

Name of Publisher: EVERMIND EDUCATION & RESEARCH

Review Type: Double Blind Peer Review

Area of Publication: Social Sciences (miscellaneous)



Vol. 2 No. 4 (2024)

Journal of Polítical Stability Archive

Online ISSN

Print ISSN

3006-5879

3006-5860

https://journalpsa.com/index.php/JPSA/about

Exploring Occupational Wellbeing Among University Teachers from the Lens of Russell's Circumplex Model of Affect

Rabia Siraj

Lecturer, University of Swat, KP, Pakistan, realrubi43@gmail.com

Mussarat Anwar, PhD

College of Home economics, University of Peshawar, KP, Pakistan, musaratanwar@uop.edu.pk

Ayesha Anwar, PhD

College of Home economics, University of Peshawar, KP, Pakistan, neeshy1@yahoo.com





Abstract

Teachers throughout the world continue to struggle with stress, burnout, and decreased job satisfaction which can adversely impact their occupational well-being. This study examines how positive emotions can reduce burnout and enhance job satisfaction among university teachers. A multi-stage sampling technique was used to gather data from N=270 university teachers of Peshawar distric with fair representation of both gender. Burnout was assessed with the short version of Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES). Work engagement was calculated with Utrecht Work Engagement Scale shortened version (UWES-9). Dutch Work Addiction Scale (Schaufeli et al., 2008; Schaufeli et al., 2009) is a popular measure for assessing workaholism was supplemented with other scales. Based on Russell's Circumplex Model of Affect occupational wellbeing was assessed and teachers were categorized into four primary quadrants: high pleasure/high activation, high pleasure/low activation, low pleasure/high activation, and low pleasure/low activation. Results indicate no association of demographic factors with occupational wellbeing. However, pleasant emotional states tend to boost occupational wellbeing, leading to higher job satisfaction, fulfillment, and resilience against workplace stressors. Unpleasant emotional states, whether high or low in activation, generally decrease job satisfaction and increase the likelihood of burnout among university teachers. Universities should consider promoting a positive work culture and providing ample opportunities for professional development.

Keywords: teachers, emotions, burnout, job satisfaction, pleasure-activation Introduction

Occupational wellbeing has been studied in the field of psychology for decades and teacher's occupational wellbeing has been an important part of organizational psychology. The present research assesses Russell's Circumplex Model of Affect in relation to occupational wellbeing among university teachers who face a unique set of challenges in their workplace, which can significantly impact their well-being and engagement. This model covers both hedonic and eudemonic aspects of emotions and helps understand occupational wellbeing better. The model suggests that well-being is a multidimensional construct, with distinct profiles reflecting varying combinations of positive and negative affect, as well as meaningful engagement and purpose. Moreover, It can be used by educational institutions to create a supportive work environment by identifying areas that need improvement.

Russels in 1990 put forth a Circumplex model of emotions, proposing that emotions are not discrete but exist on a continuum from high to low. He mapped them in across two dimensions suggests that various emotional states are processed and represented as points in an emotional space along valence (positive-negative) and arousal (intensity) dimensions. Underlying the Circumplex Model is the *curvilinear hypothesis*, which argues that "balanced levels of emotions and engagement are most conductive to healthy occupational functioning. Conversely, unbalanced levels of emotions and engagement are associated with unhealthy occupational functioning.

Emotion affects both our behavior and health, influencing how we perceive

and manage stress. Unchecked stress can lead to burnout, a state where emotional regulation is significantly impaired, impacting well-being and professional effectiveness. Emotions, stress, and burnout are closely interwoven, especially in high-stakes, people-centered professions like teaching. Emotions play a dual role; they can foster motivation and positive engagement, but when unregulated or predominantly negative, they can lead to stress and emotional exhaustion. Persistent stress arises when individuals feel overwhelmed by demands they perceive as exceeding their ability to cope. This often stems from emotions like frustration, fear of failure, or feeling undervalued. Without adequate recovery or coping strategies, prolonged stress can lead to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced professional efficacy.

