Burnout among Faculty Members in Adventist Higher Institutions of Learning in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Mahlon Juma Nyongesa

Adventist University of Africa, Ongata Rongai, Nairobi

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0478

Received: 18 July 2026; Accepted: 24 July 2026; Published: 01 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study investigated burnout using a quantitative descriptive design with a sample of 130 faculty members. Data from a self-constructed questionnaire were analyzed using SPSS 27 and SmartPLS 4.0 for statistical treatment. The faculty members experienced *a high level* of reduced professional efficacy but lower levels of exhaustion and cynicism. In terms of age, the younger faculty members were more vulnerable to exhaustion, reduced professional efficacy, and cynicism. Being male or female made no difference in the experience of burnout. Further, the faculty members who work from home more than 80% of the time face higher levels of burnout than those working from home 2 - 3 days a week and more than 80% in the office. For future research, the study recommends the following.

For future research, a convergent parallel design mixed-methods approach could complement personal and organizational factors. Not only should standardized and validated instruments such as the Maslach Burnout Inventory be used to enhance reliability, but also the sample size should be expanded to include different Adventist universities across Sub-Saharan African countries to improve generalizability. Changes in burnout over time and identifying causal relationships would require a longitudinal research design. Future research would look at how variables such as workload, organizational support, leadership style, job satisfaction, and mental health resources affect burnout.

Keywords: Burnout. Faculty members. Exhaustion, Cynicism, Professional efficacy.

INTRODUCTION

Burnout is an occupational phenomenon that is characterized by emotional exhaustion, physical and energy depletion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy. Zainab et al. (2019) observed that studies on post-secondary education faculty members have been carried out in several nations, including Portugal, South Africa, Spain, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Turkey. The literature on burnout in academic settings from the UK, Australia, and Canada indicates that increased stress is a growing concern (Catano *et al.*, 2010; Rothmann & Barkhuizen, 2008; Tytherleigh *et al.*, 2005; Watts & Robertson, 2011; Winefield *et al.*, 2003). The impact of burnout among faculty members in Adventist institutions in sub-Saharan Africa is under- researched.

Maslach and Leiter (2022) use a picture of a canary in a coal mine. These are healthy birds, singing away as they enter a coal mine cave. Upon coming out, they are full of soot and disease, no longer singing. People then ask why the canaries made themselves sick. The birds are not making themselves sick; '*the coal mine is making the birds sick'* (p. 4). Although burnout is frequently perceived as an individual issue, Maslach asserted that evidence is rising indicating that burnout is a workplace phenomenon, and by this, relocating responsibility from the individual towards the organization (p. 3).

Burnout has been recognized as a disease by the World Health Organization and listed in the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11; Atroszko et al., 2020). According to the study, the employee burnout rate in 2020 was at 29.6%, 34. 7% in 2021, while in 2022, it was at 38.1% of the three combined constructs. A national study of US general surgery residents found that estimates varied from 3.2% to 91.4%, with 43.2% of

respondents acknowledging weekly symptoms (Hewitt *et al.,* 2020). Burnout is measured using the three variables, namely exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy.

Exhaustion

This is characterized by emotional fatigue, energy depletion, lack of physical rest, and unmanageable workloads. It has chronic workplace stress that leads to symptoms of energy depletion or exhaustion, increased mental distance, disengagement, cynicism, negativism towards the workplace, and a sense of ineffectiveness or lack of efficacy (Atroszko *et al*., 2020; Hewitt *et al.*, 2020). Besides, burnout leads to learned helplessness and decathexis from work (Plante, 2020).

Burnout has consequences on the organization. Workers who have low motivation and performance yield a lower quality of service (Humborstad *et al.,* 2007). Similarly, burnt-out workers are vulnerable to conflicts that interfere with work, which lowers output and lengthens production schedules (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Consequently, burnout can have a 'contagion effect' that results in a poor working environment, as suggested by the emotional contagion theory (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2000). Due to absenteeism, inefficiency, and unproductive behavior, this syndrome typically results in large financial losses as well (Ugwu *et al.,* 2017).

Besides, the organization ensures well-being as part of the organizational culture, which deals with the norms that define an organization - '*why we exist,' 'what we believe in, '* and *'how we do things'*-dictates how employees treat each other and experience the workplace. When an organization places an accent mark on workplace wellness and provides resources for employees to live healthier lives, they take better care of themselves. The employees will encourage each other to live healthy, meaningful, and productive work lives. They will support each other in pursuing their ideal work-life balance - whether that means working reasonable hours, taking advantage of a flexible work environment, or enjoying their vacation time -- and they collectively model making healthy choices

Cynicism

Burnout is highly linked to cynicism. According to Anderson (1996), this trait is characterized by the experience of receiving unfair treatment and compensation, unstable bonds, and irregular performance rewards. Besides, it is a negative attitude in which an employee becomes critical and disparaging of their organization. Chiaburu et al. (2013) noted that cynicism includes reduced commitment, increased turnover intentions, and reduced performance. It affects all ranks of employees, thereby producing less commitment and job satisfaction. Faculty members with cynicism experience mental distance, alienation, and feelings of negativity at the workplace; they become desirous of the use of electronic devices associated with AI, where there is less interaction with colleagues. In view of this, Maslach et al. (2001), in consonance with Tarafdar *et al.* (2011), opined that jobs that required a high level of interaction with AI technologies posed specific demands on individuals. The integration of AI, if not accompanied by proper training, support, or manageable workloads, could contribute to burnout. Besides, the introduction of new technologies, including AI, contributed to technostress – a form of stress caused by using technology. If the employees perceive the use of AI as stressful or if they lack the necessary resources and support, it may lead to burnout.

