

Factors Affecting Occupational Burnout Among Basic Course Teachers in Public Schools in Hubei Province: A Study Based On Structural-Equation Approach

DISERTASI



**EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM
GANESHA UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION
2026**



- UU ITE No. 11 Tahun 2008 Pasal 5 Ayat 1 "Informasi Elektronik dan/atau hasil cetaknya merupakan alat bukti hukum yang sah"
- Dokumen ini telah ditandatangani secara elektronik menggunakan sertifikat elektronik yang diterbitkan BSrE - BSSN, validitas dokumen elektronik ini bisa dicek menggunakan aplikasi mobile VeryDS oleh BSrE
- Cetakan dokumen ini merupakan salinan dari file dokumen bertandatangan elektronik yang keabsahannya dapat diakses melalui scan QRCode yang terdapat pada sertifikat ini.



DISERTASI

DIAJUKAN UNTUK MELENGKAPI TUGAS DAN MEMENUHI SYARAT-SYARAT UNTUK MENCAPAI GELAR DOKTOR



Promotor	Prof. Dr. Putu Kerti Nitiasih, M.A. NIP.196206261986032002
Ko Promotor I	Made Hery Santosa, S.Pd, M.Pd., Ph.D. NIP.197910232003121001
Ko Promotor II	Dr. Putu Nanci Riastini, S.Pd., M.Pd. NIP.198604272009122003



- UU ITE No. 11 Tahun 2008 Pasal 5 Ayat 1 "Informasi Elektronik dan/atau hasil cetaknya merupakan alat bukti hukum yang sah"
- Dokumen ini telah ditandatangani secara elektronik menggunakan sertifikat elektronik yang diterbitkan BSrE - BSSN, validitas dokumen elektronik ini bisa dicek menggunakan aplikasi mobile VeryDS oleh BSrE
- Cetakan dokumen ini merupakan salinan dari file dokumen bertandatangan elektronik yang keabsahannya dapat diakses melalui scan QRCode yang terdapat pada sertifikat ini.

Disertasi oleh Liu Jing telah dipertahankan di depan tim penguji dan dinyatakan diterima sebagai salah satu persyaratan untuk memperoleh gelar Doktor di Ilmu Pendidikan (S3), Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha
Pada tanggal 18 Agustus 2026

Dewan Penguji

Ketua	Prof. Dr. I Nyoman Jampel, M.Pd. NIP.195910101986031003
Anggota	Prof. Dr. Putu Kerti Nitiasih, M.A. NIP.196206261986032002
Anggota	Made Hery Santosa, S.Pd, M.Pd., Ph.D. NIP.197910232003121001
Anggota	Dr. Putu Nanci Riasitini, S.Pd., M.Pd. NIP.198604272009122003
Anggota	Prof. Dr. Ni Nyoman Padmadewi, M.A. NIP.196202021988032001
Anggota	Prof. Dr. Ir. Kadek Rihendra Dantes, S.T., M.T. NIP.197912012006041001
Anggota	Dr. Basilius Redan Werang, S.S., S.Sos., JCL. NIP.196606142003121002
Anggota	Dr. Ni Wayan Surya Mahayanti, S.Pd., M.Pd. NIP.198805172012122002

Mengetahui Direktur Program Pascasarjana
Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha,



Prof. Dr. I Nyoman Jampel, M.Pd.
NIP.195910101986031003



- UU ITE No. 11 Tahun 2008 Pasal 5 Ayat 1 "Informasi Elektronik dan/atau hasil cetaknya merupakan alat bukti hukum yang sah"
- Dokumen ini telah ditandatangani secara elektronik menggunakan sertifikat elektronik yang diterbitkan BSrE - BSSN, validitas dokumen elektronik ini bisa dicek menggunakan aplikasi mobile VeryDS oleh BSrE
- Cetakan dokumen ini merupakan salinan dari file dokumen bertandatangan elektronik yang keabsahannya dapat diakses melalui scan QRCode yang terdapat pada sertifikat ini.

DISSERTATION SUMMARY

On this basis, the research, entitled “Factors influencing occupational burnout among public basic course teachers in Hubei Province: structural-equation model”, delves into mechanisms of occupational burnout among public basic course teachers in Hubei Province, China, employ the structural equation analysis method. On the basis of the job demands-resources model (JD-R model), effort-reward imbalance model (ERI model) and social cognitive career theory (SCCT), the research clarifies the relationships among job demands, job resources, occupational stress, physical exhaustion and students’ disruptive behaviours in causing occupational burnout.

