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Abstract

High rates of burnout plague academics due to the inherent demands of their professions. Traditionally, research has concentrated on the stress-inducing factors within academic settings. This study, guided by positive psychology, explores the protective role of psychological capital in mitigating burnout among academics. The study investigated how psychological capital buffers overall burnout and its three core dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Additionally, the research explored whether generational differences moderated these relationships. Employing quantitative methodology, the study utilized structural equation modeling (SEM) to analyze the research hypotheses. The results demonstrated a negative association between psychological capital and burnout, specifically with emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment. Importantly, generational differences moderated these relationships. However, no significant correlation was found between psychological capital and depersonalization, nor was the moderating effect of generation significant for this specific dimension. The study offers valuable insights for the educational sector. By fostering psychological capital among academics, institutions can potentially reduce burnout levels and contribute to a more positive and productive academic environment.

1. Introduction

Burnout is a serious issue that can negatively affect people's health and well-being. Recognizing this, the World Health Organization (WHO) has classified burnout as an occupational phenomenon in its latest edition of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11). The WHO defines burnout as stemming from chronic workplace stress that an individual is unable to manage effectively (World Health Organization, 2019).

Higher education Institutions have witnessed a concerning rise in professional burnout among their academic staff. University work is divided into three main groups, teaching, research, and administration responsibilities. Academic staff struggles to deal with the heavy workload in teaching, consultation, supervision, timely, quality research publication, and interpersonal conflicts (Khan et al., 2018; Kassim et al., 2020; Seo et al., 2022). They are...
expected to excel in all these areas while maintaining student satisfaction and meeting institutional expectations. This pressure often leaves them with the additional burden of managing personal and emotional challenges on their own, increasing their susceptibility to work-related stress (Rusdi et al., 2021).

When the organizational support or the individual's psychological resilience fails to counter this high level of stress, the academic’s defense mechanisms weaken, making it harder to cope with demanding situations. This ultimately contributes to the development of burnout symptoms (Anjum et al., 2021).

Academic staff burnout can have a detrimental effect on their job performance. This manifests through a decline in faculty engagement in professional development, diminished interest and attention to students, and a subsequent decrease in student academic performance (Khan et al., 2018), ultimately leading to the deterioration of the quality of education and the degradation of the educational system.

Thus, Understanding the factors that contribute to teacher burnout holds significant implications. Not only can it improve teacher well-being, effectiveness, motivation, and job satisfaction, but it can also lead to greater student success in academic achievement and personal development, instigating the advancement of the educational and scientific environment (Koster and Mchenry, 2023).

Research on burnout has traditionally focused on its antecedents and precursors, with less attention paid to protective factors such as strengths, resilience, and other positive characteristics that may significantly contribute to accentuating its symptoms (Anjum et al., 2021). Hence, the construct of psychological capital (PsyCap) has emerged as a subject of considerable interest to mitigate burnout due to its ability to improve human resources positivity, alleviate negativity, and enhance well-being, predicting positive outcomes (Bolelli and Eklezle, 2022; Fathi et al., 2023).

Despite advancements in understanding the repercussions of psychological capital (PsyCap) on burnout in some educational settings, the domain of its impact on burnout academic staff remains relatively unexplored, especially in Egypt.

A dearth of research was also found to examine how the generation cohort may moderate this relationship within the unique context of higher education institutions. This is significant because the distinct shared characteristics of different generations may cause differences in Staff’s workplace attitudes, work values, and satisfaction. These variations in work perception could potentially influence how psychological capital (PsyCap) impacts burnout.

This study aims to bridge a gap in the literature by investigating the influence of psychological capital on burnout among academic staff in higher education institutions. We specifically focus on the academic staff in the faculties of hotels and tourism in Egypt. Furthermore, we aim to expand the current understanding by exploring how generational differences might moderate this relationship. By examining this potential moderating effect, we can gain a more nuanced understanding of how psychological capital protects against burnout for academic staff across different generations.

