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ABSTRACT

This study has investigated the burnout levels of 81 Kurdish EFL instructors working at governmental schools in district of Erbil and attempted to indicate whether there was a meaningful relationship between teachers’ burnout levels and their age, gender, marital status, seniority in profession, educational background. In order to conduct the research, the participants of the study were selected among only English teachers working at governmental schools in district of Erbil. The setting of the study was nearly all governmental schools affiliated to the Ministry of Education of Kurdistan in district of Erbil. The study was conducted during the academic year (2017-2018). In the study two types of questionnaires were distributed to collect data from participants. The first one was demographic form and the second one was Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). The quantitative data which was gathered via questionnaire were analysed by utilizing SPSS 11.5. The descriptive data analysis was led by ascertaining frequencies, arithmetical averages and standard deviations for deciding what the level of burnout was and whether there was a statistically significant difference between burnout levels and participants’ age, gender, marital status, seniority in profession, educational background. The results indicated that the participants showed a very low level of burnout with respect to Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization. In contrast, the participants showed higher level of burnout in accordance to Personal Accomplishment. Moreover, the study showed that there was no significant difference between some variables of the study including age, gender, and marital status and burnout levels of the subjects. As for seniority in profession variable, the results reported that there was no significant difference between the years of experience of the teachers and the levels of burnout in regard of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales, whereas, for personal accomplishment subscale, the subjects showed a slight significant difference of the levels of burnout. Likewise, for educational background variable, the statistical outcomes revealed that there was no significant difference of burnout levels regarding emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment subscales, while, there was a significant difference concerning depersonalization subscale.
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1- Introduction
This chapter presents a brief discussion of literature concerning Burnout level. Additionally, this chapter deals with the organization, purpose, significance, assumptions and background of the study.

The concept of burnout is relatively new. In 1974, Freudenberger was the first to use this concept demonstrating the physical and affectionate reactions coming about because of specialists' long haul introduction to push in occupations creating exclusive standards without assurance particularly those giving human administrations for example, health, media, police, education, etc. (Richard, Marion, and Marich 2006).

Lately significant commitment to this area has come from two social psychologists from the College of California at Berkeley, Christina Maslach and Ayala Pines. Numerous late studies in human administration and instructive associations have systematically analysed partners' emotions about themselves, their customers and their occupations in a variety of settings utilizing the exploratory work of Maslach and associates as the beginning stage. These studies have appeared individuals included in delayed steady, extraordinary collaboration with individuals in a candidly charged environment are susceptible to the disorder of burnout, which, as indicated by Maslach and Jackson (1981), has three different viewpoints: passionate weariness,
According to Jason (2006), Ozdemir (2007), and Colangelo (2004), instructors are presented to different negative encounters and circumstances related to the teaching process which are pondered their patterns and emotions towards others and the work. They likewise influence the teachers' accomplishment furthermore causes burnout.

The outcomes of burnout are possibly intense for the staff, the customers and the bigger foundations in which they collaborate. “Our initial research on this syndrome suggests that burnout can lead to deterioration in the quality of care or service that is provided by the staff. It appears to be a factor in job turnover, absenteeism, and low morale. Furthermore, burnout seems to be correlated with various self-reported indices of personal distress, including physical exhaustion, insomnia, increased use of alcohol and drugs, and marital and family problems” (Maslach, 1976).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The burnout has become the core of conversation among employers especially teachers in Kurdistan. The teachers started to hate their jobs which they spent all their life to reach it. Furthermore, many teachers have tried to change their occupations because they have thought that teaching is the main cause of their burnout. Since burnout has become a serious problem, this study has carried out in order to check out the level of burnout of Kurdish EFL teachers who work for governmental schools in Erbil district.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to concentrate on burnout levels of English instructors who work in governmental schools for Directory of Education in district of Erbil and determine if there is a meaningful relationship between teachers' burnout levels depending on their age, gender, marital status, seniority in profession, educational background. The study additionally intends to discover answers to the accompanying research question

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, various definitions of burnout are mentioned. Moreover, three dimensions of burnout are highlighted. Likewise reasons for burnout, teacher burnout and preventing burnout are specified as well. Also, numerous studies about burnout cover a part of this chapter, as well as, instruments used to measure burnout are sited in this part. At the end the researcher gives a summary of the part.

2.1 Definitions of Burnout

The term burnout is regularly used to depict the state of being emotionally and/or physically exhausted and not having the capacity to do one's work effectively.

Freudenberger (1974) was the first to term the phrase “burnout” when looking at people in public service jobs
who were mentally and physically exhausted due to long hours, heavy workloads, and extreme intensity at work as cited in Yong & Yue, 2007).

