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ABSTRACT The issue of burnout is among factors that influence retention in an organization as well as the health of that institution including survivability. This research was undertaken to examine the burnout level of workers in a higher-level educational institution in Central Jamaica, and to identify factors influence burnout of the workers. It provides an analysis and evaluation of contributing factors. The conclusion includes a list of recommendations which can be implemented to address issues identified in the analysis. This study employed a quantitative research design that was cross-sectional in nature. It was a cross-sectional probability sample survey (i.e., stratified random sampling) of workers in the higher-level educational institution. A standardized instrument was used to collect the data for this research. This survey instrument was used to provide data on which this study answered the research questions on factors that determine burnout among workers. The survey instrument was a standardized questionnaire comprising 45 questions, with none being open-ended. The instrument also contained Socio-demographic, Social items, including items on burnout. The participants of the study consisted of workers who are currently at work for December 2017. The sample frame consisted of 522 personnel who are employed at the above-mentioned institutions for a minimum of one month—the sampling frame was obtained from the human resource department, from which the sample size was computed for this study. Stratified random sampling was used to select the workers who are likely to participate in the study. The sampled population was 222 workers, with a response rate of 70 per cent (n=164 workers). The current findings revealed that 43 out of every 50 employees are experiencing a high-level of burnout, and age is a negative factor of depersonalization and personal achievement. Another critical finding of this study is a high-level of reduced personal achievement experienced by staff members. Hence being employed to a higher educational institution does not reduced a high level of stress, and so this has meaning for the social psychology in organization.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The issue of burnout in the workplace is a phenomenon which requires urgent attention, especially as it relates to the level of productivity of the entity and the wellbeing of the workforce. The word “burnout,” coined by Freudenberger (1974) refers to a chronic state of physical, mental and emotional exhaustion and manifests itself in terms of cynicism and detachment, feelings of ineffectiveness and lack of accomplishment. The difference between stress (Selye, 1956; Pearlin, 1983) and burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1982, 1983), therefore, is one of degree, with burnout being at the extreme end of the continuum and reflects a degree of exhaustion, depersonalization and inefficacy (Azeeem, Nazir, Zaidi, & Akhtar, 2014; Maslach & Jackson, 1982, 1983; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Negi, & Bagga, 2015). The value of burnout in organization is important because of its influence on organizational hazard and wellbeing (Maslach, & Leiter, 2016), which is a rationale for many studies examining the measures this construct (Feldt, Rantanen, Hyvonen, et al., 2014; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach, 1996; Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996). Exhaustion is the hallmark of burnout, its main symptom. Individuals who experience burnout exhibit signs of extreme fatigue (physical, cognitive, and emotional) that inhibits their ability function effectively or efficiently and appreciate the contribution they are making (Lorenz, Benatti, & Sabino, 2010; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach, 1996; Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996). Stressors include an organizational culture with high demands on performance without corresponding resources or work overload, without the flexibility of control or participation in decision-making and accounts burnout among workers (Lorenz, Benatti, & Sabino, 2010). Exhaustion manifests itself in an inability to concentrate, to perform routine or once enjoyable tasks and the lack of will to face each day in the work environment. Cynicism, or depersonalization, is a lack of engagement. Individuals distance themselves psychologically from work. There is no ‘buy in’ as regards improvement in the functioning of the organization. There is no commitment or loyalty to duties or responsibilities, undertakings, colleagues, customers, and other collaborators. There is a feeling of detachment, negativity, and callousness. Cynicism often results from work
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overload, the presence of high conflict, unfairness, and lack of participation in decision making. Persistent
cynicism indicates a loss of connection to, enjoyment of, and pride in work, and means that burnout accounts for
job dissatisfaction and lowered performance (Aiken, Clarke, Sloane, Sochalski, & Silber, 2002). Inefficacy is the
feelings of incompetence and a lack of achievement and productivity. In this regard Individuals assume they are
losing their ability to succeed in certain situations or accomplish certain tasks as a result of losing their skills. It
often manifests in with exhaustion and cynicism because of the inability to perform efficiently and effectively
when chronically fatigued or disengaged, which is encapsulated in Maslach Burnout Index (Maslach & Jackson,
1983; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach, 1996; Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996). However, burnout can also
start with inefficacy if there is a lack of resources and support to function effectively. A conducive environment
includes good communication, clear expectations, autonomy, and a good working relationship with colleagues.
There is also need for feedback and meaningful recognition, the absence of which have implications for
perceptions of work quality and feeling unappreciated. Research undertaken over the years has established links
between burnout and many negative physical and mental health outcomes, psychological and physiological issues
as well as job attrition (Rushton, Batcheller, Schroeder, & Donohue, 2015; Pearlin, 1983; Patrick, & Lavery, 2007;
Mobley, Griffeth, & Meglino, 1979; Salvagioni, Melanda, Mesas, González, et al., 2017; ).

In fact, some studies have established a statistically significant correlation between burnout and general wellbeing
including coronary artery disease, hypertension or increased blood pressure levels, sleep disturbances/insomnia,
depression, and anxiety, and increased alcohol and drug use (Edmondson, Lawler, Jobe, Younger, Piferi, & Jones,
2005; Jurkovic & Walker, 2006; Cohen, & Wills, 1985; Ahola, Honkonen, Pirkola, et al., 2006; Brand, Beck,
Hatziner, et al., 2010; Ahola, Honkonen, Isometsa, et al., 2005; Ahola, Pulkki-Raback, Kouvonén, et al., 2012;
Aghilinejad, Zargham, Sarebanha, et al., 2015). Additionally, researchers conclude that burnout often results in
feelings of futility and alienation, negatively impacts the quality of relationships, and undermines long-term career
prospects. Burnout, therefore, influences attitude to work, job satisfaction, job performance and attrition, and as
such explains the importance of this psychological issue in organizational behavior. With institutions of higher
learning providing training and development of the human capital, a study of burnout among workers would
provide critical insights into the psychology of working in these organizations. An examination of the
phenomenon of burnout would provide in-depth understanding of how workers are cared for or otherwise. On
reviewing of the literature no study emerged that evaluates burnout among workers in higher educational
institutions in Jamaica. It is within this context that research on the burnout level among workers in a higher
educational organization in Central Jamaica to determine the extent of the wellbeing of the workers and to identify
solution where negative issues are identified, as the Institution is cognizant of the fact that satisfied and healthy
customers, clients and workers create a positive environment in which to thrive and accomplish objectives both
on a corporate and an individual level. This study detailed the theoretical framework as this provide the guide for
interpreting idea including the selected method and conclusions.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Empirical model of attitude to work Crotty (2005) forwarded a justification for the use of a theoretical
framework in research, epistemological thinking (or paradigm). He postulated “…the philosophical stance that lies
behind our chosen methodology. We attempt to explain how it provides a context for the process and grounds its
logic and criteria” (Crotty, 2005, 7). Therefore, the current study will employ three theoretical frameworks. One
is for attitude to work (Figure 1), staff tenure (Figure 2) and attitude, job satisfaction and job performance (Figure
3).
Figure 1: A model of Attitude: The model of attitudes (Figure 1) shows that attitude is influenced by values and beliefs and that intention to behavior precedes the actual behavior. Embedded in the model is some identifiable object. Human behavior is in response to some act or action, and that attitude is in reference to some affective component. The affective component denotes the emotional tone which occurs in response to the object of the attitude. Humans are social agents, which means that their behavior is an expression of parental socialization as this is one way in which people acquire values, beliefs and attitude and by extension their part therein. It follows that organization socialization is equally critical to the attitude of works as it is a part of the acculturalization of the individual as to acceptable (or otherwise) behavior. Hence, the aforementioned factors contribute to positive or negative attitude to life, including work.

Empirical model of attitude to leaving a company: The intention to leave a company has been empirically examined by Zeytinoglu, et al. (2009). They established that the attitude to leave a company is influenced by job security, job satisfaction, commitment to the job, and particular socio-demographic characteristics – gender, age, and educational attainment. Figure 2 captures the relationship between different independent variables and the attitude to leave the company.

Empirical model of attitude, job satisfaction and job performance Unlike the two aforementioned presented theoretical models, this one developed by Cook (2008) brings together attitude, job satisfaction and job performance in a single model, while excluding retention. The relationship between attitudes and job satisfaction, and job attitude and performance is captured herein as all the tenets of attitude do not directly impact job satisfaction likewise job performance; but they are routed through job complexity, with the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance being a Weak one (r = 0.30).

