Przegląd Badań Edukacyjnych
Educational Studies Review
ISSN 1895-4308
nr 57 (2/2025), s. 23–44

ORIGINAL RESEARCH PROJECTS

ORYGINALNE ARTYKUŁY BADAWCZE

Maja Gajda
University of Warsaw, Poland
e-mail: mj.gajda2@uw.edu.pl
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8118-6251

Anna Zielińska
University of Warsaw, Poland
e-mail: azielinska@uw.edu.pl
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7686-2673

Predicting Teacher Burnout in Public Primary Schools: The Roles of Self-Efficacy, Emotion Regulation, Mindfulness, and School-Related Factors

http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/PBE.2025.027

Abstract
Burnout is increasingly recognized as a major occupational health concern. Teachers are particularly vulnerable due to the emotional demands of their work, high expectations, and limited institutional support. This study examined individual (self-efficacy, mindfulness, and emotion regulation) and school-related factors (satisfaction with the school environment and availability of educational resources) as predictors of two dimensions of burnout: exhaustion and disengagement. Additionally, burnout was assessed using Polish norms for the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory. Participants were 240 public elementary school teachers with over ten years of experience who completed online questionnaires. Multivariate regression analysis was used. Teachers who felt more supported and satisfied with their school environment reported lower levels of exhaustion and disengagement. Better emotion regulation and mindfulness were also associated with reduced exhaustion, while disengagement was primarily linked

to emotion regulation. Self-efficacy and satisfaction with educational resources were not significant predictors. Half of the teachers scored above average on exhaustion and one-third on disengagement. These findings indicate that both personal and organizational factors play a key role in teacher well-being. Strengthening emotion regulation and mindfulness, along with fostering supportive school environments, may help reduce burnout. Limitations and implications for practice are discussed.

Keywords: teacher burnout, school-related factors, self-efficacy, emotion regulation, mindfulness.

Introduction

Burnout is a complex phenomenon that has intricate links with the workplace environment, work-life balance, personality characteristics, and individual coping skills (Boamah et al., 2022). Empirical data shows that the primary cause of the onset of burnout is experiencing intense or prolonged stress at work (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Stressful situations can stem from a toxic work environment, excessive workload, and long working hours (Demerouti et al., 2001).

Burnout can have far-reaching consequences for mental health, job satisfaction, and professional performance. Beyond affecting teachers' well-being, it also disrupts classroom dynamics, weakens teacher-student relationships, and may impair students' academic success (Madigan & Kim, 2021). Given these serious implications, understanding teacher burnout in specific educational contexts is crucial.

Studying teacher burnout in Poland is critical due to concerning data on teachers' well-being. According to the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS, 2021), Poland ranked last among 53 countries in teachers' job satisfaction, with only 27% of students taught by highly satisfied teachers, compared to the 61% international average. Since burnout can significantly affect teacher-student relationships and educational outcomes, further research into this issue remains necessary despite existing studies.

Factors affecting burnout: individual and school-related factors

Burnout in teachers can result from insufficient support from principals and coworkers, as well as a lack of recognition (Aronsson et al., 2017). Individual traits, beliefs, and skills can also contribute to burnout. For instance, neuroticism, low self-efficacy, and poor emotion regulation can predispose some individuals to burnout (Brown et al., 2019). In contrast, positive coping strategies, strong self-efficacy beliefs, and effective emotion regulation skills are negatively associated with burnout (Wu et al., 2022; Li, 2023). Similarly, strong social networks, positive workplace interactions, and a favourable work climate are considered valuable resources and protective factors (Aronsson et al., 2017; Jimenez & Dunkl, 2017).

Aim of the study

The study examines predictors of teacher burnout by exploring the relationship between emotion regulation, self-efficacy, mindfulness, and school environment satisfaction. It also evaluates participants' burnout levels using norms from the Polish version of the OLBI questionnaire (Baka & Basińska, 2016). The three categories of below-average, average, and above-average levels of burnout are established for Polish non-clinical samples.

Hypothesis 1 & 2: Satisfaction with the school environment and school resources negatively predicts burnout.

Studies show that teachers' professional satisfaction is a robust predictor of turnover, attrition, and burnout (Ogresta, et al., 2008). Factors influencing job satisfaction include the quality of workplace relationships, communication, and interactions with school staff, students, and parents (Maxwell et al., 2017). Tangible aspects such as salary, school conditions, and access to educational resources also play an important role (Gembalska-Kwiecień & Żurakowski, 2016; Spiegelman, 2018). Insufficient resources and school equipment can be significant stressors (von Haaren-Mack et al., 2020), as their lack may undermine teachers' sense of purpose, leading to frustration and marginalization (Weißenfels et al., 2022).

Hypothesis 3: Self-efficacy negatively predicts burnout.