Maslach & Jackson (1981), two of the pioneers in the domain of burnout research, define burnout as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do “people work” of some kind” (p. 99).

Maslach and Leiter (1997) further state that, “Frustration and anger are the emotional hallmarks of burnout” (p. 27).

Pines & Aronson (1988) present a marginally more extensive meaning of burnout, which incorporates physical manifestations. In their perspective, burnout is not confined to those involved in the social administrations. They describe burnout as “a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion caused by long-term involvement in situations that are emotionally demanding” (Pines & Aronson 1988:9).

Haberman utilizes a behavioural meaning of burnout and characterizes it as a condition in which a previously committed professional disengages from his or her work in response to stress and strain experienced in the job”.

To date, there is no universally accepted definition of burnout. Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter (2001) state that burnout is a very slippery concept – there can be no standard definition of it.

2.3 Dimensions of Burnout

Individuals begin their occupations with vitality, inclusion and a feeling of viability. Notwithstanding, once burnout shows itself, their energy and engagement no more continue and these positive sentiments transform into negative emotions: energy changes into exhaustion (emotional exhaustion), involvement into cynicism (depersonalization) and efficacy into ineffectiveness (reduced personal accomplishment) (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).
Emotional Exhaustion

Emotional Exhaustion is the first dimension in the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). This dimension describes “feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one’s work” (Maslach, et al., 2008, p. 93). Emotionally exhausted individuals imagine that they have done whatever they can in their occupation and that they can’t work viably anymore because of emptying of their enthusiastic assets. Besides, emotionally exhausted individuals are once in a while psychically depleted, they need to invest less time with individuals, and have sleep disorders (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Depersonalization

The Depersonalization dimension refers to “an unfeeling and impersonal response towards recipients of one’s care or service” (Maslach, et al., 2008, p. 93). Depersonalization causes people to separate themselves from their customers and to create detached and critical disposition towards them. Another effect of depersonalization is that individuals have a tendency to see their customers as generic items (Maslach, et al., 2001). Moreover, depersonalization brings disappointment with one’s work, and, additionally, the feeling of pointlessness and uselessness in one’s job.

Reduced Personal Accomplishment (or Inefficacy)

Reduced Personal Accomplishment is the third dimension of burnout. It describes the lack of “feelings of competence and successful achievement in one’s work with people” (Maslach, et al., 2008, p. 94). Individuals who experience this feeling are liable to assess their prosperity adversely and be disappointed with their self-improvement on their employment. Moreover, one’s negative assessment of his/her proficient viability may be identified with sufficiency toward oneself since risky circumstances could result in anxiety, and if stress cannot be overcome, it could result in burnout (Bandura, 1977, 1997).

Teacher Burnout

A number of authors concur that teaching is regarded as a stressful occupation (Blasé 1986; Kyriacou 1987, 2001; Claxton 1989; Bachkirova 2005; De Nobile & McCormick 2005).

The outward articulations of teacher burnout could be serious. Talmor et al. (2005) portray the indications of teacher burnout as “extreme reactions of anger, anxiety, depression, fatigue, boredom, cynicism, guilt, psychosomatic reactions, and in extreme cases, also emotional breakdown” (p. 217-218).

Instructor burnout is portrayed as a loss of vision and eagerness, which leads to poor teaching practices and to poor student achievement (Wood & McCarthy, 2002).
Burned out teachers may have negative impacts on their school reputation (Schwab, 2001).

Burnout has negative impacts on teachers’ physical and mental health. Concerning the physical health, it raises teachers’ feeling unwell, tension, high blood pressure, backache, headache, indisposition, insomnia, frequent flu. Psychologically, it raises self-inferiority, depression and despair, low self-confidence, amnesia, sadness, feeling disable, dull, uneasy and angry (Schonfeld, 2001).

Rudow (1999) puts forward that educators who fall exploited person to burnout can demonstrate a more absence rate. As the nature of their instructing is antagonistically influenced by the anxiety and burnout they encores, their work execution decays. They may be disappointed with their occupations and demotivated, since they create negative sentiments towards the students, parents, their partners and the principals, their connections are impeded and they are less included and less charming. They cannot create warm feelings while communicating with the students but, contrarily, they influence student learning, inspiration and discipline.

Dewey (1933) believes, “teachers are not just passive curriculum implementers, but they can also play an active role in curriculum design and educational reform” (p. 49).