Burnout if experienced by professionals in an organization can become a multidimensional syndrome by reducing their job satisfaction and occupational wellbeing (Gold & Roth, 2013; Marek et al., 2017). Teaching is also a demanding and stressful (Larrivee, 2012; Agyapong et al., 2022) profession. Like other professional, teachers are expected to be productive and efficient. Teachers do a lot of social labor in their careers (Xu, 2013), along with other academic labor to maintain high standards of education which in turn can lead to burnout and sabotage their instructional consciousness. Attesting the similar views, Méndez et al. (2020) and Freire et al. (2020) explains that burnout in teachers often results from prolonged stress, which can demoralize and disrupt their sense of self-consistency. If not identified and controlled early teacher burnout may result in chronic psychological and health condition, as well as job abandonment (Marek et al., 2017; Silva et al. 2015; García-Arroyo et al. 2019)

Frequent reform in educational policies can also encourage obsession among teachers with satisfying the need of the employer. Doyle and Hind (1998) highlight that modern higher education institutions face increased job demands and constraints, putting teachers and staff at risk for stress and burnout, unlike the stressfree environments of the past (McCormick & Barnett, 2011). Teachers, for instance, are frequently face high demands, emotional labor, and limited support, which can compromise their health, performance, and relationships with students and colleagues, creating a cycle where burnout exacerbates stress, intensifying negative emotions (Xu, 2013). Schaufeli et al., (2009), while identifying the source of burnout explains that the radical shift toward a service economy in educational institutions has further taxed teacher by necessitating that teachers be more productive and teaching be less expensive (Schaufeli et al., 2009). Research indicate that burnout in teachers negatively impact their self-efficay, self-confidence, motivation, self-esteem, productivity, professional engagement and job satisfaction (Jukić & Ham, 2024; Larrivee, 2012; Herman et al., 2018; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014; Gold & Roth, 2013). If not identified and controlled early, it could lead to job abandonment (Marek et al, 2017).

Various studies (Chang, 2009; Durr et al., 2014) have identified three sources of burnout in teachers. These include: personal, interpersonal and institutional. Personal sources contribute to emotional exahution are age, gender, educational

level, experience, and socioeconomic factors (Chang, 2009; Gold & Roth, 2013). Institutional sources include low salary, poor policies, lack of basic facilities, excessive workload and job mobility (Durr et al., 2014). On the other hand, interpersonal sources refer to interactions between individual and organizational or social factors. Evidence indicate that teachers' self-efficacy, attitude, and beliefs play the central role in interactional variables in educational settings. Some researchers have pointed over to the fact that that employees may exhibit differing levels of occupational health even under similar conditions (Zurlo, Vallone, & Smith, 2018). Occupational well-being has been associated with factors such as cognitive demands (Meyer & Hünefeld, 2018), emotional intelligence (Bowen, Pilkington, & Rose, 2016), attachment styles in the workplace (Lanciano & Zammuner, 2014), and organizational support (Thompson & Prottas, 2006). Burns and Machin (2013) highlight the influence of personality on occupational well-being. Based on Burns and Machin's (2013) findings, this study aims to understand academic staff's occupational well-being in relation to their level of engagement and emotional exhaustion.

In the present context, the framework is built on several key assumptions regarding the dynamics of engagement and well-being. It is posited that High pleasure states in occupational wellbeing are positive emotions that promote job satisfaction and wellbeing. These states include High Pleasure, High Activation, and High Pleasure, Low Activation. High Activation, such as enthusiasm, excitement, and inspiration, are triggered by high-engagement, motivation, or a stimulating work environment. Low Activation, on the other hand, is low-energy, contentment, calm, and relaxation, resulting from a stable work environment. These states boost job satisfaction, fulfillment, and resilience against workplace stressors. Conversely, low pleasure states, such as anxiety, frustration, and anger, can decrease job satisfaction and increase the likelihood of burnout.

Aim & Objectives

The aim of this study is to explore the Circumplex Model of Occupational Well-Being among academicians in public sector universities of Peshawar District.

- 1. To assess pleasure-activation states impacting job satisfaction and occupational wellbeing among university teachers
- 2. To evaluate the pleasure and activation states in relation to burnout

Hypotheses

- 1. High pleasure emotions (regardless of activation level) tend to increase occupational wellbeing and job satisfaction
- 2. Low pleasure emotions (regardless of activation level) tend to increase emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and productivity.

Methodology

Research Design

This quantitative research approach uses a cross-sectional survey method to collect data from university teachers. The primary focus revolves around the relationships between pleasure and activation dimensions and their relationship with teacher's wellbeing and job satisfaction.

Participants

Data was gathered from seven public universities of Peshawar District. Sample consisted of N= 290 faculty members, with 44% men (128) and 60% women (162). Professionally, the majority identified as lecturers (57.9%), followed by Assistant Professors (31.0%). Professors and Associate Professors constituted 5.5 percent of the total sample. The primary responsibilities of the faculty members included: teaching, research, and executive duties.