According to Alves *et al*. (2019), this results in "negative behavior, a detachment from students, and a negative appraisal of their professional role" (p. 2). Burnout is exacerbated by the ever-increasing workloads and competing demands from teaching, research, and service. Besides, studies have demonstrated that an increase in contract positions further strains core faculty (Biron et al., 2008; Byrne et al., 2013).

Reduced Professional Efficacy

Reduced professional efficacy is the inability to function professionally within the mandate as a faculty member due to adverse effects of job demands, workload, value conflicts, lack of social support, and rewards. According to research, faculty members who are frequently subjected to occupational stress, which is defined as high work demand and limited resources, are more susceptible to burnout syndrome (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Brenninkmeijer & Van Yperen, 2003; Carlotto, 2010; Moreno-Jimenez *et al.*, 2002).

Burnout among faculty members has negative consequences both to individuals and to the organization. There are effects on the individual. *First*, there is diminished work performance (Demerouti *et al.,* 2001; Atkins et al., 2023), negative health implications (Salvagioni *et al.,* 2017), emotional concerns, high turnover rates (WHO, 2019), decreased focus and memory (Bryan *et al.,* 2018), difficulty making decisions, decreased coping skills, anxiety, depression, life dissatisfaction, low self-esteem, insomnia, irritability, and increased alcohol and tobacco use (Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Salvagioni *et al.,* 2017). *Secondly*, there is a diminished desire to learn and grow (WHO, 2019). There is difficulty in fulfilling family responsibilities.

Thirdly, the employees who experienced burnout were 23% more likely to visit the emergency room. It is costly (Moss, 2019), with the emotional and financial toll from workplace stress having a cost and mortality of 'nearly $190 billion — roughly 8% of national healthcare outlays — and nearly 120,000 deaths each year' (p. 3). In the US and Worldwide, 615 million employees suffer from depression and anxiety, costing the global workforce an annual estimate of $1 trillion in lost productivity. Moreover, workplace stress had an estimated cost of more than 500 billion dollars to the U.S. economy, and 550 million workdays annually are lost due to stress on the job.

Fourthly, the numerous physical health issues including musculoskeletal discomfort, stomach changes, headaches, increased susceptibility to infections, sleeplessness, and chronic fatigue, were more common among people who had experienced burnout (Giorgi *et al.,* 2018), increased blood cortisol levels dangerously (Guthier *et al.,* 2020) and is a risk factor for type 2 diabetes on its own (Melamed *et al.,* 2006). The prolonged exposure to burnout was associated with increased risks of gastrointestinal disorders, cardiovascular diseases, anxiety, and depression (Salvagioni *et al.,* 2017)

Preventing and Reversing Burnout.

Organizations. How can employee burnout be prevented and reversed? As for the organization, Wigert and Agrawal (2018) proposed two prongs in dealing with burnout: organizational and individual prongs. *First*, changing the way of managing and leading employees. The best practice is to address the true causes of employee burnout in the organization to empower employees to feel and perform their best. It was discovered that when employees run low on high-performance fuel, the organization's decision-making, customer service, quality control, and innovation engines suffer low productivity. Organizations with limited resources to spend on reducing burnout can focus on the five factors above to yield the best return on investment. The following are ingredients to prevent employee burnout.

Edú-Valsania *et al*. (2022) opined that organizational interventions for preventing burnout include the use of rewards and incentives that are not only financial. Recognizing work well done is a very efficient way to increase workers' motivation levels and prevent burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). As seen earlier, one of the factors causing efficiency crises, which in turn were triggers of burnout, was the lack of reinforcement and appraisal by supervisors. In addition to recognition of accomplishment, other types of rewards, such as greater time flexibility (which can facilitate work-life balance) or protected time to achieve personally meaningful work goals, can enhance well-being. In contrast, employing simple financial rewards may be less effective by encouraging overwork and pressure to achieve goals, which promotes burnout.

Shanafelt and Noseworthy (2017) asserted that there is a need to develop welcoming and orientation sessions for new employees. Since role conflicts and ambiguities are potential triggers of burnout, organizations should develop welcoming processes for new workers, where the mission of the position, tasks, and objectives to be fulfilled are explained with absolute clarity, and they are progressively introduced to the most stressful elements of the job, always offering support from the supervisor or other colleagues.

Monitoring burnout and designing personalized plans is important. Kannampallil *et al*. (2021) asserted the importance of conducting periodic surveys and measurements of workers to monitor the organization's burnout levels and compare the scores of workers according to units, location, position, supervisor, etc. In essence, the goal is to detect the onset of the initial symptoms to stop the syndrome from developing into a chronic condition. Along with assessing burnout levels, the organization must pinpoint any potential risk factors in the workplace as precisely as possible to reduce them.