Figure 3: Integrated theoretical model of the Relationship among personality, job characteristics, cognitive ability, job satisfaction, and job performance (Cook, 2008, 39).
Empirical model - burnout (MBI) Studies have empirically established that ‘burnout’ is a feature of high stress jobs including nursing (Jennings, Bakker, Le Blanc, & Schaufeli, 1997, 2005; Maslach and Jackson, 1982, 1983; Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter, 2001). The issue of stress resulting from work load is well documented in the literature (Selye, 1956; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; French & Caplan, 1972), and burnout which is used to assess stress levels on the job has been computed by way of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). In fact, MBI is the most widely employed measure of burnout. MBI was developed by Christina Maslach, Susan E. Jackson, Michael P. Leiter, Wilmab S. Schaufeli and Richard L. Schwab to assess burnout among people in Organizations. It also assesses burnout among college students. It is a self-reported survey of some 22 items. The items are grouped under three areas: 1) emotional exhaustion, 2) cynicism or depersonalization and inefficacy (reduced personal accomplishment). Hence, it is a psychometric measure that is a multidimensional conceptualization of burnout. More than 25 years have elapsed since it was first published, and many other studies have validated its appropriateness in assessing burnout. A comprehensive measuring of the MBI can be found in Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter’s (1996) work. The MBI self-test is categorized into three sections—Section A (Emotional Exhaustion), Section B (Depersonalization), and Section C (Personal Achievement). Emotional exhaustion evaluates fatigue, sleeping conditions, and physical problems. Depersonalization seeks to measure loss of empathy, and personal achievement addresses individual reduced accomplishments.

Literature review A rapidly growing number of people have been experiencing psychological stress at their Workplace. In most industrialized countries, absenteeism, increasing turnover rates, and an increasing number of workers receiving disablement benefits because of psychological problems is evident. What gives rise to such a phenomenon? The concept of burnout starts with prolonged stress and demands at work, that may eventually lead to an individual gradually losing energy, functionality and ultimately withdrawal becoming exhausted emotionally. The term “burnout” was first conceived by Herbert Freudenberger, in the 1970s. Since then, over five thousand books have been published on the subject. Freudenberger (1974) first defined this phenomenon as “the extinction of motivation or incentive, especially where one’s devotion to a cause or relationship fails to produce the desired result.” (Peter Janssen, 1998) Pines and Aronson define burn out as “A state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion caused by long term involvement in emotionally demanding situations.” The only measure that is used to assess burnout in all three core dimensions is the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). Maslach defined burnout in the 1970s as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind (Barbara Loera, 2014).”

The three dimensions developed were emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, and depersonalization, which reflect the focus for those persons in occupations that require them to interact with several persons. Two main surveys were developed: the MBI-Human services survey (MBI-HSS), designed for individuals within the health sector and MBI-educators survey (MBI-ES) for educators. Over the way the issue of burnout has been attracting much attention, not only applicable to persons who are in highly interactive jobs such as teachers and health care professionals, but also regarding the public in general. This has led to the development of the MBI-general survey (MBI-GS), which still assesses the three dimensions, as used in the other two previously mentioned surveys. Although it uses slightly revised items, it maintains a consistent factor structure across a variety of career areas (Christina Maslach, 2001). An evaluation of the three dimensions of burnout by Maslach shows the importance of each in the survey to provide the best evaluation (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). Emotional exhaustion is the feeling of being fatigued and tired at work.

This is the most reported and therefore the most thoroughly inspected. The research shows that since so many persons can identify with exhaustion and it is the most easily identified, then the others might be unnecessary. However, the mere fact that it is an integral part of burnout does not mean it is not the only determining factor. The second aspect of burnout using MBI is depersonalization which occurs when an individual reaches the point of being hostile or uncareing to their customers. It involves the attempt to distance one’s self from the persons who should be served. This is an immediate reaction to exhaustion, with attendant cynicism, which has been found in many researches on burnout. The third dimension of the MBI is personal accomplishment which indicates an employee’s feeling that he or she may not be accomplishing anything worthwhile in his or her career. The research done by Maslach shows that this usually develops because of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization or a combination of both. This is understandable as it can be difficult to feel any form of accomplishment when on is either exhausted or feels indifferent to the persons whom he or she is serving. According to Maria (2015), “The Royal College of nursing revealed that in a survey carried out in 2013 involving 10,000 nurses, 62% of them contemplated resigning from their job the previous year citing stress. 61% cited hectic schedules as being a hindrance to provision good quality care and 83% felt an increase in workload which has seen 5000 nurses leaving
the profession in a three-year period (RCN 2013)" (p. 7). Such findings give evidence that burnout is associated with physiological characteristics of people to include productivity. In fact, Research has shown that workaholic, younger people, females, singles and highly educated people. Over the last three years, physicians have seen a 9% increase in the incidence of burnout. In a study of the working population in Northern Sweden, the prevalence of burnout is 13%, with women at 16% and men at 10%. It was found that among women, work-related issues have the greatest association with burnout and this, to a large extent, is related to the socioeconomic situation. The study recommended that this association should be considered in further study of burnout. (Sofia Norlund, 2010) The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics report for 2008 (Statistic, 2009) shows that women are underrepresented in the following occupations: managers (37%), computer operators (25%), architects and engineers (14%), scientists (46%), lawyers and judges (40%), dentists (27%), physicians and surgeons (31%), police officers (15%), and correctional officers (30%), for example. In contrast, men are underrepresented in the following occupations: nursing (8%), physician assistants (33%), community and social workers (21%), educators and librarians (26%), telemarketers and customer service representatives (33%), childcare and elderly care workers (4%), office support workers (25%), paralegals (12%), claim adjusters, accountants, and auditors (35%), and food preparation and serving workers (35%).

This shows that men and women are employed in jobs that fit the stereotype of male and female jobs. Historically, burnout materializes itself in Human service, though it is not limited to this phenomenon. The Journal for Sociology and Social Welfare defines human service as social services designed to meet human needs or required for maintaining or promoting the overall quality of life of the prospective service populations. (Zins, 2001) Borritz in his PhD thesis stated that burnout can be caused by several factors, including a great demand on hiding one’s feelings, low possibility of development or even promotion, little or no meaning of work, high work pace or unclearly defined roles. (Borritz, 2006) On the other hand, according to (Wilmar B. Schaufeli, 2017), human service workers are usually givers. They provide services, whether by giving attention, support, guidance or comfort.

They are constantly giving, while the recipient of care simply receives. This constant giving produced through this asymmetrical relationship can put a strain on the individual, eventually leading to a depletion of the emotional resources of that individual. While some persons hold the view that stress is a telltale sign that life is meaningful and possibly successful, this might not always be the case, especially when such stress leads to burnout. Alexandra Michel’s article in The Association for Psychological Science en titled “Burn out and the brain,” states that stress can cause strain and problems with the brain such as memory, attention, créativité and problem-solving issues. (Michel, 2016) Amita Golkar, a psychological scientist, and her colleagues from the Institute in Sweden discovered evidence that burnout can cause alterations to the neural circuits of the brain. Stress of this nature weakens the neurological abilities of an individual to bounce back when faced with negative situations, which in turn causes more stress. (Golkar, 2014) It is important to note that anyone can experience burnout, whether it is a student or a vender on the street corner. In a study carried out by the London Metropolitan University School of Psychology on the need for achievement, burnout and the feeling of leaving school, it was indicated that the need for achievement lowers the risk of burnout.