Self-efficacy is the belief in one's ability to successfully fulfill tasks and achieve goals. High self-efficacy is a valuable resource for teachers, enabling them to plan and organize the learning process effectively, which is essential for achieving educational goals (Çelik & Kahraman, 2018). The research shows that self-efficacy correlates positively with teachers' work commitment and is associated with better coping in stressful situations at school (Betoret, 2006).

Hypothesis 4: Emotional self-regulation negatively predicts burnout.

Self-regulation is the ability to alter one's automatic responses and inner states to pursue long-term goals (Gajda et al., 2022). Self-regulation helps teachers cope with stressful situations and control emotions (De-la-Fuente et al., 2015). High emotion regulation skills are considered a protective factor against burnout (Atmaca et al., 2020). Teachers with high levels of emotional regulation are less likely to be adversely affected by challenging work conditions and inappropriate student behaviour, which reduces the risk of experiencing burnout (Mulyani et al., 2021).

Hypothesis 5: A high level of mindfulness predicts a low burnout level.

Mindfulness involves being fully present and aware of one's thoughts, feelings, and surroundings without judgment (Keng et al., 2011). It is considered a valuable workplace skill and a protective factor against burnout (Abenavoli et al., 2013; Hilton et al., 2019). In education, mindfulness helps teachers stay present, adopt an open attitude, and build supportive relationships with students through acceptance and compassion (Moyano et al., 2023). Also, mindfulness helps teachers become more self-aware, engaged in their teaching, and effective in classroom management (de Carvalho et al., 2021).

Materials and methods

Data collection

The study used a quantitative method with data collected via the online platform Survs through convenience sampling. An invitation was sent to headteachers of public elementary schools in Warsaw by the Office of Education, Poland, who then forwarded it to their staff. Data were collected from June 9 to June 29, 2022, after obtaining informed consent from participants.

A total of 290 respondents completed the survey, with a 58% completion rate, considered satisfactory for online self-reports (Fincham, 2008). Forty participants were excluded for not meeting inclusion criteria, and ten more for failing to meet the six-minute minimum completion time, resulting in a final sample of 240 observations.

Inclusion criteria

The study focuses on burnout among public primary school teachers with moderate to extensive teaching experience, specifically those with more than 10 years in the profession. Teachers with less than 10 years of experience report higher job satisfaction but also greater emotional burnout compared to their more experienced peers (Tūtlys et al., 2021). Another inclusion criterion was current employment in a public elementary school.

Participants

The sample consisted of 240 primary school teachers aged 30 to 67 ($M = 47.6$; $SD = 8.1$). The majority of participants were women (90%). The number of years of professional experience in the educational sector ranged from 10 to 43 years ($M = 21.8$; $SD = 8.8$) (Table 1).

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the study sample

Variable	Group	n	Percentage (%)
Professional role	Elementary education teacher (grades I-III)	63	26.3%
	Subject teacher (grades IV-VIII)	135	56.3%
	School headteacher	17	7.1%
	Class teachers, daycare room teachers, support teachers, and therapy teachers	25	10.3%

Source: Own elaboration.

One in four respondents (26.3%) worked in grades 1–3 of elementary education, while more than half (56.3%) taught older students in grades 4–8. Approximately 17% of participants held other roles within the school, such as headteacher, class teacher, daycare room teacher, or support teacher.

Instruments

School Environment Satisfaction (SES), adapted from Liu and Meyer (2005). measures satisfaction with the school environment through seven items assessing cooperation, management, professional development, and support. Respondents rated items on a 5-point scale from 1 (very bad) to 5 (very good), with higher scores reflecting a more positive perception. The tool showed satisfactory reliability ($\alpha = 0.82$).

Educational Resources Satisfaction (ERS) – tool for measuring satisfaction with school equipment consisted of three items rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (very bad) to 5 (very good). Respondents evaluated the availability and quality of multimedia equipment and educational aids, such as multimedia boards, a well-equipped computer lab, printers, Internet access, and similar resources. Cronbach's alpha reliability test showed acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.77$).

The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI), developed by Evangelia Demerouti et al. (2001) and adapted to Polish by Baka and Basińska (2016), measures occupational burnout across various professions. It includes 16 items across two factors: exhaustion and disengagement from work. The

emotional exhaustion subscale assesses difficulties in resting, managing workload, and maintaining energy, while disengagement measures negative attitudes and beliefs toward work, viewing tasks as routine obligations. Items 2, 4, 8, and 12 (exhaustion) and 3, 6, 9, and 11 (disengagement) are reverse-coded. Respondents rate items on a 4-point scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). In this study, the tool demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.90$).

Self-Regulation Scale (SRS) – a tool originally developed by Novak and Clayton (2001), and adapted to Polish by Gajda et al. (2022). The study employed a shortened version of the emotional dimension, consisting of four items. Respondents rate how true each statement is for them on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (never true) to 4 (always true). The items for the emotional dimensions are scored inversely so that higher scores represent better emotional regulation skills. Cronbach's alpha in this study was 0.84.

