



International Conference on Education and Educational Psychology (ICEEPSY 2012)

The Burnout Level Among Faculty Of Education Students At Celal Bayar University

Aynur Pala

Faculty of Education, Celal Bayar University in Manisa/Turkey

Abstract

Burnout is a popular term and it's easy to apply to just having stress, but burnout is actually something a lot more serious than people just being stressed from school. It is not simply a heavy workload that makes people feel burned out. Maslach explained that some people can work hours on end and be perfectly happy because they enjoy their job. Actual burnout is a combination of exhaustion, depression and negative feelings about oneself. It has been shown that burnout is experienced by students as well as in all types of professions and occupational groups. Burnout among students refers to feeling exhausted because of students demand, having a cynical and detached attitude toward one's study, and feeling in competent as a student. The objective of the current study is to investigate the burnout level among Faculty of Education Students at Celal Bayar University . Students' burnout level was assessed with a modified version of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) for students.

Key words: *Undergraduate students, burnout, workload.*

© 2012 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

Selection and peer-review under responsibility of Dr. Zafer Bekirogullari of Cognitive – Counselling, Research & Conference Services C-crcs.

Keywords: Type your keywords here, separated by semicolons ;

I-Introduction

Burnout is defined as exhaustion resulting from excessive demands on energy and resources. In English, the term “burnout” means to burn or destroy by means of fire. It is a labor site syndrome that features a chronic occupational stress-response process, when confronting methods fail or come short, entailing negative consequences at the individual, professional, family and social levels (Maslach C, Jackson SE.,1986). According to psychoanalyst Freudenberger, who first approached the term in the field of Psychology, the burnout syndrome is also defined as a result of intense work that is disregardful of the needs of the individual, which leads not only to physical but also emotional wearout. Thus, “burnout” is here defined as a “failure, inside out burn, becoming worn out by the over-expenditure of energy, force or resources”. The term was further spread by Cristina Maslach and Susan Jackson in more recent studies over the last years (Rosen IM, Gimotty PA, Shea JA, Bellini LM, 2006). It is reasonable to assume that objective external reasons (e.g., workload) contributes to burnout (e.g., Greenglass, Burke, & Fiksenbaum, 2001), but many workers seem to cope successfully with heavy workloads, whereas others do not. Perhaps it is the subjective response to external factors, rather than the external factors itself, that contributes most to burnout. (e.g., Zellars, Perrewe, & Hochwarter, 2000).

Some studies have explored burnout among college students (e.g., Fuehrer & McGonagle, 1988). Between overcrowded classes, examinations, doubtful employment as a teacher, side jobs, and extracurricular activities, students are likely to experience high levels of work stress. Feelings of being undervalued by professors and colleagues, perceptions of excessive academic demands and workloads, and limited latitude in decision-making due to time and resource constraints are also inherent in being a student. However, it is still unclear whether they do experience burnout. Much research is needed to determine the prevalence of burnout, to identify important intrapersonal and interpersonal factors that influence burnout, and to develop effective interventions to prevent and reduce burnout in college students.

Recently a few studies have indicated burnout evidence among student and novice teacher samples (e.g., Dückers-Klichowski, 2005), therefore this study aimed firstly to establish levels of burnout among the sample group of 281 university students and to investigate correlations

between these levels and depend on their departments, grade level and kinds of education (first and second education).

II- Methodology

II.1. The aim of the study

The objective of the current study is to investigate the burnout level among students Faculty Of Education Students At Celal Bayar University.

II. 2. Participants

Participants were enrolled in Primary school Teacher traning, Science Teacher Traning, and Turkish Teacher Training programs at the Faculty Of Education at Celal Bayar University. The demographic statistics of participants are displayed in Table 1.

Table. 1. Demographic of the participants

		N	%
Department	Primary teacher training	80	29
	Science teacher traning	158	56
	Turkish teacher training	43	15
Group	First education	143	51
	Second education	139	49
Grade Level	1	106	38
	3	104	37
	4	72	25

II.3. Data Collection

In order to assess burnout a modified instrument of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was used. 15 statements are answered in terms of the frequency on a 5 point scale (ranging from 0 “never” to “always”. In an attempt to clarify the parameters of the phenomenon, Leiter and

Maslach (2001) proposed that burnout be considered as an extreme point on a three-dimensional continuum that comprises energy (exhaustion), involvement (cynicism) and effectiveness (professional efficacy). Exhaustion consists of five items and refers to both physical and mental exhaustion, to the feeling of having come to the limit of possibilities, whereas, Cynicism contains five items consisting of behavior alterations by the individual upon the contact with the users of their services, when they take up a cold and impersonal attitude towards suffering, and, Finally Professional Efficacy with six items that measure the perception of the influence caused by others, the feeling comfortable at work as well as their relation with their own problems, which provides evidence for the feeling of dissatisfaction.

Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of subscales are: Exhaustion: .70, Cynicism : .75, and Professional : .75.

II. 4. Research Questions

- 1- What are the Burnout Level Among Faculty Of Education Students At Celal Bayar University?
- 2 - Is there significant differences according to variables such as;
 - a) departments,
 - b) kinds of education (first and second education)
 - c) grade level.

III. Results

Means of burnout level according to participants department is shown table 2 below. It shows means of of factors of exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy.

Table 2. Means of burnout level according to participants' department.

Descriptives	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Exhaustion	1	80	14,1625	4,15352
	2	158	16,4557	5,63157
	3	43	15,3953	5,21509
	Total	281	15,6406	5,26671
Cynicism	1	80	12,0000	3,55428
	2	158	13,0633	3,53631
	3	43	12,0698	4,02608
	Total	281	12,6085	3,64346
Professional Efficacy	1	80	12,2250	3,77860
	2	158	11,3165	3,18853
	3	43	12,0465	4,57714
	Total	281	11,6868	3,61270

Table: 3. ANOVA for the comparison of the means of burnout level according to participants department.