Educational reformers have attempted to make teaching more professional occupationally by expanding teachers’ dedication and responsibility to their employments (Helsby, 1999; Lieberman & Miller, 1999). Despite reformers instructors have a solid slant to leave their occupations and work forever or, incidentally, change their occupation altogether (Bobbitt, Leich, Whitener and Lynch, 1994). This is not amazing on the grounds that students who graduate from teacher’s training, around 25% of them don’t enter the occupation and alternate, 25% of them leave educating during the first years of employment. The latest research biased information distributed by the ISRAEL Bureau of Statistics (2003) demonstrates that 8-10% of the instructors leave the profession every year. In different studies on educators’ responsibility or their aims of leaving the profession, a high rate of instructors reported that they wanted to leave educating later on.

**Causes of Burnout**

Teaching is a distressing occupation (Chaplain, 2008), and stress among teachers is attributed to causing burnout (Friesen & Sarros, 1989; Zhang & Sapp, 2007). Yet stress is caused by a wide change of environmental, emotional, and individual factors.

Student trouble making and interruption in the classroom is a huge driver of burnout interfaced to a teacher’s emotional exhaustion (Evers et al., 2004).
Male & May's (1997) study position workload as the wellspring of most serious anxiety among teachers. The inclination of budgetary insufficiency brings about low resolve, low inspiration, and a decrease in performance (Chen & Miller, 1997; Eggers, 2011).

According to Langan-Fox and Cooper (2011), class sizes and over-packed classrooms do lead to enthusiastic depletion, physical weariness, stress, and burnout among educators. DeFrank and Stroup (1989) find that more youthful, unpractised instructors reported more stress and burnout than tenured instructors.

McCormick and Solman (1992) state that female instructors experience higher amounts of anxiety and burnout than their male partners do.

Therefore, those studies could be abridged that it is a remorseless reality fact that there are numerous reasons trigging burnout, for example:

**Biographical Variables Factor**

The most frequently researched biographical variables that analysts have noted as potential causal components for burnout are gender, age and teaching experience, marital status and level of education.

**Gender**

Beer and Beer (1992) maintain that men and ladies experience burnout in comparative ways.

The crucial contrasts lie in what they encounter as stressors. For men, the wellsprings of anxiety focus on the workplace and identify with the crevice they encounter in the middle of individual and natural requests. Ladies find that time is the significant wellspring of anxiety. Time administration, in adapting to their family and profession requests, gets to be troublesome and the reason part clash (Beer and Beer, 1992)

Most studies report higher levels of emotional exhaustion (a component of burnout) amongst women and higher levels of depersonalization (another component of burnout) amongst men (Purvanova & Muros, 2010; Smit, 2007).

**Age and Teaching Experience**

In many studies, it appears that there is a clear relationship between age and burnout. Smit (2007) has stated that age connects most reliably to burnout of all demographic variables.

Young teachers, who are new in the profession, have a tendency to be hopeful and are often very anxious to perform and attain professionally (Gibbs, 2010; Friedman, 2000). When they fail of convince their students, they feel undervalued and overlooked in their execution. They feel more restless and deficient and get to be helpless against burnout (Daniel & Schuller, 2000; Tynjälä & Heikkinen, 2011).

**Marital Status**
Researches with various results have been published about interrelation of marital status and burnout. The individuals who are unmarried (particularly men) appear to be more inclined to burnout contrasted with the individuals who are married (Erşan, Doğan & Doğan, 2011; McDermott, 1984; Maslach & Jackson, 1985). On the other hand, Sears and Navin (1983) discover no meaningful relationship between marital status and burnout.

**Level of Education**

Instructors with higher levels of education have a tendency to have higher desires about what they need to attain. Falling short in meeting these desires makes them inclined to burnout (Maslach, 1982). In addition, Altun, ağlar and Yazici (2011) and Schaufeli and Enzmann (1998) find that employees with higher levels of education are more susceptible to burnout.

**Organizational (Institutional) Factors**

These factors refer to those which are described and set by the foundation or the association where the educator is working and those that are not under the control of the instructor.

**Classroom Management**

Since educators are confronted basically with students in their everyday work, and since they are the ones to whom instructors give administration, associations with the students and student behaviours, which describe the atmosphere and the environment of a
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These factors refer to those which are described and set by the foundation or the association where the educator is working and those that are not under the control of the instructor.

**Classroom Management**

Since educators are confronted basically with students in their everyday work, and since they are the ones to whom instructors give administration, associations with the students and student behaviours, which describe the atmosphere and the environment of a
classroom, are of the central point influencing an educator's state of mind and emotions about their employment.