Data Collection Techniques

A demographic data sheet was incorporated for obtaining biographic information such as name, age, gender, income, educational qualification, and designation of the respondents within the institution. Job Exhaustion was assessed with the short version of Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES). It is designed for people in educational settings. The shortened form comprises of 9 items covering three dimensions of burnout: Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and reduced Personal Accomplishment. It is proved to have good internal consistency and validity (Iwanicki & Schwab, 1981). Work engagement was calculated with Utrecht Work Engagement Scale shortened version (UWES-9) developed by Schaufeli et al. (2009). The UWES-9 has been validated in several countries including Pakistan. Yusoff, Ali, Khan & Bakar (2013) evaluation of UWES-9 indicated that this scale possesses good psychometric properties ($\alpha = 0.87 \& r=0.65$) and it can be effectively used to assess work engagement of university teachers across Pakistan. Dutch Work Addiction Scale (Schaufeli et al., 2008; Schaufeli et al., 2009) is a popular measure for assessing workaholism was supplemented with other scales. It's reliability coefficient is found 0 .71 for research on workaholism in Pakistan (Mir, Kamal, & Masood, 2016). Job Satisfaction was measured through Ho and Au (2006), five-item Teaching Satisfaction Scale (TSS) that is based on Diener, et al. (1985), Life Satisfaction Scale (LSS). The TSS offers a simple, direct, reliable (cronbach's α = 0.77) and valid assessment of teaching satisfaction.

Procedure

A multi-stage sampling technique was used to identify the sample. The sample size was calculated using Cochran's (1977) formula, resulting in a final sample of 270 participants after adjustments. Inclusion criteria mandated that participants be inservice teachers of both genders with a minimum of one year of teaching experience, while exclusion criteria eliminated those on study leave, deputation, retirement, or those employed on a contractual basis, as well as individuals with chronic health issues. The research data collection process began by securing formal permission from the vice chancellors of the selected public sector universities to engage their faculty for the purpose of data collection in this research. Once approvals were obtained, individual consent was sought from the faculty members by sending out emails and letters inviting them to participate in the study.

Results

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Teacher profiles based on Work Quality Engagement (QWE) and Pleasure Dimension of Emotions (PDE)

Grouping Variable	N	Percentage
Quality of Work Engagement (QWE)		
Healthy work engagement	154	53%
Unhealthy engagement work	136	47.2%
engagement		
Pleasure Dimension of Emotions		
(PDE)		
Pleasant Emotions	176	60.7%
Unpleasant Emotions	114	39.3%

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of teachers' profiles based on their work engagement quality and the Pleasure Dimension of Emotions. When categorized by work engagement quality (healthy vs. unhealthy), both types occur at similar frequencies, suggesting a balanced distribution in engagement quality. However, categorizing the sample based on the Pleasure Dimension of Emotions reveals that high-pleasure engagement is more prevalent, with a majority (60.7%) of teachers experiencing positive emotions. This indicates that a larger proportion of teachers report engaging in their work with high levels of pleasure or positive emotional experience.

Table 2
The Relationship of Demographic Factors with level of Pleasure-Activation States

	Pleasure-Activation States					
	Category	High	High	Low	Low	Total
		Pleasure/	Pleasure/	Pleasure/	Pleasure/	
		High	Low	High	Low	
		Activation	Activatio	Activation	Activatio	
			n		n	
Gender	Men	72 (24.8%)	10 (3.4%)	26 (9.0%)	20 (6.9%)	128
						(44.1%)
	Women	82	12 (4.1%)	24 (8.3%)	44	162
		(28.3%)			(15.2%)	(55.9%)
	Total	154	22 (7.6%)	50 (17.2%)	64	290
		(53.1%)			(22.1%)	(100.0%)
Status	Married	112	10 (3.4%)	36 (12.4%)	48	206
		(38.6%)			(16.6%)	(71.0%)
	Unmarrie	42 (14.5%)	10 (3.4%)	12(4.1%)	16 (5.5%)	80
	d					(27.6%)
	Divorced	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.7%)	2 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	4(1.4%)
	Total	154	22 (7.6%)	50 (17.2%)	64	290
		(53.1%)			(22.1%)	(100.0%)
Educati	M.Sc/MA	14 (4.8%)	2(0.7%)	6 (2.1%)	4 (1.4%)	26 (9.0%)
on						