The study identified three component of study related burnout - emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced efficacy. Emotional exhaustion promotes cynicism which in turn promotes reduced efficiency. These three factors can cause a student to want to abandon his or her academic studies. This study also showed that study-related burnout and work-related burnout are basically the same. (B.Moneta, 2011) In a Gleaner article entitled “Students experiencing burnout after GSAT – psychologist,” educational psychologist Kellie-Anne Brown Campbell expressed her concerns for students starting high school who were already experiencing burnout. She explained that pressure put on students to do well may be affecting them psychologically. (Poyser, 2016) This is a clear indication that burnout is not only limited to working persons but affects even children. Nurses are important to the health sector of every country; however, their jobs can be strenuous. The Nurses Association of Jamaica, in an article stated that resignation due to burnout has led to a 1:35 patient to nurse ratio within the health sector (Dunkley, 2011). (Pinto, 2017) indicated that the long hours with a salary that is not commensurate with the work, poor working environment and lack of involvement in decision making, the high risk of unemployment and relationship with one’s superiors are some of the causes identified for burnout in healthcare professional. The study further pointed out that nurses believe that the source providing the greatest stress in their occupation include patient to nurse ratio, lack of technical and human resources and the technical and physical conditions in which they work. (Brian E.Lacy, 2017) reported that issues of burnout have gone unrecognized or unreported and may be affecting up to 60% of family practice providers and one-third of gastroenterologists. This problem is not only limited to these individuals but also to younger physicians and individuals doing jobs that have risk procedures.
This may lead to suicide or drug and alcohol abuse, thus indicating the importance and the need to be addressed. Teachers are also a part of a profession that demands a lot of them. It is agreed that dealing with one’s own child or children is manageable; however, dealing with numerous children, with varying background and personalities, can pose a problem. A study done in Australia by Howard and Johnson indicated that the main causes of stress to teachers were “teaching students who lack motivation; maintaining discipline; time pressures and workload; coping with change; being evaluated by others; dealings with colleagues; self-esteem and status issues; problems dealing with administration/management; role conflict and ambiguity and poor working conditions” (Howard, 2004).

En 2016 the connection between stress and teachers became a deadly reality in Jamaica. (Johnson, 2016) In a Gleaner article entitled “Too stressed - Another teacher dies, Jamaica Teachers’ Association (JTA) blames being overworked, expert says not so fast”, and English teacher at the Spanish Town High School died after collapsing after a speech she gave at a workshop. Though this has been the third teacher to die in less than a month while on the job, psychologist Dr Semaj Said that teaching "has always been stressful", there putting a link to this death and stress with the proper assessment might basically jumping to conclusion, though this might be so it raises the question as to whether this issue is given the priority that it needs. Everyone experiences stressful period, children, working adults, even celebrities. But what happens when these Gets out of hand? What happens when we are burnout? Do we know the signs to look for in ourselves and the individuals around us? According to an online article entitled Causes and Prevention of Burnout in Human Services (2012) some of the signs which indicate burnout are: 1) Withdrawing from responsibilities, 2) Isolating self from others, 3) Procrastinating, taking longer to get things done, 4) Using food, drugs, alcohol to cope, and 5) Taking out frustrations on others and skipping work or coming in late and leaving early. The Mayo Clinic ((Staff, 2015) published an article entitled “Job burnout: How to spot it and take action.”

It stated that answers to the following questions could indicate whether an individual is experiencing burnout: 1) Have you become cynical or critical at work? 2) Do you drag yourself to work and have trouble getting started once you arrive? 3) Have you become irritable or impatient with co-workers, customers or clients? 4) Do you lack the energy to be consistently productive? 5) Do you lack satisfaction from your achievements? 6) Do you feel disillusioned about your job? 7) Are you using food, drugs or alcohol to feel better or to simply not feel? 8) Have your sleep habits or appetite changed?, and 9) Are you troubled by unexplained headaches, backaches or other physical complaints? Maria (2012) forwarded some important issue on burnout that provide some understanding of the matter, she postulated that:

Burnout is a problem in nursing. These studies and others indicate the prevalence of Burnout in the nursing profession. Burnout has a negative impact on the performance of an individual (Maslach et al 2001). For nurses, this is crucial information as this directly puts patients’ wellbeing and lives in danger as well as going against the code of ethics for nurses. Some of the elements in this code require nurses to:

1. Advocate for health promotion and safety of patients
2. Develop own competence throughout their practice as well as being mindful of own health.
3. Active participation and contribution to nursing research and development
4. Collaborate with others in the health care team to promote health and safety of patients

The issue of burnout among health care professionals is well documented in the literature and some potent questions were asked by Maria (2012) as they would answer questions relating to performance of these people, and the quality of health care they deliver to patients. To answer those question Maria (2012) and another researcher have sought to employed Maslach burnout inventory (Lorenz, Benatti, and Sabino, 2010). Maslach et al. (2001) had constructed an index to assess burnout and this is categorized into three dimensions. These are 1) emotional exhaustion, 2) depersonalization and 3) efficacy. A part of the rationale for this index is to capture the wellbeing of people, quality of life and quality of care provided following the experience of burnout. From a sample of 667 Canadian nurses, Leiter and Maslach (2009) found that some of sampled people’s working lives account for their burnout, and that this resulted in job separation (or turnover). Burnout among nurses was not only found to be associated with job separation or worker retention, it was also found to be correlated with high
infection rates, which was caused by heavy workload including heavy patient care delivery (Cimoitti, et al., 2012; Leiter & Maslach 2009). In fact, Cimoitti et al.'s (2012) research revealed that whenever burnout was low and staff was adequate, less infections occurred among nurses. The rationale for using nursing in this study is simply because this is high stress professional and can be provide an understanding in other professions. The literature has provided evidence that the ‘burnout’ phenomenon is not atypical to Jamaica (Patrick & Lavery, 2007; Azeem, Nazir, Zaidi, & Akhtar, 2014; Jennings,) as well as outside of the health care system (Bakker, Demerouti & Sanz-Vergel, 2014; Leiter, Bakker, & Maslach, 2014; Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001), which supports its usage to assess burnout among staff at a tertiary educational institution. This study employs the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) to assess burnout among workers at a higher-educational organization in Central Jamaica, and by way of descriptive quantitative research design.

### III. METHODOLOGY

**Research Design**: This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design. It is a cross-sectional probability sample survey (i.e., stratified random sampling) of workers at a higher-level educational organization in Central Jamaica. A standardized instrument was used to collect the data for this research. This survey instrument was used to provide data upon which this study answered the research questions on factors that determine burnout among workers. The survey instrument is a standardized questionnaire comprising 45 questions, with none being open-ended. The instrument also contained Socio-demographic, Social items, including items on burnout. The dependent variable is burnout and the independent variables are the assumed factors that contribute to burnout.

**Population and Sampling** The participants of the study consisted of employees who are currently working in the organization as at December 31, 2017. The sample frame consisted of 522 personnel who are employed at the above-mentioned institutions for a minimum of one month—the sampling frame was obtained from the human resource department. Stratified random sampling was used to select the employees who participated in the study. The number of persons in the population from each category can be seen in Table 1. The sample size is 222 with a margin of error of 5 percent (as well as being verified by Survey Monkey).

![Sample Size Formula](image)

where $Z_{\alpha/2}$ is 1.96 (95% confidence interval), $N$ is 522, and error is 5%.

**Table 1**: Staff Composition at workers, December 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY/STAFF COUNT 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As at December 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection** The sampled employees were required to complete the Maslach Burnout Inventory, socio-demographic characteristics and General Outside-Work Stress Index. All participants in the study were given seven days in which to complete and return the questionnaires. Participants were to drop the completed questionnaires in a secure box or place them in an envelope and send them to specify department. The participants were provided with the office contact of the researchers in order to facilitate inquiries about the survey instruments and or to make alternative arrangements for the collection of questionnaires. All participants who agreed to participate in the study were given a seven days period in which to complete same after which they were placed in a designated box that was placed in the different units. All the boxes were collected by the researchers at the end of the period.
**Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria** The current study comprised all workers who were employed at higher-educational organization at the time of the study. As such, those that were included were administrators, faculty, ancillary staff, security officers, maintenance personnel, and student workers as well as consultants (including adjunct staff) were excluded from the study. The rationale for the exclusion of the adjunct faculty and other consultants was that they are not a part of the normal decision-making apparatus of the University or its functionaries except being facilitator/lecturer or working on a special project.

**Conceptualization and Operationalization**: The variables to be measured are 'burnout' among employees (the dependent variable) and the factors accounting for the 'burnout' (the independent variables). The instrument used to measure the variables was the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) which is by far the most widely used, accepted, valid, and reliable measurement tool of stress and burnout. The 22 total items were separated into the three themes with nine items related to emotional exhaustion, five to depersonalization, and eight to accomplishment. Each item was also rated on a frequency and intensity scale. The frequency scale ranges from zero (never) to six (everyday). The level of 'burnout' is determined by the summarization of all the items in Maslach Burnout Inventory. The large score indicates greater degree of 'burnout' and vice versa. Each participant was required to complete the above-mentioned instrument plus two others developed by the researchers to obtain demographic information and general outside-work burnout scale (Section D). The MBI self-test instrument consists of twenty-two items on a four-point Likert-type scale: SD: Strongly Disagree; D: Disagree; A: Agree; and SA: Strongly Agree.

