

A Structural Model of Job Burnout and Work-Family Conflict in Teachers, with the Mediating Role of Mental Health and Psychological Capital: A Gender Comparison

Fereshteh. Niksirat¹, Molouk. Khademi Ashkzari^{2*}, Zahra. Naghsh³

¹ Department of psychology, Qo.C., Islamic Azad University, Qom, Iran

² Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of education and psychology, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Education, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mkhademi@alzahra.ac.ir

Editor

Mehdi Rostami¹
Department of Psychology and
Counseling, KMAN Research
Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario,
Canada.
Email:
mehdirostami@kmanresce.ca

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Seyed Milad Saadati¹
Faculty of Education and Health Sciences, University of Limerick School of
Medicine, Ireland. Email: 24361836@studentmail.ul.ie
Reviewer 2: Farzaneh Mardani¹
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farzanehmardani@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The theoretical background is generally comprehensive and well-structured, especially in defining burnout, work-family conflict, mental health, and psychological capital. Nonetheless, the argumentation would benefit from a more explicit, theory-driven articulation of the hypothesized paths in the model—for example, grounding the indirect effects and the mediating role of mental health and psychological capital more rigorously in established frameworks (e.g., Conservation of Resources theory, Job Demands-Resources model), and deriving each path as a clearly numbered hypothesis rather than implicitly stating expectations.

The cross-sectional design and reliance on self-report measures are important methodological constraints that are not sufficiently problematized in the discussion. The authors should explicitly acknowledge issues such as common method variance, social desirability bias, and the inability to infer causality from the proposed directional paths. A brief discussion of potential remedies (e.g., longitudinal designs, time-lagged data, multi-informant reports, or objective indicators of mental health and burnout) would strengthen the methodological reflexivity of the article.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The choice of measurement instruments (MBI, GHQ-28, PCQ, Carlson's WFC scale) is appropriate and consistent with international standards. At the same time, the psychometric reporting is incomplete: several Cronbach's alpha values and model fit indices (e.g., RMSEA, CFI, χ^2/df , R^2) are missing or only qualitatively described as "acceptable." For a high-quality empirical article, the authors should provide all reliability coefficients, sample items or response scales, and full model fit statistics in tables, enabling readers to independently evaluate the robustness and adequacy of the measures and the structural model.

The manuscript makes effective use of SEM and multi-group analysis to test the structural relations and the moderating role of gender, and the logic of comparing constrained versus unconstrained models is correct. However, the reporting of the multi-group results is relatively superficial: the authors should provide detailed path coefficients with standard errors and confidence intervals for both men and women, clearly indicate which paths significantly differ across groups (e.g., via critical ratios or $\Delta\chi^2$ for individual paths), and discuss potential measurement invariance (configural, metric, scalar) before fully interpreting gender differences in structural paths.

The description of the sample and sampling procedure appears insufficiently detailed in the available text. For a rigorous assessment of external validity, the manuscript needs explicit information on sample size, sampling method (random, convenience, cluster, etc.), response rate, demographic characteristics (age, marital status, teaching level, years of experience, school type), and the gender distribution. Without this level of detail, it is difficult to judge the representativeness of the sample and to what extent findings can be generalized to the broader teacher population.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.