

Burnout Syndrome, Stress and Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in College of Medical Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria

Nwokoye S.C.¹, Madume A. K^{2*}, Ezekiel R.³, Nweke VC.⁴, Woko, C.N.⁵, Okuku M⁶

¹Department of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences, College of Health Sciences, University of Benin, Edo State, Nigeria.

²Department of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences, College of Medical Sciences, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

³Department of Nursing, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

⁴Department of Human Physiology, Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences, College of Medical Sciences Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

⁵Department of Planning Research and Statistics, Rivers State Hospitals Management Board, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

⁶Department of Nursing, Faculty of Basic Medical Science, College of Medical Sciences Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

*Correspondence Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2024.130305>

Received: 16 February 2024; Accepted: 26 February 2024; Published: 30 March 2024

Abstract:

Background: Burnout syndrome is a psychosomatic state which can result from prolonged exposure to job stressors, capable of leading to negative self-concept, job dissatisfaction and lack of communication with the client, University academic staff are exposed to high demands of work and sometimes in a not ideal facility which may increase their risk for burnout syndrome.

Aim: This study aimed to determine the relationship between Burnout syndrome, stress, job satisfaction and the socio-demographic profiles of lecturers in College of Medical sciences, University of Benin, Benin City.

Methods: Purposive sampling technique was used to recruit 89 participants. Asocio-demographic questionnaire, the MBI-ES, PSS-14 and JSS questionnaire were administered. Descriptive statistics of mean, frequency and standard deviation were used to summarize the data. Spearman rank test was used to test the relationship between components of burnout, stress, job satisfaction scores and some socio-demographic and working profiles of the participants and T-test analysis was used to test for the differences between burnout, stress, job satisfaction and gender. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

Results: A total of 89 participants were recruited with mean age and years of experience 47.9 ± 8.78 , 15.9 ± 7.49 respectively. More than half were Male 50(56.2%). The significant level of socio-demographic profile (age, gender, experience, rank and educational level) and level of burnout, stress and job satisfaction were ($p=0.61$, 0.24, 0.35, 0.04 and 0.39), ($p=0.24$, 0.90, 0.32, 0.12 and 0.09) and ($p=0.81$, 0.52, 0.93, 0.53 and 0.24) respectively. The values showed no significant relationship.

Conclusion: The findings showed no statistically significant relationship between level of burnout, stress, job satisfaction and socio-demographic data, but there are significant differences between burnout syndrome, stress, job satisfaction and gender. These parameters did not affect the level of burnout stress and satisfaction among the lecturers.

Keywords: Burnout syndrome, stress, job satisfaction, medical sciences lecturers

I. Introduction

Burnout syndrome(BOS) was first described by Freudenberger in 1974 as a state of chronic physical and emotional exhaustion, accompanied by cynicism and detachment from work, and a sense of reduced accomplishment but was later defined by [1] as

syndrome that is thought to be brought on by ongoing workplace stress that has not been effectively controlled, and categorized into three dimensions that define it as: feelings of energy depletion or exhaustion; a greater mental separation from one's employment, or emotions of pessimism or cynicism about one's job; and diminished effectiveness in the workplace. Burnout is a common phenomenon among professionals who are exposed to chronic job stress and high work demands. Studies have shown that workers who experience burnout may exhibit symptoms such as depression, physical and mental fatigue, chronic sadness, reduced commitment, increased absenteeism, decreased job satisfaction, reduced motivation, and impaired job performance [2]. Burnout among workers can also negatively impact their physical and mental health, as well as their overall well-being [3]. Observation has shown that burnout is a growing problem in business, institutions and organizations.

Many lecturers are worn-out, complaining of fatigue, anxiety and workload. Researches have revealed that at some point in one's career burnout will be experienced, regardless of how much a person loves his job, there will be a time when a person will not feel like doing it anymore. Observation further shows that the successes or failure of any institution is to a great extent dependent on the group that makes up such institution [3], [4].