Validity and Reliability Thomas Kuhn, physicist, argued extensively on the validity and verifiability of qualitative inquiry despite its seeming non-objectivism. Knowing how things operate was not singly embedded in empiricism, objective measurability and statistical analyses (Balashov and Rosenberg, 2002; Kuhn, 1996) as meaning accounts for actions that are sometimes outside the realm of objectivism. It can be extrapolated from Kuhn’s perspectives that validity and reliability are equally important in all scientific inquiry, and the issues of conceptualization and measurement must include an aspect of validity and verification. For any research project to be credible, its reliability and validity have to be clearly established (Wiersman, 2000). As such, the necessary steps must be taken to ensure that the proposed project has both internal and external validity and internal and external reliability on the instrument used are outlined. According to Wiersman, reliability is concerned with the reliability and consistency of the methods, conditions and results while validity deals with the accurate

Interpretability of the results and the generalizability of the results. In order to ensure a high response rate on the questionnaire, the researchers ensured that all steps were taken to have the number of items necessary to elicit the required information, thereby avoiding unnecessary and ambiguous questions. In this study, reliability of some items was based on Equivalence Reliability - Cronbach alpha (Neuman, 2006, 180). This was compared based on high or low values of Cronbach alpha. Reliability was increased by way of using 1) previously tested items (or questions), 2) pre-testing, testing and post-testing of items. The researcher adhered to the following types of measuring validity – 1) Face validity; 2) Content validity, and 3) Criterion Validity (Neuman, 2006, 183). The issue of the validity and reliability of Maslach Burnout Inventory has been examined by many scholars (Iwanicki, & Schwab, 1981; Gold, 1984). Using factor analysis, Iwanicki & Schwab (1981) as well as Gold (1984) empirically verified the factorability of the items in the MBI. Like the initial MBI, they found Cronbach alphas of 0.90 for emotional exhaustion, 0.76 for depersonalization, and 0.76 for personal accomplishments. Other studies have also empirically examined MBI, using Principal Component Analysis, and the findings revealed high Cronbach alphas (i.e., 0.7) for the three sub-component of the MBI (i.e., emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) —( Powers, & Gose, 1986; Abu-Hilal, & Salameh, 1992; Gold, Bachelor, & Michael, 1989). Those studies support the reliability and validity of employing MBI to assess burnout, and justify its widespread usage by many scholars, researchers, and human relations practitioners. Before the researcher begins collecting data from the sampled participants, the other instruments will be brought through testing, retesting and modifications, which are referred to as pilot testing process. The instrument will be forwarded to my supervisor who will vet the items. The modifications will be made based on the comments of qualitative and quantitative research methodologists. The instrument will then be given to measurement practitioners, statisticians, social researchers and demographers for them to vet the items. The comments of those individuals were incorporated in the instrument which was then pilot tested on a similar group of employees.

Psychometric properties of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) Burnout is a syndrome of emotional, reduced personal accomplishment and depersonalization experienced by an individual. Using exploratory and confirmatory factor analytic techniques, Maslach found that there are three subscales of burnout. These dimensions were 1) emotional exhaustion, 2) depersonalization, and 3) cynicism (or reduced personal
accomplishment). All the properties leading up to employment Principal Component Analysis (PCA) such as normality of items, KMO of at least 0.6, and item descriptive in excess of 3 were met and this makes for the appropriateness of using PCA (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). In addition, the psychometric properties of Maslach burnout instrument can be reviewed in the following Works (Maslach and Jackson, 1979, 1981, 1984; Maslach and Pines, 1977; Bain and Jerome, 2018; Han, 2018; Konstantinou, Bonotis, Sokratous, et al, 2018). Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was developed by Christina Maslach and Susan E. Jackson as an introspective psychological inventory to examine occupational burnout (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). It is a 22 item-instrument of three dimensions of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

Ethical Issues All the participants were required to give their consent prior to being included in the study. The participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity unless permission is granted to do otherwise. This was done by way of not requesting any personal marker that could be associated with the respondents. They were advised that at any time during the study they could withdraw and return the instrument without any form of penalty. The information gathered will be used solely for the purpose of this study.

Data Analysis For this study, data was stored, retrieved and analyzed using the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows version 20.0 (SPSS Inc; Chicago, IL, USA). Descriptive statistics, percentages and frequency distributions were performed on the available data. Ordinary least square (OLS) regression was employed to examine the factors that account for 'burnout' among workers. Cross tabulations were utilized to examine associations (or not) among two non-metric variables. Independent sample t-test was employed to determine the difference between two variables – one being metric and the other being dichotomous nominal variable. Statistical significance determined a p-value less than or equal to five percentage points (≤ 0.05) – two-tailed. The data was collected by a 7-point standardized questionnaire, after which it was entered in the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows, Version 25.0. A p value of less than 5% was be used to determined statistical significance. Data was e analyzed by way of cross tabulations, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and multivariate regressions. The information is presented using graphs and tables. In addition, factor analysis was used to examine the validity of the instrument (i.e., MBI). An examination of the findings are presented immediately after this paragraph, and they are to answer the objective of this research.

Results: Analyses of Findings: The sampled population is one-hundred and sixty-four employees of the intended two hundred and twenty-two employees (i.e., a response rate of 73.9%). Selected demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, age, staff composition and length of service) are presented in Table 2, below. Of the sampled respondents (n=164), 95.3% responded to the question on gender; 92.3% on the staff categorization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67 (41.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94 (58.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff categorization:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>4 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>6 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>40 (25.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Managers</td>
<td>16 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>90 (57.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>42 yrs. 9 months ± 12 yrs. 8 months, 40 yrs. 6 months – 45 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>9 years (i.e., median), 36 years (range)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using Independent Sample t-test, Table 3 presents a disaggregation of age and length of service by gender of respondents. The average age of male-respondents was 44.0 years compared to 42 years for female-respondents, with there being no statistical difference between both ages (t=0.897, P = 0.371). Likewise, no statistical difference emerged between the length of service for male-respondents (9.9 years) and female-respondents (11.0 years)—t=-0.841, P = 0.401). This means that the average length of time worked by male-respondents is statistically the same as that of female-respondents.
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Table 3:
Gender disparity by age and length of service,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Means±SD, 95%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.0yrs±13.7yrs (n=54), 40.8-48.5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41.9yrs±12.1yrs (n=75), 40.1-45.6 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.9yrs±8.2yrs (n=54), 7.5-12.5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.0yrs±8.0yrs (n=84), 9.4-13.4yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability coefficients for the sub-scales are as follows: 0.937 for Emotional Exhaustion, 0.816 for Cynicism or depersonalization, 0.839 for Inefficacy and 0.773 for Outside-Milieu Stress Index (see Table 4). Such values provide ample evidence that sub-scales as well as the Outside-Milieu Stress Index (OMSI) are very good to use to assess both burnout and stress among workers.