There is a need for the institutionalization of occupational health and safety. This intervention refers to the obligation of organizations to incorporate into their structure departments or devices in the form of agreements with other entities to ensure the health and reduction of burnout in workers (Herrera-Sánchez et al., 2017). This intervention translates into the delivery of psychoeducational workshops on stress and burnout that can be scheduled in the same organization or by outsourcing the service (Sørensen & Holman, 2017). Besides, it has been noted that it will be challenging to break the burnout-inducing patterns that cause employees to feel exhausted after work when the organization's culture encourages working excessively long hours, working during personal time, and overall prioritizing work before family.

What should well-being look like to employees? Wigert and Agrawal's (2018) research posited the five interrelated essential elements that would differentiate thriving lives from struggling or suffering lives. Besides, managers were challenged to be responsible for generating positive employee experiences and learning how to reduce stress at work for employees. They must set clear expectations, remove barriers, facilitate collaboration, and ensure that employees feel fully supported to do their best work. When they do, managers can reverse burnout and prevent further burnout before it starts.

There is a need to design your employee experience to reduce burnout. Wigert and Agrawal (2018) posited the seven critical stages an employee must go through during which any organization will impact an employee, from their application until they exit the organization. The stages are 1/ attraction, 2/ hire, 3/ being onboard, 4/ engage, 5/ perform, 6/ develop, and 7/ depart. These are the key experiences that shape the organizational culture.

Individuals. How can individuals recover from Burnout? Wigert and Agrawal (2018) made several suggestions to the organizations. Individuals can recover if the managers can do the following. Managers are responsible for dealing with burnout signs. They ought to set role expectations and structure the jobs into manageable tasks that are more involving. The workload and time pressure are reasonable. There is a need to encourage team playing and shared accountability within the organization. Supporting each other makes work lighter. Ideal environments should be designed to be as comfortable and attractive as possible. The employees require a workspace for gathering whenever they choose to get away from the bustle and hustle of work. The managers need to ensure that well-being is part of the organizational culture.

The Wigert and Agrawal (2018) study indicated how managers can prevent employee burnout. The following ways were suggested. First, they should listen to the employees on work-related challenges. The managers are encouraged to make frequent employee check-ins and make employee conversation a high priority. The employees are helped through awareness, time, and attention. Secondly, teamwork should be encouraged, and managers should ensure that there are highly cohesive teams with deep bonds. Third, managers should hold everyone's opinion in high esteem. This creates ownership, creativity, and the birth of new ideas. Fourth, work should be made purposeful. Burnout is less experienced if the employees connect their work with the organization's mission. Fifth, there should be strength-based feedback and development. The employee's strengths ought to be tapped and engaged. The employees are positioned to provide value to the organization. Other factors include physical exercises on schedule for individuals (Edú-Valsania et al., 2022). Studies revealed that female professionals had a lower perception of their quality of life (Tabeleão *et al.,* 2011), while research on the subject showed no gender differences in quality of life.

In addition to the methodological gap wherein Alves *et al.* (2019) suggested that future studies utilize other methodological designs in universities of different legal natures (public and private), inserting other variables, and organizational variables, Moss (2019) opined that there was a lack of evidence and "a debate growing increasingly contentious" on burnout. There was a paucity of research on the quality of life of university faculty members (Garcia *et al.,* 2008; Oliveira Filho *et al.,* 2008; de Oliveira *et al.,* 2012; Yao *et al.,* 2015). Studies on burnout among healthcare workers from teaching and healthcare were published in the literature (Oliveira Filho *et al.,* 2008; Yao *et al.,* 2015). Nonetheless, research on academic staff in other domains of expertise, such as applied human/social sciences and exact/technological sciences, is underrated in the literature (Alves *et al.,* 2019, p. 2). There is a dearth of literature on the impact of burnout among faculty members in Adventist institutions in sub-Saharan Africa.

Research Questions

The study aimed to determine the extent of burnout among faculty members in Seventh-day Adventist higher learning institutions in sub-Saharan Africa. Specifically, the study sought to address the following questions:

1. What is the extent of burnout among faculty members in Adventist higher learning institutions in sub-Saharan Africa in terms of:
    a. Exhaustion
    b. Reduced Professional Efficacy
    c. Cynicism
2. Is there a significant difference in the level of burnout when a personal profile is considered?

The study tested the following hypothesis. There is no significant difference in the level of burnout when a personal profile is considered.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A correlational research design was employed in this quantitative study. The design quantifies and evaluates the variables of the study. It determines the trends and patterns in data and establishes whether the relationships are positive or negative. The correlations were examined using descriptive and inferential statistics and partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM-4.0). This study examined how faculty members' personal profiles related to burnout.

The Population, Sample, and Sampling Techniques

Faculty members from higher educational institutions within the three Church divisions in Africa, particularly the East-Central Africa Division (ECD), West-Central Africa Division (WAD), and Southern Africa-Indian Ocean Division (SID), participated in this study. From the 118 tertiary institutions operated by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, categories C and G institutions that grant only baccalaureate and graduate degrees, respectively, were selected (Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research, April 3, 2024). The Office indicated that there were seven accredited institutions in ECD, six in SID, and five in WAD.

