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ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study aims to examine the occupational burnout levels of teachers working in special education and rehabilitation centers affiliated with the Ministry of National Education regarding socio-demographic variables, job satisfaction, and general self-efficacy levels.

Research Methods: The descriptive method and relational scanning model were used in the study. The research group consists of 297 females and 155 males. This total of 452 teachers participated in the Special Education Specialist Training Course in Aydın/Kuşadası, Mersin, and Erzurum provinces between 04/20/2015 and 07/10/2015 for participants in different cities of Turkey. A Personal Information Form created by the researchers, along with the Burnout Scale-Short Form (BS-SF), Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale, and General Competence Belief Scale (GCBS) were used in the research. In the analysis of the data, t-test, One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Pearson correlation coefficient, and multiple regression analysis were used. Findings: As a result of the analysis, significant negative correlations were found between teachers’ occupational burnout levels and levels of job satisfaction and general competence beliefs. Also, job satisfaction and general competence belief levels together were a significant precursor of occupational burnout levels.

Implications for Research and Practice: The work environment of special education teachers should be improved, and they should be provided social opportunities. The emphasis should be on family education studies. The burden of special education teachers should be reduced by providing the necessary counseling and guidance services for families parenting children with disabilities.
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Introduction

The burnout concept was first voiced by Freudenberger (1974) as a phenomenon of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion accompanied by underachievement, depersonalization, and apathy at work. In particular, burnout is more common in occupations that require face-to-face communication and intense interaction (Cokluk, 2003). Researchers have tried to identify causes of individual and organizational burnout in research directed towards teachers in this context (Colak, 2017; Emery & Vandenberg, 2010; Fernet et al., 2012; Girgin & Baysal, 2005; Kapar, 2016). Individual causes of burnout include age, educational level, personality and emotional characteristics, expectations, values, goals, motivation, professional experience, marital status and number of children, family characteristics, and living conditions (Gozum, 1996). These factors affect individuals in different ways.

Research examining burnout in teachers who work with disabled people has spread in recent years (Akinci, 2016; Aksoy, 2007; Arslan & Aslan, 2014; Aydemir, 2013; Girgin & Baysal, 2005; Mistan, 2017; Oruc, 2007; Ozcan, 2016; Sahin & Sahin, 2012; Tuncbilek, 2016; Yuksel, 2009). Demographic variables such as age, gender, and marital status related to burnout have been examined in most of this research. In the research findings, no significant difference was found in terms of burnout variables such as gender (Arslan & Aslan, 2014; Cabuk, 2015; Sucuoglu & Kuloglu, 1996; Sahin & Sahin, 2012), marital status (Arslan & Aslan, 2014; Cabuk, 2015; Kaybasi, 2008; Oruc, 2007; Sahin & Sahin, 2012), whether or not receiving support from colleagues (Celik, 2016; Cabuk, 2015), age and duration of duty (Aydemir, 2013; Cam, 1989; Cabuk, 2015; Sucuoglu & Kuloglu, 1996; Tumkaya, 1996; Tuncbilek, 2016), or recognition by managers (Aksoy, 2007; Cam, 1989; Cabuk, 2015). A negative relationship was found between manager support and burnout levels.

On the other hand, job satisfaction, expressed as an emotional reaction to work experiences, arises from employee attitudes about their work (Avsaroglu, Deniz, & Kahraman, 2005). Individuals lose their initial organizational loyalty and working qualifications by being unable to cope with stressful situations brought about by business life, and they become uninterested in their jobs. For personal and organizational reasons, employees experience dissatisfaction with work first and then experience burnout (Otabicoglu, 2008). The literature shows that research on the relationship between occupational burnout and job satisfaction has begun with teachers in recent years (Ari, 2015; Erturk & Kececioglu, 2012; Filiz, 2014; Gunduz, Capri, & Gokcakan, 2013; Kinman, Wray & Strange, 2011; Sagir et al., 2014). However, there are only a few studies on occupational burnout and job satisfaction among teachers working in special education and rehabilitation (Ciftci, 2015; Mistan, 2017; Tarakci, Tutuncuoglu & Tarakci, 2012; Yalcin & Bek, 2010).