Table 4:
Reliability analysis of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) and Outside-Milieu Stress Index (OMSI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism or Depersonalization</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy (reduced personal accomplishment)</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMSI</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 presents descriptive statistics on total MBI and its sub-scales. The mean value for the overall MBI is 40.8±12.6 (95%CI: 37.8-42.7), with mean values being more than 30 and this indicates a high level of burnout among the sampled respondents. In fact, 82.6% of the sampled respondents indicated a high-level of burnout. As such, there is a high burnout among staff at the studied Organization, as well as the belief of low-level of personal achievement (8.6±7.7, 95%CI: 7.7-9.8). It can be deduced from the current findings that people believed that the studied Organization is doing little as it relates to their personal achievement or accomplishment. In addition, there is moderate external burnout experienced by employees of the studied Organization (7.0±5.1, 6.2-7.8, maximum value is 18) and this suggests that burnout of employees is substantially owing to the studied Organization’s milieu and not in general.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) and Outside-Milieu Stress Index (OMSI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean±SD, 95%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBI sub-scales:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>16.7±12.3, 14.8-18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism or Depersonalization</td>
<td>7.3±7.3, 6.6-8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy (Personal accomplishment)</td>
<td>8.6±8.2, 7.4-9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total score for MBI</td>
<td>40.8±7.7, 37.8-42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMSI</td>
<td>7.0±5.1, 6.2-7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 6-8 present percentages and frequency of each sub-scale of MBI. In fact, 98.8% of sampled respondents indicated that they were experiencing low level of personal accomplishment (i.e. Table 8). This means that employees do not feel personally accomplished working at the studied Institution, and this indicates a high-level of burnout. However, emotional exhaustion is relatively low among employees (59.3%)
Table 6:
Categorization of Emotional Exhaustion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (less than or equal to 18)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (19 - 26)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (Greater than or equal to 27)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7:
Categorization of Depersonalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (less than or equal to 5)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (6 - 9)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (More than or equal to 10)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8:
Categorization of Personal Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 presents the overall burnout of the studied Organization’s employees in the sampled survey. Eight-six percentage of the sampled respondents indicated a high-level of general burnout. This means that 43 out of every 50 employees are experiencing a high-level of burnout or 8.6 out of every 10 employees. It can be deduced from the results that such a high-level of burnout is ingredient for 1) high staff turnover, 2) low job performance, 3) high degree of dissatisfaction, and 4) demotivated people.
Almost 31% of the sampled respondents indicated that they are highly burnt-out outside of the organization compared to 23% who are lowly burnt-out and 45.4% who are moderately burnt-out (See Table 10).

Table 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Outside-Milieu Stress Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (less than or equal to 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (5 - 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (More than or equal to 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 presents a detailed analysis of subscale and general burnout outside of organization. Although high values for the subscales ‘Emotional Exhaustion’ and ‘Depersonalization’ indicate high-level of burnout among employees, it is clear that people still do not feel like they are at the end of their rope or that the job is making them uncaring. In fact, on average, employees are still optimistic and ‘full of energy’.

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics of each item on the subscale, Outside-Milieu Burnout Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel emotionally drained by my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with people in this organization all day long requires a great deal of effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like my work is breaking me down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel frustrated by my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I work too hard at my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It stresses me too much to work in direct contact with people at this organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I’m at the end of my rope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I look after certain students/clients impersonally, as if they are objects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day at work 159 6.00 2.7±2.1
I have the impression that my students/clients make me responsible for some of their problems 155 6.00 1.4±1.8
I’m at the end of my patience at the end of my workday 154 6.00 1.6±1.9
I’ve become more insensitive to people since I’ve been working 156 6.00 0.9±.7
I’m afraid that this job is making me uncaring 157 6.00 0.8±1.6

**Cynicism (or reduced personal accomplishment)**
I accomplish many worthwhile things in this job 157 6.00 4.6±1.8
I feel full of energy 152 6.00 4.0±1.8
I’m easily able to understand what my students/clients feel 155 6.00 4.9±1.5
In my work, I handle emotional problems very calmly 155 6.00 4.8±1.6
Through my work, I feel that I’ve a positive influence on people 156 6.00 5.1±1.4
I’m easily able to create a relaxed atmosphere with my students/clients 157 6.00 5.1±1.3
I feel refreshed when I’ve been close to my students/clients at work 154 6.00 4.6±1.7

**Outside-Milieu Burnout Index**
It stresses me too much to work in direct contact with people 157 6.00 1.3±1.8
I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day 155 6.00 2.5±2.2
I feel refreshed when I am away from work 153 6.00 3.4±2.2

Valid N (listwise) 118

Weak statistical correlations (r < 0.5) existed between most of the MBI’s subscale as well as the stress level outside of the organization, with the only exception being between emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (r > 0.7, P < 0.05). A positive statistical correlation between personal achievement and emotional exhaustion indicates that employees who are more personally accomplished are more emotionally exhausted, which is the same for depersonalization and emotional exhaustion. It means that employees who are more depersonalized are more emotionally exhausted, suggesting that customer service must be tackled. In addition to the issue, there is a direct statistical relationship between stress level outside of organization and its influence on internal burnout in the organization.

<p>| Table 12: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlations of MBI subscales and stress levels outside of organization |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>Personal Achievement</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Stress level outside of the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>.714**</td>
<td>.424**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>.248**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.714**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress level outside of this</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.448**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Factor Analysis The 22 items were subjected to principal components analysis (PCA) using SPSS. Prior to performing PCA, suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. According to Table 13, the descriptive statistics revealed that the mean scores were normally distributed. Hence, the values ranged between 0.6 and 3.3 on a 6-point scale. The item with a value of 2.60 can be concluded not relevant in the instrument, and so all the items in this subscale are relevant as none exceeds.

Inspection of the correlation matrix in Table 15, overleaf, revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was 0.889 (Table 14), exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970, 1974) and the Bartlett’s Test of Phericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance (.000), supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. A close look at the total Variance Explained, Table 16, revealed that four components eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 61.3% of the variance. The Scree Plot revealed a clear break after the fourth component, after which the graph flattens. This means that the items falling below this break can be discarded or approached with caution in the analysis. Components table shows the loading of each factor on the component. However, three components were used in this study in keeping with the work of Maslach et al. Communalities show the number of variables accounted for in the component captured by each variable. That is, how much of the variance in each of the original variables is explained by the extracted factors. The table of Communalities for this analysis shows communalities for five items that were below 0.50. Higher communalities are desirable. If the communality for a variable is less than 50%, it is a candidate for exclusion from the analysis because the factor solution contains less than half of the variance in the original variable, and the explanatory power of that variable might be better represented by the individual variable. Results of rotation show the factor loadings that result from ProMax rotation. The rotated factors are just as good as the initial factors in explaining and reproducing the observed correlation matrix in the Total Variance Explained. Also, the cumulative percentages are the same. This work of the studied Organization is with the three subscales used by Maslach et al. in their original construction of burnout. As such, we can conclude that MBI is good to use to assess burnout among employees at the studied Organization.

Table 13:
Descriptive Statistics for MBI subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel emotionally drained by my work</td>
<td>2.9524</td>
<td>2.03119</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with people at the studied Organization all day long requires a great deal of effort</td>
<td>3.2540</td>
<td>2.12014</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like my work is breaking me down</td>
<td>2.2302</td>
<td>2.08677</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel frustrated by my work</td>
<td>2.3175</td>
<td>2.27209</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I work too hard at my job</td>
<td>2.4921</td>
<td>2.21539</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It stresses me too much to work in direct contact with people at the studied Organization</td>
<td>2.1111</td>
<td>2.07932</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I’m at the end of my rope</td>
<td>1.6349</td>
<td>2.13767</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I look after certain students/clients impersonally, as if they are objects</td>
<td>.4365</td>
<td>1.18993</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day at work</td>
<td>2.6032</td>
<td>2.07877</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve the impression that my students/clients make me responsible for some of their problems</td>
<td>1.3095</td>
<td>1.78646</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m at the end of my patience at the end of my workday</td>
<td>1.5476</td>
<td>1.86164</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve become more insensitive to people since I’ve been working</td>
<td>.9048</td>
<td>1.75922</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m afraid that this job is making me uncaring</td>
<td>.6667</td>
<td>1.39714</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accomplish many worthwhile things in this job</td>
<td>1.3730</td>
<td>1.76061</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel full of energy</td>
<td>1.8175</td>
<td>1.68476</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m easily able to understand what my students/clients feel</td>
<td>.9921</td>
<td>1.38850</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In my work, I handle emotional problems very calmly

Through my work, I feel that I’ve a positive influence on people

I’m easily able to create a relaxed atmosphere with my students/clients

I feel refreshed when I’ve been close to my students/clients at work

Table 14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Correlation Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 16:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.075</td>
<td>40.376</td>
<td>40.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>61.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>5.045</td>
<td>66.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>4.597</td>
<td>70.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>3.902</td>
<td>74.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>3.566</td>
<td>78.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>2.998</td>
<td>81.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>84.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>86.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>88.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>1.913</td>
<td>90.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>1.814</td>
<td>92.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>94.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. When components are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.