Moreover, the study seeks to contribute to providing more understanding in the burnout context in higher education in Egypt, in an attempt to present implications that may alleviate burnout among academic staff. Which could result in improving the work environment in Egyptian universities, elaborating teaching practices, enhancing scientific research, and improving educational outcomes.
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2. Theoretical review
2.1. Psychological Capital (PsyCap)

The concept of psychological capital was initially introduced by Goldsmith et al. in 1998 as personal attributes reflected in a person's self-view and influencing productivity (Tang, 2024). Since then, the term PsyCap has received a lot of attention in positive psychology and positive organizational behavior (Ferradas et al., 2019; Freire et al., 2020). It answers the questions of who the person is and what are his potential in terms of personal growth (Fathi et al., 2023). Psy Cap was conceptualized as a primary psychological and motivational factor that is a vital point for work performance and achievement (Freire et al., 2020; Nguyen and Ngo, 2021).

The term was then defined by Luthans et al. (2007) as an individual's psychological capacities and resources manifested as a positive mental state that empowers individuals to overcome adversities. This definition introduces PsyCap as a multifaceted construct encompassing several attributes such as self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience (Luthans et al., 2007). Each component contributes distinctively to an individual’s psychological health and resilience when confronting challenges within their professional and personal spheres (Liu and Du, 2024). These constructs were further explained as follows:

Self-Efficacy: Self-efficacy is the person’s belief regarding his/her ability to execute courses of action required to effectively accomplish tasks or attain predetermined objectives (Bolelli and Ekizle, 2022). It is established in social cognitive theory, as a fundamental determinant of human motivation and performance, significantly defining how individuals approach their goals and how they deal with obstacles that may arise along the way (Wahid et al., 2023; Liu and Du, 2024).

In the context of education, teachers who possess high self-efficacy are more likely to be proactive, persistent, have a stronger sense of control, perform well at work, and experience less job-related stress. Moreover, individuals with high self-efficacy are directed by trust in their own successes to set higher goals for themselves, which leads to greater achievements (Nguyen and Ngo, 2021; Wahid et al., 2023). As self-efficacy is related to goal setting, it helps teachers set ambitious goals which influence student’s learning outcomes.

Hope: PsyCap hope is a cognitive state that signifies the belief in finding pathways to desired goals and becoming motivated to use those pathways (Snyder et al., 2002). It is closely related to agency, which is the sense that one can make things happen through one's actions. This, in turn, prompts positive emotions, such as happiness and satisfaction. Hope is also associated with physical and mental health outcomes because hopeful people are more likely to adopt healthy behavior and seek social support when needed (Wahid et al., 2023).

Hope has a dual nature which contains willpower and way power elements. In willpower people set goals and direct their energy and determination to achieve them; the proficiency of finding alternative pathways to attain these goals when the initial ones are blocked is referred to as way power (Bolelli and Ekizle, 2022). In the context of education, both elements of hope shape a higher commitment to students among teachers and encourage them to persist in helping students achieve their goals (Liu and Du, 2024).

Optimism: is a critical facet of psychological capital that conveys an individual’s positive worldview, an optimist person ascribes positive events to internal, prevalent causes, while they impute negative events to external, situational reasons that could be controlled (Fathi et
al.,2023). Optimism goes beyond the cognitive processes involving emotional elements. This combination makes optimism both a driving force and a result of motivation (Bolelli and Ekizle, 2022).

In organizational behavior, optimistic employees expect that they can achieve success, both now and in the future, they have forward-looking beliefs regardless of past issues or setbacks. This belief shapes their behaviour and provides them with a foundation to pursue their goals and overcome obstacles (Nguyen and Ngo, 2021; Wahid et al., 2023).

Resilience: The final pillar of PsyCap is the individual’s capacity to recover from adversity, adapt to challenging situations, and maintain well-being despite hindrances. Recovering or bouncing back from hard times is the distinctive feature of resilience (Tang, 2024).

Three main perspectives about resilience have emerged: resilience as a result, as a mechanism, and as a characteristic of personality. Resilience, as a result, refers to the outcome of an individual's ability to overcome obstacles and recover from difficult situations. As for resilience, as a mechanism, highlights the importance of problem-solving and positive thinking in building coping strategies. Finally, Resilience, as a characteristic of personality, suggests that some individuals are naturally more resilient than others which influences their ability to cope with setbacks. Applying resilience to education, resilient teachers were found to be more adaptable (Nguyen and Ngo, 2021; Fathi et al., 2023; Wahid et al., 2023).