Similarly, studies of occupational burnout and teachers’ competence beliefs, one of the most important concepts of social learning theory, and are done mostly on specific beliefs rather than general competence beliefs (Evers, Brouwers & Tomic, 2002; Friedman, 2003). At this point, it stands out that new research is needed to reveal the relationship between general competence beliefs and teachers’ professional burnout of
teachers, including special education teachers. The teaching profession, which has a high-stress level, becomes even more stressful when it comes to educating children with disabilities. Based on these students’ characteristics and the intensity of direct contact with the students, special education teachers are more likely to experience burnout than the other teachers. The burnout level of the teachers working in private institutions is higher than those who work in state institutions (Akinci, 2016, Girgin & Baysal, 2005; Weiskopf, 1980).

Burnout is an important issue in the special education field. Difficulties in controlling these students’ behavior and the students being difficult and tiring to teach are risk factors for burnout in special education teachers (Sucuoğlu & Kuloğlu, 1996). Most of the teachers in special education and rehabilitation centers in Turkey are graduates from fields other than special education. This situation can become exhausting for teachers who are working out of their fields of education. Thus, these teachers are included in the burnout risk group due to occupational responsibilities and applications that require special knowledge and skills.

Problems that arise as a result of teacher burnout can negatively impact both the individual and the education and training services. Identifying burnout levels of participants regarding socio-demographic variables, job satisfaction, and general competence beliefs can contribute to examining the variables causing burnout, determining future practices to be carried out for teachers to prevent burnout, improving socioeconomic conditions and environment where teachers provide services. This could lead to new studies on the subject.

In light of the above information, the general aim of this study is to examine the occupational burnout levels of teachers working in special education and rehabilitation centers affiliated with the Ministry of National Education regarding socio-demographic variables, job satisfaction, and general competence belief scores. Answers are sought for the below questions:

1- Do the occupational burnout scores of teachers in special education and rehabilitation centers differ according to their gender, age, marital status, branch, duration of duty, their perceived fitness for the job, whether they receive support from their colleagues, whether they are appreciated by their superiors, or their loyalty to the job?

2- Are job satisfaction and general competence belief scores predictors of burnout scores of teachers in special education and rehabilitation centers?
Method

Research Design

The relational scanning model with descriptive method was used in this study.

Research Sample

The research group consists of 297 females and 155 males, a total of 452 teachers who participated in the “Special Education Specialist Training Course” in Aydın/Kuşadası, Mersin, and Erzurum provinces between 04/20/2015 and 07/10/2015 for participants in different cities in Turkey. Thirty-three (7.5%) of the teachers are graduates of the department of child development and education; 257 (56.9%) are from the department of primary school teaching, and 161 (35.6%) are from the department of early childhood education. From the group, 166 (36.7%) teachers were age 20-29; 97 (21.5%) were age 30-39; 44 (9.7%) were age 40-49, and 145 (32.1%) were age 50 and older. Of the teachers, 243 (53.8%) were married, and 209 (46.2%) were single. 150 (33.2%) of them were in the teaching profession for five years or less; 95 (21.0%) for 6-10 years; 86 (19.0%) for 11-15 years, and 121 (26.8%) for 16 years or more.

Research Instruments and Procedures

Burnout Scale-Short Form (BS-SF). The Burnout Scale-Short Form was created by Pines (2005); validity and reliability studies of its Turkish version were done by Capri (2013). It consists of ten items and is a scale of seven grades (1=Never to 7=Always) to measure individuals’ occupational burnout level. It was determined that the internal consistency coefficients of the scale calculated with data acquired from different groups of ethnic backgrounds, occupations, and students vary between .85 and .92.

Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale. The Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale, developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) and adapted to Turkish by Baycan (1985), is a 20-item, five-point Likert, where the five options range from "Never Satisfied" to "Very Satisfied" and measure the degree of satisfaction. The original reliability coefficient of the scale was .83, and the test-retest reliability of the scale was found to be .89 in many studies conducted abroad. The reliability study in Turkey was conducted by Baycan (1985), and the internal consistency coefficient was found to be .77.

General Competence Belief Scale (GCBS). The initial form was developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1981) as 20 items and then reduced to a ten-item form by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1992) and adapted to Turkish by Celikkaleli and Capri (2008). Items of the Likert type scale are scored between 1 and 4 in the original form. The lowest score in the scale is 10, and the highest score is 40. First, validity and reliability studies were conducted in three different cultures by Schwarzer and Schroder (1997), and the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients were calculated as .84, .81 and .91, respectively.