ANOVA							
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Difference
Exhaustion	Between Groups	282,341	2	141,171	5,244	,006*	1-2
	Within Groups	7484,356	278	26,922			
	Total	7766,698	280				
Cynicism	Between Groups	74,782	2	37,391	2,854	,059	
	Within Groups	3642,158	278	13,101			
	Total	3716,940	280				
Professional Efficacy	Between Groups	50,407	2	25,204	1,944	,145	
	Within Groups	3604,034	278	12,964			
	Total	3654,441	280				

*p<0,05

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) applied to data in order to test whether the means of burnout level based on participants department are significantly different or not. According to the test there is a significant difference only for exhaustion factor among departments have been found to be significantly different. The difference is between the Science teacher training and Primary teacher training program. The burnout level among students in Science teacher training is higher than students in primary school teacher training program. There is not found any significant difference among other programs and for other factors.

Table:4. T test for the comparison of the means of burnout level according to participants' kinds of education

	Grup	N	Mean	ss	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Exhaustion	First	143	15,9510	5,89142	1,12	280	,263
	Second	139	15,2446	4,59654	1		
Cynicism	First	143	12,7413	3,64771	,695	280	,487
	Second	139	12,4388	3,65370			
Professional Efficacy	First	143	11,7413	3,57754	,235	280	,815
	Second	139	11,6403	3,64951			

An independent t test applied in order to test whether the means of burnout level based on participants kinds of education are significantly different or not. According to the test, there is no significant difference.

Table: 5. Means of burnout level according to participants grade level.

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Exhaustion	1	106	16,7453	5,83595
	3	104	14,4423	4,54925
	4	72	15,5972	5,16396
	Total	282	15,6028	5,29537
Cynicism	1	106	13,0755	3,47151
	3	104	11,7885	3,68590
	4	72	13,0417	3,69025
	Total	282	12,5922	3,64731
Professional Efficacy	1	106	11,0000	2,80476
	3	104	12,5192	4,15239
	4	72	11,5139	3,61917

Table: 6. ANOVA for the comparison of the means of burnout level according to participants department.

ANOVA							
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Difference
Exhaustion	Between Groups	278,422	2	139,211	5,110	,007*	1-3
	Within Groups	7601,096	279	27,244			
	Total	7879,518	281				
Cynicism	Between Groups	106,485	2	53,243	4,090	,018*	1-3
	Within Groups	3631,617	279	13,017			
	Total	3738,103	281				
Professional Efficacy	Between Groups	124,212	2	62,106	4,906	,008*	1-3
	Within Groups	3531,948	279	12,659			
	Total	3656,160	281				

* $p < 0,05$

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) applied to data in order to test whether the means of burnout level based on participants' grade level are significantly different or not. According to the test there is a significant difference have been found. The first year students' burnout level is higher than third year students for factors exhaustion and cynicism. But there is no significant difference between level of four year students and first and third year students. For professional efficacy factor third year students' is higher than first year students.

V. Conclusion

The main finding from this study was that for university students was not very high. The means of the three subscales indicate that the students rated themselves as more burnout in Cynicism (= 3.15) than in Exhaustion (= 3.12) and Professional Efficacy (= 2.33). Item 5 in

the Exhaustion subscale (I feel burned out from my studies) had the highest mean. Item 6 in the subscale cynicism (have become less interested in my studies since my enrollment at the university) had the highest mean. And finally item 11 in the professional efficacy subscale (I believe that I make an effective contribution to the classes that I attend.) had the highest mean.

The reasons of burnout among university students should be studied and find out solutions for decrease burnout level. One of the reason of burnout can be related to examination. Examination anxiety can be reduce by coordinating examinations among the classes within academic years before the semester begins so that students do not have more than one examination on a single day and usually no more than two examinations per week.

References

- Dückers-Klichowski, S. (2005). *Burnout bei Lehramtsanwärtern im Primarbereich* [Burnout in teachers on probation in primary schools]. Berlin: Logos.
- Fuehrer, A., & McGonagle, K. (1988). Individual and situational factors as predictors of burnout among resident assistants. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29, 244-249.
- Greenglass, 1991; Gill et al., 2006; Levinson, (1996). Exploring the origins of burnout among secondary educators Original Research. Greenglass, E. R., Burke, R. J., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2001). Workload and burnout in nurses. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 11, 211-215. Leiter, P.M., & Maslach, C. (2001). Burnout and quality in a sped-up world. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 24(2), 48-51. Maslach C, Jackson SE. Manual of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. 2nd ed. Palo Alto, Calif: Consulting Psychologists Press; 1986. Maslach C, Jackson SE. Manual of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. 2nd ed. Palo Alto, Calif: Consulting Psychologists Press; 1986.
- Rosen IM, Gimotty PA, Shea JA, Bellini LM. Evolution of sleep quantity, sleep deprivation, mood disturbances, empathy, and burnout among interns. *Acad Med*.2006;81:82–5.
- Schorn, N. K. & Buchwald, P. (2007). Burnout in Student Teachers. In P. Roussi, E. Vasilaki, K. Kaniasty, & J. D. Barker (Eds.), *Electronic Proceedings of the 27th Conference of the STAR Society*, 13-15 July 2006, University of Crete, Rethymnon (pp. 150 - 159).
- Zellars, K. L., Perrewe, P. L., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2000). Burnout in health care: The role of the five factors of personality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 1570-1598.