| P-ISSN: 2790-6795 | Annals of Human and Social Sciences | July-September 2025,Vol. 6, No. 3 |
|---|---|---|
| O-ISSN:2790-6809 | http://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2025(6-III)64 | [764-773] |

Annals of Human and Social Sciences
www.ahss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

# Impact of Teachers' Burnout on Students' Academic Performance at the Primary Level

**[1]Hafiz Khalid Imran, [2]Dr. Asif Jamil and [3]Awais Iqbal**

1. PhD scholar, Department of Teacher Education, Qurtuba University, D.I Khan, KP, Pakistan
2. Professor, Department of Teacher Education, Qurtuba University, D.I Khan, KP, Pakistan
3. Lecturer in Education, Higher Education Department, Punjab

**Corresponding Author** khalidniaxi@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT**

The study examined the relationship between teachers' burnout and its impact on students' academic performance. The null hypotheses of the study posit that there is no significant relationship between teachers' burnout and students' academic performance, and that burnout has no significant impact on students' results, engagement, and motivation. A quantitative survey research design was employed, with data collected from 364 respondents from a population of 4,117 PSTs in District Bhakkar, Punjab, Pakistan. Using stratified random sampling, proportional representation was given to the tehsils and gender. A structured questionnaire was developed to assess the prevalence of burnout and the academic performance of students. The questionnaire's validity was assessed by expert review and confirmatory factor analysis, while its reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha. Correlation and regression analyses revealed a modest but statistically significant association between teacher burnout and students' academic performance; nevertheless, the effect was small, indicating that burnout is not a primary predictor of academic outcomes. It is suggested that educational departments and school administrations may enhance teacher autonomy, facilitate professional development, and provide support mechanisms to mitigate burnout and to improve classroom engagement.

**Keywords:** Burnout, Academic Performance, Education

## Introduction

Burnout is characterized by persistent physical and emotional fatigue, accompanied by a negative attitude toward job responsibilities and a decrease in task effectiveness. There are several types of burnout, including frenetic burnout, underchallenged burnout, temporal burnout, demoralization burnout, apathetic burnout, and contagious burnout, which are commonly experienced in educational settings (Leiter & Maslach, 2016). Teachers, being essential components of the educational framework, might get fatigued by a multitude of factors. Workload, inadequate resources, lack of support, classroom management challenges, low autonomy, student behavioral issues, insufficient professional development, and administrative pressures are common causes of burnout among Pakistani teachers. (Ayub et al., 2018). The combination of demanding performance standards and bureaucratic limitations, along with unruly student behavior and frequent changes to educational guidelines, contributes to burnout among educators (Maslach & Leiter, 2017). There are three categories of burnout in the field of education, and their dimensions are emotional exhaustion, low self-efficacy, and depersonalization (Knox et al., 2018). The term Academic Performance refers to the level of achievement and success demonstrated by students in their educational endeavors. It encompasses several indicators, including measures such as grades, test scores, class participation, completion of assignments, and overall mastery of the subject matter. (Affuso et al., 2023).

Teachers face several challenges, including excessive workloads, limited time, and the need to cater to diverse student needs (Martínez & Domínguez, 2016). Instructors might

experience dissatisfaction and disillusionment due to the expectations and demands placed upon them. This often culminates in burnout among educators. Several studies have shown the correlation between TBO and student AP. Research conducted by Zheng (2022) showed that classrooms in schools facing TBOs had a higher frequency of student misconduct. Consequently, these characteristics were shown to be associated with a decrease in AP. Moreover, TBO has a significant impact on both the quality and quantity of schooling. According to Madigan and Kim (2021), TBO may erode students' motivation to study, which not only hinders instructors' ability to convey material effectively but also prevents them from forming a deep connection with their students. Elevated levels of burnout have the potential to result in teacher absence and turnover, thereby diminishing instructional quality throughout the entire school (Marušić et al., 2023). According to Cheng (2022), this diminishes their enthusiasm in the classroom, thus hurting the overall quality of teaching.

