

Burnout Syndrome and Self-Efficacy Beliefs in Professors

Síndrome de Burnout y sentimiento de autoeficacia en profesores universitarios

Arlington Antonio García Padilla^{a*}, Carla Vanessa Escorcía Boniventó^b, & Blinis Sat Pérez Suárez^b

Universidad Metropolitana, Barranquilla, Colombia.

^aPsychologist. Master's degree in Education. Professor of the Psychology Program. ^bResearch Incubator Students. Tenth Semester of Psychology.

Received on 7-13-17

Approved on 10-6-17

Online on 10-20-17


***Correspondence**

Email: agarcia@unimetro.edu.co

Cited as:

García, A., Escorcía, C., & Pérez, B. (2017). Burnout Syndrome and Self-Efficacy Beliefs in Professors. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 5(2), 65 - 126. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2017.v5n2.170>

© Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola, Vice-Chancellorship for Research, 2017.

 This article is distributed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Summary

The presence of the Burnout syndrome in professors may be regarded as a deterioration of their mental health with negative impacts on their job performance. It is known that teachers develop different activities in the areas of teaching, outreach and research. This study aims to analyze the relationship between the Burnout syndrome and self-efficacy beliefs and the academic performance in professors of the psychology and dentistry programs at a private university in the city of Barranquilla. This study is empirical and analytical with a descriptive-correlational design. The study population consisted of 93 teachers of the psychology and dentistry programs. To choose the sample, a non-probabilistic sample was used according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria that allowed selecting a total of 36 teachers who met the criteria for the study. The instruments that were used in this study was the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI, 1981) adapted by Seisdedos (1997), and the Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk (2001) adapted by Covarrubias and Mendoza (2016). According to the results, it was observed that there is no significant relationship between Burnout, Self-efficacy Belief and the academic performance.

Keywords: Burnout's Syndrome, Teacher Performance, Self-efficacy.

Resumen

La presencia del síndrome de Burnout en docentes universitarios, puede considerarse como un deterioro de la salud mental de estos, teniendo consecuencias negativas en su desempeño laboral. Se sabe que el docente desarrolla diferentes actividades en las áreas de docencia, extensión e investigación. Éste estudio tiene como objetivo analizar la relación del Síndrome Burnout y los sentimientos de autoeficacia con el rendimiento académico en profesores universitarios pertenecientes a los Programas de Psicología y Odontología de una Universidad privada de la ciudad de

Barranquilla. La investigación es empírico analítica, con un diseño descriptivo correlacional. La población de estudio estuvo conformada por 93 docentes de los programas de psicología y Odontología, para elección de la muestra, se utilizó una muestra de tipo no probabilista, siguiendo con unos criterios de inclusión y exclusión que permitieron seleccionar un total de 36 profesores que cumplieron con los criterios para el estudio realizado. Los instrumentos que se utilizaron en este estudio, fue el Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI, 1981) adaptado por Seisdedos (1997) y Sentimiento de Autoeficacia en el Profesor de Tschannen-Moran y Woolfolk, (2001). Teniendo en cuenta los resultados, se observó que no se presenta una relación significativa entre el Burnout, sentimientos de autoeficacia con el rendimiento académico.

Palabras claves: Síndrome de Burnout, desempeño docente, autoeficacia.

Introduction

The presence of Burnout syndrome in professors can be considered a deterioration of their mental health causing negative consequences in their job performance. It is known that teachers develop different activities in the areas of teaching, outreach and research. However, sometime they can feel tired and without any interest in developing the tasks assigned. Over the last years many authors have supported the need to research the phenomenon of Burnout in this profession, and all of them have confirmed that the syndrome is not questionable in case of this profession, since these professionals develop somatic and psychological problems that significantly damage their academic work and affect the relationships with their students and the teaching quality (Guerrero & Rubio, 2005).

Botero (2012) says that characteristics that increase the prevalence of the Burnout Syndrome in professors have been found and they include: “great variety of tasks, workload, limited time to accomplish academic activities, lack of recognition, mental load, unsuitable work spaces, and lack of suitable remuneration that compensates for their efforts and few social relationships at work.” (p. 7)

Esteras, Chorot, P and Sandín, B. (2014) found that “the religion variable was a significant predictor of the level of Burnout in the three Burnout dimensions, and explains the reduction in the variance in emotional exhaustion by 7% and in the variance in lack of personal accomplishment by 5%, and increases the variance in depersonalization by 3% in the education stage variable.” (p. 85).

Bareño, Berbesi and Montoya (2015) identified that “statistically significant and Burnout Syndrome-related variables were the following: direct relationship with the company, wage dissatisfaction, working more than 45 hour a week, feeling sick in the last three months and having consulted a professional.” (p. 46).

Guerrero (2003) found statistically significant differences in the different levels of emotional exhaustion and personal achievement, ($F= 4.12$; $p=.0172$) so that teachers with low level of emotional exhaustion felt more competent or with greater personal achievement ($F= 3.238$), than those with high and/or intermediate level of emotional exhaustion ($F= 4.119$).

According to Bermejo and Prieto (2005), by means of a correlational analysis between manifestations of psychological symptoms and the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy, most of the correlations between TSES (Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale) and Burnout were significant. In addition, the global rate of Burnout was associated in a significant, negative and moderate way with the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy. Therefore, according to the authors, the subjects, who showed more confidence in their capacities as teachers, had lower Burnout scores.