At the point when educators experience issues with students, experience discipline issues or when the students act problematically bringing on classroom administration issues for the educators, instructors are destined to feel baffled which prompts burnout at last (Friedman, 2000).

2.6 Symptoms of Burnout

According to Spickard et al, (2002) the symptoms and signs of burnout incorporate passionate weariness, negativity, and saw clinical incapability, and a feeling of depersonalization involved with collaborators, patients, or both. Burnout has been associated with impaired job performance and poor health, including headaches, sleep disturbances, irritability, marital difficulties, fatigue, hypertension, anxiety, depression myocardial infarction, and may contribute to alcoholism and drug addiction.

The incongruity of Burnout is that it happens to the same individual who a while ago was eager and bringing over with vitality and thoughts when initially included in an occupation or new circumstance. This kind of individual has a by and large an exclusive requirement of what can be fulfilled. As all passes by all the objectives aren't attained, the eagerness bites the dust and a kind of
is respected and heard (cited in Warrad, 2012).

One way educators can guarantee understudy accomplishment and a positive far reaching society is by supporting one another and keeping up help systems (Nieto, 2007; Quinn, 2003).

Having a life outside of work and being dynamic in family exercises is an alternate incredible approach to keep away from the assemble up of burnout (Nagy, 2006).

In addition, Blanch, Aluja&Biscarri (2003) conclude that some difficult circumstances are past teachers' control. Thus, the consolidation of utilizing dynamic and avoidance techniques may help educators to accomplish better adjustment and psychological well-being.

2.8 Instruments Used to Measure Burnout

Since the rise of burnout as an idea, various types of instruments have been introduced to measure it. There are loads of scales to measure job burnout such as Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI), The Oldenburg (OLBI), Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM), Spanish Burnout Inventory (SBI).

2.8.1 Oldenburg Burnout Inventory

The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) was initially created in German. There are 2 sub-scales, 8 items, 4 items +, 4 items - in the inventory. Fatigue and separation (from work) are two requesting; addressing the estimation of one's work.

Spiritual Burnout Stage: esteem framework breaks down totally; little on the other hand no feeling of individual achievement.

Preventing Burnout

At the point when teachers experience difficult circumstances, the adapting techniques utilized are useful within taking out the wellsprings of anxiety and accordingly keeping away from the improvement of burnout.

Maslach (1982) states, “Coping can occur at several different levels: individual, social, and institutional” (p. 89).

People experiencing burnout need somebody in their life to incline toward, converse with, and feel near to help work through the manifestations of burnout (Freudenberger, 1980).

Utilizing liquor or medications to adapt or separate oneself from other people, can make the process of recovering from burnout considerably harder (Maslach, 1982).

DiPaola and Hoy (2008) say that administrators must provide support for all teachers in a very collegial manner whereby the teacher is treated as equal and his or her values, opinions, and voice
measurements of burnout as per The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory.

2.8.2 Maslach Burnout Inventory
Recognized for more than a decade as the main measure of burnout, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) fuses the far reaching research that has been directed in the more than 25 years since its introductory production. The MBI Surveys address three general scales:

- **Emotional exhaustion** measures sentiments of being sincerely overextended and depleted by one's work.
- **Depersonalization** measures a cruel and generic reaction to beneficiaries of one's administration, mind treatment, or direction.
- **Personal accomplishment** measures emotions of skill and fruitful accomplishment in one's work.

2.8.3 Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI)
The CBI is constantly utilized as a part of various nations and interpretations into eight dialects are accessible. The inventory consists of 19 items, 5 reaction categories and Individual Burnout, work-related, and customer related burnout are the disorder of burnout.

2.8.4 Shirom-Melamed Burnout (SMBM)
(SMBM) was developed by Shiron and Melamed in 2006. It is utilized within Israel and USA. There are three subscales 14 items. There are three disorder, for example, P=physical weakness, E=emotional fatigue, and C=cognitive exhaustion.

2.9 Studies in the Field
There are numerous investigations, which are carried out around the globe about instructor burnout, yet lamentably the researcher did not recognize any research done in his district to specify it among those studies. The followings are some of researches which were done around the world:

The first study is Guven (2010) which is made in Turkey to investigate the level of burnout among Turkish EFL teachers. 64 participants who teach at three different foundation universities in Istanbul called Kadir Has University, Istanbul Kultüür University and Istanbul Fatih University were participated. Maslach Burnout Inventory was used. Based on findings, there were no meaningful differences amongst variable of gender, age, marital status, and department of graduation and burnout.