Burnout at high levels can lead to increased absenteeism and turnover, as well as a decline in teaching quality. This creates very real problems for educational institutions. (Vincent et al., 2023). Eradicating burnout in the education sector is vital to creating a conducive, healthy, and sustainable work environment for educators. The majority of educators face challenges in their profession, making them vulnerable to stress and burnout. When compared to other professional vocations, educators in the teaching community reported a lower level of well-being (Roeser et al., 2012). Understanding burnout among teachers is crucial due to its potential to produce numerous harmful consequences for instructors, students, and schools. The complex relationship between teachers 'burnout and students' AP deserves further investigation. Numerous studies have shown a negative connection between TBO and various measures of AP. Burnout hurts AP, but the way in which burnout affects different dimensions of students 'learning experience still needs to be explored. Investigating the correlation between TBO and students' AP may address a significant gap, providing vital insights for educators, administrators, and educational psychologists to improve teaching methods and student performance.

**Literature Review**

Empirical studies show a strong relationship between teacher burnout and decreased student engagement. Teachers with high levels of burnout reported lower levels of student engagement in their classes. Symptoms of burnout, including emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, can lead to low teacher enthusiasm and less engaging instructional practices. (Kossyva et al., 2023). Burned-out teachers may struggle to keep the classroom engaging, resulting in a lack of student interest and enthusiasm. Burnout tends to reduce the motivation and energy of teachers, resulting in less dynamic and engaging teaching. (Mattern & Bauer, 2014). Emotionally exhausted teachers may have a limited ability to establish positive relationships with students, which is crucial for creating a supportive and engaging learning environment. (Liu et al., 2020).

Teacher Burnout may affect student motivation in several ways. The burnt-out teachers might offer less challenging and engaging learning tasks, which decreases the motivation of the students to immerse themselves in the material (Ahmad et al., 2023). Teachers' burnout can lead to a negative emotional state that impacts the classroom climate and compromises both intrinsic motivation and students' sense of competence. (Xue, 2020).

Kim et al (2018) found that the higher the teacher's burnout, the more likely they are to perform poorly on standardized tests. This research has shown that burnout among teachers deteriorates their ability to educate students, leading to worse performance among the students. Emotional detachment by teachers towards students is expected to negatively affect the performance of students in their studies. The achievements of students tend to be low when teachers exhibit a high level of depersonalization. Learning and the grades of students can be affected when teachers feel depersonalized, as they may not be as

supportive towards their students, and their teaching can be of lower quality. (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2020).

In the Pakistani context, a study found that teachers' use of information and technologies reduces stress by trimming the workload, so it benefits both teachers 'mental health and the quality of education. (Shaheen & Mahmood, 2016). Farooq and Kai, (2017) states that psychological factors are positively related to interdependence and team authority. At the same time, the report's conclusions indicate strong relationships between psychological factors and effective teamwork. Ayub et al (2018) performed a survey on urban primary schools and reported on gender, age, marital/family status, and type of student. According to the study, postgraduates are a symbol of personal achievement. Emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment are age-related. Differences between males and females clearly affect both emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, thus generating stress in educational institutions. In every level of the academic system, though, organizational factors are more influential than these differences.

Cheema et al., (2022) discovered that academic staff were under higher stress than general staff. A majority of staff members said that job stress was detrimental to both their personal and professional lives. The stresses that came into play included insufficient funding, overload, poor management and communication, job insecurity, and others. Coping mechanisms encompassed both a positive work environment and individual coping strategies. The primary sources identified were work overload, job insecurity, insufficient resources, poor management, and inadequate incentives. It has been discovered that there is a direct correlation between job-related stress and the performance of instructors. The study suggests that it is essential to motivate female university teachers to adopt a positive mindset towards their personal growth and development. Furthermore, female teachers should be encouraged to pursue further education and enhance their professional skills. (Lodhi et al., 2023). Nasir et al., (2023) conducted research on private schools of Karachi and reported that Teachers' work dissatisfaction stems from inadequate compensation and elevated job-related stress, resulting in attrition. The state's education department needs to augment teachers' remuneration and arrange for its people to do school inspections every quarter. Sohail et al., (2023) indicated that emotion regulation, a positive workplace environment, and teacher self-efficacy (feeling successful as a teacher) are significant factors that promote teachers' well-being. Conversely, a hostile workplace environment, negative emotions, and experiencing marginalization or bullying from coworkers contribute to teacher burnout. Moreover, the correlation between TBO and students' AP lacks thorough investigation and comprehensiveness. Additionally, specific effects of burnout on students' academic performance are little explored in the context of Pakistan. While numerous studies exist on what leads to burnout, less is known about the factors that contribute to burnout among primary school teachers. Most studies either combine data from different school levels or focus on secondary or higher education, which may not always capture the specific challenges in primary education.