Cifre and Llorens (2001) obtained as results that exhaustion and cynicism have a high and positive correlation between them and a negative relationship with professional efficacy, value of which is higher in case of correlation with cynicism. In addition, it is observed that demands are positively and significantly related to Burnout, but only in exhaustion and cynicism dimensions and not in the professional efficacy dimension.

Nowadays, there are mechanisms in the environment that lead to work overload in professors and university researchers, blurring their professional role and, therefore, aggravating their work conditions, quality of working life and all for the same or less salary, which affects their social recognition.

Taking into account the foregoing, this study is aimed at determining the relationship between Burnout Syndrome, self-efficacy beliefs and teaching performance in professors of the psychology and dentistry programs at the Universidad Metropolitana.

Moreover, it is worth mentioning that this study arises in the research group DEHUSM of the psychology program. In this way, it would respond to new analysis and theoretical and methodological contributions,

strengthening the participation of researchers at local, regional, national and international level. For that reason, this research will contribute with the self-assessment processes that are being worked in the institution and will help with the improvement plans with respect to the design and implementation of strategies for the management of risk factors and approach to prevention and promotion of mental health in professors.

Theoretical References

Burnout Syndrome in Professors

Villanueva, Jiménez, García and Durán (2005) say that stress in professors is explained as a “dysfunction caused by professional demands derived from teaching tasks and the capacity of the teacher to solve complex, dynamic and conflictive situations that arise in the school and turn into stressful situations and situations beyond their control.” (p. 12).

Mena (2010, as cited in, 2008) says that the professional burnout “is a prevalent suffering of being professionally drained, of not bearing the task to be performed.” (p: 12). According to the author Maslach (2001) Burnout manifests itself in a series of symptoms such as exhaustion, loss of expectations and estrangement.

Maslach and Leiter (1997) cited by Mena (2010, p: 20) say that Burnout manifests itself differently in everyone, it shows three common effects:

Erosion of engagement: what was important and significant becomes unpleasant, unsatisfactory and meaningless. At the beginning of a job, people feel energetic and willing to commit time and effort to it.

Erosion of emotions: positive feelings of enthusiasm, dedication, safety and enjoyment at work turn into anger, anxiety and depression.

Organization problems: the syndrome has effects on the structure of the organization and its processes. It manifests itself with certain

characteristics such as efficacy and efficiency, unsuitable implementation of policies, problems between the members of the company or organization.

Taking into account the foregoing, according to Miño, (2012) Burnout symptomology presents an own characteristic which excels physical and psychic exhaustion, feelings of impotence and despair. Subjects can develop a negative self-concept, a negative attitude towards work, life and others, and this is consistent with a type of flat feeling towards the others.

Therefore, for Maslach and Jackson (1984, pp. 144-145) the three dimensions that characterize the syndrome include:

- **Emotional exhaustion.** It is the main element of the syndrome and it is characterized by an increasing sense of loss of energy at work and a feeling of being at the end of one's rope, of not being able to give more of oneself from a professional perspective and of having exhausted all the emotional resources.

- **Depersonalization.** It implies a negative change in the attitudes towards others (negative, distant and cold attitudes and answers), emotional estrangement, especially towards people who are the target of the professional activities, and also towards colleagues, being cynical, irritable and ironic, and even using sometimes derogatory labels to refer to users or trying to blame them for their frustrations and low work performance.

- **Low professional and/or personal accomplishment or achievement.** Low self-esteem, feeling of insecurity and incompetence, efficacy decrease at work, ideas of failure. Feelings of defenselessness or loss of control.

García et al. (2004) establishes that the assessment of the student implies the analysis of a wide range of activities required by the institution for the professors to carry out them, and they are teaching, advice, tutorial, culture dissemination, preparation of teaching materials and research.

Work stress can be generated when work demands exceed the time limits, physical capacity, and skills of teachers. This can occur regardless the category or seniority of the teachers. Moreover, it is common that the result of chronic stress is underestimation and failure (characteristics of the burnout syndrome) and it is considered they are related to quality of the teacher's class.

As in other care professions, burnout in teachers does not appear abruptly, but it is the final phase of a continuous and developing process and it can be identified through signs such as sense of unsuitability for the job, sense of lack of resources to face the teacher job, reduction of the problem-solving capacity, etc.

The professional exhaustion of professors: a predictive model

In the particular case of the faculty, many authors have defended the need to research the Burnout phenomenon in this profession over the last years and all of them have been able to verify that the syndrome is not questionable in the case of teaching, due to the development of somatic and psychological problems that significantly damage their academic work and affect their relationships with students and the teaching quality (Guerrero & Rubio, 2005).

From this organizational perspective that focuses on showing the exogenous nature of burnout and its etiological relationship with work life, it is convenient to orient the intervention and prevention actions towards the organizational change and that of external work conditions. However, then from this perspective, some variables that are related to internal work conditions, such as the capacity to make decisions and develop work skills, are introduced (Santavirta, Solovieva & Theorell, 2007; Taris, Stoffelsen, Bakker, Schaufeli & Dierendock, 2005).

Nowadays, there are mechanisms in the environment that lead to work overload in professors and university researchers, blurring their professional role, and therefore, aggravating their work conditions, their work life and

all for the same or less salary, which affects their social and academic recognition.

Gil-Monte (2003) says that currently, it is necessary to consider aspects of wellbeing and occupational health when evaluating efficacy of a specific organization, since the work life quality and the physical and mental health state affect the organization (such as absenteeism, rotation, productivity decrease, quality decrease, etc.). The consequences of the physical and mental health of the worker in the face of a stressful situation can be observed. This observation would facilitate to understand and recognize that the body and mind work reciprocally, that is, if any of them is weakened, this will directly affect the other areas of the person.