Personal Information Form. This form, which contains information related to the participants’ gender and occupational variables, was prepared by the researchers.
After informing the participants about the purpose of the research and its voluntary basis, practices were conducted in the course environment of participants. In the implementation process, basic guidelines related to the implementation of the scales and the purpose of the research were explained normatively to all participants.

**Data Analysis**

The data obtained from the measuring instruments were transferred to the computer environment and made ready for corresponding statistical processing. SPSS 16.0 software package was used for statistical analysis of the data obtained from the study. The t-test was applied for binary comparisons, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied for multiple comparisons to determine whether teachers’ professional burnout levels differed significantly regarding socio-demographic variables. The Scheffe test was applied as the post hoc test to determine the source of differentiation, while the eta-squared ($\eta^2$) value was used to determine the effect size. Also, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to identify the relation between occupational burnout levels and levels of job satisfaction and general competence beliefs of teachers. Multiple regression analysis was used to address the contribution of job satisfaction and general competence belief scores in predicting the occupational burnout scores. The error margins in the analyses were assumed to be 0.01 and 0.05.

**Results**

Findings obtained from statistical analyses of data collected in the direction of the research purpose are presented in this section.

1- The occupational burnout levels of participants do not differ based on gender, age, marital status, branch, duty term, whether thinking themselves fit for the job, whether being supported by colleagues, being appreciated by superiors, and devotion to the job.

**Findings on Gender**

Findings of whether the occupational burnout levels of participants differ depending on their gender are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*The t-Test Results on Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significant Difference $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>Female (F)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (M)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the occupational burnout scores of the participants do not differ significantly according to gender ($t(450) = .56, p > .05$).

**Findings on Age**

Findings related to whether the occupational burnout levels of participants differ depending on their age are given in Table 2.

**Table 2**

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test Results on Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>$.000^*$</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-49, 50+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Table 2 shows that there is a statistically significant difference according to age in the average of the scores of occupational burnout ($F(3, 448) = 6.28, p < .05$) of the participants. According to the results of the Scheffe test, which is applied as a post hoc test to investigate the source of this difference, the occupational burnout scores of those in the age range of 20-29 are significantly different and higher than those 40-49 and 50 or more in terms of ages of the participants. Also, the effect of the age variable on the average of occupational burnout ($\eta^2 = .040$) scores was found to be at a minor level according to eta-squared variables. It can be said that 4% of the observed variance in occupational burnout scores depends on the age variable.

**Findings on Marital Status**

Findings related to whether the occupational burnout levels of participants differ depending on marital status are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3**

The t-Test Results of Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that the occupational burnout scores ($t(450) = 1.56; p> .05$) of participants do not differ significantly according to their marital status.

Findings on Branch

Findings related to whether the occupational burnout levels of participants differ depending on their branch are given in Table 4.

### Table 4

The One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test Results on Branch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary School Teaching</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

In Table 4, there is no statistically significant difference regarding the average of occupational burnout ($F(2,449) = 1.04; p> .05$) according to the branches of participants.

Findings on Duty Term

Findings related to whether the occupational burnout levels of participants differ depending on their duty term are shown in Table 5.

### Table 5

The One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test Results on Duty Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Duty Term (Years)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td>6-10 &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 and over</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 and over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
According to Table 5, a significant difference can be seen statistically in the average of occupational burnout ($F_{(3-448)} = 3.73$, $p < .05$) according to the duration of duty of the participants. According to the results of the Scheffe test, applied as a post hoc test to investigate the source of this difference, the occupational burnout scores of those who worked for 1-5 and 6-10 years were significantly different and higher than those who worked for 16 years and over participants. Also, the effect of the duty term variable on the average of occupational burnout ($\eta^2 = .024$) scores was found to be at a small level; it can be said that 2.4% of the observed variance in occupational burnout scores depends on the duty term variable.

**Findings on Fit for the Job**

Findings related to whether the occupational burnout levels of participants differ depending on if they think themselves fit for the job are shown in Table 6.

### Table 6

*The One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test Results on Fit for the Job*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Fit for the job</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>Not Fit (NF)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially Fit (PF)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>$9.02$</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit (F)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good Fit (GF)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NF, F, GF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Table 6 shows a statistically significant difference in the average of occupational burnout scores ($F_{(3-448)} = 9.02; p < .05$) according to the variable of whether the participants think themselves fit for the job. According to the results of the Scheffe test, applied as post hoc test to investigate the source of this difference, the occupational burnout scores of those Partially Fit for the job (PF) are significantly different and higher than those of the Not Fit (NF), Fit (F), and Good Fit (GF) regarding the variable of whether participants think themselves fit for the job. Further, the effect of the variable on the average of occupational burnout ($\eta^2 = .056$) scores was found to be at a minor level. It can be said that 5.6% of the observed variance in occupational burnout scores were related to the variable of whether teachers think themselves fit for the job.