## Material and Methods

This study employed a quantitative research methodology and followed a survey research design. The population consisted of all the PSTs working in the primary schools of District Bhakkar in 2023. A total of 4117 PSTs are presently (2023-2024) working in the delimited district. The sample size comprised 367 respondents. Keeping in view the principle of proportional representation, 172 Male and 195 Female PSTs were selected. Based on the Tehsils 158, 83, 60, and 66, respondents were selected from Bhakkar, Darya Khan, Mankera, and Kallurkot, respectively. The sample size has been determined using Yamane's sample size formula (Yamane, 1973). Data were collected using a self-designed, closed-ended questionnaire. An expert appraisal ensured the validity of the questionnaire; eight experts in the social sciences evaluated each item on a three-point scale (Valid, Invalid,

Needs Alteration). Out of all the items, most were found valid, and three items that gauge academic performance were reformulated to be clear and relevant prior to finalization. They used Cronbach's Alpha in SPSS to calculate reliability, and a limit of 0.70 was applied to retain only the items that were internally consistent. The research participants were informed about the study's goals, assured that there were no compulsory requirements, and given sufficient time to answer the questions. A total of 384 surveys were distributed, and 361 were returned, resulting in a 94% response rate. The data was analyzed using SPSS.

## Results and Discussion

**Table 1**
**Regression analysis for the impact of teachers' burnout rate on Classroom engagement**

Model summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .164[a] | .027 | .024 | .75110 |

ANOVA

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 5.630 | 1 | 5.630 | 9.980 | .002[b] |
| | Residual | 204.220 | 362 | .564 | | |
| | Total | 209.850 | 363 | | | |

Coefficients

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.724 | .174 | | 9.889 | .000 |
| | Teachers Burnout | .193 | .061 | .164 | 3.159 | .002 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Teachers' Burnout Rate
b. Dependent Variable: Classroom Engagement

Table 1 shows that burnout explains only 2.7% of variance in classroom engagement ($R^2$ = .027; adj. $R^2$ = .024), with a weak correlation (R = .164) and SE = 0.75110. Though statistically observable, the effect is minimal, indicating most variance is driven by other factors. ANOVA shows the model is significant (F = 9.980, p = .002), confirming teacher burnout meaningfully predicts classroom engagement. Though $R^2$ indicates limited explained variance, the low p-value validates the model's predictive relevance. The coefficients show a significant positive link between teacher burnout and classroom engagement (B = 0.193, β = 0.164, $t$ = 3.159, $p$ = .002). While the effect is modest and somewhat counterintuitive, it may reflect contextual factors, such as compensatory teaching efforts; yet, the significance confirms the robustness of the association.

**Table 2**
**Regression analysis for the impact of Teachers' burnout rate on Motivation**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .198[a] | .039 | .037 | .72150 |

ANOVA

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 7.699 | 1 | 7.699 | 14.789 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 188.445 | 362 | .521 | | |
| | Total | 196.144 | 363 | | | |

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.634 | .167 | | 9.756 | .000 |
| | Teachers Burnout Rate | .226 | .059 | .198 | 3.846 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), Teachers' Burnout Rate

The data presented in Table 2 for the regression analysis assessing the impact of teachers' burnout rate on student motivation reveals a correlation coefficient (R) of 0.198, indicating a weak but positive linear relationship between the two variables. The ANOVA results indicate a statistically significant relationship. The F-value of 14.789 with a significance level (p = .000) confirms that the teachers' burnout rate significantly predicts variation in students' motivation. The unstandardized coefficient (B = 0.226) indicates that with each one-unit increase in teachers' burnout rate, students' motivation increases by 0.226 units. Although the result suggests a positive association, it presents a paradox in the educational context, as burnout is generally associated with diminished teacher effectiveness. This may reflect a compensatory mechanism wherein students, facing reduced instructional engagement due to teacher burnout, independently strive to maintain their academic drive. Alternatively, the nature of motivation captured in the instrument may be influenced by external rather than instructional factors.