Effective utilization of the intellectual ability of the lecturers helps in the development of the universities and the society at large. Work environment of any society has a magnetic capability of influencing staff behaviour positively or negatively depending on whether the organizational climate is friendly or hostile. If the work environment is harsh and drab, not meeting the needs of the lecturers, it could cause burnout [5]. [6] stated the way a worker perceives his environment influence the way the person actually behaves in the environment. Non-conducive environment, strike actions, un-fulfilment at work may result in suspended activities and in a situation where the university management trivializes the welfare of the workers and high priority is not accorded their promotion, advancement, remuneration, health and recreation. Hence, if the university gives room for conflict between them and the lecturers, it could result in burnout. This has resulted in the work accumulation for the lecturers and having annual leave when they can travel with their families and relax from work stress has become impossible. With the growing population of university students, the lecturers have so much to do within a limited time, ranging from teaching the regular and the distance learning students, supervision of examinations, marking, recording and computation of students' results, being course advisers to students and doing other administrative work in the school. These heavy responsibilities combined with limited resources, long hours, hostile working condition and sometimes unimaginable demands from students and the community leads to chronic stress and ultimately burnout. Six major influences identified as workload, lack of control, over establishing and following day to day priorities, insufficient reward and accompanying feelings of community in which relationship become impersonal and team work is undermined, the absence of fairness in which trust, openness and respect are not present and conflicting values in which choices that are made by management often conflict with their mission and care values. Obviously, the presence of each of these could certainly indicate a strong likelihood of the development of burnout symptoms in an individual [7].

Stress is a natural response to demanding situations and can be triggered by various factors in the workplace, such as high workloads, time pressure, role ambiguity, lack of resources, and interpersonal conflicts. Lecturers in the College of Medical Sciences often face multiple stressors, including the need to meet high academic standards, supervise students, engage in research activities, and maintain clinical competence. Prolonged exposure to stressors can lead to chronic stress, which can negatively impact lecturers' physical and mental health, as well as their job satisfaction and performance. Understanding the sources of stress and its impact on lecturers in the College of Medical Sciences is critical for developing effective stress management strategies [8].

Job satisfaction refers to the overall evaluation of one's job and is influenced by various factors, such as work conditions, compensation, job autonomy, social support, and the alignment between personal values and job requirements. High job satisfaction is associated with increased motivation, engagement, and well-being, while low job satisfaction can lead to burnout, turnover, and reduced job performance. Job satisfaction is an important factor in the work-life of lecturers in the College of Medical Sciences, as it can impact their retention, engagement, and overall job performance [9].

Burnout syndrome, stress, and job satisfaction are critical factors that can impact the well-being and performance of lecturers in College of Medical sciences [10]. College faculty, particularly in the medical sciences field, face unique challenges such as heavy workload, high job demands, and exposure to emotionally demanding situations [11]. These challenges may contribute to the development of burnout syndrome, elevated stress levels, and decreased job satisfaction among lecturers, ultimately affecting their personal and professional lives, as well as the quality of education they provide to students [12].

Existing literature suggests that burnout syndrome, stress, and job satisfaction among lecturers are complex and multifaceted issues that can be influenced by various individual, organizational, and contextual factors [13]; [14]; [15]. Therefore, the researchers triggered by the need for a comprehensive investigation to better understand the prevalence, causes, and consequences of burnout syndrome, stress, and job satisfaction among lecturers in this specific setting. This study therefore aimed to address this gap by conducting a thorough examination of burnout syndrome, stress, and job satisfaction among lecturers in College of Medical

Sciences. The findings of this research may provide valuable insights into the factors contributing to these issues and their impacts on lecturers' well-being and job performance. The results can inform the development of evidence-based interventions and strategies to mitigate burnout syndrome, reduce stress, and improve job satisfaction among lecturers, ultimately enhancing the overall functioning of the College of Medical Science.

II. Materials and Methods

Material

Participants Selection

This study was conducted among Academic staff (lecturers) in the College of Medical Sciences, University of Benin, Benin city, Edo state, Nigeria.

Apparatus/Instrument

Four sets of research instruments were utilized in this study, the first set of questionnaire used was A Proforma, which is a self-designed questionnaire used to assess the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants, the second questionnaire used was Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES) designed by Maslach *et al*(1986)the third questionnaire used was the Perceived Stress Scale(PSS-14) designed by Cohen *et al*(1983), the fourth questionnaire used was the Job satisfaction survey(JSS) designed by Spector (1994).

I) Maslach Burnout Inventory -Educators Survey (MBI-ES)

To measure burnout, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) has been recognized for more than a decade as the leading measure of burnout, incorporating the extensive research that has been conducted in more than 25years since its initial publication. The MBI includes three questionnaires - the Human Services Survey, the General Survey, and the one to be used for this study, the Educators Survey. The MBI surveys address three general scales:

1. Emotional exhaustion measures feelings of being emotionally over-extended and exhausted by one's work
2. Depersonalization measures an unfeeling and impersonal response toward recipients of service, care treatment or instruction.
3. Personal accomplishment measures feelings of competence and successful achievement

The Educators Survey (ES) evaluates three dimensions of burnout in education, including teachers, aides and administrators. This instrument is very similar to the Human Services Survey (HSS), except that it specifically deals with educational administrative stress in relation to students and teachers.