Grounded on positive psychology, the concept of PsyCap and its constructs were positively related to employee's job satisfaction (Zhang et al., 2021), commitment (Sahoo and Sia, 2019), performance (Sen et al., 2024), well-being (Paul et al., 2023), and personal accomplishment. On the other hand, PsyCap is negatively correlated with emotional exhaustion. Further, previous studies have established that the four components of PsyCap have a profound effect on reducing job burnout (Nguyen and Ngo, 2021; Fathi et al., 2023; Wahid et al., 2023; Tang, 2024).

2.2 Burnout

While research on burnout began in the 1970s, it remains a prevalent issue with significant consequences for employees and organizations (Demerouti et al., 2021). Burnout negatively affects people’s functioning in all spheres of their lives. It manifests as a constellation of psychological and physiological symptoms. Psychologically, individuals may experience chronic fatigue, diminished self-esteem, and feelings of inadequacy or depression. Physiologically, burnout often causes headaches, muscle tension, and even hypertension (Droogenbroeck et al., 2014).

Social workers, particularly those interacting with clients (students, patients, etc.), are especially prone to burnout (Droogenbroeck et al., 2014; Wahid et al., 2023). This can happen when constant interpersonal communication at work becomes a chronic source of stress. The emotional toll of these complex interactions can lead to a variety (of negative emotions) due to feeling overwhelmed and mentally exhausted (Kyrian et al., 2020; Anjum et al. 2021).

Liu et al., 2023 defined burnout as a specific, multidimensional stress reaction characterized by prolonged emotional, physical, and mental exhaustion resulting from ineffective attempts to manage chronic stressors. Work-related stress occurs when expectations at work surpass an individual's capacity for coping, these stressors could be
complex stressors, long-term influence occupational stressors, uncontrolled occupational stress, etc.) (Kyrian et al.,2020; Perveen et al.,2023).

The multifaceted nature of burnout was explained by Stamm (2010), who considered burnout as a syndrome comprising emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment.

Emotional exhaustion is known as the central dimension of burnout. It is a state of profound physical and emotional deficiency. Individuals experiencing emotional exhaustion feel overwhelmed by daily work demands and lack the energy to effectively address them (Rehman et al.,2017; Safdar et al.2020).

The second dimension of burnout, depersonalization, occurs when a person chooses automatic functioning to avoid stress (Kyrian et al.,2020). It manifests in a dehumanized perception of colleagues, leading to cynicism and a detachment characterized by apathy and indifference in workplace relationships (Rehman et al.,2017; Freire et al.,2020). The third dimension of burnout is the reduced sense of personal accomplishment, it is associated with feelings of professional inefficacy and diminished self-esteem. This can lead to a negative self-evaluation of one's ability to fulfill job requirements and potentially culminate in a desire to give up the profession (Freire et al.,2020).

Rehman et al. (2017) exhibited that Burnout development is a progressive phenomenon, not a sudden event. The three dimensions pointed out are considered phases in the progression of burnout which follow each other and carry causes and symptoms independently. The initial phase is characterized by emotional exhaustion, where individuals experience a depletion of emotional and physical resources attributable to chronic work demands. This depletion can lead to impaired focus and diminished motivation for job tasks. As burnout progresses, depersonalization emerges when individuals become increasingly disengaged from their work, exhibiting emotional detachment, and potentially withdrawing from social interactions with colleagues. Still, he/she continues to undertake his/her job tasks but in a more mechanical than a human way. Prolonged depersonalization leads to the loss of faith in an individual’s competence and ability to finish his/her job successfully.

Previous studies showed that university academic work could be tough and challenging due to increased demands in academic work performance, heightened occupational strain, overwhelming job responsibilities, and research expectations set by institutions, in addition to their personal and familial commitments (Rusdi et al.,2021). The junction of these factors puts academics at high risk of burnout.

Burnout impedes the attainment of professional goals and depletes coping resources. This leads to a decline in mental and physical health, weak interpersonal relations, decreased teaching performance, loss of concentration toward students and organization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Droogenbroeck et al.,2014; Dinis et al.,2024). As a result, Educators experiencing burnout fall into a self-perpetuating cycle that’s hard to break, ultimately becoming a potential misfit for the demands of the educational environment.