General Self-efficacy Scale (GSES) – a 10-item unidimensional tool developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer, adapted into Polish by Juczyński (2000). The scale measures an individual's belief in their ability to cope with difficult situations and overcome obstacles. Respondents rate how true each statement is for them on a 4-point scale from 1 (no) to 4 (yes). In this study, the tool demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.90$).

Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ) – a 39-item scale developed by Baer et al. (2006) and adapted to Polish by Radoń (2014). The questionnaire measures mindfulness across five factors: observing, describing, acting with awareness, non-judging of inner experience, and non-reactivity to inner experience. Respondents rate each statement on a 5-point scale from 1 (never or very rarely true) to 5 (very often or always true). In this study, the tool demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.90$).

Statistical analysis:

All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 28.0. with a 95% confidence interval. A frequency analysis of selected variables was performed, and mean and standard deviation were calculated. In addition, correlations between variables were calculated and an analysis of the normal distribution of the variables was performed. Multivariate regression analysis was also

performed to determine which factors significantly determine the level of professional burnout in the studied sample.

Preliminary analysis

Descriptives

All variables were analyzed in terms of descriptive statistics, such as mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis. In addition, Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was performed to verify whether the variables were normally distributed.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and normality test

Variable	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Z
OLBI_EH	22.2	4.44	−0.18	−0.02	0.06**
OBLI_DIS	20.3	3.9	−0.14	−0.19	0.07**
SR_EMO	11.9	2.3	−0.5	0.11	0.11***
GSES	30.7	4.25	0.39	−0.01	0.19***
FFMQ	135	19.4	0.13	−0.33	0.05
SES	26.1	4.84	−0.31	−0.33	0.08***
ERS	11	3.1	−0.12	−0.78	0.09***

Note: OLBI_EX – Exhaustion; OLBI_DIS – Disengagement from work; SR_EMO – Emotional self-regulation; GSES – General self-efficacy; FFMQ – Mindfulness; SES – School environment; ERS – Educational resources.

Annotation. Z – Kolmogorov-Smirnov test's result.

** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Source: Own elaboration.

Only mindfulness met normality assumptions ($p > 0.05$), while the other variables did not ($p < 0.05$). However, skewness and kurtosis values were within ±1, indicating no significant deviation from normality.

The next step of data verification was to test whether the data met the assumptions for the regression analysis. The values of the VIF coefficient and

tolerance for identifying multicollinearity were obtained. Also, the Durbin-Watson test for autocorrelation in the residuals was performed.

Table 3. Multicollinearity statistics of the regression model

	Collinearity indices	
Variable	**Variance inflation factor (VIF)**	**Variance tolerance**
SR_EMO	1.69	0.59
GSES	1.31	0.76
FFMQ	1.85	0.54
SES	1.65	0.61
ERS	1.40	0.71

Note: SR_EMO – Emotional self-regulation; GSES – General self-efficacy; FFMQ – Mindfulness; SES– School environment; ERS – Educational resources.

Source: Own elaboration.

VIF values below 2 and tolerance above 0.5 indicate no multicollinearity among the independent variables. A Durbin-Watson test confirmed the independence of residuals, yielding acceptable values of 1.96 for emotional exhaustion and 1.9 for disengagement from work (within the 1.5 to 2.5 range). Homoscedasticity was verified using a scatterplot of residuals against the dependent variables, showing an even distribution of errors. As regression assumptions were met, multiple linear regression was employed.

Main results

Burnout levels in the studied sample

The data were analyzed to assess the level of burnout among the respondents. The results were calculated using raw scores for the dimensions of burnout, as well as the total score from the OLBI questionnaire. Descriptive statistics for overall burnout, exhaustion, and disengagement are presented in the table below.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for burnout scores

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	Z
OLBI_EX	22.2	4.4	8	32	−0.18	−0.02	0.06**
OBLI_DIS	20.3	3.9	10	31	−0.14	−0.19	0.07**
OLBI_SUM	42.5	7.8	20	63	0.08	−0.14	0.06

Note: OLBI_EX – Exhaustion; OLBI_DIS – Disengagement from work; OLBI_SUM – Overall burnout score.

Annotation. Z – Kolmogorov-Smirnov test's result.

** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Source: Own elaboration.

The mean level of burnout was 42.5 (*SD* = 7.8) on a scale from 16 to 64, where a higher score indicates a higher level of burnout. For the subscales, possible scores ranged from 8 to 32 and teachers scored an average of 22.2 (*SD* = 4.4) on exhaustion and 20.3 (*SD* = 3.9) on disengagement from work.

