affects JS and JB. The inconsistency between the results of this research and the studies claiming that low SEF results in job dissatisfaction or JB may result from the difference in the sampling. In this sense, it is recommended that further studies that examine the predictive role of SEF on JS and JB should be conducted with different and broader samplings. Also, such studies should also collect qualitative data so that the reasons that affect the relation between these variables could be understood comprehensively.

Another result obtained from the research is that JS predicts JB, which is consistent with what related literature claims about the issue. Considering the predictive role of JS on JB, it can be recommended that the authorities at the Ministry of National Education and Provincial Directorate of National Education should certainly take the needs and satisfaction of school administrators into consideration while deciding on educational practices. Also, further mixed-method studies should be conducted which investigate the factors that improve school

administrators' JS levels. Such studies could give the authorities clues about the issues and practices to be considered to improve JS levels of school administrators and reduce, or even totally prevent, JB.

REFERENCES

- Ağaoğlu, E., Ceylan, M., Kasım, E. & Maden, T. (2004). "Araştırma Görevlilerinin Kendi Tükenmişlik Düzeylerine İlişkin Görüşleri". Malatya: XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı.
- Akçamete, G. (2001). XI. Ulusal Kongre Bildirilerinden Notlar (Konya, Selçuk Üniversitesi), 11–13.
- Akman Y., Bilge F. & Kelecioğlu H. (2007). Öğretim Elemanlarının İş Doyumlarının İncelenmesi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 32, 32-41.
- Alvarez, H., K. & Grayson, J., L. (2008). School climate factors relating to teacher burnout: A mediator model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1349–1363.
- Arı, G. S. & Bal, E. Ç. (2008). Tükenmişlik Kavramı: Birey Ve Örgütler Açısından Önemi. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, 15(1), 131-148.
- Ataman, A. (2001). XI. Ulusal Kongre Bildirilerinden Notlar (Konya, Selçuk Üniversitesi), 11–13 Kasım 2001.
- Avşaroğlu, S., Deniz, E., M. & Kahraman, A. (2005). Teknik Öğretmenlerde Yaşam Doymu İş Doymu ve Mesleki Tükenmişlik Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4, 115-129.
- Babaoğlu E., (2004). İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinde Tükenmişliğin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre Araştırılması. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 55-67.
- Bagozzi, R., P. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *A Comment. J. Mark.Res.*, 183: 375-381
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward A Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215.
- Bandura, A., & Locke, E., A. (2003). Negative Self-Efficacy and Goal Effects Revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 87–99.
- Baysal, A. (1994). "Öğretim Elemanlarında Tükenmişlik Sendromu: Maslach Burnout Envanteri'nin D.E. Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Öğretim Elemanı Örneklemine Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması." I. Ulusal Sınıf Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu, Bursa.
- Bham, M., S. & Hastings, R., P. (2003). The Relationship between Student Behaviour Patterns and Teacher Burnout. *School Psychology International*, 24 (1), 115-127.
- Bilgin, N. (2003) *Sosyal Psikoloji Sözlüğü: Kavramlar, Yaklaşımlar*, 1.Baskı, İstanbul, Bağlam Yayınları.
- Black, A. E. & Deci, E. L. (2000). The Effects of Instructors' Autonomy Support and Students' Autonomous Motivation on Learning Organic Chemistry: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective. *Science Education*, 84(6), 740-756.
- Bosscher, R.J. & Smit, J.H. (1998). Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the General Self Efficacy Scale. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 36(3), 339-343.