To select the participating institutions, a multi-stage sampling technique was utilized. Purposive sampling was used to select accredited institutions from each division (ECD, SID, and WAD). Five of the seven accredited institutions in ECD were selected, three of the six institutions from SID, and three of the five institutions from WAD. Easy accessibility, contact with institutional leadership, and ethics clearance served as selection criteria for the institutions. Stratified random sampling was used to obtain a sample from the population of faculty members through the Human Resource Office.

The selection criteria were based on easy accessibility and easy contact with institutional leadership and ethics clearance. Stratified random sampling was used to obtain a sample from the population of faculty from the Human Resource Office. This sampling involved statistical inference made using a subset of a population, strata based on shared characteristics that include age, sex at birth, religious affiliation, and highest educational attainment.

A sample of 130 faculty members participated. The eligibility criteria included current employees 1/ on permanent record, 2/ with experience of working from home and office, 3/ serving as faculty members or Head of Department or Dean, 4/ aged between 18 and 64 years, 5/ any sex (at birth), and 6/ whose Highest education attainment at bachelor's degree and above, and 7/ of any religious affiliation. The participants were those exposed to teaching, research, and service pressure.

Table 1

Demographic profile of the respondents

Profile	**Variable**	**Frequ**	**Percent**
Sex	Male	91	70.0
	Female	38	29.2
Age	18 – 44 years	67	51.5
	40 - 64 years old	63	48.5
HEA	Up to Bachelors	39	30.0
	Post Graduate Level	90	69.2
Religious Affiliation*	Catholic	88	67.7
	Protestant	32	24.6
	Muslim	10	7.7
Job Level	Faculty	109	83.8
	HOD or Dean of School	21	16.2
Work Location	Work from home over 80% of the time	14	10.8
	Work between home and office 2-3 days a week	37	28.5
	Work from the office/worksite over 80% of the time	79	60.8

*NB: Most Universities are required by the government to have multi-religious representation in their faculty.

Instrumentation

A self-constructed questionnaire on burnout was constructed based on the literature. The questionnaires were subjected to external and internal validation by experts and statistical processes and had an *acceptable* range of statistical properties.

Burnout. Burnout was characterized by three sub-variables: exhaustion, reduced professional efficacy, and cynicism. Cynicism is the mental distance, alienation, and feelings of negativity. It had 9 items with a strong reliability of Cronbach's alpha of 0.874, considered *good*. Exhaustion is the feeling of energy, emotional, mental, and physical depletion and had 9 items with an adequate reliability of Cronbach's alpha of 0.724, considered *acceptable*. Reduced professional efficacy is the inability to function professionally within the mandate as a faculty member due to adverse effects of job demands, workload, value conflicts, lack of social support, and rewards. This sub-variable had 9 items with an exceptional reliability of Cronbach's alpha of 0.912, considered *excellent.* In general, burnout had a *strong* Cronbach's alpha of 0.836, considered to have *good* internal consistency.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for this study involved having ethical clearance from the University's Ethics Review Board (AUA-ISERC), a research permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI), and permission from the Unions and Conferences to gather data from their universities. A consent form was utilized. Confidentiality and anonymity of participants were ensured. There was no physical harm, no personal harm arising from the disclosure of information collected. They were treated fairly and equally in terms of participation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the meaning and implication of the results of all the questions. The findings in the tables below foster a better understanding of the study.

The Faculty Level of Burnout

Table 2

The Faculty Level of Burnout

Sub-variable	*M*	*SD*	Scaled response	Verbal Interpretation
Exhaustion	2.45	0.63	Rarely	Low
Reduced Professional Efficacy	2.84	0.44	Often	High
Cynicism	2.11	0.65	Rarely	Low
Burnout	***2.47***	***0.57***	***Rarely***	***Low***

Scoring system: 4:00 – 3.50= Always=*Very High*; 3.49 – 2.50= Often =*High*; 2.49 -1.50=Rarely = *Low;* 1.49 – 1.00= Never=Very low.

Burnout.

In general, the faculty members experienced *low levels* of burnout (*M = 2.47, SD = 0.577*). This means that the faculty members have manageable workloads. This is *contrary* to the literature. According to Zainab et al. (2019), faculty members in post-secondary in Canada, China, India, Iran, Ireland, Pakistan, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, the Netherlands, the US, and Turkey, and in the UK, Australia, and Canada (Catano *et al.*, 2010; Rothmann & Barkhuizen, 2008; Tytherleigh *et al.*, 2005; Watts & Robertson, 2011; Winefield *et al.*, 2003), indicated that the increase of burnout in academic settings was a growing concern. The burnout is perpetuated by increased workload and conflicting demands between teaching, research, and service. Besides, studies (Biron *et al.*, 2008; Byrne *et al.*, 2013) indicated that an increase in contract positions placed even greater demands on core faculty.