To further interpret the results, we compared the data with the norms established by Baka and Basińska for the OLBI questionnaire, based on non-clinical samples working in social professions (Baka & Basińska, 2016). The results are summarized in the table below.

Table 5. Distribution of burnout level in the sample

Stanine	Norms for exhaustion	Percentage of the studied sample	Norms for disengagement from work	Percentage of the studied sample
1	1.00 – 1.34	1.3%	1.00 – 1.33	0.4%
2	1.35 – 1.62	0.4%	1.34 – 1.61	1.2%
3	1.63 – 1.90	4%	1.62 – 1.88	8.8%
1 – 3	1.00 – 1.90	5.7%	1.00 – 1.88	10.4%
4	1.91 – 2.17	8%	1.89 – 2.15	17%
5	2.18 – 2.46	15.4%	2.16 – 2.44	15%
6	2.47 – 2.74	15%	2.45 – 2.71	20%

Tabela 5. (continued)

Stanine	Norms for exhaustion	Percentage of the studied sample	Norms for disengagement from work	Percentage of the studied sample
4 – 6	**1.91 – 2.74**	**38.4%**	**1.89 – 2.71**	**52%**
7	2.75 – 3.01	25.4%	2.72 – 2.98	16.3%
8	3.02 – 3.29	12.9%	2.99 – 3.26	15.1%
9	3.30 – 4.00	17.6%	3.27 – 4.00	6.2%
7 – 9	**2.75 – 4.00**	**55.9%**	**2.72 – 4.00**	**37.6%**

Note: Norms are based on the arithmetic mean.

Source: Adapted from Baka & Basińska, 2016.

The results obtained indicate that the respondents had a relatively high level of burnout. More than half of the respondents (55.9%) scored above average on exhaustion (above 2.75 mean points). Also, one in three respondents (37.6%) scored above average on disengagement (mean score above 2.72). Average and below-average levels of exhaustion are characteristic of 38.4% and 5.7% of respondents, respectively. Similarly, average and below-average levels of disengagement from work are characteristic of 52% and 10.4% of respondents, respectively.

Correlation analysis

The relationships between teachers' burnout and selected variables were studied with Pearson's *r* coefficient. The results of the correlation analysis are shown in the table below.

Table 6. Pearson correlations between study variables and teachers' burnout (n = 240)

	OLBI-DIS	OLBI-EH	EMO	GSES	FFMQ	ERS	SES
OLBI-DIS	1	0.72**	−0.40**	−0.17**	−0.27**	−0.26**	−0.52**
OLBI-EH		1	−0.46**	−0.29**	−0.40**	−0.16*	−0.46**

Tabela 6. (continued)

	OLBI-DIS	OLBI-EH	EMO	GSES	FFMQ	ERS	SES
EMO			1	0.34**	0.58**	0.16*	0.39**
GSES				1	0.44	0.13	0.29**
FFMQ					1	0.05	0.25**
ERS						1	0.53**
SES							1

Note: OLBI_DIS – Disengagement from work; OLBI_EX – Exhaustion dimension of burnout; EMO – Emotional self-regulation; GSES – General self-efficacy; FFMQ – Mindfulness; SES – School environment; ERS – Educational resources.

** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Source: Own elaboration.

Correlation analysis revealed a moderate negative correlation between exhaustion and emotional regulation ($r = -0.46$; $p < 0.001$), school environment satisfaction ($r = -0.46$; $p < 0.001$), and mindfulness ($r = -0.40$; $p < 0.001$). Weak negative correlations were found with self-efficacy ($r = -0.29$; $p < 0.001$) and educational resource availability ($r = -0.16$; $p < 0.05$).

Disengagement from work showed a strong negative correlation with school environment satisfaction ($r = -0.52$; $p < 0.001$) and a moderate negative correlation with emotion regulation ($r = -0.40$; $p < 0.001$). Weak but significant negative relationships were also found with mindfulness ($r = -0.27$; $p < 0.05$), educational resources ($r = -0.26$; $p < 0.001$), and self-efficacy ($r = -0.17$; $p < 0.001$).

Multiple regression analysis

A linear multiple regression analysis using the enter method was conducted twice, with exhaustion and disengagement from work as dependent variables. Both models included the same independent variables: emotional regulation, self-efficacy, mindfulness, satisfaction with the school environment, and educational resources. The results are presented separately below.

Exhaustion

Five independent variables were simultaneously entered into the model to determine which independent variables were statistically significant predictors of exhaustion. Then, variables statistically insignificant were deleted, and the regression analysis was performed again. The results are shown in the table below.