**Table 3**
**Impact of Teachers' burnout on annual results**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .009[a] | .000 | -.003 | .506 |

ANOVA

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | .007 | 1 | .007 | .028 | .867[b] |
| | Residual | 92.718 | 362 | .256 | | |
| | Total | 92.725 | 363 | | | |

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.739 | .117 | | 23.317 | .000 |
| | Teachers Burnout | .007 | .041 | .009 | .168 | .867 |

b. Predictors: (Constant), Teachers' Burnout Rate
a. Dependent Variable: Class Annual Results

Table 3 presents the R value, which is 0.009, indicating an extremely weak positive correlation between the independent variable (teachers' burnout rate) and the dependent variable (students' annual results). The ANOVA results indicate a sum of squares of 0.007, with an F-statistic of 0.028, and the corresponding p-value is 0.867, which is substantially above the conventional significance thresholds ($p < 0.05$ or $p < 0.01$). This indicates that the model is not statistically significant, and there is no evidence to suggest that teachers' burnout rate has a measurable impact on students' annual academic performance. Moreover, the unstandardized coefficient (B) for teachers' burnout rate is 0.007, with a standard error of 0.041. The standardized beta coefficient is a negligible 0.009, and the t-value is 0.168, associated with a p-value of 0.867. These statistical indicators confirm that there is no significant relationship between the level of teachers' burnout and students' annual academic results.

**Table 4**
**Regression analysis for the impact of Teachers' burnout on students' academic performance**

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .187[a] | .035 | .032 | .71050 |

*ANOVA*

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 6.624 | 1 | 6.624 | 13.122 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 182.740 | 362 | .505 | | |
| | Total | 189.365 | 363 | | | |

Coefficients

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.679 | .165 | | 10.181 | .000 |
| | Teachers Burnout Rate | .210 | .058 | .187 | 3.622 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Students' Academic Performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), Teachers' Burnout Rate

Table 4 presents the regression analysis of the impact of teachers' burnout on students' academic performance, revealing that the teachers' burnout rate accounts for approximately 3.5% of the variance in students' academic performance, as indicated by an R-squared value of 0.035.ANOVA shows the model is significant (F = 13.122, p = .000), indicating teacher burnout affects student performance. However, low explanatory power suggests the effect is modest, and more predictors are needed. The coefficient table shows teacher burnout is a significant positive predictor of student performance (β = 0.187, p = .000; B = 0.210, t = 3.622). While statistically significant, the small beta coefficient indicates a modest practical impact, suggesting that other mediating factors, such as teaching quality and institutional support, may also influence outcomes.

**Table 5**
**Correlation of teachers' burnout and students' academic performance**

| | | Teachers Burnout | Academic performance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers Burnout | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .187** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 364 | 364 |
| Academic performance | Pearson Correlation | .187** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 364 | 364 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 presents the correlation analysis between teachers' burnout rates and students' academic performance, revealing a significant positive relationship with a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.187. This correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level, as indicated by a p-value of 0.000. Despite the positive correlation, the relatively low coefficient suggests that while a measurable relationship exists between the two variables, it is weak. This implies that while teachers' burnout may have some influence on students' academic performance, the effect is not substantial.

The research findings indicate that the burnout level of teachers had a low but significant positive impact on academic results (r = .187, $R^2$ = .035), classroom engagement ($R^2$ = .027), and motivation ($R^2$ = .039), with effect sizes that were also low. ANOVA confirmed the statistical significance of these models, and coefficient analysis revealed small but consistent positive predictive values, which may indicate complex behavioral or contextual dynamics. Burnout among teachers was not significantly related to the annual results of the students ($R^2$ = 0.000, p = 0.867), indicating that burnout has a minimal effect on classroom engagement, motivation, and performance, but does not significantly impact long-term outcomes.

## Discussion

It was found that teacher burnout was linked to students' lower academic performance, particularly in terms of motivation and involvement. This finding is consistent with research indicating that classroom dynamics are significantly influenced by teacher well-being, even though annual academic attainment was not substantially impacted. According to Rodriguez et al (2020) Students' motivation and self-regulation are impacted by the emotional environment of the classroom, which is shaped by the social-emotional competency of the teachers. Lower levels of student behavioral engagement and effort are significantly predicted by teacher stress, as Evans et al (2019) Showed.