As a quantitative research method, the data was collected through questionnaire surveys, which was administered to 500 teachers in 8 universities (including Hubei University, Wuhan Polytechnic University and China Three Gorges University) in Hubei Province. A pretest was conducted on 50 teachers to test and revise the questionnaire, and the reliability of it was high (Cronbach’s α : 0.743 for Positive Coping Styles to 0.952 for Job Demands), the internal structure of it was good (the IOC index of Item: 0.67 ~ 1.0), which means the questions measured the contents adequately. CFA was conducted to verify the measurement model of the questionnaire. The good fit indices were obtained: CMIN/DF=1.500, GFI=0.933, AGFI=0.917, NFI=0.922, CFI=0.972, TLI=0.968, RMSEA=0.032; these fit indices support our seven latent variables: Job Resources (JR), Job Demands (JD), Occupational Stress (OS), Positive Coping Styles (PCS), Physical Exhaustion (PE), Students’ disruptive behaviours (SDB) and Teacher burnout (TB) being measured by their manifest items sufficiently.

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) results provided robust support for all six hypotheses. Job Demands (e.g., intensive teaching preparation workload, administrative burdens) positively predicted burnout ($\beta=0.140^*$, C.R.=2.324), consistent with the JD-R model’s health-impairment process. Notably, Job Resources unexpectedly exhibited a positive association with burnout ($\beta=0.209^{**}$, C.R.=3.194), a phenomenon attributed to "resource overload," wherein misaligned resources (e.g., irrelevant training) function as additional stressors. Occupational Stress strongly inhibited Positive Coping Styles

($\beta=-0.596^{**}$, C.R.=9.358), forming a vicious cycle wherein stress erodes adaptive strategies. Conversely, Positive Coping Styles buffered burnout ($\beta=-0.202^{**}$, C.R.=3.939), underscoring their protective role. Physical Exhaustion emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta=0.271^{**}$, C.R.=3.613), reflecting the cumulative toll of prolonged standing, heavy workloads, and chronic fatigue. Disruptive Students (e.g., classroom indiscipline, low motivation) also significantly exacerbated burnout ($\beta=0.201^{**}$, C.R.=2.753), aligning with evidence that behavioral management depletes emotional resources. The integrated model explained 46.7% of the variance in burnout, highlighting its multifaceted nature.

Our demographic analysis indicated that the sample was mainly female (61%), between 31 and 40 years of age (35.4%), married (77.2%), and experienced (47.4% had over 10 years of teaching). Participants perceived their workloads as heavy (15–20 weekly class hours), with administrative tasks consuming teaching time. Physical exhaustion was common: 48% doubted their ability to work to the end of their careers; many had poorer health than their peers. Confucian cultural expectations for a « devotion » and « sacrifice » increased work burnout by normalising the teacher's notion of personal self-neglect (because teachers were working out themselves).

Practical recommendations align with the findings: organizational interventions include dynamic resource matching (e.g., prioritizing cross-disciplinary teaching materials and on-demand training over bureaucratic mandates) and reducing non-teaching burdens via administrative delegation. Physiological interventions focus on fatigue prevention, such as mandatory rest breaks, ergonomic equipment, and bi-annual health screenings for stress-related indicators (e.g., sleep quality). Cultural-cognitive adjustments involve reframing professional values through narrative therapy (shifting from "self-sacrifice" to "sustainable care") and revising evaluation systems to prioritize teaching effectiveness over workload. Policy suggestions include cross-institutional curriculum standardization to reduce preparation burdens and establishing early warning systems integrating workload, health metrics, and student feedback.

Limitations include geographic bias (focus on urban universities, excluding municipal colleges) and a cross-sectional design, which constrains causal inference regarding burnout's dynamic progression. Future research should expand to regional comparisons (eastern, central, western China), track long-term impacts of post-COVID hybrid teaching, and explore the moderating effects of psychological capital (resilience, self-efficacy) and organizational fairness.

This study contributes to theoretical discourse by validating the JD-R, ERI, and SCCT models in a Chinese context while highlighting cultural nuances. It provides actionable strategies to mitigate burnout, supporting sustainable teacher well-being and educational quality.



STATEMENT SHEET

I hereby solemnly affirm that the dissertation I have submitted as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral Degree at the Postgraduate Program of Ganesha University of Education is the result of my own original research and intellectual effort. Any portions of this dissertation that incorporate the ideas, data, or writings of others have been explicitly acknowledged and referenced in strict accordance with the established conventions, ethical standards, and citation guidelines of scholarly work.