Table 7. Regression analysis results for the model with the dependent variable emotional exhaustion

Variable	*SE ß*	*ß*	*F*	R^2
EMO	0.13	−0.43**	19.5***	0.32
GSES	0.06	−0.05		
FFMQ	0.02	−0.04*		
SES	0.06	−0.32***		
ERS	0.09	0.11		
After removing statistically insignificant variables				
EMO	0.13	−0.23***	38.2***	0.32
FFMQ	0.02	−0.19**		
SES	0.05	−0.32***		

Note: EMO – Emotional self-regulation; GSES – General self-efficacy; FFMQ – Mindfulness; SES – School environment; ERS – Educational resources.

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Source: Own elaboration.

The overall regression was statistically significant ($F(3, 236) = 38.2$; $p < 0.001$.) and it explained 32% of the variance in the dependent variable ($R2 = 0.32$). It was found that satisfaction with the school environment ($ß = -0.32$; $p < 0.001$), emotional self-regulation ($ß = -0.23$; $p < 0.001$), and mindfulness ($ß = -0.19$; $p < 0.05$) predicted emotional exhaustion. Self-efficacy and satisfaction with educational resources were not significant predictors ($p > 0.05$).

Disengagement

As in the previous analysis, five independent variables were entered into the model. Then, variables that proved to be statistically insignificant were deleted, and the regression analysis was performed again. The results are shown in the table below.

Table 8. Regression analysis results for the model with the dependent variable disengagement from work

Variable	SE ß	ß	F	R^2
EMO	0.12	−0.38**	19.18***	0.31
GSES	0.06	0.04		
FFMQ	0.02	−0.01		
SES	0.06	−0.37***		
ERS	0.08	0.01		
After removing statistically insignificant variables				
EMO	0.1	−0.41***	55.71***	0.31
SES	0.05	−0.35***		

Note: EMO – Emotional self-regulation; GSES – General self-efficacy; FFMQ – Mindfulness; SF – School environment-related factors; ER – Educational resources.

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Source: Own elaboration.

The overall regression was statistically significant ($F(2, 237) = 55.7$; $p < 0.001$) and it explained 31% of the variance in the dependent variable ($R2 = 0.31$). It was found that emotional self-regulation ($ß = -0.41$; $p < 0.001$) and satisfaction with the school environment ($ß = -0.35$; $p < 0.001$) were the only variables that predicted disengagement from work. The other predictors, i.e., general self-efficacy, satisfaction with educational resources, and mindfulness did not predict disengagement from work ($p > 0.05$).

Discussion

Our findings align with previous research showing that burnout is associated with organizational and individual factors (Lubrańska, 2011; Abenavoli et al., 2013; Anjum et al., 2018). However, only school environment satisfaction and emotional regulation predicted both emotional exhaustion and disengagement. Self-efficacy and resource availability did not predict any burnout dimension, and mindfulness yielded mixed results.

Previous studies suggest that practicing mindfulness can be beneficial in preventing burnout because it reduces perceived stress and anxiety (Hsieh et al., 2021). In our study, mindfulness predicted the level of emotional exhaustion but not disengagement from work. However, a more detailed analysis of the relationships between disengagement and the five dimensions of mindfulness – observation, description, aware actions, non-judgmental inner experience, and non-reactivity – could provide deeper insight into the nature of these associations. For example, in a study by Taylor and Millear (2016), only certain dimensions of mindfulness were significant predictors of burnout.

Our study did not support the hypothesis that self-efficacy is a significant predictor of burnout. This finding may seem surprising because previous research suggests that self-efficacy is closely related to burnout (Buonomo et al., 2017; Fida et al., 2018). However, some studies did not yield such conclusive results. For example, a longitudinal study by Dicke et al. (2015) showed that elevated initial levels of emotional exhaustion led to significant changes in teacher self-efficacy over time, however, changes in teacher self-efficacy did not similarly predict shifts in emotional exhaustion. Additionally, our results may suggest that emotional regulation and mindfulness may have overshadowed the role of self-efficacy in predicting burnout.

The results indicate that both organizational and individual factors are significant determinants of burnout. Emotion regulation and mindfulness may help teachers manage work-related stress and adversity. Nonetheless, the quality of support within the school environment remains a key predictor (Sterling et al., 2022). Our study shows that factors such as insufficient support and poor cooperation significantly predict burnout. Similarly, other studies sug-

gest that an unsupportive school environment can increase job stress and lead to health issues like depression and anxiety (Anjum et al., 2018).

Burnout reduces life satisfaction, prosocial behaviour, and personal achievement (Peláez-Fernández et al., 2022) and undermines teachers' ability to deliver effective instruction, provide individualized support, and manage classrooms (Madigan & Kim, 2021). In our study, over half the teachers showed above-average emotional exhaustion, suggesting emotional fatigue, low energy, and difficulty handling demands, while one in three exhibited above-average disengagement, indicating a negative attitude toward their work and interacting with students automatically and out of necessity.