Research suggests that burnout is significantly influenced by how individuals perceive their work environment (Guan,2021). This perception interacts with a person's characteristics, known as individual resources, to affect their vulnerability to burnout. These individual resources include personality traits, positive and negative emotional tendencies, and psychological capital (PsyCap) (Núñez et al.,2020; Pluta and Rudawska,2021). This emphasizes the need for further investigation into how these individual factors interplay with the work environment to contribute to burnout.
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3. Hypotheses development

3.1. Psychological capital & burnout

PsyCap is one of the most valuable human resources that has received attention as a deterrent against job burnout. Theoretical frameworks, supporting the protective role of psychological capital, accentuate that individuals endowed with this positive resource believe they have greater control over the work setting, can better handle their job demands, and feel more satisfied (Estiri et al., 2016). These qualities act as a shield protecting them from the damaging effects of burnout and helping them to maintain their mental well-being (Zhang et al., 2021).

The conservation of resource (COR) theory is widely used in studying internal pressure in organizations. COR states that people are encouraged to acquire, protect, and promote their resources (Hobfoll and Shirom, 2001) which motivates human behavior in the face of stress. According to the COR theory, psychological capital can be used as an individual resource to help employees alleviate their job stress, thus mitigating their job burnout (Gong et al., 2019). (Núñez et al. (2020) have shown that personal resources, specifically psychological capital, play a protective role and have a positive effect in reducing burnout levels among workers in various professional sectors.

A growing body of research has explored the relationship between psychological capital and burnout among school teachers (Zhao et al., 2022). Studies have revealed the multidimensionality of this relation: Perveen et al. (2023) identified a significant interrelationship between these constructs among Pakistani teachers, suggesting organizational commitment as an additional factor influencing the dynamic. Rehman et al. (2017) explored the moderating effect of psychological capital on the association between burnout and faculty performance in Pakistan. Fathi et al. (2023) demonstrated that self-regulation fully mediates the relationship between psychological capital and burnout among Iranian English educators. Furthermore, Both Ferradás et al. (2019) and Liu & Du (2024) revealed that psychological capital serves as a critical resource for reducing burnout among teachers. More specifically, Anjum et al., 2021 associated PsyCap with burnout symptoms among primary school teachers. According to this consistent association between PsyCap and burnout among educators, the study suggests the following hypothesis:

H1: Psychological capital is negatively associated with burnout dimensions among academic staff.

3.2. Generational differences

On the social system level, Popescu (2019) defined generation as a group of individuals born around the same time and who share a set of cultural experiences and characteristics. This shared background fosters a sense of group identity and belonging. People in the same generational cohort are born within a defined series of birth years, and share attitudes and values shaped by common historical or social life experiences and life events of their formative years. (Wyatt and Potage, 2024).

At present workplaces are dominated by diverse generational cohorts, mainly: Baby Boomers (individuals born between 1946 and 1964), Generation X (born between 1965 and 1980), Millennials (born between 1981 and 1996), and Generation Z (born between 1997 and 2012) presents a complex array of interactions within the global workforce (Pew Research Center, 2023). Each cohort has distinctive attributes shaped by shared experiences and core values. These attributes affect work attitudes, ambitions, and perception of authority and
organizational values in each generation (Lu and Gursoy, 2016). It also affects each generation’s technological adaptability, effective leadership styles, work-life balance initiatives, and dismantling of generational stereotypes (Wyatt and Potage, 2024).

Research on the effect of age on burnout was not always conclusive. Several studies found that younger employees suffer from higher burnout levels than older group ages (Kyrian et al., 2020). Whereas other studies demonstrate that older employees suffer from higher levels of burnout. (Motallebzadeh et al., 2014). The age variable was even found insignificant in moderating the relationship between burnout and its antecedents and consequences by Nguyen and Ngo (2021).