According to Montoya and Moreno (2012), it is clear that the presence of the Burnout Syndrome causes economic, social, personal and work costs both in people who suffer from it and the organization in which they work, making it possible the deterioration of several areas of operation, not only the areas in which the person operates, but also those internal works areas. For that reason, the person would rotate from one position to another, causing low productivity and more expenses for the company.

Teaching Performance

Valdés, Cantón & Mercado (2006) say that “Education is the important means of societies to conserve, transmit and transform the culture and life of individuals (p: 40). It allows each one of the actors involved to obtain the necessary resources from it to carry out personal and social changes. In this regard, teachers should keep a status as their performance is more suitable; for that reason, they are in a constant development taking into account the demands and regulations of the institutions.

According to the foregoing, Cárdenas, Méndez and González (2014) say that “this entails certain underlying changes, among them, what is expected

to be done by the teachers and the need to evaluate if they really fulfill the expectations, which is called evaluation of teaching performance.” (p. 4).

Teaching performance, when discussed from a subjective perspective, is associated with the way how each teacher value the quality of their work and the satisfaction they experience with it. When focused from an objective perspective, it is related to the quantification of the indicators that are evaluated (Fernández, 2002).

Teaching performance is evaluated through a systematic process for obtaining data in order to verify and value the educational effect in students, the effect of the development of their teaching capacities, their emotionality, work responsibility and the nature of their interpersonal relationships with students, parents, directors, colleagues and representatives of the institutions of the community (Valdés, 2000).

There are dimensions that explain the excellence of the professor and their job. For that reason, Salazar (2006) proposes three dimensions. 1) Personal dimension: empathy is integrated in order to relate the professor with their students; after the objective has been achieved. 2) Discipline dimension: it is linked to the professor’s knowledge of a discipline, this knowledge allows the recognition of epistemological or psychic obstacles the students can face when learning it and thus, professors can make educational decisions as the case may be. 3) Teaching dimension: the knowledge of a discipline is necessary but not enough to teach it. It is necessary to understand the way students will access and learn this knowledge.

On the other hand, Cárdenas, Méndez and González (2014) say that most teachers, particularly professors are subject to constant demands, such as making important decisions, introducing effective changes, innovating and keeping up to date in technological advances and advances of the specific area of the discipline. Moreover, demands are also established in terms of production of educational material, preparation of scientific articles and other administrative activities (reports, meetings, etc.).

It is important to consider the responsibility of teachers, that is, educating, teaching, guiding, but at the same time, they play the role of parents many times. Salanova, Llorens and García (2003) establish that these responsibilities along with the increasingly complex demands from students and relatives, as well as of changes and reforms of curriculums and of the education system restructuration, are turning teaching into a profession of high risk for the development of certain syndromes.

Self-Efficacy in Teachers

Self-efficacy beliefs the professors perceive in relation to their capacities to facilitate learning of students are an important source of information that allows interpreting actions of the professor in the classroom. Chacon (2006) says that the efficacy of professors is regarded as the main predictor of the teacher's behavior in relation to effort and persistence in their teaching activities and their commitment to supporting and improving learning of their students.

On the other hand, Covarrubia and Mendoza (2016) say that “the theory of self-efficacy has gone through different conceptual and methodological stages. From its beginning to the present, this theory has tried to show how cognitive, behavioral, contextual and affective aspects of people are affected by self-efficacy.”(p.:98). Moreover, the authors propose that self-efficacy “can be developed through four sources: mastery experience, vicarious experiences, social persuasion and psychological and emotional states. Even, it includes the capacity to activate cognitive, motivational, affective and selective processes.” (p.: 9).

For Fernández (2008), self-efficacy can be defined as the set of beliefs people have about their own capacities to achieve specific results. Of course, this variable varies intrapsychically over time and interpersonally, that is, that self-efficacy acts in a particular or individual way.

Teachers with self-efficacy beliefs are weakened by stress, and develop less effective actions with students (Gonzalo & León, 1999, as cited in Bermejo & Prieto, 200, p. 494). Moreover, the authors state that these beliefs can make teachers doubt about their professions and can make them develop high levels of stress.

Regarding social value, teachers who think that they are doing their task with greater enthusiasm are seen by the directors as people with high averages in performance levels.

In addition, Carlos (2016) says that “self-efficacy implies feeling responsible for learning of the students, not blaming for academic failures, staying motivated in what they do despite adversities, typical limitations or difficulties of the job.” (p. 306). They are actions that cause teachers to evaluate themselves in a positive way and that contribute to their performance and relationships with their students. Carlos – Guzmán (2016) says that there are some factors that contribute to self-efficacy: self-perception of their competencies and the belief that support materials, technological and virtual tools are available for them in order to solve any difficulty or problem arising satisfactorily during the teaching-learning process.

Method

Design

The approach of this Empirical-Analytical study is transactional or cross-sectional since data collection instruments were used in a single moment; and likewise, work was performed based on a correlational and descriptive design since an analysis of the relationship between study variables was conducted.

Participants

A non-probabilistic sample is established in this study (Sampieri, Fernández & Baptista, 2014, p: 176). In this regard, the authors propose that since the

procedure is not mechanic, certain criteria, which considering the research process, define the route for the selection of participants, are established.

Taking into account the foregoing, criteria for the selection of professors who participated in the research were the following: inclusion criteria include: professors of the psychology and dentistry programs, with at least 1 year working experience at the university, with classes assigned, and with the complete 2016.1 performance evaluation¹.