Mukundan and Khandehroo (2010) study tried to find out the English teachers’ burnout and its relation with their demographics of age and workload in Malaysia. 184 participants were selected for the sample of the study. In order to measure the burnout level of the teachers, the Maslach Burnout Inventory was used. The findings of the study showed that a high level of burnout is
A study conducted by Audeh (1998) aimed at identifying the level of burnout and its relationship with work stress that state secondary school teachers in the West Bank have. Moreover, he uncovered the relationship between the phenomenon of burnout and a number of variables. The study sample consisted of 130 male and female teachers. It used Maslach’s inventory and the work stress questionnaire prepared by the researcher. It was found that the spread of the phenomenon of burnout was medium as well as work stress. There was no effect of the age, gender, educational qualification, social status, and experience variables on both of burnout and work stress. There was positive correlation and significant indication between work stress and burnout.

Farah (2001) conducted a study that aimed at detecting burnout level of people working with the disabled in Qatar. The study sample was 122 teachers, administrators, specialists, and trainers in related establishments in the Qatar State. Maslach’s inventory was used. The study found that the degree of burnout was medium with the sample subjects, and the male realized their short achievement than the female. No significant differences attributed to the dimensions of educational level or years of experience were found amongst the sample subjects related to the whole degree of the inventory or its three sub-dimensions.

evident among English teachers in public school. Moreover; some age and workload categories demonstrated significant relations with emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment.

Dunham’s (1976) study, on stress situations and responses which involved 658 teachers in United Kingdom, reported that role conflict, role ambiguity, poor working condition, relationship with the head master and lack of autonomy were significant predictors of burnout.

Antoniou, Polychroni & Walters (2000) investigated sources of psychological burnout of special education teachers in Greece. The study sample consists of 110 teachers in Greece; (68) male and (42) female. The researcher developed psychological pressures inventory and used Maslach Teacher burnout scale. Results indicated that there are no statistically significant differences between male and female special education teachers in sag feeling and lack of feeling of personal achievement.

Shiavo (1991) conducted study to check out the relationship between work stress and burnout among deans of the faculties of education in the United States of America. The researcher used Maslach Burnout Inventory and Occupational Stress Scale. The study sample consists of 348 deans. The study reported a significant difference between years of experience and age of deans and their burnout levels.
A study by Al-Wabi (1995) investigated levels of burnout of public education teachers in the city of Mecca Al-Mukarramah applying Maslach’s inventory. The study sample was 457 teachers (male and female). The study found that public education teachers had medially suffered from the burnout phenomenon regarding frequency and severity at the two dimensions of affectionate stress and apathy towards students, and highly in the feeling short of achievement. However, no significant differences appeared amongst variable categories of age, educational qualification, educational level, and social status regarding the affectionate stress and feeling short of achievement dimensions.

Al-Mahmoud’s (2000) study aimed at measuring levels of burning amongst teachers of English as a foreign language in north provinces of Palestine and their relationship with some demographic variables. The study sample was 400 male and female teachers. The study found that public education teachers had medially suffered from the burnout phenomenon regarding frequency and severity at the two dimensions of affectionate stress and apathy towards students, and highly in the feeling short of achievement. However, no significant differences appeared amongst variable categories of age, educational qualification, educational level, and social status regarding the affectionate stress and feeling short of achievement dimensions.

Al-Khaldi’s (2002) study aimed at investigating the burnout that secondary school teachers of Karak, Jordan suffer from. The sample subjects were 325 male and female teachers. High degree of burnout with the affectionate stress dimension was found, and a medium degree with the feeling short of achievement, and a low degree with apathy dimension. There were significant differences in the burnout degrees attributed to the gender variable for the male with the three dimensions.

Research Questions
This study aims to seek answers to the following sub-research questions:
1. What are the burnout levels of the English teachers who work in Directory of Education Schools in Erbil District in Kurdistan Region?
2. Is there a significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their age?
3. Is there a significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their gender?
4. Is there a significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their marital status?
5. Is there a significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their seniority in profession?
6. Is there a significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their educational background?

3. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY
3.1 Introduction
This chapter explains the methodology used to complete the study. It explains the population and sample used, the design of the study, how the data were collected, the instrumentation selected, and the analysis of the data.

3.2 Design of the Study and Objective

Brink et al. (2006:92) describe a research design as the set of steps taken by the researcher to answer the research question which determines the methodology used to obtain information. This research tackled an exploratory research endeavour approach. That is, it is even more a prelude to future research on this point rather than looking into a hypothesis.

The detailed analysis system is pertinent to genuine circumstances and it is reachable to the community through composed reports and can identify with an individual's understanding of the topic (Yin, 1984).