MS/M.Phi 60 (20.7%) 10 (3.4%) 24 (8.3%) 34 128 I (11.7%) (44.1%) PhD 72 (24.8%) 10 (3.4%) 20(6.9%) 26 (9.0%) 128 (44.1%) (44.1%) (44.1%) (44.1%) (44.1%) PostDoc 8 (2.8%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 8 (2.8%) Total 154 22 (7.6%) 50 (17.2%) 64 290 (53.1%) (22.1%) (100.0%) BPS 18- 88 (30.3%) 14(4.8%) 30 (10.3%) 42(14.5%) 174 Lecturer) (60.0%) 19-Assist. 54 (18.6%) 8 (2.8%) 18 (6.2%) 12(4.1%) 92 Prof (31.7%) 20-Assoc. 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 4 (1.4%) 10 (3.4%) Professor 7 21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
PhD 72 (24.8%) 10 (3.4%) 20(6.9%) 26 (9.0%) 128 (44.1%) PostDoc 8 (2.8%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 8 (2.8%) Total 154 22 (7.6%) 50 (17.2%) 64 290 (22.1%) (100.0%) BPS 18- 88 (30.3%) 14(4.8%) 30 (10.3%) 42(14.5% 174 Lecturer) (60.0%) 19-Assist. 54 (18.6%) 8 (2.8%) 18 (6.2%) 12(4.1%) 92 (31.7%) 20-Assoc. 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 4 (1.4%) 10 (3.4%) Prof 21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor
PostDoc
PostDoc 8 (2.8%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 8 (2.8%) Total 154 22 (7.6%) 50 (17.2%) 64 290 (53.1%) (22.1%) (100.0%) BPS 18- 88 (30.3%) 14(4.8%) 30 (10.3%) 42(14.5%) 174 Lecturer) (60.0%) 19-Assist. 54 (18.6%) 8 (2.8%) 18 (6.2%) 12(4.1%) 92 Prof (31.7%) 20-Assoc. 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 4 (1.4%) 10 (3.4%) Prof 21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor -
Total 154 22 (7.6%) 50 (17.2%) 64 290 (53.1%) (22.1%) (100.0%) BPS 18- 88 (30.3%) 14(4.8%) 30 (10.3%) 42(14.5% 174 Lecturer) (60.0%) 19-Assist. 54 (18.6%) 8 (2.8%) 18 (6.2%) 12(4.1%) 92 Prof (31.7%) 20-Assoc. 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 4 (1.4%) 10 (3.4%) Prof 21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor
BPS 18- 88 (30.3%) 14(4.8%) 30 (10.3%) 42(14.5% 174 Lecturer) (60.0%) 19-Assist. 54 (18.6%) 8 (2.8%) 18 (6.2%) 12(4.1%) 92 Prof
BPS 18- 88 (30.3%) 14(4.8%) 30 (10.3%) 42(14.5% 174 Lecturer
Lecturer) (60.0%) 19-Assist. 54 (18.6%) 8 (2.8%) 18 (6.2%) 12(4.1%) 92 Prof (31.7%) 20-Assoc. 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 4 (1.4%) 10 (3.4%) Prof 21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor
19-Assist. 54 (18.6%) 8 (2.8%) 18 (6.2%) 12(4.1%) 92 Prof (31.7%) 20-Assoc. 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 4 (1.4%) 10 (3.4%) Prof 21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor
Prof (31.7%) 20-Assoc. 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 4 (1.4%) 10 (3.4%) Prof 21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor
20-Assoc. 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 4 (1.4%) 10 (3.4%) Prof 21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor
Prof 21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor
21- 6 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%) 2(0.7%) 6 (2.1%) 14 (4.8%) Professor
Professor
Total 154 22 (7.6%) 50 (17.2%) 64 200
10ta1 194 22 (7.0%) 30 (17.2%) 04 290
(53.1%) (22.1%) (100.0%)
Job Teaching 44 (15.2%) 8 (2.8%) 16 (5.5%) 26(9.0%) 94
Descript (32.4%)
ion
Teaching 86 (29.7%) 10 (3.4%) 28 (9.7%) 16(5.5%) 140
& (48.3%)
Research
Executive 10 (3.4%) 2 (0.7%) 4 (1.4%) 8 (2.8%) 24 (8.3%)
Teaching 14 (4.8%) 2 (0.7%) 2(0.7%) 14 (4.8%) 32
& (11.0%)
executive
Total 154 22 (7.6%) 50 (17.2%) 64 290
(53.1%) (22.1%) (100.0%)