Exclusion criteria include: professors of the psychology and dentistry programs, who have less than one year in the job, with exclusively administrative and research assignment and professors who do not have the complete 2016.1 performance evaluation.

Twenty professors of the dentistry program and 17 professors of the psychology program participated in the study, meeting the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Thus, making a total of 37 professors who met the research criteria.

Taking into account the foregoing, 36% of professors are 51 to 60 years old, 9% of them are 41 to 50 years old, 5% are 31 to 40 years old, 4% are 20 to 30 years old and 2% of them are more than 60 years old). More professors of the dentistry program participated (52.8%), while 47.2% of professors of the psychology program participated. On the other hand, the female gender had greater participation than the masculine gender, 58.3% and 41.7%, respectively.

1 Regarding the selection of the sample taking into account the inclusion and exclusion criteria, an average number of professors of the dentistry program did not meet the inclusion criteria, since some of them did not teach classes. On the other hand, other professors did not meet the criteria because their performance evaluation was not complete.

Instruments

Sociodemographic scale: it is a scale used to collect information about age, gender, number of components, years of experience in the university, among others.

MBI of Maslach and Jackson: the instrument that will be used for this research is the first inventory created by Maslach and Jackson (Maslach Burnout Inventory, 1981, 1986) that is used to measure the level of Burnout. It was previously a 47-question survey. Finally, due to its high contribution to the explanation on this syndrome, 22 final questions were established for the Burnout Syndrome, (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). For this study, the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Teachers (MBI-Ed) reviewed by Seisdedos (1997) will be used, the psychometric properties show an internal consistency for all items of 0.80, and specifically in the three dimensions evaluated, with a validity of 0.90 for emotional exhaustion, 0.71 for personal accomplishment and 0.79 for depersonalization (Maslach Burnout Inventory, 1981, 1986). The foregoing is confirmed by Barbosa, Muñoz, Rueda and Suárez, K. (2009), Justo (2010), Rionda-Arjona and Mares-Cárdenas (2012), Guerrero (2003), Oramas, Almirall, and Fernández (2007) and Rojas, Zapata, Grisales (2009).

On the other hand, cut-off points are established for Burnout Syndrome dimensions. For exhaustion dimension, the following cut-off points were established: 1-19 low level – very low; 19-26 intermediate level and 29+ high level. For depersonalization dimension, the following cut-off points were established: 1-6 low level – very low, 6 to 9 intermediate level and 10+ high level. And for personal accomplishment dimension, the cut-off points were the following: 0 to 30 low levels – very low, 34 to 39 intermediate level and 40+ high level.

Teacher's self-efficacy beliefs: to measure self-efficacy, the instrument of teacher's self-efficacy beliefs developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk, (2001) was used and this instrument consists of 24 questions in a scale from

1 to 9 (1= “nothing”, 9= “a great deal”), and are divided in 3 sub-scales: a) “Efficacy for student engagement”, b) “Efficacy in teaching strategies” and c) “Efficacy in classroom management”. However, for this study, the version adapted and translated into Spanish (TSES) by Covarrubias y Mendoza (2015) is used.

This adaptation has 147 questions and 3 to 4 factors are added compared to the original version. The authors added a fourth factor focused on the “Efficacy in approaching singularity of students”. All of this coincides with the reports on the validation of this construct (Covarrubias & Mendoza, 2015; Revelli Galarza et al., 2013; Rodríguez, Núñez, Valle, Blas, & Rosario, 2009; Toro & Ursúa, 2005), which have shown an average ranging from 3 to 6 factors. Responses to each question were assessed on a simplified Likert scale: Nothing, very little, some influence, quite a bit, a great deal. The cut-off points for the values of the dimensions are from 0 to 1. In addition, the total reliability of the 17-question inventory showed a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.922. Therefore, reliability per factor varied between 0.737 and 0.838 (Covarrubias & Mendoza, 2015).

Procedure

The research started with the selection of the topic to be discussed. Then it was focused on formulating and delimiting the problem, this was carried out based on the primary and secondary bibliographic review. As a result of this phase, the theoretical framework that allowed the conceptualization of variables was developed. Likewise, the foregoing contributed to the identification of the necessary instruments for data collection. To collect information, the Teacher’s Burnout Inventory (MBI-Ed) developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981; 1986) and adapted by Seisdedos (1997) was used and the Teacher’s Self-efficacy Beliefs Scale developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk (2001), adapted by Covarrubias and Mendoza (2015) was also employed.

After that, the empirical phase continued. In this phase the instruments were applied in October and November to professors of the dentistry and psychology programs. The application of the instruments showed particularities, since it was carried out collectively, researchers went to places where professors perform their activities, such as classrooms, teacher's lounge or offices. It is worth mentioning that the academic coordinators of the programs collaborated, since they provided the list of professors with their respective information. To select the sample, inclusion and exclusion criteria were taken into account and this allowed choosing a number of representative subjects in each one of the programs. For the application of the instruments, a letter was sent to the programs for authorization. Before the application, an informed consent was submitted to professors.

The statistical analysis was executed by using the statistical program SPSS, version 23, in which the construction of a data matrix and the statistical analysis of the results were initially established. Finally, the analysis was executed and the objectives of the study were met, making a descriptive analysis of variables and establishing the bivariate correlation procedure that calculates the Spearman correlation coefficient with its levels of significance.

Results

Teaching Function Analysis

Table 1.

Frequency analysis of teaching function.