In this research, quantitative research design was used. Furthermore, Maslach Burnout Inventory was applied to find out teachers' burnout level and Personal Form, which was prepared by the researcher, to handle demographical variables.

The main objective of this study is to find out what are the levels of burnout of English teachers who work in Ministry of Education in district of Erbil. In addition, to figure out whether there is a meaningful difference between burnout levels and demographic features such as age, gender, marital status, seniority in profession, and educational background or not is another objective of the study.

3.3 The Variables of the Study

This descriptive research includes (5) independent variables: gender, age, marital status, years of experience and educational level. The dependent variable consists of the three dimensions of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and lack of personal accomplished.

3.4 Participants and the Setting of the Study

The setting of the study was nearly almost all governmental schools affiliated to the Ministry of Education of Kurdistan in district of Erbil. The study was conducted during the academic year (2014-2015).

The target population was all governmental schools in district of Erbil. Although the researcher got the permission from the director of Education in Erbil who showed his fully support and readiness for the researcher, unfortunately, the researcher could not get in touch with all instructors because some of the instructors did not want to participate in this study since there were some sensitive questions and they refused to share it.

The sample employed in this study consists of 81 Kurdish EFL instructors working at governmental schools in district of Erbil. The demographic characteristics of participated teachers are showed in table 3.1.
Table 3.1: The demographic characteristics of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATIONAL STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor or in English</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate in English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23 – 30) years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31 – 37) years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38 – 43) years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Over 43) years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARITAL STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (divorced or widow)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENIORITY IN PROFESSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 – 5) years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 – 10) years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11 – 15) years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16 – 25) years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26 years and more)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 shows the participants are 81 (58 males and 23 females). With respect to age, 46 of participants are within (23 – 30) years group, while 23 participants are within (31 – 37) years group, moreover participants within (38 – 43) years group are three, there are nine participants within (43 or over) years group. On the other hand, for marital status there are 31 single participants and 49 married participants while there is one divorced participant. For seniority in profession, 46 participants are within group of (0 – 5) years, 18 participants have between (6 – 10) years of experience, 10 participants are within group of (11 – 15) years, four participants have experience of (16 – 25) years and just three participants are within group of (25 and over) years. And for educational background, 14 participants have Diploma degree, 49 carry Bachelor degree and 18 have Master
correlation between three subscales and all variables, Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization show very weak correlation (.18) for Emotional Exhaustion and (.16) for Depersonalization. On the other hand, Personal Accomplishment shows stronger correlation than other subscales with average (.47). These statistics show that Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization burnout of teachers are very low, while Personal Accomplishment shows stronger feeling of burnout than the other subscales. There is no significant level of burnout of teachers in accordance to Emotional Exhaustion (.739) and Depersonalization (.844), while there is a very weak significant level of burnout of teachers with respect to Personal Accomplishment (.002).

Table 4.2: significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION</td>
<td>23 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 - 37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be figured out from Table 4.1, the subscale Personal Accomplishment has the highest mean among all subscales. The mean of Personal Accomplishment is (2.92) while the Depersonalization is slightly higher than Emotional Exhaustion with mean (1.53), the lowest mean is scored for Emotional Exhaustion subscale (1.44). With respect to Standard Deviation, Emotional Exhaustion scores highest average among all subscales (.71), while Depersonalization scores (.54) and the last score is for Personal Accomplishment with an average (.53). In accordance to the
As can be seen in the table 4.2, concerning Emotional Exhaustion, the mean of the burnout levels of the 23-30 age group is 1.5022, the mean of the 31-37 age group is 1.3874, the mean of the 38-43 age group is 1.7967 and the mean of the 43 and over age group is 1.1556. The 38-43 age group scored highest mean among all age groups while the 43 and over age group scored lowest mean.

With respect to Personal Accomplishment, the mean of the burnout levels of the 23-30 age group is 2.8472, the mean of the 31-37 age group is 2.8778, the mean of the 38-43 age group is 3.1667 and the mean of the 43 and over age group is 3.3356. The 43 and over age group scored highest mean while the 23-30 age group has the lowest mean.