The ES is a 22-item survey, which uses a 7-point scale for responses. An answer can range from "Never" to "Everyday". Several studies carried out by Iwanicki and Schwab (1981) and Gold (1984) support reliability such as the three-factor structure and internal reliability. Schwab reported Cronbach alpha ratings of 0.90 for emotional exhaustion, 0.76 for depersonalization and 0.76 for personal accomplishment; very similar ratings were reported by Gold. Time periods of a few weeks, 3 months, and 1 year were used for test-retest reliability. Scores in the few weeks range were the highest (62-82) whereas scores in the year range were the lowest (34-60). The test manual covers validity for the MBI by noting patterns that appear again in the field. For example, male teachers score higher than female in the depersonalization scale, which is consistent with other helping professions. The level of burnout is High if EE is greater than or equal to 27, PA is less than or equal to 31, and DP is greater than or equal to 13; Moderate if EE is 17-26, PA is 32-38, and DP 7-12; Low if EE is less than or equal to 16, PA is greater than or equal to 39, and DP is less than or equal to 6. For both the EE and DP subscales, higher mean scores correspond to higher degrees of perceived burnout. Conversely, lower mean scores on the PA subscale correspond to higher degrees of perceived burnout. The psychometric properties of MBI have been established as follows: Cronbach alpha of 0.86 and split-half of 0.57 and a convergent validity of 0.01-0.36. For the purpose of this study, the MBI-ES was used as the study is based on lecturers (educators).

II) Percieved Stress Scale (PSS-14):

The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) is a globally used and self-report scale measuring perceived stress. Three versions of PSS (PSS-14, PSS-10 and PSS-4) are available which comprise 14, 10 and 4 items respectively. The internal consistency coefficients are satisfactory for PSS-14 and PSS-10, but not for PSS-4. The corresponding Cronbach's alpha was 0.830, 0.754 and 0.473 respectively. For the purpose of this study, the PSS-14 was used as it has a higher internal consistency coefficient. Responses are indicated in terms of how true the statement is (higher scores indicate "truer" statements) based on a six-point rating scale ranging from disagree very much (1) to "agree very much" (6).

III) Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS): is a 36- item questionnaire, nine facet scale used to evaluate nine dimensions of job satisfaction related to overall satisfaction. This instrument is well established and reliable with Cronbach alpha coefficients exceeding 0.70 for all the facets. The JSS has been found to be reliable among nurses (Cronbach alpha 0.89) and shows good construct validity. This tool has also been found to possess acceptable reliability across cultures (Cronbach alpha 0.90 in 17 countries including South Africa). Respondents are then asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with each item. The scores for job satisfaction survey range from 36-216, the ranges are 36-108 for dissatisfaction, 144-216 for satisfaction and between 108 and 144 for ambivalent.

III. Method

Sample size determination

The sample size was calculated using the Slovin's sample size Formula.

$$n = N / 1 + N(e)^2$$

were,

n= sample size

N= population

e = margin error (0.05)

$$n = 292 / 1 + 292 (0.05)^2$$

$$n = 292 / 1.73$$

$$n = 168.78$$

$$n \sim 169$$

Therefore, the sample size required to conduct this study using the Slovin's formula is estimated to be 169 participants.

Due to industrial action (strike) embarked upon by medicine and dentistry lecturers and tight schedule of the available participants at the time of data collection, the researcher was only able to recruit 89 participants.

Sampling technique

The sampling technique that was used to recruit the participants is purposive sampling technique and is a form of non -probability sampling in which researchers rely on their own judgement when choosing members of a population to participate in their survey.

Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria

Academic staff who have been lecturing for more than 1year in different schools under the college of medical sciences and who also consented to participate while the exclusive criteria were lecturers on sabbatical leave

Research design

This research design is a cross sectional survey.

Procedure for data collection

The data for this study was collected using a self-administered questionnaire that comprise of the sociodemographic data, MBI-ES, PSS-14 and the JSS questionnaire. The participants were selected according to the different schools under the college of medical sciences .The self-administered questionnaire was administered to the participants in their various offices, the self-administered questionnaire was filled, completed and retrieved by the researcher on different days as agreed by the participants.