Teaching Function		Frequency	%
Administrative duties/management	Yes	10	27.8
	No	25	69.4
Professors with tutorials	Yes	19	52.8
	No	17	47.2
Thesis advisor	Yes	13	36.1
	No	23	63.9
Development of research activities	Yes	22	61.1
	No	14	38.9
Development of outreach activities	Yes	20	55.6
	No	16	44.4

Source: Own data

Taking into account administrative duties/management, it is observed that 69.4% of professors do not have specific duties; while 27.8% of professors do have them. Regarding professors that are tutors, it is observed that 52.8% of professors are tutors with a greater participation; while 47.2% of professors are not tutors.

It is worth mentioning that 36.1% of professors are thesis advisors, while 63.9% of them are not.

Based on the previous table, it can be identified that professors with research activities had a greater participation with 61.1%; while 38.9% of professors do not have research activities. 55.6% of professors develop outreach activities, while just 44.4% of them do not develop them.

Analysis of Variable Frequency

Table 2.

Frequency analysis of the levels of Burnout syndrome dimensions.

Dimensions	Ranges	Frequency	Percentage
Emotional exhaustion	Low levels	30	83.3
	Intermediate levels	3	8.3
	High levels	3	8.3
	Total	36	100.0
Depersonalization	Low levels	34	94.4
	Intermediate levels	2	5.6
	Total	36	100.0
Personal accomplishment	Low accomplishment	2	5.6
	Intermediate	10	27.8
	Sense of Achievement	24	66.7
	Total	36	100.0

Source: Own data

The emotional exhaustion dimension showed that 83.33% of professors do not present emotional exhaustion, while 8.3% of them, who show an intermediate/high level of emotional exhaustion, have the sense of feeling exhausted, as well as physically and mentally drained when dealing with their academic responsibilities.

Regarding depersonalization, there was a percentage of 94.4 in low levels and a percentage of 5.6% in intermediate levels. So it can be said that professors show negative attitudes and cold feelings towards students and their academic activities. However, there is a percentage in intermediate levels that may show this type of attitudes and feelings.

Regarding personal accomplishment dimension, it was found that 5.6% of professors show low level of personal accomplishment, 27.5% of them show intermediate level of personal accomplishment and 66.7% show more

scores in sense of achievement, which indicates that professors tend to evaluate themselves in a positive way, that they are motivated at work and satisfied with the results of their academic activities.

Table 3.

Frequency analysis of self-efficacy belief in professors.

Dimensions	Ranges	Frequency	Percentage
Efficacy in the participation of students (FA)	High Levels	36	100.0
Efficacy in learning and teaching strategies (FB)	High Levels	36	100.0
Efficacy in classroom management (FC)	Intermediate	1	2.8
	High Levels	35	97.2
	Total	36	100.0
Efficacy in approaching singularity of students	High Levels	36	100.0

Source: Own data

In Factor A about Teacher's Self-efficacy Beliefs, 100% of professors presented high levels, indicating that professors are able to achieve motivation and participation of their students in the teaching-learning process.

In Factor B about Efficacy in teaching and learning strategies 100% of professors presented high levels, which describes the capacity of professors to use different strategies and/or methodologies to teach and provoke learning in students (Covarrubias, 2015).

In Factor about Efficacy in classroom management 2.8% of professors presented intermediate levels, while 97.2% of them presented high levels, which indicates, according to Covarrubias (2014) the capacity of professors to manage and control behavior, discipline and order favoring a positive environment in classroom.

On the other hand, it was observed that in Factor D about Efficacy in approaching singularity in students, 100% of the results are located in high levels. The foregoing indicates that professors are able to adapt teaching to the specific learning needs and/or demands of each student. (Covarrubias, 2015).

Descriptive- Statistic Analysis

Regarding Burnout syndrome dimensions, there is an average value in the emotional exhaustion (10.88) and depersonalization (2.19) dimensions and it corresponds to low - very low levels. In addition, the average value of personal accomplishment is 41.27 that corresponds to the high level. This could mean that professors feel a greater personal accomplishment and at the same time, they do not feel exhausted when dealing with duties performed in the university.

Table 4.

Burnout syndrome description.

	N	Average	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Emotional exhaustion	36	10.8889	9.29448	1.00	36.00
Depersonalization	36	2.1944	2.79611	0.00	9.00
Personal Accomplishment	36	41.2778	5.25145	28.00	48.00

Variables of self-efficacy beliefs obtained intermediate and high values. This shows that professors are able to activate motivational, cognitive and behavioral processes that allow them to establish a positive assessment of themselves and regulate their own performance properly.

Table 5.*Self-Efficacy belief description.*

	N	Average	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Self-efficacy beliefs _FA	36	4.2917	0.43712	3.25	5.00
Self-efficacy beliefs _FB	36	4.4653	0.38337	4.00	5.00
Self-efficacy beliefs _FC	36	4.2667	0.47809	3.00	5.00
Self-efficacy beliefs _FD	36	4.3310	0.41618	3.50	5.00

Analysis of Variable Correlation

The relationship between variables of Burnout, Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Teaching Performance allowed the analysis of the following data:

Table 6.*Relationship between teaching performance and Burnout syndrome dimensions.*

	Teaching performance	Emotional exhaustion	Deper-sonalization	Personal accomplishment
Teaching performance	1	.332*	.284	-.94
Emotional exhaustion	.332*	1	.342*	-.065
Depersonalization	.284	.342*	1	-.611**
Personal accomplishment	-.194	-.065	-.611**	1

*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Own data

Taking into account the previous results, there is a positive relationship between teaching performance and emotional exhaustion dimension (.332*). In the same way, there is a positive relationship between emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (.342*) as well as a negative relationship between depersonalization and personal accomplishment (-.611**).