Limitations

The main limitations of the present study are the cross-sectional design, which does not allow for causal conclusions, and the use of convenience sampling, which may have led to a higher participation of teachers interested in the topic of burnout or experiencing burnout symptoms. Another limitation is the homogeneity of the sample. All participants worked in Warsaw, the capital city of Poland. Next studies should include teachers from more diverse backgrounds, which would make it possible to compare burnout levels between subgroups.

In this study, we focused on teachers with over 10 years of experience to examine burnout shaped by long-term exposure to job stressors. Until 2022, the Polish teaching career framework required 10 years to reach the highest level of advancement, marking a key milestone that often closed further promotion opportunities and could diminish professional engagement. However, psychological and pedagogical models of professional development (Poraj, 2009) distinguish 1–5 years as the entry stage and 6–20 years as a phase of professional stabilization. Future research would be informed by differentiating career stages, as burnout profiles may vary based on teachers' transitional status between early and expert phases.

Also, although this study did not aim to compare teachers across different educational stages, previous research suggests that early education teachers (grades 1–3) tend to report lower burnout than teachers working with older students (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). In the present sample, early education

teachers represented nearly one-fourth of participants, which may have influenced patterns of burnout. Future studies may benefit from examining early education teachers as a distinct group.

Conclusion

Today's education systems increasingly face teacher shortages due to high turnover and the declining attractiveness of the profession. As a result, promoting teacher well-being and preventing professional burnout has become a critical priority for educational policy. Our findings indicate that teacher burnout is a relatively common phenomenon. Given its many negative consequences, such as harming teachers' mental health, reducing job satisfaction, lowering instructional quality, and negatively affecting teacher-student relationships and students' academic success, there is an urgent need to support teachers' well-being. Understanding the relationship between teacher burnout and individual and school-related factors is essential for fostering a supportive work environment and providing targeted assistance to teachers at risk of burnout. The collected data contributes to existing research on professional burnout in teachers and can serve as a basis for developing recommendations for headteachers, policymakers, and teachers.

Recommendations for practice:

1. Fostering a supportive school environment: Satisfaction with the organizational climate, strong staff cooperation, and collegial support significantly reduce both emotional exhaustion and disengagement.
2. Enhancing teachers' emotion regulation skills: Emotional regulation was the strongest individual predictor of burnout. Integrating strategies that help teachers manage stress and emotional demands should be a key element of professional development.
3. Promoting mindfulness practices: Mindfulness can help reduce emotional exhaustion. Interventions should emphasize specific strategies, for example *non-reactivity* (the ability to observe thoughts and feelings without automatically reacting to them), *acting with awareness* (engag-

ing in activities with full attention rather than operating on "autopilot"), or *non-judging of inner experience* (accepting rather than criticising of internal states).

4. Addressing burnout proactively: With over half of teachers experiencing high emotional exhaustion, burnout prevention should be a systemic priority. Policies should combine individual-level interventions with structural changes that reduce overload and increase support.

References

Abenavoli, R. M., Jennings, P. A., Greenberg, M. T., Harris, A. R., & Katz, D. A. (2013). The Protective Effects of Mindfulness Against Burnout Among Educators. *Psychology of Education Review*, *37*(2), 57–69, doi: 10.53841/bpsper.2013.37.2.57.

Anjum, A., & Ming, X. (2018). Combating Toxic Workplace Environment: An Empirical Study in the Context of Pakistan. *Journal of Modelling in Management*, *13*(3), 675–697, doi: 10.1108/JM2-02-2017-0023.

Aronsson, G., Theorell, T., Grape, T., Hammarström, A., Hogstedt, C., Marteinsdottir, I., Skoog, I., Träskman-Bendz, L., & Hall, C. (2017). A Systematic Review Including Meta-Analysis of Work Environment and Burnout Symptoms. *BMC Public Health*, *17*(1), 1–13, doi: 10.1186/s12889-017-4153-7.

Atmaca, Ç., Rızaoğlu, F., Türkdoğan, T., & Yaylı, D. (2020). An Emotion-Focused Approach in Predicting Teacher Burnout and Job Satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *90*, 103025, doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2020.103025.

Baer, R.A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using Self-Report Assessment Methods to Explore Facets of Mindfulness. *Assessment*, *13*(1), 27–45, doi: 10.1177/1073191105283504.

Baka, L., & Basinska, B. A. (2016). Psychometryczne właściwości polskiej wersji oldenburskiego kwestionariusza wypalenia zawodowego (OLBI) [Psychometric Properties of the Polish Version of the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI)]. *Medycyna Pracy*, *67*(1), 29–42, doi: 10.13075/mp.5893.00353.

Betoret, F. D. (2006). Stressors, Self-Efficacy, Coping Resources, and Burnout Among Secondary School Teachers in Spain. *Educational Psychology*, *26*(4), 519–539, do i: 10.1080/01443410500342492.