Ethical Consideration

Ethical approval for this study was sought for and obtained (CMS/REC/2023/414) from the Research Ethics Committee of College of Medical Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City.

Informed consent was obtained from the participants using informed consent form. Before seeking informed consent, prospective participants were adequately informed of the aims, methods, the anticipated benefits and potential risks of the study. Having been fully informed of the aim, methods, benefits and the potential risk, prospective participants were reserved with the right to refuse to participate without reprisal.

Data analysis

The data was analysed using the International Business Machine (IBM) statistical product and service solutions (SPSS) version 21.0. Descriptive statistics of frequency, mean, percentage and standard deviation was used to summarize participants socio-demographic variables (gender, age, years of experience, marital status, religion, state of origin, rank, highest educational level, school). Inferential statistics such as Spearman rank correlation and T-test was used to test for the relationship between respondents demographic characteristics and the development of burnout syndrome, stress and job satisfaction. The level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

IV. Results

Table 1: Socio-demographic data of the respondents N = 89

Variable	Frequency	Percentage	Mean \pm S.D
Age(yrs)			47.9 \pm 8.78
Years of exp. (yrs)			15.9 \pm 7.49
Gender			
Male	50	56.2	
Female	39	43.8	
Religion			
Christian	86	96.6	
Muslim	3	3.4	
Marital Status			
Single	11	12.4	
Married	73	82.0	
Widowed	2	2.2	
Divorced	3	3.4	
Educational Status			
B.Sc	2	2.2	
BDS	1	1.1	
M.Sc	49	55.1	
Ph.D	33	37.1	
Fellowship	4	4.5	
School			
B.Medical Sciences	52	58.4	
Medicine	19	21.3	
Dentistry	18	20.2	
Ranks			
Assistant Lecturer	1	1.1	
Lecturer II	9	10.1	
Lecturer I	27	30.3	
Senior lecturer	28	31.5	
Associate Professor	10	11.2	
Professor	14	15.7	

The mean age of the participants was 47.9 ± 6.52 and mean value for years of experience was 15.9 ± 7.49 . More so, 50 (56.2%) of the respondents were male, 86 (96.6%) were Christians, 73(82%) married, more than half were M. Scdegree holders 49 (55.1%) and 28 (31.5%) were Senior Lecturers as shown in Table 1.

Table 2: Level of burnout, stress and job satisfaction

Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Emotional Exhaustion		
Never	22	24.7
At least a few times a year	24	27.0
At least once a month	30	33.7
Several times a month	8	9.0
Depersonalization		
Never	7	7.9
At least a few times a year	2	2.2
At least once a month	68	76.4
Several times a month	11	12.4
Once a month	1	1.1
Personal Accomplishment		
Never	3	3.4
At least a few times a year	6	6.7
At least once a month	36	40.4
Several times a month	37	41.6
Once a month	7	38.3
Perceived Stress Scale		
Never	15	16.9
Almost never	21	23.6
Sometimes	27	30.3
Fairly often	15	16.9
Very often	11	12.4
Job Satisfaction		
Disagree very much	6	6.7
Disagree moderately	3	3.4
Disagree slightly	12	13.5
Agree slightly	28	31.5
Agree moderately	40	44.9

The Table 2 shows the frequencies and percentages of the component (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal achievement) used to measure level of burnout syndrome, stress and job satisfactory survey. For the components of burnout, most respondents are 30(33.7%) at least once a month or less emotionally exhausted, mostly depersonalized 68 (76.4%) at least once a month, less than half have several personal accomplishments in a month 37 (41.6%), 27(30.3%) are sometimes stressed and 40 (44.9%) moderately agreed that they have job satisfaction. The tables below show the details of the respondents' responses

Table 3: Mean scores for the participants N =89

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. dev
Emotional Exhaustion	1.0	4.0	1.79	0.89
Depersonalization	0.0	6.0	1.51	0.99
Personal Accomplishment	2.0	6.0	4.79	0.91
Perceived Stress Scale	1.0	5.0	3.11	0.98
Job Satisfaction Survey	2.0	6.0	4.51	1.36
Age	29	69	47.9	8.78
Years of experience	1.0	42	15.9	7.49

The descriptive statistics from the responses of the participants is seen in the table 3. The components used to measure the level of burnout syndrome, EE with mean score of 1.79 ± 0.89 , DP mean score 1.51 ± 0.99 , PA mean score 4.79 ± 0.91 , perceived stress scale has mean score of 3.11 ± 0.98 and job satisfactory survey with 4.51 ± 1.36 . Also, age and years of experience have mean score values of 47.9 ± 8.78 and 15.9 ± 7.49 respectively.