- Evers, W. J., Tomic, W., & Brouwers, A. (2004). Burnout among Teachers: Students' and Teachers' Perceptions Compared. *School Psychology International*, 25(2), 131-148.
- Bush, T. & Middlewood, D. (2005). *Leading and Managing People in Education*. SAGE Publications, London.
- 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.
- Cemaloğlu N. & Erdemoğlu D. Ş., (2007). Öğretmenlerin Mesleki Tükenmişlik Düzeylerinin Farklı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. *Kastamonu Üniversitesi Kastamonu Eğitim Fakültesi*, 15(2) 465-484.
- Cenkseven-Onder, F., & Sari, M. (2009). The Quality of School Life and Burnout as Predictors of Subjective Well-Being among Teachers. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 9(3), 1223-1235.
- Cordes, C. L. & Dougherty, T. W. (1993) A Review and an Integration of Research on Job Burnout *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4):621-656.
- Çapri B. & Kan A., (2007). Öğretmenlerin Kişilerarası Öz-Yeterlik İnançlarının Hizmet Süresi, Okul Türü, Öğretim Kademesi ve Unvan Değişkenleri Açısından İncelenmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(1) 63-83.
- Çapri, B. (2006). Tükenmişlik ölçeğinin Türkçe uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(1), 62-77.
- Çetin, C., Tikici, M., Akdemir, B. & Ünal H. (2008) "İş Doymu ile Tükenmişlik Sendromu İlişkinin Aile İşletmelerindeki Görünümüne İlişkin Bir Araştırma" *İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi, 3. Aile İşletmeleri Kongresi*, 107-120.
- Çetinkanat, A.C. (2000). "Örgütlerde Güdülenme ve İş Doymu", Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Dağlı A. & Gündüz H., (2008). Yatılı İlköğretim Bölge Okullarında Görev Yapan Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerin Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri (Diyarbakır İli Örneği). *D. Ü. Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10, 12-35.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A., B., Vardakou, I., & Kantas, A. (2003). The Convergent Validity of Two Burnout Instruments: A Multitrait-Multimethod Analysis. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 19, 12–23.
- Deniz M., E. & Öztürk A. (2008). Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Duygusal Zekâ Yetenekleri İş Doymaları ve Tükenmişlik Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Elementary Education Online*, 7(3) 578-599.
- Dolunay, A., B. & Piyal, B. (2003). Öğretmenlerde Bazı Mesleki Özellikler ve Tükenmişlik. *Kriz Dergisi*, 11(1), 35-48.
- Dorman, J. (2003). Testing a Model for Teacher Burnout. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 3, 35-47.
- Dönmez, B., Özer, N. & Cömert., M. (2009). "Okul Müdürlerinin Öz-Yeterlik Algıları İle Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki". 18. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı.
- Erigüç, G. (2000) Sağlık Personelinin Kişisel Özel-liklerine Göre İş Doymu Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Hacettepe Sağlık İdaresi Dergisi*, 5(3):7-40.
- Eripek, S. (2001). "XI. Ulusal Kongre Bildirilerinden Notlar". 11–13 Kasım 2001. Konya.

- Ertürk, E., & Keçecioğlu, T. (2012). Çalışanların iş doyumları ile mesleki tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkiler: Öğretmenler üzerine örnek bir uygulama. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 12(1), 39-52.
- Friedman, I. A. (2003). Self-Efficacy and Burnout in Teaching: The Importance of Interpersonal-Relations Efficacy. *Social Psychology of Education*, 6, 191–215.
- Girgin, G., (1995). İlkokul Öğretmenlerinde Meslekten Tükenmişliğin Gelişimini Etkileyen Değişkenlerin Analizi Ve Bir Model Önerisi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Goddard, M., Goddard, R. & O'Brien, P. (2006). Work Environment Predictors of Beginning Teacher Burnout. *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(6), 857–874.
- Gündüz, B., (2005). İlköğretim Öğretmenlerinde Tükenmişlik. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*,1(1), 152-166.
- Güneri, O.Y. & Özdemir, Y. (2003). Sınıf Yönetiminde Özyeterliğin, Medeni Durumun, Cinsiyetin ve Öğretmenlik Deneyiminin Öğretmen Tükenmişliğindeki Rolü. VII. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, Malatya.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. C.(1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Prentice Hall International Inc. Herráiz, IG, MA Torres, AC Fariña, J. Freire and JR Cancelo.-2009. "The NAO index and the long-term variability of Nephrops norvegicus population and fishery off West of Ireland". *Fish. Res*, 98(1-3), 1-7.
- Hoyle, R., H. (1995). *Structural Equation Modelling: Concepts, Issues and Applications*. London: Sage Publication Inc
- Hughes, R. E. (2001) 'Deciding to Leave but Staying: Teacher Burnout, Precursors and Turnover'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(2): 288–98.
- Hutchings, M., Mentor, I., Ross, A. & Thomson, D. (2000), *Teacher Supply and Retention in London 1998–1999*, London, University of North London School of Education.
- Karademir, T. Çoban, B. Kafkas, M. E., Mendeş, B. & Acak, M. (2009). Beden Eğitimi öğretmenlerinin tükenmişlik durumlarının bazı değişkenler ile değerlendirilmesi. *E-Journal of New World Science Academy; Sports Sciences*, 4(3), 179-197.
- Karasar, N. (2006). "Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi" (16. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Keser, A. (2007) "İş Tatmininden Yaşam Tatminine Bireysel Tatmin" içinde: Solmuş, T. Endüstriyel Klinik Psikoloji ve İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi: Kuramdan Uygulamaya Psikoloji, I. Baskı, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Klassen, R. M., & Klassen, J. R. (2018). Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Medical Students: A Critical Review. *Perspectives on medical education*, 7(2), 76-82.
- Klassen, R. M., & Usher, E. L. (2010). Self-Efficacy in Educational Settings: Recent Research and Emerging Directions. In *The Decade Ahead: Theoretical Perspectives on Motivation and Achievement*, 1-33. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Kokkinos, C. M. (2007). Job Stressors, Personality and Burnout in Primary School Teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(1), 229-243.