Chi-square: Gender: χ^2 (3, 290), 6.008, p>0.05; Marital status: χ^2 (6, 290), 20.16, p < 0.01; Qualification: χ^2 (9, 290), 11.01, p>0.05; BPS: χ^2 (9, 290), 13.15, p>0.05; Primary Responsibility: χ^2 (9, 290), 23.46, p<0.01

Table 2 provides information about how demographic factors influence the pleasure-activation states of participants across four categories: *high pleasure/high activation*, *high pleasure/low activation*, *low pleasure/high activation*, and *low pleasure/low activation*. Chi-square tests were used to determine the significance of the relationship between each demographic factor and the pleasure-activation states. Table 1 provides a thorough analysis of pleasure-activation states in relation to demographic variables among university teachers. Based on Pleasure-Activation states, the four quadrants identified are: high pleasure/high activation state, high pleasure/low activation state, low pleasure/high activation state, and low pleasure/low activation state. The study involved 290 respondents, with women representing 55.9% (162 participants) and men 44.1% (128 participants). The majority (53.1%) were found in the high-arousal, positive-valence quadrant of the

circumplex model. These findings suggest that they experienced both energetic and positive emotions. Emotions in this quadrant include feelings of excitement, motivation, enthusiasm, and joy. For these teachers, this emotional state is correlated with high productivity and job satisfaction. Being in a high pleasure/high activation state suggests that they are not only content with their work but also motivated and energized. This combination often results in greater engagement and effectiveness in the workplace, as these emotions can drive proactive behaviors, creativity, and resilience in their teaching roles.

The chi-square test shows that gender differences across pleasure-activation states are not statistically significant (χ^2 (3, 290), 6.008, p>0.05), indicating no strong association between gender and emotional states. Both men and women are predominantly in the high-arousal, positive-valence quadrant (24.8% for men, 28.3% for women) of the circumplex model, suggesting that majority of the participants feel motivated and energized. Married participants fall into the *High Pleasure/High Activation* quadrant (38.6%), indicating high positivity and energy levels. The chi-square analysis indicates a significant association between marital status and pleasure-activation states, χ^2 (6, 290), 20.16, p < 0.01.

The result suggests that while there are variances in Pleasure-Activation States levels across educational backgrounds, they may not be strong enough to assert a definitive causal relationship. The chi-square statistics do not show a significant association between educational qualifications and pleasure-activation states χ^2 (9, 290), 11.01, p > 0.05. According to the findings in Table 1, the *high pleasure/high activation* state is more common among lecturers (30.3%) compared to assistant professors (18.6%) and other higher positions. This suggests that lecturers may feel more positive and energized in their roles. However, the chi-square analysis shows no significant relationship between job position and pleasure-activation states, χ^2 (9, 290), 13.15, p>0.05.

Results reveal that teachers who were engaged in both *teaching and* research report high levels of high pleasure/high activation (29.7%), indicating they feel positive and energized. Teaching-only roles have higher percentages in the *low* pleasure/low activation state (9.0%) compared to other roles. The chi-square test shows a significant relationship between primary job responsibility and pleasure-activation states (χ^2 (9, 290), 23.46, p<0.01), suggesting that job roles impact emotional states.

Based on these findings it is concluded that pleasure-activations states correlate with mariatal status and job responsibilities of employees. Whereas, gender, education and job position are not significantly associated with pleasure-activations states. These findings suggest personal life factors and job responsibilities play crucial role in determining emotional states which in turn can impact occupational wellness Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction by the level of Pleasure-Activation States

Quadrants	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
High Pleasure/High Activation	30.208	2.702	154
High Pleasure/Low Activation	28.273	2.186	22

Low Pleasure/High Activation	19.460	6.779	50
Low Pleasure/Low Activation	20.188	3.290	64
Total	25.979	6.269	290

F(3,290)7206.89,p<.01

Table 3 provides a comprehensive overview of job satisfaction among university teachers categorized by Pleasure-Activation States. The analysis shows distinct variations in mean job satisfaction scores across the four quadrants. The group representing High Pleasure/High Activation, comprised of 154 respondents, reported the highest mean job satisfaction score of 30.208 with standard deviation of 2.702, indicating a strong sense of fulfillment and motivation among those engaged in a healthy manner. Conversely, the employees with Low Pleasure/High Activation had a lower mean score of 19.460 with standard deviation of 6.779 on job satisfaction, reflecting high level of engagement and emotional exhaustion tend to reduce job satisfaction among university teachers. The multivariate analysis yields a statistically significant effect of pleasure-activation states and job satisfaction, F(3,290)7206.89,p<.01. This significance suggests that employees with High Pleasure/High Activation were more satisfied with their job.