Exhaustion. The results demonstrate that the faculty members experienced *low levels of* exhaustion (*M=2.453, SD=. 633*). This means that the faculty members had low levels of energy depletion, took physical rest, had manageable workloads, and had autonomy. This implies that the faculty members practice self-care. The results are *contrary* to the literature. Literature observed that symptoms of energy depletion or exhaustion were increasing (Atroszko *et al.*, 2020; Hewitt *et al.*, 2020) due to lengthened production schedules (Maslach & Leiter, 2016), poor working environments leading to absenteeism, and large financial losses as well (Ugwu *et al.*, 2017). This could be explained by the fact that the Adventist faculty tap into their religious heritage – they utilize their spiritual and religious tools for self-care. The Sabbath rest is crucial in reducing the weekly workload. The use of religious and spiritual tools to manage burnout is explored in a study among the Catholic Church employees. Employees in faith-based institutions rely on spiritual and religious strategies for stress management, lifestyle management, and discernment for career directions (Pargament & Exline, 2021; Plante, 2023, 2021a, b)

Cynicism. The results demonstrate that the faculty members experienced *low levels of* cynicism (*M=2.113, SD=. 655*). This means that the faculty members have fair treatment and compensation, steady bonds, and receive regular performance rewards. The results are *contrary* to the literature. Burnout in academic settings from the UK, Australia, and Canada indicates that increased stress is a growing concern (Catano *et al.*, 2010; Rothmann & Barkhuizen, 2008; Tytherleigh *et al.*, 2005; Watts & Robertson, 2011; Winefield *et al.*, 2003). Cynicism was seen when members received unfair treatment and compensation, became critical and disparaging of their organization, had increased turnover, with unstable organizational bonds (Chiaburu *et al.*, 2013). Besides, cynicism is increased when the core faculty members are on contractual employment terms (Biron et al., 2008; Byrne et al., 2013). The results are *contrary* to this literature. This could be explained by the fact that the Adventist Institutions of higher learning have streamlined terms of employment for the faculty.

Reduced Professional Efficacy. However, the faculty members experienced *a high level* of reduced professional efficacy (*M=2.846, SD= .445*) in general. Although the faculty members are aware of the institutional expectations, talk with immediate supervisors, and pay attention to details, the results showed that the faculty members in the higher institutions of learning in Sub-Saharan Africa witness a decline in work

productivity of work.

The results *agree* with the literature. Literature (Blix *et al.*, 1994; Byrne *et al.*, 2013; Demerouti *et al.*, 2001; Edú-Valsania et al., 2022; Maslach *et al.*, 2001; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Watts & Robertson, 2011) indicated that the faculty's challenging employment climate could reduce personal and professional competencies and reduce productivity. Studies indicated that employees reported a reduced professional efficacy rate of 2.69% in 2020, a rate of 2.79% in 2021, and an increase to 2.9% in 2022. Those who experienced burnout reported 57% less productivity in the past 12 months and 47% lower quality of work in 2022.

The Differences in Burnout Considering Personal Profile

The tables presented in this part answer research question 5: Is there a significant difference in the level of burnout when the personal profile is considered? Specifically, if there is a significant difference between age, sex, and highest educational attainment of the faculty members.

Difference in Burnout by Age

There was an investigation on burnout and personal profile in terms of age. Table 3 shows the results.

Table 3

T-test results Comparing Burnout and Ages 18 – 44 years and 45 – 64 years old

				Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	Ages in years	*M*	*SD*	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
											Lower	Upper
AI-	18 – 44	2.53	.52	13.019	.001	1.60	121.45	.056	.128	.135	-.068	.623
Readiness	45 – 64	2.40	.38									

F(df) = 13.019 (121.45); *NS: Not Significant*

An independent sample *t*-test was conducted to compare burnout for Ages 18 – 44 years and 45 – 64 years old. There were significant differences (t (1.600) = 121.45, p = .056) in the scores with the mean score for Ages 18 - 44 years (M = 2.53, SD = .52) higher than Ages *45 – 64 years* (M = 2.40, SD = .38). The magnitude of the difference in the means (mean differences = 0.128, 95% CI: -.068 to 0.623) was *insignificant*. Hence, H_1 is supported. This means that younger faculty members had higher levels of burnout than older members. This implies that the younger in age, the more vulnerable one becomes to exhaustion, reduced professional efficacy, and cynicism.

The results are *contrary* to the literature. According to WHO (2019) and Bianchi and Schonfeld (2023), the demographic trends in burnout indicated an annual increase in occupation, age, gender, and organizational levels. In general, the rates of burnout continue to grow with workplace stress, and rates of burnout continue to hit new record levels. Ages between 18 and 24 years had 27% in 2020, 28% in 2021, and 47% in 2022, compared to ages between 45-54 had 31% in 2020, an increase of 39% in 2021, and a decrease of 33% in 2022. Lastly, ages 55-64 years had 30% of burnout in 2020 and 25% in 2022. The shift could be attributed to technology. The explanation is that the younger generation has already tapped into current AI technologies to reduce burnout.

Difference in Burnout by Sex

There was an investigation to identify if there exists a difference between male and female participants. Since

the data was *not normally distributed*, a Mann-Whitney U test was used. Besides, it is utilized to compare two groups where the data is *either ordinal or continuous*, which is non-normal. Instead of comparing *means* as for the independent sample, the T-test of the two groups of the Mann-Whitney U test compares the *medians* because the data is ordinal or non-normal.