- Koustelios, A., & Tsigilis, N. (2005) Relationship between Burnout and Job Satisfaction among Physical Education Teachers: A Multivariate Approach *European Physical Education Review*, 11:189-203.
- Kurbanoğlu, S. S., (2004). Öz-yeterlik inancı ve bilgi profesyonelleri için önemi, *Information World*. 5 (2): 137-153.
- Lomax, R. G., & Schumacker, R. E. (2004). *A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling*. Psychology Press.
- Maddux, J. E. (2016). Self-efficacy. In *Interpersonal and intrapersonal expectancies*, 41-46. Routledge.
- Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The Measurement of Experienced Burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2(1), 99–113.
- Maslanka, H. (1996). Burnout, social support and AIDS volunteers. *AIDS care*, 8(2), 195-206.
- Mearns, J., & Cain, J., E. (2003). Relationship between Teachers' Occupational Stress and Their Burnout and Distress: Roles of Coping and Negative Mood Regulation Expectancies. *Anxiety Stress Coping*, 16, 71–82.
- Murat, M., (2003). Üniversite Öğretim Elemanlarında Tükenmişlik. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(19), 25-34.
- Mwanwenda, T. (1995), 'Job Satisfaction among Secondary School Teachers in Transkei', *South African Journal of Education*, 19(2), 84–87.
- Nural, E. (2002). *Okul ve sınıf ortamı (Eğitim Üzerine-Ed: Erdal Toprakçı)*. Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000) Is Length of Service Related to the Level of Job Satisfaction?. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 27(3):213-226.
- Otacıoğlu S. G. (2008). Müzik Öğretmenlerinde Tükenmişlik Sendromu ve Etkileyen Faktörler. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(15) 103-116.
- Özyılmaz, A., Erdoğan, B., & Karaeminoğulları, A. (2018). Trust in Organization As A Moderator of The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Workplace Outcomes: A Social Cognitive Theory-Based Examination. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(1), 181-204.
- Pilay, H., Goddard, R. & Wills, L. (2005). Well-Being, Burnout and Competence: Implications for Teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(2), 22-33.
- Pines, A., M. (2002). Teacher Burnout: A Psychodynamic Existential Perspective. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 8(2).
- Pines, A., M. & Aronson, E. (1988). "Career Burnout: Causes and Cures". New York: Free Press.
- Sapre, P. (2002), Realising the Potential of Educational Management in India. *Educational Management and Administration*, 30(1), 101–108.
- Sarı, H. (2000). An Analysis of the Policies and Provision for Children with SEN in England and Turkey. Doctoral Thesis, Brookes University, Oxford
- Sarı, H. (2004). An Analysis of Burnout and Job Satisfaction among Turkish Special School Headteachers and Teachers, and the Factors Effecting Their Burnout and Job Satisfaction. *Educational Studies*, 30(3), 291-306.

- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the Fit of Structural Equation Models: Tests of Significance and Descriptive Goodness-of-Fit Measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23-74.
- Schmitz, G. S., & Schwarzer, R. (2000). Selbstwirksamkeitserwartung Von Lehrern: Längsschnittbefunde Mit Einem Neuen Instrument. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie/German Journal of Educational Psychology*. 14, 12–25.
- Schunk, D. H., & Usher, E. L. (2012). Social Cognitive Theory and Motivation. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *Oxford Library of Psychology. The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*, 13-27. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Schunk, D., H. & DiBenedetto, M., K. (2016). Self-Efficacy in Education. In K. R. Wentzel & D. B. Miele (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation at School*, 34-54, NewYork, US: Routledge.
- Schwarzer, R. & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived Teacher Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Job Stress and Burnout: Mediation Analyses. *International Association of Applied Psychology: Health and Well-being*, (57), 152-171.
- Sears, S. F., Urizar, G. G. & Evans, G. D. (2000). Examining a Stres-Coping Model of Burnout and Depression in Extension Agents. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 56-62.
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B. & Rogers, R., W. (1982). The Self-Efficacy Scale: Construct and validation. *Psychological Reports*, (51), 663-671.
- Skaalvik E. M. & Skaalvik S. (2009). Does School Context Matter? Relations with Teacher Burnout and Job Satisfaction, Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 518-524.
- Skaalvik E. M. & Skaalvik S. (2010). Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1059-1069.
- Stoeber, J., & Rennert, D. (2008). Perfectionism in School Teachers: Relations with Stress Appraisals, Coping Styles, and Burnout. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 21, 37–53.
- Sucuoğlu, B. & Kuloğlu, N., (1996). Özürlü Çocuklarla Çalışan Öğretmenlerde Tükenmişliğin Değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, (10)36, 44-60.
- Sünbül, A. M. (2003). An Analysis of Relations among Locus of Control, Burnout and Job Satisfaction in Turkish High School Teachers. *Australian Journal of Education*, 47 (1) 58-72.
- Şimşek, Ö. F. (2007). "Yapısal Eşitlik Modellemesine Giriş Temel İlkeler ve Lisrel Uygulamaları [Introduction to the Structural Equation Modelling: Principles and LISREL Practices]." Ankara: Ekinoks Yayıncılık.
- Tarakçı, U., A. (2009). Türk Özel Sektör Yöneticilerinin Çatışmaları Çözmede Kullandıkları Stiller ve Bu Stillerin Öz Yeterlilik Algılamasıyla İlişkisi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Balıkesir.
- Teven, J., J. (2007) 'Teacher Temperament: Correlates with Teacher Caring, Burnout, and Organizational Outcomes'. *Communication Education*, 56(3), 382-400
- Tuğrul, B., & Çelik, E., (2003). Normal Çocuklarla Çalışan Anaokulu Öğretmenlerinde Tükenmişlik. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(25), 33-39.

- Tümekaya, S. & Türker, P. (2010). İlköğretim 1. Kademe Öğretmenlerinde Algılanan Problem Davranış Düzeyleri ve Bazı Sosyo Demografik Değişkenlere Göre Tükenmişliğin incelenmesi. *Ç. Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(38), 92-109.
- Unrau, N. J., Rueda, R., Son, E., Polanin, J. R., Lundeen, R. J., & Muraszewski, A. K. (2018). Can Reading Self-Efficacy Be Modified? A Meta-Analysis of the Impact of Interventions on Reading Self-Efficacy. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(2), 167-204.
- Unterbrink, T., Hack, A., Pfeifer, R., Buhl-Grießhaber, V., Müller, U., Wesche, H., & Bauer, J. (2007). Burnout and Effort–Reward-Imbalance in a Sample of 949 German Teachers. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 80(5), 433-441.
- Williams, D. M., & Rhodes, R. E. (2016). The Confounded Self-Efficacy Construct: Conceptual Analysis and Recommendations for Future Research. *Health Psychology Review*, 10(2), 113-128.
- Yılmaz E. (2009). Examining Organizational Commitment of Primary School Teachers Regarding to Their Job Satisfaction and Their School’s Organizational Creativity. *Elementary Education Online*, 8(2) 476-484.
- Yoon, J., S. (2002). Teacher Characteristics as Predictors of Teacher Student Relationships: Stress, Negative Affect and Self-Efficacy. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 30, 485–494.