![Scree Plot](image)

Figure 5: Scree plot

### Table 17: Communalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bivariate analyses** Table 19 presents the descriptive statistics for MBI, its subscales and stress outside of the studied Organization Index is disaggregated by gender of respondents, with Table 20 presenting the Independent sample t-test values. Based on Table 20, statistical differences exist between the selected subscales and the gender of respondents, such as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and stress outside of the studied Organization index. Female-employees are more emotionally exhausted compared to their male counterparts (t=-2.343, P = 0.020) as well as for depersonalization (t=-2.171, P = 0.031) and for stress outside of the studied Organization (t=-2.473, P = 0.015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14.1194</td>
<td>11.57521</td>
<td>1.41414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.6277</td>
<td>12.64485</td>
<td>1.30422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.3731</td>
<td>6.79089</td>
<td>0.82964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.9355</td>
<td>7.75271</td>
<td>0.80392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.5970</td>
<td>7.25104</td>
<td>0.88586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9.2581</td>
<td>7.68384</td>
<td>0.96782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress outside of the studied</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.5909</td>
<td>2.73989</td>
<td>0.33726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Index</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.7527</td>
<td>3.15421</td>
<td>0.32078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MBI</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41.7015</td>
<td>10.41584</td>
<td>1.27283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>40.7128</td>
<td>12.99100</td>
<td>1.33692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20:**

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>1.855 0.106</td>
<td>-2.306 0.022</td>
<td>F value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6557</td>
<td>-3.6947 0.051</td>
<td>1.9574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>4.705 0.031</td>
<td>-2.171 0.031</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3524</td>
<td>-4.8479 0.001</td>
<td>1.9524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
<td>1.277 0.200</td>
<td>-1.381 0.169</td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0134 0.200</td>
<td>-1.9147 0.169</td>
<td>1.89105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_STUDIED ORGANIZATION_INDEX</td>
<td>3.810 0.053</td>
<td>-2.414 0.017</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4811</td>
<td>-2.11220 0.2138</td>
<td>-2.9479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBI</td>
<td>2.043 0.155</td>
<td>0.155 5.156</td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9837</td>
<td>2.9075 0.053</td>
<td>1.89105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 presents the descriptive statistics for MBI, its subscales and stress outside of the studied Organization Index is disaggregated by being a member of the SDA faith, with Table 22 presenting the Independent sample t-test values. Based on Table 22, no statistical differences exist between the selected subscales and being a member of the SDA faith or otherwise; for example, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and stress outside of organization (P > 0.05). This means that religious affiliation has no influence on the levels of burnout among employees at the studied Organization.

### Table 21:

**Group descriptive statistics for MBI, its subscales and stress outside of the studied Organization disaggregated by being a member of the SDA faith**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Member of SDA Faith</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Exhaustion</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17.5833</td>
<td>12.33009</td>
<td>1.07320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.9130</td>
<td>11.36547</td>
<td>2.36986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depersonalization</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7.8855</td>
<td>7.22990</td>
<td>.61168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.5652</td>
<td>8.46826</td>
<td>1.76575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Achievement</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>8.9389</td>
<td>7.58415</td>
<td>.66263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.6522</td>
<td>6.73261</td>
<td>1.40383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stress outside of THE STUDIED ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.3923</td>
<td>3.02828</td>
<td>.26560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.8696</td>
<td>3.07932</td>
<td>.64208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MBI</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>41.6591</td>
<td>12.25420</td>
<td>1.06559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.9130</td>
<td>10.25100</td>
<td>2.13748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 22:

**Independent Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBI</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL_MBI</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 presents the descriptive statistics for MBI, its subscales and stress outside of the studied Organization Index disaggregated by staff categorization, with Tables 24 and 25 presenting the level of significance of the mean values. Based on Table 23, no statistical differences exist between the selected subscales and staff categorization, such as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and stress outside of the studied Organization index (P > 0.05). This means that staff categorization does not impact the levels of MBI experienced by members of staff.

### Table 23:
Descriptive for MBI, its subscales and stress outside of the studied Organization disaggregated by staff categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhastion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>3.2951</td>
<td>3.1054</td>
<td>22.0646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (include security)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.833</td>
<td>2.635</td>
<td>3.1951</td>
<td>3.3694</td>
<td>24.9835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.725</td>
<td>13.6020</td>
<td>2.4724</td>
<td>11.7379</td>
<td>25.7282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.795</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td>3.2441</td>
<td>3.5141</td>
<td>10.5063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.144</td>
<td>11.5182</td>
<td>2.1786</td>
<td>18.8035</td>
<td>21.8664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>15.878</td>
<td>12.4511</td>
<td>8.8959</td>
<td>18.0198</td>
<td>19.5020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Effects</td>
<td>12.2467</td>
<td>0.1204</td>
<td>15.0318</td>
<td>16.2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Random Effects</td>
<td>2.00481</td>
<td>11.0202</td>
<td>22.0733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (include security)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>4.5720</td>
<td>0.1812</td>
<td>3.3442</td>
<td>4.0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.078</td>
<td>1.30347</td>
<td>1.25222</td>
<td>4.8131</td>
<td>9.0900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Manager</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.885</td>
<td>5.93014</td>
<td>1.28434</td>
<td>0.9200</td>
<td>10.1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.784</td>
<td>0.75715</td>
<td>7.7222</td>
<td>10.3050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7.843</td>
<td>7.45184</td>
<td>5.2006</td>
<td>8.8611</td>
<td>9.0472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Effects</td>
<td>7.43960</td>
<td>0.0576</td>
<td>8.0054</td>
<td>8.0437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Random Effects</td>
<td>8.20547</td>
<td>5.0628</td>
<td>10.1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.760</td>
<td>0.5743</td>
<td>0.7871</td>
<td>5.2286</td>
<td>6.2736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (include security)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>6.09620</td>
<td>2.07195</td>
<td>3.8408</td>
<td>9.8028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.025</td>
<td>2.35353</td>
<td>2.6103</td>
<td>5.2127</td>
<td>10.3528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Manager</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.250</td>
<td>0.93088</td>
<td>1.02622</td>
<td>3.7288</td>
<td>10.7712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.138</td>
<td>7.80707</td>
<td>3.3511</td>
<td>7.7222</td>
<td>10.4041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>9.8066</td>
<td>7.57773</td>
<td>8.0989</td>
<td>7.4041</td>
<td>9.8388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Effects</td>
<td>7.50613</td>
<td>0.8595</td>
<td>7.4000</td>
<td>9.8109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Random Effects</td>
<td>7.49657</td>
<td>0.8178</td>
<td>7.4000</td>
<td>9.8109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress outside studied Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator (Include Vice President and Vice Presidents)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>3.40353</td>
<td>4.8103</td>
<td>5.1257</td>
<td>10.3323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (include security)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>4.14729</td>
<td>1.0921</td>
<td>1.5477</td>
<td>9.3323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.0250</td>
<td>3.40353</td>
<td>4.8103</td>
<td>5.1257</td>
<td>10.3323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Manager</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>1.65269</td>
<td>4.0265</td>
<td>4.1200</td>
<td>8.7672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>3.23305</td>
<td>3.4471</td>
<td>5.8717</td>
<td>7.4240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>6.2288</td>
<td>3.08629</td>
<td>2.4701</td>
<td>5.7458</td>
<td>6.7218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Effects</td>
<td>3.05714</td>
<td>0.2471</td>
<td>3.7494</td>
<td>3.7222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Random Effects</td>
<td>2.47157</td>
<td>0.3475</td>
<td>2.9620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total_MBI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59.500</td>
<td>8.62669</td>
<td>3.43243</td>
<td>24.0590</td>
<td>52.0415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (include security)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.0000</td>
<td>5.99667</td>
<td>2.43964</td>
<td>30.7265</td>
<td>52.2915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.675</td>
<td>10.20059</td>
<td>1.81538</td>
<td>38.4108</td>
<td>44.9302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Manager</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.637</td>
<td>13.45363</td>
<td>3.39641</td>
<td>30.7265</td>
<td>45.0569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.496</td>
<td>13.04020</td>
<td>1.37475</td>
<td>38.7591</td>
<td>44.1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>41.2964</td>
<td>12.05289</td>
<td>9.9612</td>
<td>35.0429</td>
<td>43.1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Effects</td>
<td>12.10003</td>
<td>97.352</td>
<td>52.3334</td>
<td>43.1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Random Effects</td>
<td>97.3285</td>
<td>36.5842</td>
<td>0.9508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24: Analysis of Variance for MBI, its subscales and stress outside of the studied Organization (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1327.909</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>331.977</td>
<td>2.216</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>22624.911</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>149.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23952.810</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>286.314</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71.579</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8279.841</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55.199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8566.155</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>203.757</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.939</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8619.236</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>57.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8822.994</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Outside of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studied Organization</td>
<td>35.894</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.973</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1401.691</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9.407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1437.584</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL_MBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>352.631</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88.158</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>22313.113</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>147.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22665.744</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: Robust Tests of Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statistic(^1)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Outside of the</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studied Organization</td>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL_MBI</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 presents the Pearson’s Product Moment correlations for MBI, its subscales and stress levels outside of the studied Organization as well as selected demographic characteristics (i.e., age and length of service). The findings revealed no significant statistical correlation between 1) length of service at the studied Organization and all the subscales, and MBI, 2) age and emotional exhaustion, 3) age of respondents and stress levels outside of the studied Organization, and 4) overall MBI (P > 0.05). On the other hand, significant statistical Relationship existed between 1) age of respondents and depersonalization (r=-.248, P =0.005), 2) age and personal achievement (r= -0.203, P = 0.021). Such findings denote that irrespective of the time employed by each worker, their level of burnout is the same, which is not the case for age and depersonalization, and age and personal achievement. As it relates to negative correlation for age and depersonalization, and age and personal achievement, this means that younger-staff members are more depersonalized (high burnout) and less personally achieved in life.