Boamah, S. A., Hamadi, H. Y., Havaei, F., Smith, H., & Webb, F. (2022). Striking a Balance Between Work and Play: The Effects of Work-Life Interference and Burnout on Faculty Turnover Intentions and Career Satisfaction. *International*

Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, *19*(2), 809, doi: 10.3390/ijerph19020809.

Brown, P. A., Slater, M., & Lofters, A. (2019). Personality and Burnout Among Primary Care Physicians: An International Study. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, *12*, 169–177, doi: 10.2147/PRBM.S195633.

Buonomo, I., Fatigante, M., & Fiorilli, C. (2017). Teachers' Burnout Profile-Risk and Protective Factors. *The Open Psychology Journal*, *10*, 190–201, doi: 10.2174/1874350101710010190.

Çelik, O.T., & Kahraman, Ü. (2018). The Relationship Among Teachers' General Self-Efficacy Perceptions, Job Burnout and Life Satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(12), 2721–2729, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2018.061204.

De Carvalho, J. S., Oliveira, S., Roberto, M. S., Gonçalves, C., Bárbara, J. M., de Castro, A. F., Pereira, R., Franco, M., Cadima, J., Leal, T., Lemos, M. S., & Marques-Pinto, A. (2021). Effects of a Mindfulness-Based Intervention for Teachers: A Study on Teacher and Student Outcomes. *Mindfulness*, *12*(7), 1719–1732, doi: 10.1007/s12671-021-01635-3.

De la Fuente, J., Zapata, L., Martínez-Vicente, J. M., Sander, P., & Cardelle-Elawar, M. (2014). The Role of Personal Self-Regulation and Regulatory Teaching To Predict Motivational-Affective Variables, Achievement, and Satisfaction: A Structural Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, 399, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00399.

Demerouti, E., Nachreiner, F., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands-Resources Model of Burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 499–512, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499.

Dicke, T., Parker, P. D., Holzberger, D., Kunina-Habenicht, O., Kunter, M., & Leutner, D. (2015). Beginning Teachers' Efficacy and Emotional Exhaustion: Latent Changes, Reciprocity, and the Influence of Professional Knowledge. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *41*, 62–72, doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.11.003.

Fida, R., Laschinger, H. K. S., & Leiter, M. P. (2018). The Protective Role of Self-Efficacy Against Workplace Incivility and Burnout in Nursing: A Time-Lagged Study. *Health Care Management Review*, *43*(1), 21–29, doi: 10.1097/HMR.0000000000000126.

Fincham, J. E. (2008). Response Rates and Responsiveness for Surveys, Standards, and the *Journal*. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *72*(2), doi: 10.5688/aj720243.

Gajda, M., Małkowska-Szkutnik, A., & Rodzeń, W. (2022). Self-Regulation in Adolescents: Polish Adaptation and Validation of the Self-Regulation Scale. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(12), 7432, doi: 10.3390/ijerph19127432.

Gembalska-Kwiecień, A., & Żurakowski, Z. (2016). Przyczyny i skutki wypalenia zawodowego [Causes and Effects of Professional Burnout]. *Zeszyty Naukowe. Organizacja i Zarządzanie/Politechnika Śląska*, *92*, 73–83.

Hilton, L. G., Marshall, N.J., Motala, A., Taylor, S. L., Miake-Lye, I. M., Baxi, S. Shanman, R. M., Solloway, M. R., Beroesand, J. M., & Hempel, S. (2019). Mindfulness Meditation for Workplace Wellness: An Evidence Map. *Work*, *63*(2), 205–218, doi: 10.3233/WOR-192922.

Hsieh, C.-C., Ho, S. S.-H., Li, H.-C., & Liang, J.-K. (2021). Mindfulness as a Moderator Against Emotional Exhaustion Due to Online Teaching During the COVID-19 Pandemic: An Investigation Using Job Demands-Resources Model and Conservation of Resource Theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 781804, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.781804.

Jimenez, P., & Dunkl, A. (2017). The Buffering Effect of Workplace Resources on the Relationship Between the Areas of Worklife and Burnout. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 12, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00012.

Juczyński, Z. (2000). Poczucie własnej skuteczności: teoria i pomiar [Self-Efficacy: Theory and Measurement]. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Psychologica*, *4*, 11–23.

Keng, S. L., Smoski, M. J., & Robins, C. J. (2011). Effects of Mindfulness on Psychological Health: A Review of Empirical Studies. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *31*(6), 1041–1056, doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2011.04.006.

Li, S. (2023). The Effect of Teacher Self-Efficacy, Teacher Resilience, and Emotion Regulation on Teacher Burnout: A Mediation Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14,* 1185079, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1185079.

Liu, X. S., & Meyer, J. P. (2005). Teachers' Perceptions of Their Jobs: A Multilevel Analysis of the Teacher Follow-Up Survey for 1994–95. *Teachers College Record*, *107*(5), 985–1003, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9620.2005.00501.x.