Conversely, the relation between generation and burnout was well-established in the literature. Kobyakova et al. (2021) found that millennials and Gen Z suffer from higher levels of depersonalization and reduced personal achievement, while GenX suffers from higher emotional exhaustion and baby boomers were the lowest in all burnout components. Lu and Gursoy (2016) suggest that different generations' distinct work values, preferences, and expectations will make workers interpret and perceive burnout differently. Moreover, studies examining generational differences in psychological traits reported that younger generations have higher narcissism and self-esteem than older generations (Seo et al., 2022), which could moderate the effect of burnout. Further, Staples (2014) identified significant generational differences in psychological capital (PsyCap) scores. Baby Boomers exhibited higher overall PsyCap compared to younger generations. These differences extended to PsyCap constructs, Baby Boomers and Millennials reported greater PsyCap efficacy than Generation X, they also demonstrated the strongest PsyCap resilience followed by Generation X and then Millennials, finally, Baby Boomers were the highest in optimism. All three generations displayed similar levels of hopefulness. Based on the formal consensus the study suggests the following hypothesis:

H2: Generational differences moderate the relation between PsyCap and burnout among faculty staff.

The conceptual model of the research is presented in figure 1.
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**Figure (1): Conceptual model**

4. Methodology

4.1. Sampling and procedures

The present study utilized a quantitative methodology approach, employing a web-based survey conducted through Google Forms. The survey specifically targeted academics working in tourist higher education institutions in Egypt. The main emphasis was on
academics, given the distinctive difficulties they encounter in their profession, including heavy workloads, various student requirements, and the obligation to stay up-to-date with industry developments, all of which may substantially lead to job burnout. The study population consisted of 980 academics who were associated with Egyptian higher education institutes specializing in tourism (Said & Kamel, 2023).

These institutions comprise members from various generational cohorts, such as baby boomers, Generations X, Y, and Z. The study aims to collect perspectives and experiences on how PsyCap influences job burnout across different generational groups in today's academic environment. For this research, academic staff were selected via convenience sampling. By utilizing the convenience sampling method, the researcher collected data from a varied yet easily obtainable group of academic staff (Saunders, 2012; Lopez & Whitehead, 2013).

Before collecting the data, a pilot test was undertaken, which comprised 20 academic staff members, all of whom were professors affiliated with Alexandria University and specialized in the field of study. This was conducted to guarantee the survey's lucidity, precision, and reliability. A few statements underwent modest modifications in order to enhance accuracy.

The surveys were conducted in a manner that guaranteed complete anonymity and confidentiality, thereby safeguarding the privacy of the respondents. The questionnaire was distributed online to academic staff in the faculties of Tourism and Hotels in Egypt. A total of 204 respondents freely completed the online questionnaire. While the faculties included individuals from four different demographic cohorts (Baby Boomers, Generations X, Y, and Z), respondents were from Generations X, Y, and Z. The respondents were distributed as follows: Generation X had 87 participants, accounting for 42.6% of the sample; Generation Y had 76 participants, representing 37.3%; and Generation Z had 41 participants, accounting for 20.1% of the total. None of the respondents were from the Baby Boomers.

4.2. Scale development

The questionnaire consists of two main components. The primary objective of the first part is to determine the generational division of the academic staff. The second part is subdivided into two primary segments: a) The evaluation of PsyCap using the Compound PsyCap Scale (CPC–12) as revised by Lorenz et al. (2016) consisting of 12 total items and an equally balanced distribution of items per subscale (four subscales with three items each). b) Assessment of job burnout utilizing the “Maslach Burnout Inventory” (MBI), originally developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981). The most widely accepted and frequently used instrument in the current burnout research. The instrument consists of 22 statements, measuring feelings an individual might have as a result of being exhausted at work. The instrument measures the level of burnout under three dimensions: Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (DP), and Personal Accomplishment (PA). Emotional exhaustion contains 9 items, describing feelings of being emotionally exhausted because of work. Depersonalization consists of 5 items, describing impersonal responses and careless treatment toward individuals. Personal accomplishment consists of 8 items, dealing with feelings of competence and achievement in work life.

Participants were asked to express their concurrence with each statement using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Never) to 6 (Always).

4.3. Data analysis

The study employed a Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) approach to examine the research hypotheses. The data analysis was conducted using Amos software. A two-stage methodology was applied by the suggestions put out by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The
initial stage involved assessing the validity and reliability of the hypothesized model. Then, we investigated the hypothesized structural model and performed a moderation test employing the methods suggested by Byrne (2010).