Table 4
Homogeneous subsets for the *Pleasure-Activation States*

O			
Level of engagement	N	Subset	
		1	2
Tukey HSD Low Pleasure/High Activation	50	19.3600	
Low Pleasure/Low Activation	64	20.1875	
High Pleasure/Low Activation	22		28.2727
High Pleasure/High Activation	154		30.2078
Sig.		.727	.074

Table 4 reveals the results of the Tukey HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) test, which evaluates the homogeneity of subsets for various levels of Pleasure-Activation States based on job satisfaction scores. Scores under subset-1 reveals that the mean job satisfaction scores for those experiencing unpleasant emotions irrespective of their intensity are notably low. These values indicate unpleasant emotion tend to cause feelings of exhaustion and reduce sense of fulfillment. In contrast, group encompasses individuals experiencing pleasurable states irrespective of activation levels tend to experience job satisfaction. These findings illustrate that only emotions rather than intensity of them are the significant determinant of job satisfaction and work experience.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Burnout by the Level of pleasure-arousal states

Descriptive statistics to	Descriptive statistics for sufficiently the sever of preasure arousar states				
	Level of pleasure-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	
	arousal states				
	High Pleasure/High	2.148	1.142	154	
Emotional Exhaustion	1 Activation				
(MBI subscale)	High Pleasure/Low	2.878	1.157	22	
	Activation				

	Low Pleasure/High Activation	2.893	1.002	50
	Low Pleasure/Low Activation	3.083	0.893	64
	Total	2.538	1.144	290
	High Pleasure/High Activation	1.796	1.336	154
D 11	High Pleasure/Low Activation	2.198	1.102	22
Depersonalization ₂ (MBI subscale)	Low Pleasure/High Activation	2.306	1.548	50
	Low Pleasure/Low Activation	2. 455	1.160	64
	Total	2.022	1.340	290
	High Pleasure/High Activation	4.414	1.074	154
Professional	High Pleasure/Low Activation	3.850	0.958	22
Achievement ₃ (MBI	Low Pleasure/High	4.350	0.914	50
subscale)	Activation Low Pleasure/Low	3.354	0.970	64
	Activation	4.400	4 00 6	222
	Total	4.103	1.096	290

Full scale=F (9,290) 10.1, p<0.01; sub-scales (F₁ (3,290) 14.96, p<0.01; F₂ (3,290) 3.43, p<0.05; F₃ (3,290) 16.61, p<0.01)

Table 5 provides an overview of burnout scores for the participants categorized in four quadrants based on cirumplex model of affect. Overall, significant difference was observed in the four quadrants on burnout, F_1 (9,290) 10.1, p<0.01. Participants who experienced low arousal with low pleasure scored higher on emotional exhaustion with mean of 3.08 and standard deviation 0.89. The level of exhaustion was found lowest for participants with high arousal and high pleasure, M=2.15 & SD=1.14. The difference between the groups on emotional exhaustion was found significant, F_2 (3,290) 14.96, p<0.01. Correspondingly on the subscale measuring depersonalization, the respondents with low arousal and low pleasure scored higher with mean of 2.45 and standard deviation 1.16. Whereas the respondents who were highly activated but had pleasant feelings scored lowest on depersonalization scale, M=1.79 & SD=1.33 and the difference was found significant, F_3 (3,290) 3.43, p<0.05. Contrarily the subjects with were High Pleasure/High Activation had a profound sense of professional achievement, M=4.41 & SD=0.34. However, the subjects with low arousal and high displeasure had a reduced sense of professional accomplishment with the mean of 3.354 and standard deviation 0.97. This difference between the groups on professional achievement consciousness was also found significant, F_4 (3,290) 16.61, p<0.01.

Table 6

Variables	N	Correlation coefficient	sig
Pleasure-activation states vs Job	290	.355**	.000
exhaustion			

Correlation coefficient in Table 6 indicates that unhealthy engagement at work positively correlate with emotional exhaustion, r=.355°. Therefore, high pleasure-activation states tend to increase job satisfaction.

Discussion

Results reveal that teachers' work engagement is not significantly affected by their gender, years of education, or salary range. Academic roles are driven by intrinsic motivators rather than external factors. Similarly, university teaches regardless of their educational background, generally face similar professional challenges that can affect their emotional states and activation level. These challenges might include heavy workloads, additional managerial duties, publication pressures, and the demand to stay current in their fields. Since, these stressors are fairly universal in academia, they could impact mood and energy level similarly across different demographic or socio-economic groups.