Lubrańska, A. (2011). Klimat organizacyjny a doświadczenie wypalenia zawodowego. [Organizational Climate and Burnout Syndrome]. *Medycyna Pracy*, *62*(6), 623.

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, doi: 10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101714.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the Burnout Experience: Recent Research and Its Implications for Psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, *15(2),* 103–111, doi: 10.1002/wps.20311.

Maxwell, S., Reynolds, K. J., Lee, E., Subasic, E., & Bromhead, D. (2017). The Impact of School Climate and School Identification on Academic Achievement: Multi-

level Modelling With Student and Teacher Data. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 2069, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02069.

Moyano, N., Perez-Yus, M. C., Herrera-Mercadal, P., Navarro-Gil, M., Valle, S., & Montero-Marin, J. (2023). Burned or Engaged Teachers? The Role of Mindfulness, Self-Efficacy, Teacher and Students' Relationships, and the Mediating Role of Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Mindfulness. *Current Psychology*, *42*(14), 11719–11732, doi: 10.1007/s12144-021-02433-9.

Mulyani, S., Salameh, A. A., Komariah, A., Timoshin, A., Hashim, N. A. A. N., Fauziah, R. S. P., Mulyaningsih, M., Ahmad, I., & Ul din, S. M. (2021). Emotional Regulation as a Remedy for Teacher Burnout in Special Schools: Evaluating School Climate, Teacher's Work-Life Balance, and Children's Behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 655850, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.655850.

Novak, S. P., & Clayton, R. R. (2001). The Influence of School Environment and Self-Regulation on Transitions Between Stages of Cigarette Smoking: A Multilevel Analysis. *Health Psychology*, 20(3), 196–207, doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.20.3.196.

Ogresta, J., Rusac, S., & Zorec, L. (2008). Relation Between Burnout Syndrome and Job Satisfaction Among Mental Health Workers. *Croatian Medical Journal*, *49*(3), 364–374, doi: 10.3325/cmj.2008.3.364.

Peláez-Fernández, M. A., Mérida-López, S., Rey, L., & Extremera, N. (2022). Burnout, Work Engagement, and Life Satisfaction Among Spanish Teachers: The Unique Contribution of Core Self-Evaluations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *196*, 111727, doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2022.111727.

Poraj, G. (2009). Od pasji do frustracji. Modele psychologicznego funkcjonowania nauczycieli. [From Passion to Frustration. Models of Teachers' Psychological Functioning]. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. Retrieved 14 April 2025 from: https://prolib.ans-ns.edu.pl/492300139407/poraj-grazyna/od-pasji-do-frustracji?bibFilter=49&_lang=en

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Dimensions of Teacher Burnout: Relations with Potential Stressors at School. *Social Psychology of Education*, *20*(4), 775–790, doi: 10.1007/s11218-017-9391-0.

Spiegelman, M. (2018). *Teacher Satisfaction with Salary and Current Job*. Data Point. NCES 2018-116. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved 14 April 2025 from: https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018116/index.asp.

Sterling, R., Rinne, S. T., Reddy, A., Moldestad, M., Kaboli, P., Helfrich, C. D., Henrikson, N. B., Nelson, K. M., Kaminetzky, C., & Wong, E. S. (2022). Identifying and Prioritizing Workplace Climate Predictors of Burnout Among VHA Primary Care Physicians. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *37*(1), 87–94, doi: 10.1007/s11606-021-07006-x.

Taylor, N. Z., & Millear, P. M. R. (2016). The Contribution of Mindfulness to Predicting Burnout in the Workplace. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *89*, 123–128, doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2015.10.005.

Tūtlys, V., Gedvilienė, G., & Didžiulienė, R. (2021). The Influence of Teacher Professional Burnout on Professional Satisfaction in Professional Career Development. *The New Educational Review*, *63*, 226–236, doi: 10.15804/tner.2021.63.1.18.

von Haaren-Mack, B., Schaefer, A., Pels, F., & Kleinert, J. (2020). Stress in Physical Education Teachers: A Systematic Review of Sources, Consequences, and Moderators of Stress. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *91*(2), 279–297, doi: 10.1080/02701367.2019.1662878.

Weißenfels, M., Klopp, E., & Perels, F. (2022). Changes in Teacher Burnout and Self-Efficacy During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Interrelations and E-Learning Variables Related to Change. *Frontiers in Education*, *6*, 736992, doi: 10.3389/feduc.2021.736992.

Wu, H., Wang, Y., & Wang, Y. (2023). What Do We Know About L2 Teachers' Emotion Regulation? A Bibliometric Analysis of the Pertinent Literature. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, *5*(3), 2012, doi: 10.59400/FLS.v5i3.2012.