The conclusion of this study was supported by a meta-analysis by al. (2014), which discovered weak to moderate relationships between teacher burnout and student achievement. Zhu et al. (2018) also noted that teacher self-efficacy moderates the intensity

of this association, with high self-efficacy mitigating the adverse impacts of burnout. According to Ladd and Sorensen (2017), Extrinsic factors—such as peer surroundings, parental support, and family income—often have a higher predictive value for student outcomes than teacher well-being alone.

Additional investigation utilizing regression and correlation methods showed that burnout has little to no impact on students' yearly academic performance. These results support the claim that, although teacher burnout has an impact on psychological engagement and classroom procedures, it does not, by itself, significantly affect standardized academic performance. These combined results imply that burnout is a relational and contextual phenomenon, with effects that are more apparent in the classroom setting than in academic summative assessments.

Although there was little evidence of a relationship between teacher burnout and students' annual academic performance, the study did find that it had a significant impact on the learning environment, particularly on student motivation, focus, and classroom involvement. This backs up Zheng (2022) Claim that emotionally distant educators are less successful at fostering trust and student-centered learning. Emotionally capable teachers help create healthy social-emotional learning environments, which in turn promote academic resilience. Tomaszek (2020) Claims that student participation and involvement are adversely correlated with burnout, which results in ineffective classroom management.

## Conclusion

The research concluded that there is a weak but statistically significant relationship between teachers' burnout and students' academic performance, indicating that although burnout has some influence, it is not a major predictor of students' results due to the impact of external circumstances. Both correlation and regression analyses revealed negligible or null effects, indicating no substantial association between instructors' burnout and students' annual academic results. According to the results, teacher burnout does not significantly affect students' overall academic outcomes, especially yearly results; however, it is prevalent and influences classroom dynamics, such as motivation and engagement. The study's findings emphasize that burnout must be addressed through improved support systems, autonomy, and professional advancement opportunities.

## Recommendations

1. Parents and community stakeholders should be sensitized to engage constructively with teachers and respect their professional roles and boundaries.

2. Educational supervisors and inspectors should revise evaluation practices to include assessments of teacher-student motivation and classroom engagement quality.

**References**

Affuso, G., Zannone, A., Esposito, C., Pannone, M., Miranda, M. C., De Angelis, G., Aquilar, S., Dragone, M., & Bacchini, D. (2023). The effects of teacher support, parental monitoring, motivation, and self-efficacy on academic performance over time. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *38*(1), 1–23.

Ahmad, D. N., Bibi, N., & Imran, M. (2023). *Effects Of Teachers' Motivation On Students' Academic Performance At Public Secondary Schools In Karachi, Pakistan* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 5165741). Social Science Research Network. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5165741

Aloe, A. M., Amo, L. C., & Shanahan, M. E. (2014). Classroom Management Self-Efficacy and Burnout: A Multivariate Meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, *26*(1), 101–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0

Ayub, A., Hussain, M. A., & Ghulamullah, N. (2018). Causes and Impact of Work Stress on Teachers' Performance in Urban Primary Schools. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, *6*(1), 81–100.

Cheema, A. B., Parveen, A., & Ahmad, M. (2022). Analysis of Occupational Stress of Primary School Teachers. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, *6*(2), 157–169.

Cheng, Y. (2022). Investigating Factors Responsible for Teacher Burnout in English as Foreign Language Classes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.876203

Evans, D., Butterworth, R., & Law, G. U. (2019). Understanding associations between perceptions of student behaviour, conflict representations in the teacher-student relationship and teachers' emotional experiences. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *82*, 55–68.

Farooq, M. S., & Kai, Y. T. (2017). A Review of Pakistan School System. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *8*(4), 97–101.

Hederich-Martínez, C., & Caballero-Domínguez, C. C. (2016). Validation of Maslach Burnout Inventory-Student Survey (MBI-SS) in Colombian academic context. *CES Psicología*, *9*(1), 1–15.