To investigate the difference between male and female participants on burnout, the Mann-Whitney U-test was utilized. Cohen's (1988) effect size (Brydges, 2019) was used to determine the effect size. The test revealed an *insignificant* difference in the burnout for males (Median = 2, n =91), and Females (Median = 2, n = 38), U = 1607.000, z = -.631, *p* .528, r = .055. Hence, the H_1 was *supported*, although the effect size is small.

Difference in Burnout by Work Location

There was an investigation comparing work location and burnout. Work from home over 80% of the time (WFH 80%), Work between home and office 2-3 days a week (WFH/O), and Work from the office/worksite over 80% of the time (WFO 80%) as shown in Table 4.

Table 4

T-test results Comparing Burnout and WFH 80%, WFH/O, WFO 80%

F(df2) = 7.700 (113.29); SIG= *Significant*

				Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	Work Location	*M*	*SD*	F	Sig.	t	df2	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
											Lower	Upper
Burnout	WFH 80%	2.75	.723	7.700	.001	.005	113.29	.005	.566	.103	2.347	2.784
	WFH/O	2.57	.458									
	WFO 80%	2.37	.375									

An independent sample *t*-test was conducted to compare burnout and the preferred work locations - Work from home over 80% of the time (WFH 80%), Work between home and office 2-3 days a week (WFH/O), and Work from the office/worksite over 80% of the time (WFO 80%).

There were significant differences (*t* (7.700) = 113.29, *p* = .005) in the scores, with the mean score for WFH 80% (*M* = 2.75, *SD* = .723) higher than WFH/O (*M* = 2.57, S*D* = .458) higher than WFO 80% (*M* = 2.37, S*D* =. 375). The magnitude of the difference in the means (mean differences = 0.566, 95% CI: 2.347 to 2.784) was *significant*. Hence, the H_1 that there is no significant difference in the level of burnout when work location is considered, *is not supported.* The results bespeak that faculty members who work from home more than 80% of the time face higher levels of burnout than those working from home 2 - 3 days a week and more than 80% in the office. This means that the home environment causes a high level of burnout. The implication is that faculty members who opt to work away from the office have a high level of exhaustion, reduced professional efficacy, and cynicism.

This aligns with the literature. According to WHO (2019), the employees who worked from home had burnout at an 80% level. The employees who worked between home and office 2-3 days a week had 34% of burnout. The employees who worked from the office/worksite over 80% of the time had 35% of burnout. As for a remedy, the leaders of the organization were challenged to eradicate outdated indicators of value creation (such as the number of hours in the office or 'online') if they are going to attract, develop, and retain great people (Bianchi & Schonfeld, 2023). Although working from home may be preferred, it has major drawbacks. This opens doors for the formation of cross-functional and multi-level (front-line and mid-level employees)

workgroups to come up with ways to change organizational norms and ways of support –regardless of location (Bianchi & Schonfeld, 2023).

CONCLUSION

The summary, conclusions, and recommendations based on the from findings of the research follow. In general, the faculty members experienced *a high level* of reduced professional efficacy. In terms of age, the younger faculty members were more vulnerable to exhaustion, reduced professional efficacy, and cynicism. Being male or female had no difference in the experience of burnout. Further, the faculty members who work from home more than 80% of the time face higher levels of burnout than those working from home 2 - 3 days a week and more than 80% in the office.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results, the faculty members experienced burnout in terms of reduced professional efficacy; the study recommends strategies for the mitigation of burnout to include faculty breaks, setting realistic expectations, boundary setting, seeking social support, and practicing self-care. On an organizational level, seminars on stress management and emotional intelligence would provide a supportive environment.

This paper has limitations. The use of a quantitative descriptive design restricts the ability to assess the lived experiences behind burnout among faculty members. Although the self-constructed questionnaire had acceptable psychometric properties on a sample of 130 participants may raise concerns regarding generalizability across the region. A cross-sectional design prevents an investigation of changes in burnout over time. Other intervening variables such as workload, organizational support, leadership style, job satisfaction, and mental health resources were not comprehensively assessed, as these would provide a better understanding of faculty burnout.

Based on the results that faculty members who worked from home over 80% of the time had higher levels of burnout as compared to those who work from home 2 - 3 days a week and over 80% in the office, the study recommends that organizations to eradicate outdated indicators of value creation (as number of hours in the office or 'online') if they are going to attract, develop, and retain great people. Improve the working environment to increase productivity and convenience.

For future research, the study recommends the following. A convergent parallel design mixed-methods approach to complement personal and organizational factors. Besides, the study could expand the sample size to include different Adventist universities across Sub-Saharan African countries to improve generalizability. This study would be repeated using standardized and validated instruments such as the Maslach Burnout Inventory to enhance reliability and facilitate comparisons with international studies. Longitudinal research would be suitable to investigate changes in burnout over time and identify causal relationships. Lastly, future research would examine the influence of variables such as workload, organizational support, leadership style, job satisfaction, and mental health resources on burnout prevention.