Table 7.

Relationship between teaching performance and self-efficacy beliefs.

	Teaching performance	Self-efficacy beliefs_FA	Self-efficacy beliefs_FB	Self-efficacy beliefs_FC	Self-efficacy beliefs_FD
Teaching performance	1	.073	-.069	.057	.043
Self-efficacy beliefs_FA	.073	1	.659**	.287	.554**
Self-efficacy beliefs_FB	-.069	.659**	1	.309	.373*
Self-efficacy beliefs_FC	.057	.287	.309	1	.570**
Self-efficacy beliefs_FD	.043	.554**	.373*	.570**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Own data

As can be seen in the previous data, there is a significant relationship between teaching performance and self-efficacy beliefs. However, there is a significant positive relationship between Factor A and Factor B (.659**) and Factor D (.554**), a significant relationship between Factor B and Factor D (.373**), a significant relationship between Factor C and Factor D (.570**). Based on the foregoing, Factor D shows a greater relationship with Factors A (.554**) and C (.570**).

Discussion

This study is aimed at determining the Burnout Syndrome relationship in the teaching performance of the professors of the dentistry and psychology programs. It is considered that job of the professors becomes stressful (Golembiewski et al. 1983) and that according to the tasks they perform daily, stress can reach very high levels and becomes a risk factor for mental health.

On the other hand, Guerrero (2003) says that those professors who have a high level of personalization, have a positive or direct relationship unlike those who show emotional exhaustion. Besides, he says that the lower the personal exhaustion and depersonalization level, the higher the personal accomplishment level.

Regarding the results, it is observed in Burnout dimensions that the scores of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization dimensions are below the average, indicating that professors show high scores in personal accomplishment. According to the foregoing, a study conducted by Rionda-Arjona and Mares-Cárdenas (2012) found that 31% of the population shows low levels of Burnout, while 56% shows intermediate levels and 13% shows low levels. Taking into account the results obtained by researchers, 60% of the sample showed intermediate levels. However, in the personal accomplishment dimension, 43% of the sample showed high levels, while 42% showed intermediate levels and 15% showed low levels.

Although Fernández (2008) says that the activity of professors shows a stressor component that is related to fatigue and internal unease, taking into account the foregoing, there is a significant relationship between the Burnout syndrome (Emotional Exhaustion 0.332*; depersonalization 0.284) and the performance of professors. Although the scores establish a significant correlation between the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization dimensions and the academic performance, they can be related to the proposal made by Villanueva, Jiménez, García and Durán (2005) that states that they

occur due to the sense of unsuitability for job, salary factors and low capacity to solve problems.

Rodríguez et al (2014) says that results obtained from his study about teaching performance and burnout mainly lie in the relationship of teaches with their institution, showing a significant correlation favoring the emotional burnout and exhaustion.

It is considered that the results can mean a significant element to establish a baseline in the face of processes the professors go through according to the way they perceive the work environment and the way they express their emotions.

On the other hand, self-efficacy perceived supposes that the individual has a positive assessment of their capacities when dealing with a situation, and therefore, levels of anxiety, uncertainty or fear do not interfere with their performance. This would indicate that those professors who have high levels of self-efficacy would be unlikely to suffer from Burnout syndrome.

Regarding the foregoing, there are intermediate and high levels of self-efficacy beliefs in professors. In addition, there is a significant relationship between teaching performance and self-efficacy beliefs.

In this regard, according to Covarrubias and Mendoza (2013) those professors with high scores in self-efficacy are considered to be creative professors that use varied teaching strategies and they are also reflexive in relation to their teaching practice and their academic performance. Ossa, Quintana, and Rodríguez (2015) also confirm the foregoing by saying that among the positive consequences, there is a relationship oriented to the assessment of personal satisfaction and the work environment improvement.

In a study conducted by Portocarrero (2013), it is observed that 76% of the professors show high levels of self-efficacy and 59.2% of them show high frequency of it. This indicates, according to the authors, that self-efficacy can determine the performance. Professors with high level of self-efficacy can

have a greater academic success due to the use of self-assessment and meta-cognitive strategies in teaching and learning processes.

In short, this research allows establishing the partial results that will give feedback through future research actions and contributions. Even though the results are positive with respect to the low level of Burnout, it is pertinent as a recommendation to establish intervention strategies for Burnout management and promotion of self-efficacy processes in professors, allowing working for the personal, professional and work development of professors in order to generate suitable and healthy relational, organizational and academic-research environments that will enable the achievement of institutional and programmatic goals in the practice of professors, particularly in the programs that were selected in this research, comparing them with those of other academic programs of the university.

References

- Barbosa, L., Muñoz., Rueda, P., & Suárez, K. (2009). Síndrome de Burnout y estrategias de afrontamiento en docentes universitarios. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología: Ciencia y Tecnología* 2(1), 21-30. Recuperado de: <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/213/21319039003.pdf>
- Bareño S., Berbesi, D., & Montoya, C. (2010). Factores Asociados al Síndrome de Burnout en docentes de Enfermería, Medellín-Colombia 2008. *Investigaciones Andina*, 12(21), 36-48
- Bermejo, L., & Prieto, M. (2005). Malestar docente y creencias de autoeficacia del profesor. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 232, 493-510. Recuperado de: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/1373232.pdf>
- Botero, C. (2012). Riesgo psicosocial intralaboral y “burnout” en docentes universitarios de algunos países latinoamericanos. *Cuadernos de Administración*, 28(48), 117-132. Recuperado de: http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0120-46452012000200010&lng=en&tlng=es.