Furthermore, I understand and accept that if it is subsequently determined that any part of this dissertation constitutes plagiarism or is otherwise not my own original work, I am willing to accept the consequences, including the revocation of my academic degree and any other penalties as stipulated by applicable laws and institutional regulations.

Singaraja, July 2025



Liu Jing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DISSERTATION SUMMARY	iii
PROMOTER APPROVAL SHEET	vi
STATEMENT SHEET	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research Background.....	1
1.2 Problem Identification	3
1.3 Research Objectives.....	4
1.4 Research Questions.....	5
1.5 Research Significance.....	5
1.5.1 Theoretical significance.....	6
1.5.2 Practical significance.....	6
1.6 Scope of the Research.....	8
1.7 Research limitation.....	9
1.8 Definition of Terms	10
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	24
2.1 Theoretical Review.....	24
2.1.1 Job Burnout.....	24
2.1.2 Teaching Profession	25
2.1.3 Burnout Dased on The Teaching Profession	27
2.1.4 Job Resources	29
2.1.5 Job Demands.....	33
2.1.6 Teachers' Stress.....	38
2.1.7 Coping Style	40
2.1.8 Physical Exhaustion.....	45

2.1.9 Destructive Student.....	47
2.2 Empirical Review	52
2.3 Conceptual Framework.....	67
2.4 Research Hypothesis and Relationship Between Variables	75
2.4.1 Research Hypothesis.....	75
2.4.2 Job demands and teacher burnout.....	76
2.4.3 Job resources and teacher burnout.....	77
2.4.4 Occupational stress and teacher burnout	78
2.4.5 Positive coping style and physical exhaustion.	79
2.4.6 Physical exhaustion and teacher burnout.....	80
2.4.7 Disruptive student and teacher burnout	81
2.5 Operationalization of Variables.....	82
Table 2.1 Operationalization of Variables.....	82
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD	87
3.1 Research Design	87
3.2 Population and Sample	90
3.2.1 Sampling Unit.....	92
3.2.2 Sample Size	92
3.2.3 Sampling Procedure.....	94
3.3 Research Instruments/ Questionnaires.....	104
3.4 Instrument Validity and Internal Consistency Reliability	110
3.4.1 Content Validity	112
3.4.2 Construct Validity.....	116
3.4.3 Convergent Validity	116
3.4.5 Discriminant Validity	118
3.5 Collection of Data/Gathering Procedures.....	120
3.7 Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).....	122
3.7.1 Structural Model.....	125
3.7.2 Goodness of fits or Model fits	125
3.8 Summary of Statistical Tools Applied for Hypothesis Testing.....	129
CHAPTER IV FINDINDS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	131
4.1 Findings	131

4.1.1 Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....	132
4.1.2 Descriptive Statistics of Measurement Scales	133
4.1.3 Normality Test.....	136
4.1.4 Reliability Analysis	141
4.1.5 Measurement Model Assessment	145
4.1.6 Structural Equation Modeling	154
4.1.7 Research Hypothesis Testing.....	159
4.1.8 Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects of Relationship.....	167
4.2 Discussions	169
CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS	180
REFERENCES	190
APPENDICES	233



LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Summary of Population Sizes in Selected Programs	92
Table 3.2 The number of observations of potential variables	93
Table 3. 3 Sample Size Calculator for Structural Equation Models.....	93
Table 3. 4 Population and Sample Size by Programs.....	103
Table 4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....	132
Table 4.2 Descriptive Analysis of Measurement Scales	136
Table 4.3 Assessment of Normality	140
Table 4.4 The Value of Reliability Analysis of Each Construct in this Study	144
Table 4.5 Acceptable Criteria of Goodness-of-Fit Indices.....	146
Table 4.6 Goodness of Fit for Measurement Model.....	149
Table 4.7 Convergent Validity, Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	152
Table 4.8 Discriminant Validity	153
Table 4.9 Goodness-of-Fit for Strctural Model.....	154
Table 4.10 Goodness-of-Fit for the Structural Model after Modification.....	158
Table 4.11 Hypothesis Testing Result of the Structural Model	160
Table 4.12 Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects of Relationships	168

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1 Measurement Model (CFA)	150
Figure 4.2 Structural Model before Adjustment.....	156
Figure 4.3 Structural Model after Adjustment.....	159
Figure 4.4 Result of the Structural Model	164



LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) Rating Form and Results	233
Appendix 2 Questionnaire – English Version	236
Appendix 3 Questionnaire – Chinese Version	240