---

\(^1\) Asymptotically F distributed.
Multiple regression analysis - Depersonalization Based on the Table 27, a linear model can be used to determine the dependent variable (i.e., depersonalization) on independent variables (i.e., age and gender of respondents)-F[2, 126] = 5.286, P = 0.008, with the assumptions of linear and normality capture in Figures 6-8, and that the statistical correlation between the independent variables and the dependent variable are better than expected by chance. This linear model is further explained in Table 28, below:

Table 27:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>517.029</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>258.514</td>
<td>5.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6185.963</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>49.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6702.992</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Depersonalization
b. Predictors: (Constant), Male, Ques2

Age can be used to linearly predict depersonalization (P =0.007). However, gender is not a linear factor of depersonalization (P > 0.05). Furthermore, the relationship between the two variables is an inverse one, indicating that younger employees are more like to experienced greater burnout than their older counterparts. In fact, age accounts for 6.2% of the variability in depersonalization. Based on Table 28, the predictive regression equation can be written for the model (i.e., Model 1) as follows:
Model 1: Depersonalization (i.e., Y) = 14.20 - 0.135(Age) + ei where 0.135 is the scale at which depersonalization increases for every unit of change in the age variable and 14.2 meaning that depersonalization starts at this level with all other variables being held constant or none existent.

**Table 28:**
OLS of depersonalization on age and gender of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>14.200</td>
<td>2.198</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.462</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>-2.767</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-1.845</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>-1.471</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 29: Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.278*</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>7.00678</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>5.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Male, Ques.
b. Dependent Variable: Depersonalization

**IV. TESTING ASSUMPTIONS OF LINEAR MODEL**
Assumption 1 (i.e., Normality) The issue of normality was checked for each variable. This was done by way of a skewness test. Descriptive analyses were done for each variable. In fact, the frequency distribution of depersonalization is reflected in Figure 6, below. Normality of the independent variable Figure 6 shows that age (i.e., independent variable) is normally distributed in the linear model.

**Histogram**
**Dependent Variable: Depersonalization**

**Figure 6: Frequency distribution**
Assumption 2: Linear of dependent variable

Figure 8 shows that the dependent variable is a linear variable,

**Figure 7**: Linear of the dependent variable

It can be deduced from Figure 8 that normality and linear were adhered to and that a linear model can be built for this work.

**Figure 8**
Multiple regression analysis – Personal Achievements Table 33 provides the information that age, and gender fit a linear model for personal achievement at the studied Organization (F[2, 126] = 3.160, P = 0.046).

**Table 30: ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>337.590</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>168.795</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>.046³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6730.286</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>53.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7067.876</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Personal Achievement  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Male, Ques2

Table 31 presents coefficients for the estimates of age as predictive variable in the model for personal achievement. Although the age and gender variables fit a linear model for employees’ personal achievement (F [2, 126] = 3.160, P = 0.046), individually, gender is not statistically contributing to the model and therefore, there is no need to include it into the model. The model should therefore read:

Personal achievement (P) = f(Age) + e

Final equation should read:

P = 13.775 – 0.115(Age)

It can be deduced from the negative coefficient of age (-0.115) that younger employees at the studied Organization are more personally achieved than their older counterparts. This means that the older employees are more burnt out than their younger counterparts.

**Table 31: OLS regression for personal achievement on age and gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Zero-order VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>13.775</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>6.009</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>-.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-1.221</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the ‘Enter Method’ in multiple regression, it can be concluded that age accounts for 3.3% of the variability in Personal achievement of employees at the studied Organization; and that the Durbin-Watson indicates no multicollinearity (Table 32).

**Table 32: Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.219*</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>7.30855</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Male, Ques2  
b. Dependent Variable: Inefficacy

**Normality of the independent variable**

Figure 9 shows that age (i.e., independent variable) is a normal distribution in a linear model of personal achievement.
Assumption 2: Linear of dependent variable. Figure 10 shows that the dependent variable is a linear variable,
It can be deduced from Figure 11 that normality and linearity were adhered to and that a linear model can be built for this work.

Figure 11:

Table 34: Multivariate Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>8.584</td>
<td>5.129</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-1.581 - 18.749</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.079</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.625 - 4.782</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-2.988</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.298 - .060</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff category</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>-1.266 - 1.212</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being SDA</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>1.874</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>-2.110 - 5.317</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-0.026 - .324</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>13.989</td>
<td>5.462</td>
<td>2.561</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>3.163 - 24.814</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>-2.453 - 3.305</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-2.649</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.295 - .043</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff category</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>-1.156 - 1.484</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being SDA</td>
<td>-1.171</td>
<td>1.995</td>
<td>-.587</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>-5.126 - 2.784</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.034 - .339</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35 presents multivariate tests to establish statistically significant differences or otherwise in the means scores for personal achievement and depersonalizations. Given that the Wilks’ Lambda and the other tests are not significant (P > 0.05) for gender, staff category, length of service and being a member of the SDA faith, it follows that personal achievement and depersonalization do not differ with respect to gender, staff category, length of service and being a member of the SDA faith. It should be noted here that only age had a significant value (P = 0.005) indicating that employee burnout, as it relates to depersonalization and personal achievement, differ based on age.

Table 35: Multivariate Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coeff</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>7.092</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>7.092</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellings’ Trace</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>7.092</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>7.092</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellings’ Trace</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>7.092</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>7.092</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellings’ Trace</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>7.092</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the corrected model (F statistic=2.586 for Depersonalization and 1.923 for personal achievement, with a P value of 0.030 and 0.096, respectively) indicating that none of the variables (i.e., age, gender, etc.) statistically differ as it relates to personal achievement, and depersonalization as it relates to being a member of the SDA faith (Table 36).

Table 36: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coeff</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>616.765</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>123.333</td>
<td>2.186</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>12.930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>530.261</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>104.032</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>6.616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>122.634</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133.634</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>254.347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>354.867</td>
<td>6.559</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>6.559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>110.773</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110.773</td>
<td>2.132</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>2.322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.652</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.652</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>425.806</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>425.806</td>
<td>8.557</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>8.927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>378.566</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>378.566</td>
<td>7.016</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>7.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being SDA</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.730</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>24.922</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.922</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.624</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being SDA member</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>135.189</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135.189</td>
<td>2.816</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>2.816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>141.233</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141.233</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>5100.322</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>47.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>5967.385</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>54.104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>12025.000</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>14183.000</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>5316.087</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>6417.365</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

In 2007, a group of scholars, in the department of Government at the University of the West Indies, Mona conducted a national probability survey of 1,338 Jamaicans to ascertain socio-political issues experienced by people (Powell, Bourne, and Waller, 2007) and found that health was identified as the 8th leading national problem faced by Jamaicans. The issue of stress and burnout are two components that speak to ill-health and as such this study provides critical information on the health status of employees at the studied Organization. The current findings have shown that burnout is high among employees of the studied Organization and that the older employees are more stressed than their younger counterparts, suggesting that there are high stressors experienced by older employees and by extension lower health status. Another critical finding of this work is a high-level of reduced personal achievement experienced by staff members. Such finding offers insights into high degree of dissatisfaction with personal well-being of the staff at the studied Organization as employees believe that Institution is contributing little to their personal achievements. Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) has provided insights into the high degree of dissatisfaction among members of staff at the studied Organization (see also, French & Caplan, 1972), and offers an explanation for low productivity, high turnover, and poor customer service. The high level of burnout among members of staff of Organization is equally comparable to highly stressful work environment (Jennings, 2008).