Relating to Depersonalization, the mean of the burnout levels of the 23-30 age group is 1.5757, the mean of the 31-37 age group is 1.4496, the mean of the 38-43 age group is 2.1633 and the mean of the 43 and over age group is 1.3344. The 38-43 age group scored highest mean, in contrast the 43 and over age group scored the lowest mean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23-30</td>
<td>1.5022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-37</td>
<td>1.3874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-43</td>
<td>1.7967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 and over</td>
<td>1.1556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23-30</td>
<td>2.8472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-37</td>
<td>2.8778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-43</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 and over</td>
<td>3.3356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPERSONALIZATION</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23-30</td>
<td>1.5757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-37</td>
<td>1.4496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-43</td>
<td>2.1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 and over</td>
<td>1.3344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 4.3 shows that, relating to Emotional Exhaustion, the female participants mean 1.5135 is slightly higher than the male participants mean 1.4136. Also for Personal Accomplishment, the female participants mean 2.9865 is slightly higher than male participants mean 2.8964. While for Depersonalization, the male participants mean 1.5716 is higher than the female participants mean 1.4422. However this difference, between male and female participants relating to Emotional Exhaustion, Personal Accomplishment and Depersonalization subscales, is not statistically significant as the significance level (2 tailed) is 0.57>0.05 for EE, 0.49>0.05 for PA and 0.33>0.05 for DP. In short, there is no significant difference between teachers’ gender and their burnout levels.

### Table 4.4 significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their seniority in profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCAL ES</th>
<th>SENIORITY IN PROFESSION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SIG LEVEL</th>
<th>GE N DER</th>
<th>M E A N</th>
<th>S I G LE V E L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT</td>
<td>0 – 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Male 5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Male 8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Male 0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – 25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Male 4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 years and more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Male 3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.3 significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCAL ES</th>
<th>GE N DER</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M E A N</th>
<th>S I G LE V E L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION</td>
<td>Male 8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT</td>
<td>Male 8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPERSONALIZATION</td>
<td>Male 7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for Personal Accomplishment, the group of (26 years and more) has the highest mean 3.54 while the group of (0-5 years) has the lowest mean 2.73.

With respect to Depersonalization, the group of (16-25 years) has the highest mean 1.79, while the group of (11-15 years) has the lowest mean 1.21.

Despite the fact that the participants concerning Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization showed statistically no significant difference as the significance level (2 tailed). Significance is 0.292 > 0.05 for EE and 0.344 > 0.05 for DP. In contrast, Personal Accomplishment demonstrated extremely feeble significant which is 0.002 < 0.05.

In short, there is no significant difference between teachers’ seniority in profession and their burnout levels concerning Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization, conversely there is a very weak significant difference between teachers’ profession in seniority relating to Personal Accomplishment.

Table 4.5: Significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCAL ES</th>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SIG LE VE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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As it shown in the table 4.5 for Emotional Exhaustion, divorced group mean which consists of one participant is 2.88, which is the highest among other groups. While single group scored the lowest mean 1.37.

With regard to Personal Accomplishment, the single group has the highest mean 2.99 among all the groups, while divorced group has the lowest mean 2.25.

Concerning Depersonalization, married group mean 1.57 is marginally higher than single group mean 1.51; conversely the divorced group mean 1.33 is lowest among other groups.

Although there are differences in burnout mean among groups with regard to three burnout subscales, but there is not statistically significant difference as the significance level (2 tailed) is 0.089>0.05 for EE, 0.159>0.05 for PA and 0.84>0.05 for DP. Shortly, there is no significant difference between teachers’ marital status and their burnout levels.

Table 4.6 significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their educational background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>EDUCATIONAL BACK GROU</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SIG LE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SIG LE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SIG LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION</td>
<td>SIN GLE</td>
<td>MAR RIE D</td>
<td>DIV ORC ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT</th>
<th>SIN GLE</th>
<th>MAR RIE D</th>
<th>DIV ORC ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPERSONALIZATION</th>
<th>SIN GLE</th>
<th>MAR RIE D</th>
<th>DIV ORC ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 significant difference between the burnout levels of Teachers of English and their educational background
degrees of educational background (diploma, bachelor, master and doctrine), but none of the participants had doctrine degree. So that it was not mentioned in the table 4.6.

With reference to the results, for Emotional Exhaustion participants who had master degree scored highest mean (1.53). As for participants who had diploma degree scored the lowest mean (1.4121) with slight deference to participants who had bachelor degree whom scored (1.4182).

While for Personal Accomplishment, participants who had diploma scored highest mean which is (3.10). Participants who had master degree scored the lowest mean (2.73).

According Depersonalization, highest mean goes to participants who had diploma degree (1.78). On the other hand, participants who had bachelor degree scored lowest mean (1.40).

Although the participants concerning Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment showed statistically no significant difference as the significance level (2 tailed). Significance is 0.84>0.05 for EE and 0.14>0.05 for PA. In contrast, Depersonalization showed a significant deference between burnout levels and educational background which is 0.02< 0.05.