**Findings on Colleagues Support**

Findings related to whether the occupational burnout levels of participants differ depending on colleagues’ support are shown in Table 7.
Table 7
The One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test Results Colleagues’ Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Colleagues’ support</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

In Table 7, there is no statistically significant difference in the average scores of occupational burnout (F (2, 449) = 1.67, p > .05) according to the variable of colleagues’ support of teachers working in special education and rehabilitation centers.

Findings on Superior Appreciation

Findings related to whether the occupational burnout levels of participants differ depending on being appreciated by superiors are given in Table 8.

Table 8
The One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test Results on Superior Appreciation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Superiors’ appreciation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Table 8 shows that there is a statistically significant difference in the average of the scores of occupational burnout (F (2, 449) = 18.80, p < .05) regarding superiors’ appreciation of teachers who work in special education and rehabilitation centers. According to the results of the Scheffe test, applied as post hoc test to investigate the source of this difference, in terms of superiors’ appreciation, the occupational burnout scores of teachers who are not appreciated by superiors and who are sometimes appreciated by superiors are significantly different from and higher than those who are appreciated by superiors. Additionally, the effect of the variable of appreciation by
superiors on the average of occupational burnout ($\eta^2 = .077$) scores was found to be moderate according to the obtained eta-squared values, and it can be said that 7.7% of the variance observed in occupational burnout scores depends on the variable of appreciation by superiors.

**Findings on Job Devotion**

Findings related to whether the occupational burnout levels of participants differ depending on their devotion to the job are shown in Table 9.

**Table 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Devotion to Job</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>Devoted (D)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially Devoted (PD)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Devoted (ND)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>PD, ND &gt; D</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

In Table 9, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference in the average of scores of occupational burnout ($F(2,449) = 8.47$, $p<.05$) according to the teachers’ devotion to the job. According to the results of the Scheffe test, applied as post hoc test to investigate the source of this difference, in terms of devotion to the job, the occupational burnout scores of teachers who are not devoted to the job and who are partially devoted to the job are significantly different from and higher than those who are devoted to the job. Additionally, the effect of the variable of devotion to the job on the average of occupational burnout ($\eta^2 = .036$) scores was at a minor level according to the obtained eta-squared values. It can be said that 3.6% of the variance observed in occupational burnout scores depends on the variable of devotion to the job.

2- Findings of whether job satisfaction and general competence belief levels are predictors of occupational burnout levels of participants.

Correlation analysis was performed to determine the relationship between occupational burnout scores and job satisfaction and general competence belief scores of participants. Then multiple regression analysis was applied to the data to examine the contribution of job satisfaction and general competence belief scores of participants in predicting their occupational burnout scores.
Table 10 shows the results of correlation analysis and the mean and standard deviation values associated with the relationship between the scores of job satisfaction and general competence beliefs and occupational burnout scores for participants.

Table 10

Results of Correlation Analysis Regarding the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and General Competence Belief Scores and Occupational Burnout Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Occupational Burnout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General Competence Belief</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

When Table 10 is examined, significant negative correlations were found between occupational burnout scores and the scores of job satisfaction (r = -0.37, p <.05) and general competence belief (r = -0.26, p <.05) of the participants. However, positive correlations were found between job satisfaction and general competence belief scores of participants (r = 0.27; p <.05).

Based on these results, to examine the contribution of job satisfaction and general competence belief scores in predicting occupational burnout scores of the participants, job satisfaction and general competence belief scores were included in the multiple regression analysis, and the results are given in Table 11.

Table 11

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Regarding the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and General Competence Belief Scores and Occupational Burnout Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>(\beta)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-7.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Competence Belief</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-3.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .41, \(R^2 = .17\)

\(F(2,449) = 44.43, \quad p = 0.00**\)

**p<.01
According to Table 11, job satisfaction and general competence belief scores of participants together have a significant negative correlation with the teachers’ professional burnout scores ($R = .41$, $R^2 = .17$, $p < .01$). Both job satisfaction and general competence belief scores of the participants were significantly predictive of occupational burnout scores. Also, job satisfaction and general competence belief scores together account for 17% of the variance for occupational burnout scores. Finally, according to the standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$), the order of importance of the predictors over the teachers’ occupational burnout scores was determined as job satisfaction ($- .33$) and general competence belief ($- .17$).