- Briones, G. (2003). *Metodología de la investigación cuantitativa en las ciencias sociales*. Arfo Editores, composición electrónica. Recuperado de <https://www.yukei.net/wp-content/uploads/2007/08/modulo3.pdf>
- Calvete, E., & Villa, A. (1997). *Proyecto Deusto 14-16: Evaluación e intervención del Estrés docente*. Bilbao: Mensajero.
- Caramés, R. (2003). Precarización y Burnout del puesto de trabajo del personal docente e investigador de la universidad. *Revista Praxis*, 2(4), 12-20. Recuperado de: http://biblioteca.universia.net/html_bura/ficha/params/title/precarizacion-burnout-puesto-trabajo-personal-docente-investigador-universidad/id/2040403.html
- Cárdenas, M., Méndez, L., & González, M. (2014). Evaluación del desempeño docente, estrés y burnout en profesores universitarios. *Actualidades Investigativas en Educación*, 14(1), 1-23. Recuperado de: <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/447/44729876006.pdf>
- Carlos, J. (2016). ¿Qué y cómo evaluar el desempeño docente? Una propuesta basada en los factores que favorecen el aprendizaje. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 4(2), 285-358. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2016.v4n2.124>
- Cherniss, C. (1992). Long-Term Consequences of Burnout: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030130102>
- Chacón, C. (2006). Las creencias de autoeficacia: un aporte para la formación docente de inglés. *Acción Pedagógica*, 15, 44-54. Recuperado de: <http://www.saber.ula.ve/bitstream/123456789/17262/2/articulo5.pdf>
- Cifre, E., & Llorens, S. (2001). Burnout en Profesores de la UJI: Un Estudio Diferencial. Recuperado de: http://repositori.uji.es/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10234/79710/forum_2001_15.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Cordes, C., & Dougherty, T. (1993). A Review and an Integration of Research on Job Burnout. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 621-656. Recuperado de: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258593>
- Covarrubias, C & Mendoza, M. (2013). La teoría de autoeficacia y el desempeño docente: el caso de Chile. *Estudios Hemisféricos y Polares*, 4(2), 107-123. Recuperado de <http://www.hemisfericosypolares.cl/>

articulos/048-Covarrubias%20Lira-Autoeficacia%20Desempeno%20Docente%20Chile.pdf

- Covarrubias, C., & Mendoza, M. (2016). Adaptación y validación del cuestionario sentimiento de autoeficacia en una muestra de profesores chilenos. *Universitas Psychologica*, 15(2), 97-108. <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy15-2.avcs>
- Esteras, J., Chorot, P., & Sandín, B. (2014). Predicción del Burnout en los docentes: papel de los factores organizacionales, personales y sociodemográficos. *Revista de Psicopatología y Psicología Clínica*, 19(2), 79-92. <https://doi.org/10.5944/rppc.vol.19.num.2.2014.13059>
- Fernández, M. (2002). *Realidad psicosocial del maestro de primaria*. Universidad de Lima: Fondo de Desarrollo Editorial.
- Fernández, M. (2008). *Burnout, Autoeficacia y Estrés en Maestros Peruanos: Tres Estudios Foro de las Américas en Investigación sobre factores psicosociales*. Recuperado de: http://factorespsicosociales.com/segundoforo/trabajos_libres/FERNANDEZ-ARATA.pdf
- García, B., Loredó, J., Luna, E., Pérez, C., Reyes, R., Rigo, M., & Rueda, M. (2004). Algunas consideraciones sobre los aspectos teóricos involucrados en la evaluación de la docencia. En Mario Rueda y Frida Díaz-Barriga (Coord.), *La Evaluación de la docencia en la universidad* (pp. 13-61). México, D.F.: Universidad Autónoma de México.
- Gil-Monte, P. (2003). Burnout syndrome: síndrome de quemarse por el trabajo, desgaste profesional, estrés laboral o enfermedad de Tomás. *Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 19(2), 181-197. Recuperado de: <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2313/231318052004.pdf>
- Guerrero, E. (2003). Análisis pormenorizado de los grados de burnout y técnicas de afrontamiento del estrés docente en profesorado universitario. *Anales de Psicología*, 19(1), 145-158. Recuperado de: <http://revistas.um.es/analesps/article/viewFile/27931/27061>
- Guerrero, E., & Rubio, J. (2005). Estrategias de prevención e intervención del Burnout en el ámbito educativo. *Salud Mental*, 5(28), 27-33. Recuperado de <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=58252804>
- Golembiewski, T.R., & Munzenrider, R.F. (1989). *Phases of Burnout: developments in concepts and applications*. Greenwood Press.