How employees engage largely depends on organizational culture, department dynamics, and leadership styles, which can have a stronger impact than demographic or individual characteristics like gender or qualifications (Albrecht et al., 2015). In many universities, policies, workload expectations, and support resources are applied uniformly across faculty, which may neutralize differences that would otherwise stem from personal factors. Similarly, at university level, teachers generally hold advanced degrees, with qualifications often standardized (e.g., most hold master's or doctoral degrees). This level of qualification might minimize differences in engagement since all faculty members are expected to meet certain academic standards and possess a similar foundation of expertise and commitment to their field.

While pay is an important factor, many university teachers may not view it as a primary source of job satisfaction, especially in settings where salaries are similar across ranks or standardized by the institution. In these cases, variations in pay scale might not have a large impact on engagement, as teachers may be more influenced by factors like research opportunities, autonomy, or professional recognition. Our Finding regarding marital status and healthy engagement are in accord with the findings of Raison (1981), who have also found non-married regular education teachers reporting greater frequency of emotional exhaustion and more intense feelings of depersonalization than their married peers. Having a supportive partner has numerous benefits for both individuals in relationship. Married teachers if are in a supportive relationship may feel valued and cared for. They may feel less stressed and more emotionally secure. These partners also help each other grow, achieve their goals and help manage work challenges more effectively, as they provide encouragement and motivation to each other (Barker, 2014).

Additionally, being supportive encourages effective communication and problem-solving skills which in turn can lead to a deeper connection and a stronger bond between partners. Overall, the benefits of being a supportive partner include a

happier and more fulfilling relationship, personal growth, and increased overall well-being. Similarly, financial stability can contribute to a more positive outlook toward work and healthier engagement. Single teachers, especially if they are solely responsible for their financial security, may experience more financial stress, potentially affecting their engagement negatively. The results indicate that job satisfaction is closely linked to the pleasure dimension of emotional states, emphasizing the importance of fostering positive emotional experiences in the workplace to boost employee well-being and satisfaction. Since, employees overall feeling about their jobs is often associated to a sense of fulfillment and purpose. Positive emotions such as happiness or contentment carry a potential to increase a sense of meaning and purpose in one's role. When people feel fulfilled, they're more likely to perceive their work as rewarding, which increases their overall job satisfaction.

Further, High-pleasure emotional states act as psychological reinforcers. Positive emotions create a feedback loop that encourages continued engagement and investment in tasks. When employees feel good, they're more inclined to engage with their work enthusiastically, pursue goals, and feel committed to their role. Whereas, unpleasant emotions do not provide this reinforcement and make them feel less motivated to put efforts into their work, which negatively affect job satisfaction. Conversely, In contrast, unpleasant states lower the perception of personal accomplishment, leaving employees less satisfied with their work. This indicates that, employees experiencing unpleasant emotions spend significant energy on managing these feelings, which can leave them feeling drained and exhausted. This state of exhaustion decreases motivation and reduces the capacity for sustained engagement with their work, leading to lower job satisfaction.

Moreover, Positive emotional states can improve workplace interactions and relationships, which are key factors in job satisfaction. When people experience pleasure, they are often more sociable, empathetic, and constructive in their interactions, contributing to a positive work environment. Negative emotional states, however, can lead to conflicts, misunderstandings, and a lack of cohesion, further diminishing job satisfaction. Positive emotions do also contribute to resilience, helping individuals to cope with work challenges more effectively. Experiencing high pleasure can buffer against stress and setbacks, making challenges feel more manageable and reducing the toll of negative experiences (Fredrickson, 2001). When employees lack this positive emotional foundation, they're more likely to feel overwhelmed, leading to a decline in job satisfaction. In essence, pleasant emotional states create an energizing, reinforcing, and resilient work experience that supports job satisfaction.

In contrast, unpleasant states often create emotional barriers to fulfillment, leading to exhaustion and dissatisfaction. Positive emotions promote creativity, problem-solving, and resilience, all of which can increase teachers' belief in their own competence (self-efficacy), making them more confident in their abilities. This confidence leads to better performance, which reinforces feelings of professional achievement. Universities must consider implementing supportive programs, such as

stress management resources, professional development opportunities, and a positive work culture, to promote and improve teacher's well-being and effectiveness.

References

Agyapong, V. I. O., et al. (2022). The impact of stress on teachers' emotional well-being.

Frontiers in Education, 7, Article 837827.

Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2015). Employee

engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 2*(1), 7-35.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The

JD-R approach. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1(1), 389-411.