According to the results obtained from the study, it was found that while there was no significant difference in the teachers’ occupational burnout scores regarding the variables of gender ($t(450) = .56$, $p > .05$), marital status ($t(450) = 1.56; p > .05$), branch ($F(2, 449) = 1.04; p > .05$), and colleagues’ support ($F(2, 449) = 1.67; p > .05$). Also, there were significant differences in terms of age ($F(3, 448) = 6.28$, $p < .05$), duty term ($F(3, 448) = 9.02; p < .05$), superiors’ appreciation ($F(2, 449) = 18.80$, $p < .05$) and devotion to the job ($F(2, 449) = 8.47$, $p < .05$). In addition, the effect of the variable of superiors’ appreciation was moderate ($\eta^2 = 0.08$), while the effect of other variables with significant difference was found to be small on the average of the teachers’ burnout scores in terms of the eta-squared values obtained to determine the effect size. Significant negative correlations were found between occupational burnout scores and job satisfaction ($r = - .37; p < .01$) and general competence belief scores ($r = - .26; p < .01$); job satisfaction and general competence belief scores together ($R = .041$, $R^2 = .17$, $p < .01$) are significant predictors of 17% of the variance for occupational burnout scores.

**Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations**

In the study, significant negative correlations were found between occupational burnout scores of teachers and job satisfaction and general competence beliefs scores, and it was found that job satisfaction and general competence belief scores together were significant predictors of occupational burnout scores. Also in this study, occupational burnout scores were examined regarding socio-demographic variables. There was no significant difference regarding the gender variable. Similar results have been obtained in some studies about the burnout of teachers (Arslan & Aslan, 2014; Cabuk, 2015, Sucuoğlu & Kuloglu, 1996; Sahin & Sahin, 2012). Similar results were obtained in research on the academic staff of Surgevil (2005), doctors and nurses of Ozkan (2008), nurses of Sahin (2009), and primary school inspectors of Tanriverdi (2008). Although there is no significant difference in the research results, burnout scores of female teachers are higher than male teachers. The literature reports that more women experience emotional burnout (Cimen, 2007; Surgevil, 2005; Sahin, 2009). There are also other research findings that men experience burnout more than their female counterparts (Demirbas, 2006; Tumkaya, 1996). In studies conducted by Girgin and Baysal (2005) and Ciftci (2015) in private educational institutions, it was found that the burnout level of male teachers working in these institutions is higher than that
with female teachers. In the literature, it is seen that different results related to gender exist. In this study, it is thought that the indifference of burnout in male and female teachers is because special education services are carried out under equal conditions for male and female teachers, and male and female teachers are similarly affected by working conditions.

As a result of the analysis made to examine whether burnout levels of teachers were different according to marital status, it was found that marital status of the teachers is not a predictor of burnout. When the literature was examined, it was found that there was no significant difference between teachers’ burnout scores regarding marital status in the researches performed by Oruc (2007), Kaybasi (2008), Sahin & Sahin (2012), Arslan & Aslan (2014) conducted. On the other hand, some research findings indicate that single teachers have higher burnout levels than do married teachers (Celik, 2016). The lack of a significant difference regarding the marital status of the teachers suggests that factors that cause burnout are similar for married and single teachers.