4.3.1 Measurement Model Validation

Fitcher (2013) stated that the loadings of each item should be greater than 0.40. Hence, items with loadings < 0.4, such as EE.5, EE.6, and EE.7, are considered insignificant and ought to be removed. The item loadings for each construct, as shown in Table 1, vary from 0.459 to 0.965, which indicates satisfactory convergent validity.

When considering construct reliability, the overall ratings for both the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Composite Reliability (CR) are quite satisfactory. The CR of the latent variables falls within the range of 0.5 to 0.7, which satisfies the 0.70 criterion proposed by prior scholars (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Schumacker & Lomax, 2010; Al-Zwainy & Al-Marsomi, 2023). Furthermore, Table 1 presents the results pertaining to the AVE, which vary between 0.857 and 0.943. In addition, Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) define Cronbach's alpha (α) levels over 0.70 as appropriate. The results therefore provide evidence that supports the efficacy of the measurement model implemented in this research, as shown in Table 1.

Table (1) Measurement model validity and reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Cronbach's α (≥0.5)</th>
<th>AVE (≥0.5)</th>
<th>CR (≥0.7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital (PsyCap)</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Psy.SE.1</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psy.SE2</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psy.SE3</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Psy.H4</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psy.H5</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psy.H6</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Psy.O7</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psy.O8</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psy.O9</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Psy.R1</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psy.R2</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psy.R3</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Burnout (JB)</td>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>EE.1</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE.2</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE.3</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE.4</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE.5</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE.6</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE.7</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>De.1</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De.2</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De.3</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced personal achievement</td>
<td>RPA.1</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RPA.2</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RPA.3</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Results

The structural model will be evaluated once the validity and reliability of the measurement model have been verified. This will facilitate the investigation of the study’s hypotheses and the examination of the interrelationships among the constructs.

Table (2) Hypotheses testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients (beta)</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>T-Value (bootstrapping)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: PsyCap → JB</td>
<td>-0.320</td>
<td>.0905</td>
<td>-4.8091</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap → EE</td>
<td>-0.4873</td>
<td>.0879</td>
<td>-5.5458</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap → RPA</td>
<td>-0.394</td>
<td>.0859</td>
<td>-4.7967</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap → De</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>1.0578</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moderation effect of generational differences (X:n=87, Y:n=76, Z:n=41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H2: PsyCap * Generational differences → JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN.X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H3: PsyCap * Generational differences → EE(JB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN.X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H4: PsyCap * Generational differences → DE(JB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN.X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H5: PsyCap * Generational differences → RPA (JB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN.X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results presented in Table 2 indicate that psychological capital has a substantial impact on reducing job burnout among academic staff, therefore verifying the first hypothesis (H1: \( \beta = -0.320, t = -4.8091, p < 0.01 \)). The decrease is especially significant in emotional exhaustion, a crucial aspect of job burnout (\( \beta = -0.4873, t = -5.5458, p < 0.01 \)), and is then followed by personal achievement (\( \beta = -0.394, t = -4.7967, p < 0.01 \)). Nevertheless, depersonalization is not significantly influenced by psychological capital (\( \beta = -0.077, t = 1.0578, p > 0.05 \)).

In order to investigate the potential moderating effect of generational differences on the association between job burnout and psychological capital (PsyCap), a multi-group analysis was undertaken. As Byrne (2010) argues, this required the application of a t-test on the beta values of the coefficients for each respective path in order to determine the variances between the three distinct generations.

The findings in Table 3 indicate that generational variances have a substantial impact on the correlation between psychological capital and job burnout among three different generations: Generation X (\( \beta = -.280, P = .007 \)), Generation Y (\( \beta = -.282, P = .01 \)), and Generation Z (\( \beta = -.421, P = .003 \)). The moderating effect is especially apparent in the influence of PsyCap on emotional exhaustion and personal achievement, both of which are components of job burnout.
6. Conclusion and Discussion

In this study, the researcher focuses on higher educational institutions especially, faculties of Tourism and Hotels, filling the gap in research to highlight the importance of academic staff’s psychological level to alleviate burnout. The study analyzed the effect of psychological capital as an adaptive personal resource in the reduction of burnout and of each of its three dimensions among academic staff.