- Justo, C. (2010). Intervención sobre los niveles de burnout y resiliencia en docentes de educación secundaria a través de un programa de conciencia plena (mindfulness). *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 21(2), 271-288. De: http://assets00.grou.ps/0F2E3C/wysiwyg_files/FilesModule/vivirpresentes/20111102150659-xyilyfxtjgxxzqabej/Mindfulness_y_Burnout_profesores_-_Justo.pdf
- Kyriakou, C (1989). The nature and sources of stress facing teachers. Comunicación presentada en la tercera conferencia europea de investigación sobre aprendizaje e instrucción. Madrid
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1984). Burnout in organizational settings. *Applied Social Psychology Annual*, 5, 133-153. Recuperado de: https://smlr.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/documents/faculty_staff_docs/BurnoutinOrganizationalSettings.pdf
- Mena, L. (2010). El desgaste profesional en profesores universitarios: un modelo predictivo (Tesis doctoral). Universidad de Granada, Granada. España.
- Miño, A. (2012). Clima organizacional y estrés laboral asistencial (burnout) en profesores de Enseñanza Media: Un estudio correlacional. *Revista Psicología Científica*, 14(9). Recuperado de: <http://www.psicologiacientifica.com/burnout-profesores-ensenanza-media/>
- Monje, C (2011). Metodología de la investigación cuantitativa y cualitativa. Recuperado de: http://congreso enfermeria.com/2016/sites/default/files/styles/monjecarlosarturo-guiadidacticametodologiadelainvestigacion_1421658502527.pdf
- Montoya, P., & Moreno, S. (2012). Relación entre síndrome de burnout, estrategias de afrontamiento y engagement. *Psicología desde el Caribe*, 29(1), 204-227. Recuperado de: <http://rcientificas.uninorte.edu.co/index.php/psicologia/article/viewFile/1940/2813>
- Oramas, A., Almirall, P., & Hernández, I. (2007). Estrés laboral y el Síndrome de Burnout en docentes venezolanos. *Salud de los Trabajadores*, 15(2). Recuperado de: <http://www.redalyc.org/comocitar.oa?id=375839287002>
- Ossa, C., Quintana, I., & Rodríguez, F. (2015). Valoración de salud mental en formación de profesores en dos universidades chilenas. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 3(1), 125-176. <https://doi.org/10.20511/pyr2015.v3n1.70>

- Quiceno, J., & Vinaccia, S. (2007). Burnout síndrome de quemarse en el trabajo (SQT). *Acta Colombiana de Psicología*, 10(2) 117-125. Recuperado de: <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/acp/v10n2/v10n2a12.pdf>
- Rionda, A., & Mares, M. (2012). Burnout En Profesores de primaria y su desempeño laboral. *Revista Latinoamericana de Medicina Conductual*, 2(1), 43-50. <https://doi.org/10.5461/RLmc.v2.i1.27414>
- Revelli, J., et al. (2013). Auto-eficacia docente, motivación intrínseca y expectativa de resultado de alumnado. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Docencia Creativa*, 2, 54-62. Recuperado de: <http://digibug.ugr.es/bitstream/10481/27621/1/ReiDoCrea-Vol.3-Art.7-Revelli-Gutierrez-Castillo-Centeno-Vinuesa-Belcaid-Andrade.pdf>
- Rodríguez, S., Núñez, J. C., Valle, A., Blas, R., & Rosario, P. (2009). Auto-eficacia docente, motivación del profesor y estrategias de enseñanza. *Escritos de Psicología*, 3(1), 1-7. Recuperado de: <http://scielo.isciii.es/pdf/ep/v3n1/art01.pdf>
- Rojas, M., Zapata, J., & Grisales, H. (2009). Síndrome de Burnout y satisfacción laboral en docentes de una institución de educación superior, Medellín, 2008. *Revista Facultad Nacional de Salud Pública*, 27(2). Recuperado de: <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/120/12011791011.pdf>
- Salanova, M., Llorens, S. & García-Renedo, M. (2003). Por qué se están quemando los profesores. *Revista del Insight*, 28(6), 16-20. Recuperado de: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/39198157_Por_que_se_estan_quemando_los_profesores
- Salazar, S. (2006). Hacia una caracterización del docente universitario “excelente”: Una revisión a los aportes de la investigación sobre el desempeño del docente universitario. *Educación*, 30(1), 31-49. Recuperado de: <http://www.redalyc.org/html/440/44030103/>
- Sampieri, H., Fernández, C., & Baptista, P. (2014). *Metodología de la Investigación*. (6ª edición). México: McGraw Hill
- Santavirta, N., Solovieva, S., & Theorell, T. (2007). The association between job strain and emotional exhaustion in a cohort of 1,028 Finnish teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 213–228. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709905X92045>

- Seisdedos, N. (1997). *MBI Inventario "Burnout de Maslach"*. Madrid: TEA ediciones.
- Taris, T. W., Stoffelsen, J., Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B. & van Dierendock, D. (2005). Job control and burnout across occupations. *Psychology Reply*, 97(93), 955-61. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.97.3.955-961>
- Toro, L., & Ursúa, M. (2005). Malestar docente y creencias de autoeficacia del profesor. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 63(232), 493-510. Recuperado de: http://www.jstor.org/stable/23766331?seq=1#fndtn-references_tab_contents
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Johnson, D. (2011). Exploring literacy teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: potential sources at play. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(4), 751-761. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.12.005>
- Valdés, Á., Cantón, M., y Mercado, M. (2006). Aceptación del instrumento de evaluación del desempeño profesional en la carrera magisterial. *Enseñanza e Investigación en Psicología*, 11(1), 39-51. Recuperado de: <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/292/29211103.pdf>
- Villanueva, M., Jiménez, I., García, L., & Durán, J. (2005). Valoración de las fuentes de estrés laboral en personal docente. Instituto de Seguridad y Salud Laboral. Servicio de Higiene Industrial y Salud Laboral / Área de Ergonomía y Psicología Aplicada. (Documentno de Trabajo). Recuperado de: [http://www.carm.es/web/pagina?IDCONTENIDO=11452&IDTIPO=60&RASTRO=c160\\$m](http://www.carm.es/web/pagina?IDCONTENIDO=11452&IDTIPO=60&RASTRO=c160$m)
- Weber, A., Weltle, D. & Lederer, P. (2005). Ill health and early retirement among school principals in Bavaria *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 78(4), 325-331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-004-0555-9>