Significant differences were found between burnout scores according to age and duration of duty. There was a significant difference between the 20–29 age group and the 40–49 age group; burnout in the 20–29 age group was the maximum, and burnout in those 50 and above was the least. As teachers’ duty term increases, the level of burnout decreases. The burnout level of teachers who have 1-5 years of job experience is the highest. This finding supports the study results of Cam (1989), Tumkaya (1996), Sucuoglu & Kuloglu (1996), Aydemir (2013), Cabuk (2015) and Tuncbilek (2016). As duty term and age of teachers in special education increases, they may feel that they have become more successful and competent, have more realistic expectations about the work, have gained experience, and feel more successful. When studies with age variable within the country are examined, different findings also exist in the literature. However, most research findings indicate that the level of burnout decreases as age increases. Burnout decreases when age increases as found in surveys conducted on health care workers (Aslan, 1997; Cam, 1989), special education teachers (Sucuoglu & Kuloglu, 1996), school administrators (Izgar, 2001), police officers (Sanli, 2006), and teachers (Cimen, 2007). However, in some studies, no relationship was found between age and burnout (Surgevill, 2005; Tanriverdi, 2008). Similarly, there was no difference between the burnout levels of teachers regarding age and years of work in a study conducted on special education teachers (Sahin & Sahin, 2012). Increased professional experience with age, learning more skills to cope with burnout (Sahin, 2009), increased competence through professional experience are reasons the level of burnout decreases as age increases. Work experience, seniority, becoming more resistant to burnout, gaining a footing, and learning ways to cope with difficulties are effective for burnout (Aslan, 1997). The possibility of burnout decreases with increased professional experience. The fact that younger teachers are exhausted can be explained by the fact that younger teachers are more stressed (Forlin, 2001), lack work experience, are unable to make independent decisions, are idealists, and have difficulties managing the students’ behavior. It is thought that the average burnout of teachers in the 20-29 age group in the study is high; most teachers at this age are
married and have children, so the excess work and household burdens may affect their burnout level.

Due to the low number of special education programs in universities and special education graduate teachers, individuals with degrees in different fields can work in special education and rehabilitation centers by participating in short-term in-service courses. There was no significant difference in the burnout scores of graduates of child development, primary school teaching, and preschool teaching departments in the study. Since most of the teachers who graduated from different fields are not assigned to state institutions, they may be forced to work in this area; they may have low expectations because their goal was to be assigned to state institutions. Burnout is related to expectations, and the low expectations of teachers who graduated from different areas may have caused burnout. The research results are similar to the results of the research of Sucuoğlu & Kuloğlu (1996), Aksoy (2007), and Kaybasi (2008).

There was no significant difference between the level of burnout among the participants and the variable of having support from colleagues. This finding supports the results of surveys conducted by Quick (2015) and Steel (2016). Strasmeier (1992) explained that teachers’ lack of support from colleagues increased burnout. Peer support is an essential element regarding burnout and has a protective effect. The lack of a significant difference in the research can be explained by the fact that teachers working in special education and rehabilitation centers provide individual education to students and communicate with students and parents rather than colleagues.

Superiors’ appreciation is one of the factors related to the work environment. The burnout levels of teachers who are never appreciated by superiors have been higher than teachers who have been appreciated or sometimes appreciated; results are significant. Aksoy (2007), Cam (1989), and Cabuk (2015) found that there was a negative relationship between managerial support and burnout scores. It can be said that teachers who are appreciated by administrators decrease their burnout through improved motivation, commitment to work, and sense of belonging.

Significant differences were found when the burnout scores were examined according to whether the participants think their professions are suitable for them. Burnout scores of those who find their profession unsuitable are higher than those of teachers who find the teaching profession fits. The results obtained support research on this topic (Aksoy, 2007; Cabuk, 2015; Oruc, 2007). The high burnout scores of teachers who do not find their profession suitable for them can be attributed to their working in a different field from their undergraduate program.

The fact that teachers are working in a different field from their original field of study affects their commitment to work. There is a significant difference between devotion to job and burnout scores. It can be said that teachers working in a different field and the difficulties of special education have negative impacts on teachers’ devotion to the job. Therefore, their burnout levels increase.

Regarding the results obtained from the study, there was no significant difference in the teachers’ occupational burnout scores regarding marital status, gender, branch,
and colleagues’ support variables. There were significant differences regarding age, duty period, suitable for the job, appreciation by superiors and devotion to the job. Significant negative correlations were found between teachers’ occupational burnout scores and job satisfaction and general competence beliefs scores. Job satisfaction and general competence belief scores together were significantly predictive of occupational burnout scores.

Teachers should be informed about burnout syndrome. Especially, precautions should be taken to increase the positive feelings of teachers who have experienced professional burnout. Organizing in-service training, courses, and seminars which will contribute to professional development of teachers in the field of special education will also be helpful for burnout. The working environment of teachers working in the area of special education should be improved, and they should be provided social opportunities. The emphasis should be on family education studies. The burden of special education teachers should be reduced by providing the necessary counseling and guidance services for families parenting children with disabilities. The need for trained personnel in the area of special education should be satisfied. As a result, the number of special education departments in universities must be increased, and these departments should provide graduates in a number that meets their needs. It is thought that assessing burnout with some variables such as life satisfaction, marital adjustment, loading patterns, stress, problem-solving, self-efficacy would be useful in new research on participants.
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