Lahana, Papadopoulou, Roumeliotou, Tsounis, Sarafis, and Niakas, (2017). Dr. Jennings, a trained nurse, opined that: In 1974, Freudenberger (1974) coined the term “burnout” to describe workers’ reactions to the chronic stress Common in occupations involving numerous direct interactions with people. Burnout is typically conceptualized as a syndrome characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach and Jackson, 1982). Work life, however, is not independent from family life: these domains may even be in conflict (Near, Rice, and Hunt, 1980; Pearl, 1983). Stress may result from the combined responsibilities of work, marriage, and children (Haw, 1982; Muller, 1986; Woods, 1985). The effects of both work and nonwork stress among nurses have been studied infrequently (Jennings, 1990). And yet, nonwork stress may be particularly salient to nursing, a predominantly female profession. Women continue to juggle multiple roles, including those roles related to the home and family, for which the women may have sole or major responsibility (Jennings, 2008, p. 2-137) Jennings squarely placed the issue of burnout on the table, particularly among women, and based on the premise of their multi-roles in society to include work and home, which explains the high burnout among female nursing health-care professionals. This explanation of the high burnout as a result of gender role is not the case at the studied Organization. In fact, the burnout level at the studied Organization is high irrespective of one’s gender. What is substantially contributing to this health reality is personal underachievement while working at the institution. The personal underachievement of employees is echoed mainly by older workers and is contributing to poor health conditions experienced by these older workers. The high-level of burnout among employees of the studied Organization can be compared to study of nurses in Greece. In a cross-sectional study of some 180 nurses in Greece by Lahana, et al. (2017), using Maslach Inventory scale, bears some similarities to the current work. The comparison of the index for both studies (i.e., the current and Lahana et al.’s work are presented in Table 37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 37: Maslach Burnout Inventory for current and Lahana et al.’s work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employees at the studied Organization exhibit some similarities and differences to nurses in their high stress work environment (see Table 37, above). However, in a similar study, 33% of faculty members were burnout in a study conducted by Alves, Oliveira, & Paro (2019) compared to 86% in the current work. The level of burnout among workers in the current study is comparable to burnout of teachers at a central university in India (Syed, & Nazir, 2007). In Lahana et al’s study, nurses experienced a high level of emotional exhaustion, and while this is not the case for employees at the studied Organization, there is close similarity in depersonalization between the two groups. The low value for depersonalization indicates high levels of burnout with both staff members at the studied Organization and those in Lahana et al’s study.
The irony here is that the studied Organization is not a high stress environment and therefore the level of burnout should not be high, comparable with one in a high stress environment. Of great importance in this study is the vast disparity between personal accomplishment at the studied Organization and nurses in Greece. The high degree of personal accomplishment among nurses in Greece must therefore contribute to lowering the stress level in the high stress environment. The studied Organization, on the other hand, is a low stress environment with a low personal accomplishment staff complement. The low level of personal accomplishment is contributing to the burnout of employees. This needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. The issue of stress resulting from workload is well documented in the literature (Selye, 1956; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; French & Caplan, 1972), and the current work offers an explanation of this phenomenon apart from workload; that of psychological frustration. In fact, scholars have made relevant contribution on the stressors associated with emotional work (Zapf, Vogt, Seifert, Martini, & Isic, 1999), which offer some insights into the psychological challenges of employees at the studied Organization.

The reality is that the low level of personal achievement for workers is an emotional workload that is operating the same way as physical workload. The matter of internalizing low personal achievement of staff at the studied Organization is translating into negative stressors as employees feel they have sacrificed much for little return while being employed to the studied Organization. It is this emotional deficiency created by the low personal achievement that contributes to the low morale, high job turnover, and poor service to customer. Emitting from the findings is the fact that personal dissatisfaction is being transmitted to the customers is being demonstrated in the treatment of customers. The poor customer service environment that has been created at the studied Organization is a domino effect of internal challenges of employees, their mental dissatisfaction with how they are treated by the Institution and a feeling of rejection by system. It is therefore no surprise that job performance is low and there is poor customer service at the studied Organization because of the high-level of job dissatisfaction. Undoubtedly, emotional dissatisfaction with work produces resentment and an unwillingness to harmoniously work with the system to attain stated goals and/or objectives. From the current findings, it can be deduced that the system at the studied Organization is softly killing the vision, the spirit, and resolve of people to transform the institution to a high quality one. Currently, the studied Organization is a stressor to its employees, and within that context the Institution must begin to examine its contribution to the low output, poor customer service and high turnover of staff. Stress is clearly an antecedent to people’s unwillingness to offering their best and transform an institution from mediocrity to greatness, which is no different in life (Selye, 1956; Lazarus, 1999; Quirk, & Casco, 1994). An area that must become of interest to the studied Organization is the ill-health of its employees. The issue of burnout is a psychological issue that holds some explanation for not only psychological but physiological conditions in people. Stress does contributor to this situation. Selye (1956) proposed that there is a correlation between physiology and illnesses, and this can offer an explanation for stress and illness, and stress and mortality among employees at the studied Organization. Lazarus & Folkman’s work (1984) supports what is occurring at the studied Organization as it relates to mysterious deaths of seemingly healthy employees as had obtained on occasions. They indicated that there is “a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well-being” (p. 19). Presently, employees at the studied Organization have to work without critical resources in a high job demand milieu and these are recipes for current high burnout rate among staff (see, Akbari, Akbari, Shakerian, & Mahaki, 2017). Akbari et al. (2017) stated it this way “Job stress can impose significant costs to the workplaces and organizations due to some issues such as absenteeism, less productivity, and medical costs. Job overload and lack of decision latitude can lead to job stress” (p. 15). We will go further to opine that the studied Organization is pernicious to the employees’ well-being because it has failed to provide job resources and motivation to its workers (see Figures 12 and 13), and has also neglected, in its overall existence to frame a healthy, highly motivated and productive workforce. Using Figure 13, if job demands are high and resources are low, employees are more likely to experience greater levels of stress, and will account for high absenteeism, high employee turnover and unhealthy workers as a result.

VI. CONCLUSION
Stress relating to staff issues (poor staff management, resource inadequacy and security risks) are most important in determining job burnout, job satisfaction and job performance. Burnout, clearly, influences the social psychology of workers, which is most likely to impact their productivity, performance and customer service delivery. Further research exploring specific strategies for managing stress and improving job satisfaction may reduce the impact of burnout on general health of workers, while also minimizing absenteeism and turnover. This could be achieved through evidence-based policies aimed at creating better work environments where employees feel more secure and have adequate resources to successfully perform their jobs, hence improving their health.
outcomes and this will influence how they interact with their customers. Burnout plays a key role in a health impairment process that is mainly driven by high job demands, whereas engagement plays a key-role in a motivational process that is driven by job resources (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008; Schaufeli et al., in press). As for the practice of burnout, it remains to be seen if corporations and public-sector organizations are willing to provide the necessary resources to maintain extraordinary efforts from their employees. The studied Organization needs to address the warning signs related to workers’ stress levels with urgency. Stresses related to toxic workplace climate and work demands, resource insufficiency and management related deficiencies needs to be significantly reduced and where possible eliminated. Achieving the university’s mission will be jeopardized if immediate attention is not given to reinforce and ensure positive organizational behavior that reflects the core values of the institution. Workforce burnout will eventually erode employee engagement in critical functions needed to realize the institution’s goals. Employees’ mental health and general well-being will be negatively impacted therefore contributing to absenteeism, productivity, job satisfaction, customer service and a willingness to provide quality service, which is among the psychology of burnout. In concluding, there is empirical evidence that the studied organization is experiencing high burnout as a result of the psychosocial work environment. Clearly, the demands of the job and the working milieu are hazardous to the studied organization is experiencing high burnout among the Finnish working population. (2002). (2002). The relationship between job-related burnout and depressive disorders—results from the Finnish Health 2000 Study. J Affect Disord., 88(1):55–62.
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