Briefly there is no significant difference between teachers’ seniority in

As seen in the table 4.6, the number of the participants is 81. According to the educational background of the participants, 49 teachers had bachelor degree in English, 18 teachers had master degree in English and 14 teachers had diploma degree in English. Although in questionnaire there were four
profession and their burnout levels concerning Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment, in contrary there is a significant difference between teachers' profession in seniority relating to Depersonalization.

To illustrate the relationship between burnout levels according to three subscales and participants educational background, figure 4.6 is used.

Figure 4.6 shows that there is significant relationship of burnout levels between participants’ educational background and Depersonalization in contrast it shows no significant relationship of burnout between Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment and participants’ educational background.

3.5 Materials and Procedure
In this study, 81 English teachers participated. Firstly they were asked to fill the information form which consists of five questions. The questions are gender, age, years of experience, marital status and educational level. Secondly, the main data collection tool 'Maslach Burnout Inventory-Education Survey' developed by Friedman (1999) was used. It consists of 22 items forming three subscales: Emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment and depersonalization.

The emotional exhaustion subscale (EE) consists of eight items which describe feelings of being emotionally over extended and exhausted by one’s works. The items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are in the emotional exhaustion subscale. The six items on the depersonalization subscale (D) describe unfeeling and impersonal responses to co-workers or recipients of services. The items 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 are in the depersonalization subscale. The personal accomplishment subscale (PA) consists of eight items, describing feelings of competence and
success about one’s achievements. The items 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 are in the personal accomplishment subscale.

3.6 Data Collection
In the study two types of questionnaires were distributed to collect data from participants. The first one was demographic form and the second one was Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). The research was done in schools affiliated to Ministry of Education in district of Erbil. The researcher visited each school personally; ‘Personal Form’ and ‘Maslach Burnout Inventory’ were handled to English teachers. Before administration of the questionnaires, the participants were informed about the aim and the extent of the study with a specific end goal to get sincere replies. The data were collected from November to December 2014.

3.7 Data Analysis
The data were analysed by utilizing SPSS 11.5 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). The descriptive data analysis was led by ascertaining frequencies, arithmetical averages and standard deviations for deciding burnout levels and background of the respondents.

3.8 Statistical Means
The following statistical means are used:

- **SPSS program**: The answers of the questionnaires are collected, and statistically computed and analysed using the computer program: SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Version 21).

- **Pearson-correlation coefficients (r)**: The range of Pearson correlation is somewhere between 0.00 and +1.00 or -1.00. The closer the coefficient is to +1.00 or -1.00, the stronger the relationship. If the sign is positive, the relationship is positive. If the sign is negative, the relationship is negative. Coefficients that are at or near .00 indicate that no relationship exists between the variables involved.

- **One-Sample t-test**.

- **P-Value (Probability value)**: the results of P-Value are compared with alpha i.e. significant level which is (0.05, 0.01, and 0.001) as shown below:
  1. P-Value ≤ 0.001 very highly-significant (VHS)
  2. P-Value < 0.01 Highly-significant (HS)
  3. P-Value ≤ 0.05 Significant (S)
  4. P-Value > 0.05 Non-significant (NS).

4. Conclusion
This study has investigated the burnout levels of 81 Kurdish EFL instructors (58 male and 23 female). With respect to age, 46 of participants are within (23 – 30) years group, while 23 participants are within (31 – 37) years group, moreover participants within (38 – 43) years group are three, there are nine participants within (43 or over) years group. On the other hand, for marital status there are 31 single participants and 49 married participants while there is one divorced participant. For seniority in profession, 46 participants are within group of (0 – 5) years, 18 participants have between (6 – 10) years of experience, 10 participants are within group of (11 – 15) years, four participants have experience of (16 – 25) years, just three participants are within group of (25 and over) years. And for educational background, 14 participants have Diploma degree, 49 carry Bachelor degree and 18 have Master degree, in contrast none of them has Doctrine degree working at governmental schools in district of Erbil. This study also attempted to indicate whether there was a meaningful relationship between teachers’ burnout levels and their age, gender, marital status, seniority in profession, educational background.

In order to conduct the research, the participants of the study were selected among only English teachers working at governmental schools in district of Erbil. The setting of the study was nearly almost all governmental schools affiliated to the Ministry of Education of Kurdistan in
accomplishment subscale, the subjects showed a slight significant difference of the levels of burnout. Likewise, for educational background variable, the statistical outcomes revealed that there was no significant difference of burnout levels regarding emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment subscales, while, there was a significant difference concerning depersonalization subscale.
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