Bowen, C., Pilkington, G., & Rose, J. (2016). The impact of emotional intelligence on teachers'

occupational well-being. *Educational Psychology*, *36*(2), 272-291.

Burns, C., & Machin, L. (2013). Personality and occupational well-being: The role of personality

in stress management. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 21*(4), 330-343.

Chang, M. L. (2009). An appraisal perspective of teacher burnout: Examining the emotional

work of teachers. Educational Psychologist, 44(3), 154-166.

Cochran, W. G. (1977). Sampling techniques (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale.

Journal of Personality Assessment, 49(1), 71-75.

Doyle, W., & Hind, A. (1998). The impact of reform on teacher morale and motivation. *Journal*

of Educational Administration, 36(2), 158-172.

Durr, M., et al. (2014). Understanding the sources of teacher burnout: A review of the literature.

Teaching and Teacher Education, 38, 97-109.

Ekman, P. (1999). Basic Emotions. In T. Dalgleish & M. J. Power (Eds.), *Handbook of cognition*

and emotion (pp. 45-60). Wiley.

Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*,

2(3), 300-319.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-

and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218-226.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *Philosophical*

Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 359(1449), 1367-1377.

Freire, T., et al. (2020). The relationship between teacher burnout and professional self-concept.

Educational Psychology, 40(1), 39-56.

García-Arroyo, J., et al. (2019). Emotional exhaustion and its impact on teaching efficacy.

International Journal of Stress Management, 26(4), 339-347.

Gold, Y., & Roth, R. A. (2013). Burnout in Teachers: A Review of the Literature. In S. M.

Kagan & C. A. Smith (Eds.), *The Handbook of Teacher Education* (pp. 200-210). Springer.

Herman, K. C., et al. (2018). Teacher stress and coping: Examining classroom, school, and

organizational influences. Teaching and Teacher Education, 75, 10-18.

Ho, C. L., & Au, W. T. (2006). Teaching Satisfaction Scale: Measuring job satisfaction of

teachers. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66(1), 172-185.

Iwanicki, E. F., & Schwab, R. L. (1981). A cross-validation study of the Maslach Burnout

Inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 41(4), 1167-1174.

Jukić, T., & Ham, A. (2024). The implications of burnout on teachers' professional development.

Journal of Educational Psychology, 116(1), 15-25.

Lanciano, T., & Zammuner, V. L. (2014). Attachment styles and teachers' occupational well-

being. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, *3*(3), 195-219.

Larrivee, B. (2012). Transforming Teaching Practice: Becoming the Critically Reflective

Teacher. Reflective Practice, 13(5), 733-749.

Marek, T., Bojczuk, M., & Rozkosz, E. (2017). The relationship between burnout and occupational well-being in teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *31*(5), 792-804.

McCormick, J., & Barnett, K. (2011). Teacher stress and school organization. *Educational*

Management Administration & Leadership, 39(5), 527-544.

Méndez, I., et al. (2020). Burnout in teachers: Causes and consequences. *International Journal of*

Educational Research, 103, Article 101607.

Meyer, B., & Hünefeld, L. (2018). The impact of cognitive demands on occupational well-being.

International Journal of Human Resource Management, 29(11), 1837-1853.

Mir, F. A., Kamal, A., & Masood, S. (2016). Psychometric properties of the Dutch Work

Addiction Scale in Pakistan. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(2), 121-130.

Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*(6), 1161-1178.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement

with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *66*(4), 701-716.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2009). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

(UWES): Cross-national validity and reliability. *Applied Psychology*, *58*(2), 187-208.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Van Rhenen, W. (2008). Work addiction and its association

with well-being and performance. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9*(3), 325-339.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Van Rhenen, W. (2009). Work engagement: The measurement of a construct. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*(3), 333-359.

Silva, D. A., et al. (2015). Effects of burnout on teachers' health. *Psychological Reports*, *116*(3),

669-683.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy in relation

to teacher burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 41, 62-71.

Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2006). Relationships among organizational support, work-

family conflict, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(1), 39-53.

Xu, J. (2013). Emotional labor and burnout among teachers: The moderating role of emotional

intelligence. *Psychology in the Schools, 50*(6), 564-573.

Yusoff, R. M., Ali, A. R., Khan, M. A., & Bakar, N. A. (2013). Psychometric evaluation of the

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale in Pakistan. *Asian Social Science*, *9*(2), 90-95.

Zurlo, M. C., Vallone, F., & Smith, P. B. (2018). Understanding occupational health variability among employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(6), 719-733.