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What is the influence of soci-professional environment on burnout in teachers? A French study

This paper describes a timely issue on teachers’ burnout, and attempts to identify links between self-reported burnout symptoms and teachers’ socio-professional data.

In all, the study seems well implemented but there are important points that the authors should address before the publication of this paper. In addition, a thorough proof reading of the ms would improve its quality since language problems limit the reader’s understanding and cause unnecessary confusion.

More specifically:

**Abstract**

The authors should avoid abbreviations without providing explanations in parentheses throughout the text, beginning from the abstract (e.g. OR, CI). We usually say that emotional exhaustion is greater among teachers … and not in schools (see results in the abstract and in the discussion and conclusion sections).

The abstract should clearly state the measures used to collect the data (i.e. MBI, etc).

**Background**

My overall impression from the literature reviewed is that it lacks a theoretical underpinning and therefore resembles of a mere citation of research findings without any attempt to link them under a theoretical formulation. For example it does not become clear as to how personal and professional factors interrelate and cause burnout. In addition, for some correlates of burnout (e.g. personality) there are more recent works that should be cited (e.g. Kokkinos, 2007; Cano-García, et al. 2005). On pg. 3 what do the authors exactly mean by stating that the study was carried out to investigate …aspects of professional life… and degree of burnout….taking into account socio – demographic variables?

What does ZEP stands for? What do they mean by departments?

Finally, the authors do not mention why, or if there is any research evidence to suggest, they included variables such as the reason why individuals had chosen
the teaching profession, or variables concerning the presence of difficulties in their environment? (pg. 4, top paragraph).

Does the rest 14% represent teachers from the private sector? It is not clear to the reader (pg 4, 2nd paragraph).

Finally, no research hypotheses were formulated to guide subsequent analyses...

Method

Sampling

The authors must be clearer in stating how the obtained permission to conduct the study, if there was any cover letter to teachers, who funded the study. And most of all, how come the questionnaires were anonymous, since they were mailed to the participant teachers individually? Why did the authors selected 2558 teachers? Based on which criteria? What is DOM TOM?

Variables studied

Civil status (condition) is meant to be family status?

When the authors say type of classes taught, what do they mean? How has this information affected coding of the variable level of teaching.

What does SEGPA stands for?

Again ZEP is not fully explained by “educational priority areas”.

How the variables difficulties with other pupils….. and choice of profession as a vocation… were coded?

Results

Descriptive analysis

How do the authors know that … women have significantly higher levels of EX than men? In general, all these findings reported in this section have not been statistically generated.

Table 1. The authors should use the word gender instead of sex.

Pg 7. Despite the fact that the authors mention in the statistical analysis section that chi square test will be used, they merely report the obtained frequencies and compare them only in terms of obtained percentages and not statistically.

pg 7, § 5 & 5. Why do not the authors report results from statistical analyses when presenting the relationship between burnout dimensions scores and teachers’ dissatisfaction, and experienced difficulties with others?

Multivariate logistic regression

In reporting results from the logistic regression it is important to provide enough information for readers to gauge the substantive significance as well as the statistical significance.

The odds ratio can give misleading results and other approaches should be
considered including estimating probabilities and reporting tables showing outcomes.
It is important to report the exponentiated B, eB, often called the odds ratio, along with the B value.

Discussion
This section should be rewritten after all the above concerns have been addressed.
In the section, where the limitations of the study are discussed, the reader gets confused since new numbers concerning the participants of the study appears. Make sure that this is removed or included in the description of the sample section.

Conclusions
This last section of the ms needs to be carefully rewritten so as better to address the suggestions of the authors for future research. A more thorough discussion of the implications of the study should finalize the section.

In all, I believe that this study has a potential for scientific contribution to the area of teacher burnout but the way it is presented limits this potential. Therefore, Major Compulsory Revisions should be made in order for the ms to be publishable.
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