The study’s findings support the notion demonstrated by various studies conducted in the educational field, that psychological capital (PsyCap) acts as a buffer against overall burnout in demanding academic environments (Ferradas et al., 2019; Bolelli and Ekizle, 2022; Wahid et al., 2023). The research reinforces the importance of psychological capital (PsyCap) as a valuable personal resource that significantly impacts job burnout. These findings align with Lu & Du (2024) who identified a direct negative correlation between PsyCap and teacher burnout, and Freire et al. (2020) who explored the PsyCap-burnout relationship through the lens of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model.

Investigating the association between psychological capital (PsyCap) and the three dimensions of burnout, the results show that academics with high levels of PsyCap demonstrate lower vulnerability to emotional exhaustion and reduced professional accomplishment. In practical terms, academics with higher psychological capital are better equipped to withstand: feeling emotionally drained (emotional exhaustion), and losing a sense of accomplishment (reduced professional accomplishment). However, the relation between PsyCap and depersonalization was insignificant in our study which contradicts the result of Anjum et al. 2021 who found a significant correlation between PsyCap and all of the three dimensions of burnout, despite the significance of the relation between PsyCap and depersonalization was the weakest among the three dimensions.

Depersonalization, which refers to the interpersonal aspects of burnout towards colleagues, students, and the organization, is more social in nature (Freire et al., 2020). It reflects a cynical attitude that could be more impacted by social support and interpersonal relationships than by age or personality traits like PsyCap (Droogenbroeck et al., 2014; Ye et al., 2021). This justification is further strengthened by Kyrian et al. (2020) who found that factors like age and gender (sociodemographic characteristics) have a stronger influence on...
emotional exhaustion, while characteristics related to the organization and profession play a more significant role in depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment. Additionally, Khan et al. (2018) identified social support as the factor with the strongest correlation to depersonalization. The current research highlights the limited influence of personal resources on depersonalization, as evidenced by its insignificant correlation with PsyCap.

The results suggest a strong negative association between psychological capital (PsyCap) and emotional exhaustion. This relationship can be attributed to the interplay of PsyCap's core components. Self-Efficacy: Individuals with high self-efficacy exhibit a robust belief in their ability to navigate challenges. This fosters proactive coping strategies, potentially mitigating the development of emotional exhaustion (Teng and Zhang, 2022). As for the hope component, it fosters a belief in the existence of alternative pathways to achieve goals. This mindset can alleviate feelings of stagnation and contribute to reduced emotional exhaustion (Bolelli and Ekizle, 2022). Moreover, the positive outlook of optimistic individuals mitigates their emotional depletion, because they tend to hold positive outcome expectancies and view challenges as temporary setbacks. Finally, the resilience component of PsyCap equips individuals with the capacity to effectively manage stressors, thereby reducing the susceptibility to emotional exhaustion (Liu and Du, 2024).

The negative influence of PsyCap on reduced personal accomplishment can be attributed to the high sense of accomplishment among individuals with high PsyCap. This is likely because they score highly in self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience. These qualities make them believe they have more control over their work environment, can handle challenges better, and feel more satisfied. As a result, they see a greater chance of success and ultimately recognize their achievements more readily. Núñez et al., 2020 explain this link by emphasizing that personal achievement shares characteristics with other aspects of PsyCap, such as self-esteem, self-efficacy, and optimism.

In conclusion, the research reinforces the importance of psychological capital (PsyCap) as a valuable personal resource that significantly impacts job burnout. These findings align with Lu & Du (2024) who identified a direct negative correlation between PsyCap and teacher burnout, and Freire et al. (2020) who explored the PsyCap-burnout relationship through the lens of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model.