Kim, D., Choi, D., & Vandenberghe, C. (2018). Goal-Focused Leadership, Leader-Member Exchange, and Task Performance: The Moderating Effects of Goal Orientations and Emotional Exhaustion. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *33*(5), 645–660. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9516-7

Knox, M., Willard-Grace, R., Huang, B., & Grumbach, K. (2018). Maslach Burnout Inventory and a Self-Defined, Single-Item Burnout Measure Produce Different Clinician and Staff Burnout Estimates. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *33*(8), 1344–1351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-018-4507-6

Kossyva, D., Theriou, G., Aggelidis, V., & Sarigiannidis, L. (2023). Definitions and antecedents of engagement: A systematic literature review. *Management Research Review*, *46*(5), 719–738. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-01-2021-0043

Ladd, H. F., & Sorensen, L. C. (2017). Returns to teacher experience: Student achievement and motivation in middle school. *Education Finance and Policy*, *12*(2), 241–279.

Liu, W. C., Wang, C. K. J., Reeve, J., Kee, Y. H., & Chian, L. K. (2020). What Determines Teachers' Use of Motivational Strategies in the Classrooms? A Self-Determination Theory Perspective. *Journal of Education*, *200*(3), 185–195. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057419881171

Lodhi, F. A., Arshad, M., Aslam, M., Niazi, S., & Naz, S. (2023). A Study of Job Stress Level and Performance of Female Teachers at Higher Educational Institutions. *Multicultural Education*, *9*(4). http://ijdri.com/me/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/3.pdf

Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021). Does teacher burnout affect students? A systematic review of its association with academic achievement and student-reported outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *105*, 101714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101714

Mattern, J., & Bauer, J. (2014). Does teachers' cognitive self-regulation increase their occupational well-being? The structure and role of self-regulation in the teaching context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *43*, 58–68.

Nasir, S., Hussain, S., Hussain, N., Shehzadi, Y., & Hassan, M. (2023). Exploring Antecedents of Teachers' Turnover Intention-A Case of Private Secondary Schools of Karachi. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management, and Innovation*, *5*(1), 122–143.

Rodriguez, V., Lynneth Solis, S., Mascio, B., Kiely Gouley, K., Jennings, P. A., & Brotman, L. M. (2020). With Awareness Comes Competency: The Five Awarenesses of Teaching as a Framework for Understanding Teacher Social-Emotional Competency and Well-being. *Early Education and Development*, *31*(7), 940–972. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2020.1794496

Roeser, R. W., Skinner, E., Beers, J., & Jennings, P. A. (2012). Mindfulness training and teachers' professional development: An emerging area of research and practice. *Child Development Perspectives*, *6*(2), 167–173.

Shaheen, F., & Mahmood, N. (2016). Demographic Variables as Determinants of Emotional Burnout among Public School Teachers. *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education (JRRE)*, *10*(1).

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2020). Teacher burnout: Relations between dimensions of burnout, perceived school context, job satisfaction and motivation for teaching. A longitudinal study. *Teachers and Teaching*, *26*(7–8), 602–616.

Sohail, M. M., Baghdady, A., Choi, J., Huynh, H. V., Whetten, K., & Proeschold-Bell, R. J. (2023). Factors influencing teacher wellbeing and burnout in schools: A scoping review 1. *Work*, *Preprint*, 1–16.

Tomaszek, K. (2020). Why is it important to engage students in school activities? Examining the mediation effect of student school engagement on the relationships between student alienation and school burnout. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, *51*(2), 89–97.

Vincent, M. K., Holliman, A. J., & Waldeck, D. (2023). Adaptability and Social Support: Examining Links with Engagement, Burnout, and Wellbeing among Expat Teachers. *Education Sciences*, *14*(1), 16.

Xue, X. (2020). *Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Motivational Strategies in English Classes*. 14–20. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200205.004

Zheng, Y. (2022a). A review of burnout in college English teachers in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.884304

Zheng, Y. (2022b). A review of burnout in college English teachers in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.884304

Zhu, M., Liu, Q., Fu, Y., Yang, T., Zhang, X., & Shi, J. (2018). The relationship between teacher self-concept, teacher efficacy and burnout. *Teachers and Teaching*, *24*(7), 788–801. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1483913