REFERENCES

1. Andersson, L. M. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human relations*, *49*(11), 1395-1418.
2. Alves, P. C., Oliveira, A. D. F., & Paro, H. B. M. D. S. (2019). Quality of life and burnout among faculty members: How much does the field of knowledge matter? *PLoS One*, *14*(3), e0214217.
3. Atkins, R., Sener, A., Drake, M. J., & Marley, K. (2023). Predictors of burnout among supply chain management professionals. *International Journal of Value Chain Management*, *14*(1), 62-81.
4. Atroszko, P. A., Demetrovics, Z., & Griffiths, M. D. (2020). Work addiction, obsessive-compulsive personality disorder, burnout, and global burden of disease: Implications from the ICD-11. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(2), 660. https:// doi. org/ 10. 3390/ ijerp h1702 0660
5. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of*

managerial psychology, *22*(3), 309-328.
6. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD–R approach. *Annual. Review of Organizational. Psychol and Organizational Behavior, 1*(1), 389-411.
7. Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2000). Burnout contagion processes among teachers *Journal of applied social Psychology*, *30*(11), 2289-2308.
8. Bakker, A. B., Xanthopoulou, D., & Demerouti, E. (2023). How does chronic burnout affect dealing with weekly job demands? A test of central propositions in JD-R and COR-theories. *Applied Psychology*, *72*(1), 389-410.
9. Bianchi, R., & Schonfeld, I. S. (2023). Examining the evidence base for burnout. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, *101*(11), 743. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2471/BLT.23.289996
10. Biron, C., Brun, J. P., & Ivers, H. (2008). Extent and sources of occupational stress in university staff. *Work*, *30*(4), 511-522.
11. Blix, A. G., Cruise, R. J., Mitchell, B. M., & Blix, G. G. (1994). Occupational stress among university teachers. *Educational research*, *36*(2), 157-169.
12. Burnout an "occupational phenomenon": International Classification of Diseases. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019. Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases [cited 2023 Mar 21]
13. Bregman, R. (2018). *Utopia for realists*. Bloomsbury Publishing
14. Brenninkmeijer, V., & VanYperen, N. (2003). How to conduct research on burnout: advantages and disadvantages of a unidimensional approach in burnout research. *Occupational and environmental medicine*, *60*(suppl 1), i16-i20.
15. Brydges, C. R. (2019). Effect size guidelines, sample size calculations, and statistical power in gerontology. *Innovation in aging*, *3*(4), igz036.
16. Byrne, M., Chughtai, A., Flood, B., Murphy, E., & Willis, P. (2013). Burnout among accountings and finance academics in Ireland. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *27*(2), 127-142. https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igz036
17. Carlotto, M. S. (2010). Síndrome de Burnout: diferenças segundo níveis de ensino. *Psico*, *41*(4).
18. Catano, V., Francis, L., Haines, T., Kirpalani, H., Shannon, H., Stringer, B., & Lozanzki, L. (2010). Occupational stress in Canadian universities: A national survey. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *17*(3), 232. 232–258.10.1037/a0018582
19. Chiaburu, D. S., Peng, A. C., Oh, I. S., Banks, G. C., & Lomeli, L. C. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 83(2), 181-197.
20. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512
21. de Oliveira, E. R. A., Garcia, Á. L., Gomes, M. J., Bittar, T. O., & Pereira, A. C. (2012). Gender and perceived quality of life: research with professors from the health area. *Ciencia & saude coletiva*, *17*(3), 741.
22. Edú-Valsania, S., Laguía, A., & Moriano, J. A. (2022). Burnout: A review of theory and measurement. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *19*(3), 1780. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19031780.
23. Garcia, A. L., Oliveira, E. R. A., & Barros, E. B. (2008). Quality of life of superior education teachers in the health area: speech and daily practice. *Cogitare Enfermagem*, *13*(1), 18-24.
24. General Conference of Seventh – day Adventist, *Office of Achieve and Statistics,* Seventh-day Adventist (Silver Spring, MD: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventist, 2024). 2024.https://www.adventiststatistics.org/
25. Giorgi, F., Mattei, A., Notarnicola, I., Petrucci, C., & Lancia, L. (2018). Can sleep quality and burnout affects the job performance of shiftwork nurses. A hospital cross-sectional study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *74*(3), 698-708.
26. Guthier, C., Dormann, C., & Voelkle, M. C. (2020). Reciprocal effects between job stressors and burnout: A continuous time meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 146*(12), 1146–1173. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000304
27. Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford publications.