Table 4: Spearman rank test showing the relationship between components of burnout, stress and job satisfaction scores and selected socio-demographic and working profiles of participants

Variables	Burnout (r, p)	Stress (r, p)	Job satisfaction (r, p)
Age	0.06, 0.61	0.06, 0.24	0.24*, 0.81
Gender	0.13, 0.24	-0.01, 0.90	-0.07, 0.52
Years of Experience	0.10, 0.35	0.11, 0.32	0.01, 0.93
Ranks	0.22*, 0.04	0.24*, 0.12	0.07, 0.53
Educational level	0.92, 0.39	0.18, 0.09	0.15, 0.24

Age showed no significant relationship with the burnout syndromes, ($p = 0.32$), stress ($p = 0.24$) and job satisfaction ($p = 0.81$). Gender also showed no significant relationship with burnout syndrome ($p = 0.24$), stress ($p = 0.90$) and job satisfaction survey ($p=0.52$). Years of experience do not show significance relationship with the level of burnout syndrome ($p=0.35$), stress ($p=0.32$) and job satisfaction ($p=0.93$). The rank values for burnout syndrome ($p= 0.04$), stress ($p=0.12$) and job satisfaction ($p=0.53$). However, only burnout syndrome has a relationship and no significant relationship with stress and job satisfaction. The educational level values for burnout, stress and job satisfaction are ($p=0.39$), ($p= 0.09$) and ($p= 0.24$) respectively, do not have significant relationship as shown in Table 4.

Table 5: T-test values between gender, burnout, stress and job satisfaction

Domain	t-values	Df	Std. Error diff.	ρ
Burnout syndrome	-0.55	87	0.25	0.58
Stress	-2.03	87	0.13	0.05
Job satisfaction	-3.26	87	0.14	0.02

The table 5 shows the significant differences in burnout, stress and job satisfaction and age. From the table there are significant differences between gender, burnout syndrome, stress and job satisfaction

V. Discussion

The purpose of the research was to show the relationship between burnout syndrome, stress, job satisfaction and socio-demographic profiles among lecturers in College of Medical sciences in the University of Benin. As shown in table 1, there were more male than female lecturers who participated in the survey. As contained in table 2, the components used to measure the level of burnout syndrome (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal achievement) revealed that their level of burnout is at least once a month, which means that they do not easily experience the syndrome and this does conform with the study on burnout and its organizational effect which says emotional exhaustion reduces the performances of an employee if job burnout is increased [16]. Also, their perception of stress differed from one another, majority of the lecturers sometimes did get stressed. According to [17],

lecturers struggle to find a balance between their professional and personal lives, leading to chronic stress and burnout, this corroborates the results. And for job satisfactions, they moderately agreed, which implies that they are moderately job satisfied. This outcome goes with Maslow's theory, which suggests that job satisfaction is influenced by employees' fulfillment of their physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization needs [18].

The relationship between the level of burnout syndrome and socio-demographic profile among academic staff at the College of Medical Sciences, University of Benin, was evident in the study that there was no significance relationship between selected socio-demographic profile (age, gender, years of experience and educational level) and burnout syndrome, according to Table 4 which shows non-significant values that were greater than alpha value ($p = 0.05$). However, rank showed a relationship with burnout syndrome among lecturers, this means that the lecturers' ranks determine their burnout syndrome's level. This result is not in tandem with the research study by [19].

The sources of stress within the academic context are multifaceted, with this study identifying several contributing factors including but not limited to age, gender, years of experience, rank and educational level. There was no significant relationship between the socio-demographic profiles and stress based on the outcome of the survey, according to the result in Table 4. This finding is in contrast with the works of scholars such as [20], who have extensively explored the stressors faced by academic professionals.

The research found that the relationship between job satisfaction and the selected socio-demographic profiles had no significance. This is in contrary to the studies of [21] who emphasized positive relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction.