In addition to the direct link between psychological capital (PsyCap) and reduced burnout, the study also revealed the moderating effect of generational differences. Not only did the generational differences moderate the relation between the Psycap and overall burnout, but they also moderated the relation between PsyCap and each emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. The generational cohorts, however, did not moderate the relation between PsyCap and depersonalization, which confirms the non-personal nature of depersonalization. Lu and Gursoy, 2016 tried to interpret the insignificance of the moderation effect of generations by assuming that when burnout advances from emotional exhaustion to cynicism it might affect both older and younger employees at similar magnitudes.
7. Implications

The findings derived from this research possess substantial implications for educational practice, as it makes a significant contribution to understanding and addressing burnout among academic staff in Egyptian higher education. By delving deeper into this issue, the study could identify effective strategies to strengthen PsyCap and alleviate burnout among academics.

Unlike some personality traits, psychological capital (PsyCap) is more dynamic. It can change and grow over time, and its influence can be specific to particular situations or tasks (Nguyen and Ngo, 2021). This means PsyCap can be actively developed through brief training programs. Universities have an opportunity to leverage this by implementing effective human resource practices. These practices should focus on strengthening academic staff’s PsyCap through equipping academics with strategies to nurture their psychological resources. These initiatives could offer training, stress management programs, and interventions designed to augment PsyCap through organizing sessions in which, academics learn to set smart goals, develop backup plans, think positively about themselves, enhance motivation and goal achievement, utilize available support systems, proactively address potential challenges and effectively communicate and collaborate with others.

On the other hand, universities should aim to alleviate the levels of burnout among academics. This can be achieved by implementing strategies to manage workloads and providing robust support systems for educators facing burnout.

Research also suggests universities should consider developing customized support structures for academics according to their generational cohort. This is because different generations may have varying work values and preferences that affect the relationship between PsyCap and burnout.

8. Limitations

Although this study has made a valuable contribution to literature, we must acknowledge some limitations. Firstly, we only examined the relation between the overall PsyCap on burnout and its dimensions, further study is needed to examine each of the PsyCap constructs on the three dimensions of burnout. Secondly, the current research did not explore potential differences in PsyCap or burnout across generations. Future research investigating these generational variations could inform the development of even more targeted interventions.
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التأثير المثبط لرأس المال النفسي على أبعاد الاحتراق النفسي عند الأكاديميين
في كليات السياحة والفنادق المصرية:دراسة متعددة الأبعاد

هبة محمد سعيد
كلية السياحة والفنادق-جامعة الأسكندرية-جمهورية مصر العربية

الملخص:
تنوع ظاهرة الاحتراق النفسي بين الأكاديميين نظراً لطبيعة عملهم الخاصة، و يترتب عليها العديد من المشكلات على المستوى الأكاديمي والمهني. و عادة يتم التركيز في البحث العلمي عند دراسة الظروف المؤثرة على الاحتراق النفسي علىمتطلبات الوظيفة بينما هناك دراسات محدودة تتناول العوامل الدفاعية التي يركز عليها علم النفس الإيجابي. انطلاقاً من هذا الاتجاه تتناول الدراسة تأثير رأس المال النفسي على الاحتراق النفسي عند أعضاء هيئة التدريس ودراسة هذا التأثير على كل من أبعاد الاحتراق النفسي بصورة خاصة، بالإضافة إلى فحص التأثير المعدل لاختلاف الأجيال على كل من هذه العوامل. وقد استخدمت الدراسة النهج الكمي، وتم اختيار الفروض باستخدام نمذجة المعادلات الهيكلية. و قد أثبتت النتائج التأثير السلبي لرأس المال النفسي على الاحتراق النفسي ككل و على اثنين من أبعاده وهما الإرهاق العاطفي ونقص الشعور بالإنجاز. كما أثبتت الدراسة التأثير المعدل لاختلاف الأجيال على هذه العوامل، بينما أوضحت النتائج عدم وجود علاقة إحصائية بين كل من رأس المال النفسي و بعد تبادل المشاعر. كما لم يكن لاختلاف الأجيال تأثير ملحوظ في العلاقة بينهما. وقد قدمت الدراسة عدد من الاقتراحات العملية التي تساعد القطاع الأكاديمي على تنمية رأس المال النفسي لدى الأكاديميين لتقليل الاحتراق النفسي لديهم مما يساهم في تحسين وتنمية البيئة العلمية والتعليمية في الجامعات.

الكلمات الدالة: رأس المال النفسي, الاحتراق,الأكاديميين, اختلاف الأجيال
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