28. Herrera-Sánchez, I. M., León-Pérez, J. M., & León-Rubio, J. M. (2017). Steps to ensure a successful implementation of occupational health and safety interventions at an organizational level. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 2135. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02135.
29. Hewitt, D. B., Ellis, R. J., Hu, Y. Y., Cheung, E. O., Moskowitz, J. T., Agarwal, G., & Bilimoria, K. Y. (2020). Evaluating the association of multiple burnout definitions and thresholds with prevalence and outcomes. *JAMA Surgery*, 155(11), 1043–1049. https:// doi. org/ 10. 1001/ jamas urg. 2020. 3351.
30. Humborstad, S. I., Humborstad, B., & Whitfield, R. (2007). Burnout and service employees' willingness to deliver quality service. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, *7*(1), 45-64.
31. Kannampallil, T., Abraham, J., Lou, S. S., & Payne, P. R. (2021). Conceptual considerations for using EHR-based activity logs to measure clinician burnout and its effects. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *28*(5), 1032-1037. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocaa305.
32. Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of organizational behavior*, *2*(2), 99-113. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205
33. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2022). *The burnout challenge: Managing people's relationships with their jobs*. Harvard University Press.
34. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World Psychiatry, 15(2), 103–111.
35. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual review of psychology*, *52*(1), 397-422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397.
36. Melamed, S., Shirom, A., Toker, S., Berliner, S., & Shapira, I. (2006). Burnout and risk of cardiovascular disease: evidence, possible causal paths, and promising research directions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(3), 327–353
37. Moreno-Jimenez, B., Garrosa-Hernandez, E., Gálvez, M., González, J. L., & Benevides-Pereira, A. M. T. (2002). Evaluation of burnout in teachers. Comparison tools: CBP-R and MBI-ED. *Psicologia em Estudo*, *7*, 11-19.
38. Moss, J. (2019). Burnout is about your workplace, not your people. *Harvard Business Review*, *1*(1), 1-10.
39. Oliveira, E. R. A. D., Garcia, Á. L., Gomes, M. J., Bittar, T. O., & Pereira, A. C. (2012). Gênero e qualidade de vida percebida: estudo com professores da área de saúde. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, *17*, 741-747. pmid:22450416.
40. Oliveira Filho, A. D., Netto-Oliveira, E. R., & Oliveira, A. A. B. D. (2012). Quality of life and risk factors of university professors. *Revista da Educação Física/UEM*, *23*, 57-67.
41. Pargament, K. I., & Exline, J. J. (2021). Working with spiritual struggles in psychotherapy: From research to practice. Guilford.
42. Plante, T. G. (2020). Clergy sexual abuse in the Roman Catholic Church: Dispelling eleven myths and separating facts from fiction. *Spirituality in Clinical Practice*, 7(4), 220–229. https:// doi. org/ 10. 1037/ scp00 00209.
43. Plante, T. G. (2021a). Using the Examen, a Jesuit prayer, in spiritually integrated and secular psychotherapy. *Pastoral Psychology*, 71, 119–125. https:// doi. org/ 10. 1007/ s11089- 021- 00967-0.
44. Plante, T. G. (2021b). The integration of Roman Catholic traditions and evidence based psychological services. *Spirituality in Clinical Practice*, 8(1), 65–75. https:// doi. org/ 10. 1037/ scp00 00256.
45. Plante, T. G. (2023). Principles for managing burnout among catholic church professionals. *Pastoral psychology*, *72*(1), 23-31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-022-01039-7
46. Rothmann, S., & Barkhuizen, N. (2008). Burnout of academic staff in South African higher education institutions. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *22*(2), 439-456.
47. Salvagioni, D. A. J., Melanda, F. N., Mesas, A. E., González, A. D., Gabani, F. L., & De Andrade, S. M. (2017). Physical, psychological and occupational consequences of job burnout: A systematic review of prospective studies. *PloS one*, *12*(10), e0185781.
48. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315
49. Shanafelt, T. D., & Noseworthy, J. H. (2017, January). Executive leadership and physician well-being: nine organizational strategies to promote engagement and reduce burnout. In *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* (Vol. 92, No. 1, pp. 129-146). Elsevier. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2016.10.004

50. Sørensen, O. H., & Holman, D. (2017). A participative intervention to improve employee well-being in knowledge work jobs: A mixed-methods evaluation study. In *Longitudinal Research in Occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 132-151). Routledge.
51. Tabeleão, V. P., Tomasi, E., & Neves, S. F. (2011). Quality of life and burnout among the public high school and primary school teachers in Southern Brazil. *Cadernos de saude publica*, *27*, 2401-2408.
52. Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, T. S., & Ragu-Nathan, B. S. (2011). Crossing to the dark side: examining creators, outcomes, and inhibitors of technostress. *Communications of the ACM*, 54(9), 113–120
53. Tytherleigh, M. Y., Webb, C., Cooper, C. L., & Ricketts, C. (2005). Occupational stress in the UK higher education institutions: A comparative study of all staff categories. *Higher education research & development*, *24*(1), 41–61.10.1080/0729436052000318569
54. Ugwu, L. I., Enwereuzor, I. K., Fimber, U. S., & Ugwu, D. I. (2017). Nurses' burnout and counterproductive work behavior in a Nigerian sample: The moderating role of emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences*, *7*, 106-113.
55. Watts, J., & Robertson, N. (2011). Burnout in university teaching staff: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research*, *53*(1), 33-50.10.1080/00131881.2011.552235
56. Wigert, B., & Agrawal, S. (2018). Employee burnout, part 1: The 5 main causes. *Gallup. Published July 12*.
57. Winefield, A. H., Gillespie, N., Stough, C., Dua, J., Hapuarachchi, J., & Boyd, C. (2003). Occupational stress in Australian university staff: Results from a national survey. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *10*(1), 51.10.1037/1072-5245.10.1.51
58. Yao, S. M., Yu, H. M., Ai, Y. M., Song, P. P., Meng, S. Y., & Li, W. (2015). Job-related burnout and the relationship to quality of life among Chinese medical college staff. *Archives of environmental & occupational health*, *70*(1), 27-34.
59. Zainab, B., Zainab, B., Zakai, S., & Malik, S. (2019). Perceptions of international student mobility: A qualitative case study of Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 6(2), 269-287. https://doi.org/10.22555/joeed.v6i2.2340