VI. Conclusion

Burnout syndrome, stress, and job satisfaction are important factors that can impact the well-being and performance of lecturers in the College of Medical Sciences. Lecturers in this field often face unique challenges, such as heavy workload, long working hours, high job demand, and exposure to emotionally charged situations. These factors can contribute to burnout syndrome, which is characterized by physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion, as well as reduced job performance and engagement. Additionally, the presence of chronic stress and low job satisfaction can further exacerbate burnout among lecturers. Understanding the relationship between burnout, stress, and job satisfaction among lecturers in the College of Medical Sciences is crucial for identifying risk factors and developing effective interventions to promote their well-being and job performance.

From the results obtained in this research, there was no statistically significant relationship between level of burnout syndrome, stress, job satisfaction and socio-demographic profile. However, there was a significant relationship in the level of burnout syndrome and rank. It was concluded that the selected socio-demographic profiles except rank do not affect the level of burnout syndrome, stress and job satisfaction among lecturers in College of Medical Sciences.

VII. Recommendations

Based on these findings, universities should develop targeted interventions and resources to reduce and if possible, prevent burnout among faculty. For senior academics, workload adjustments, stress management training, and increased administrative support staff could help alleviate heavy demands. Mentorship programs may also be beneficial. For junior lecturers, more mentorship, training, and opportunities for collaboration could enhance support early in their careers. Promoting faculty wellness through stress reduction initiatives, improved work-life balance policies, creating time for physical activities to unwind and relieve stress and a supportive institutional culture will enable lecturers to flourish. Ultimately, addressing burnout and enhancing job satisfaction among academics will contribute to better outcomes for faculty and students.

Consideration of longitudinal studies to examine how burnout syndrome, stress, and job satisfaction evolve over time among lecturers is advised. Long-term data collection can provide insights into the long-term effects and potential interventions.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Reference

1. World Health Organization. (2019). Burn-out: An "occupational phenomenon": International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11). Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases>

2. De Hert, S. (2020). Burnout in healthcare workers: prevalence, impact and preventative strategies. *Local and regional anesthesia*, 171-183.
3. Morse, G., Salyers, M. P., Rollins, A. L., Monroe-DeVita, M., & Pfahler, C. (2012). Burnout in mental health services: A review of the problem and its remediation. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 39, 341-352.
4. Salami, S. (2011). Job Stress and Burnout among Lecturers: Personality and Social Support as Moderators. *Asian Social Science*. 7. 10.5539/ass.v7n5p110.
5. Osibanjo, O., Salau, O. P., Falola, H., & Oyewunmi, A. E. (2016). Workplace stress: implications for organizational performance in a Nigerian public university. *Business: Theory and Practice*, 17(3), 261-269.
6. Abun, D. (2021). Effect of attitude toward work, work environment on the employees' works self-efficacy. *Work Environment on the Employees' Work Self-Efficacy* (November 7, 2021).
7. Olorunshola, E. (2013). An appraisal of burnout among the university lecturers in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 3(2), 2013 ISSN 1927-0526.
8. Ubangari, A. A., & Bako, R. (2014). Relationship of stress among university lecturers in Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(1), 98-104.
9. Okolocha, C. B., Akam, G. U., & Uchehara, F. O. (2021). Effect of job satisfaction on job performance of university lecturers in South-East, Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Studies and Social Science Research*, 3(1), 119-137.
10. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for designing effective interventions. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 17(3), 69-76. <http://www.doi:10.1002/wps.20311>.
11. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 1023-1030. <http://Doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.001>.
12. Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 53(1), 27-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910120033628>.
13. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>.
14. Brouwers, A. & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 239-253. 10.1016/S0742-051X(99)00057-8.
15. Tsigilis, N., & Gregoriadis, A. (2017). Occupational stress, burnout, and job satisfaction among health care professionals working in a rural hospital in Greece. *Advances in Mind-Body Medicine*, 31(1), 14-20. <doi.org/10.1177%2F0734282908315132>.
16. Chowdhury, R. (2018). Burnout and its Organizational Effects: A Study on Literature Review. *Journal of Business & Financial Affairs*. 07. 10.4172/2167-0234.1000353.
17. Kinman, G. (2018). Stress and coping in lecturers in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(4), 665-681. <http://www.https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1210049>.
18. Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396. <http://www.dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>.
19. Guglielmi, D., & Tatrow, K. (2017). Occupational stress, burnout, and health in teachers: A focused review. *Canadian Psychology/PsychologieCanadienne*, 58(2), 123-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543068001061>.
20. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer publishing company.
21. Reissová, A. & Papay, M. (2021). Relationship between Employee Engagement, Job Satisfaction and Potential Turnover. *TEM Journal*. 10. 847-852. 10.18421/TEM102-44.