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ABSTRACT

The burnout, the anxiety and the concern. Everybody have those flashes where we’re entirely dazed by huge load of work college demands. Many step forward to finish their work as as possible, we sometimes digress into a state of despair and self-doubt when our hard work isn’t giving us the results we want. At a certain stage, we start to sense so stranded and unhappy that we retreat into our shell, away from our peers and the people who care about us the most. We’re unfulfilled, disordered, isolated, and don’t have any idea of what we are up to. Eventually, with all loading on top of us one after the other, we snap (James H. Humphrey, 2003, [5]). Taking this in consideration the study is braces out to inspect the causes accountable for burnout of the college students.

The present study is significant for the following reason:

- GARRETT ranking is used to rank which factor marks the high burnout and it is resulted that pressure & expectation and isolation regarding the work are the factors marking high burnout among the students, which will make the researchers and other people to know exactly about one of the factors which affects burnout among the students.
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INTRODUCTION

Psychosomatic information is considered as the valuation and a remedy for mental health hitches, it also points exactly towards considerate and cracking problems in many different ranges in routines of human life. Most of the psychologists are tangled in some kind of therapeutic role, practicing in clinical and counseling. Many do research on a huge array of area related to psychological thinking and behavior, and
work in university psychology departments or teach in other academic settings. Some people are engaged in industrialized and administrative settings and also in few areas likely, human expansion and aging, sporting, fitness, and the media, as well as in criminological investigation and other phases of law.

CONCEPTUAL OUTLINE

Burnout is a psychological term that refers to long-term fatigue and lessened interest in work. Burnout has been predicted to end result from persistent work-related stress (e.g., work overload). However, there is budding proof that it is multi-factorial in nature, with dispositional factors playing key part. This is particularly a reason that burnout is awkwardly close to depressing syndromes. In the only study that directly associated depressive indicators in burned out employees and clinically miserable patients, no diagnostically important differences were found between the groups: Employees who are burned out are said to have many depressive indications as clinically unhappy patients. Moreover, a recent study by Bianchi, Schonfeld, and Laurent exhibited that about majority of the workers have diagnosed for despair, signifying that burnout might be a gloomy syndrome rather than a distinct entity [11].

Clinical psychologist Herbert Freudenberger initially identified the paradigm "burnout" in the 1970s. Social psychologists Christina Maslach and Susan Jackson developed which is the preferred instrument for judging burnout, namely, the Maslach Burnout Inventory. The Maslach Burnout Inventory recognizes exhaustion as a three-dimensional syndrome which is a culmination exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy.

FEW COLLECTED WORKS OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Molly H. Fisher, Factors Influencing Stress, Burnout, and Retention of Secondary Teachers, Current Issues in Education, Vol. 14, Issue No. 1. This study examines the stress, burnout, satisfaction, and preventive coping skills of nearly 400 secondary teachers to determine variables contributing to these major factors influencing teachers. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics were conducted that found the burnout levels between new and experienced teachers are significantly different, with novice teachers having higher burnout, but their difference in stress levels was not statistically significant.

Prof. Dr. Dale, Melek Eker, Dr. Adam Anbar. Determining The Factors That Affect Burnout Among Academicians, Ankara University. The purpose of this study was to measure the levels of burnout among academicians and to investigate the factors that affect burnout levels of academicians in Turkey. The data were obtained by using sociodemographic data form, Maslach Burnout Inventory and “work and work environment” scale from 160 academicians that have been working in accounting and finance sub-department in Faculties of Economics and Administrative Sciences in 78 public and private universities. In the analysis of data, descriptive statistic (mean and standard deviation), correlation analysis, factor analysis and discriminant function analysis were used. The factor analysis of the 13 items which have possible effect on burnout among academicians revealed five factors: Work environment, administrative workload, academic workload, promotion and evaluation and research fund.

Flitz Bilge, Mehila Tuzgol Dost and Bayram Cetin. Factors Affecting Burnout and School Engagement among High School Students: Study Habits, Self-Efficacy Beliefs, and Academic Success, Educational sciences: Theory & Practice, Vol. 14, Issue. 5, 2014. This study examines high school students’ levels of burnout and school engagement.
engagement with respect to academic success, study habits, and self-efficacy beliefs. The data were gathered during the 2011–2012 school year from 633 students attending six high schools located in Ankara, Turkey. The analyses were conducted on responses from 605 students. The research methods included the Personal Information Form comprising items about students’ demographic characteristics, the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Student Form, the Utrecht School Engagement Scale, the Study Habits Inventory, and the Scale for Self-Efficacy Expectations among Adolescents. The data were analyzed with multivariate analysis of variance. The results suggested that students with low self-efficacy beliefs had higher burnout levels. In addition, students with inadequate study skills and those with low self-efficacy beliefs were at higher risk of losing their beliefs.

INTENTIONS OF THE STUDY
The intentions of the study are to,

- Checking the demographics of the respondents
- To scrutinize the factors responsible for burnout

METHODOLOGY
The study is exploratory in nature. Survey method was implemented and the study is piloted amongst college students at Salem City, Tamilnadu. The respondents for the study is confined to 500 college students. Proportionally stratified random sampling technique was adopted.

INVESTIGATION AND INTERPRETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>51.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>48.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed and calculated through questionnaire
**Exhibit 1** Family type of the faculty members

![Bar chart showing family types](chart.png)

**Interpretation**

Majority of the faculty members which is 51.40% (257) of them belong to joint family type and the remaining 48.60% (243) of them belong to nuclear family type.

**Table 2** Percentage Positions and Their Corresponding Garret’s Table Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percentage Position</th>
<th>Garret’s Table Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100(1-0.5)/5=10</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100(2-0.5)/5=30</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100(3-0.5)/5=50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100(4-0.5)/5=70</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100(5-0.5)/5=90</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Computed and calculated through questionnaire*

The table portrays percentage positions for the ranks 1,2,3,4 and 5 and their corresponding Garret’s table values. For rank 1 the calculated percentage position value is 10 and the table value is 76, this value is given in the garret ranking table for the percentage 9.17 which is near 10. As like for all the calculated positions, the table values are referred from garrets ranking table.

**Burnout**

The below table shows the number of respondents ranking the factors as 1,2,3,4 and 5 for the preference of the causes accountable for burnout.
### Table 3 Factors responsible for burnout-GARRETT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>I (76)</th>
<th>II (61)</th>
<th>III (50)</th>
<th>IV (40)</th>
<th>V (25)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proper communication</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>24980</td>
<td>49.96</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4104</td>
<td>2562</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>12786</td>
<td>48.801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hefty syllabus</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>26798</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3952</td>
<td>2684</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>12976</td>
<td>49.526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>27892</td>
<td>55.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4256</td>
<td>3172</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>13068</td>
<td>49.877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitting in the environment</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>23762</td>
<td>47.52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4104</td>
<td>3294</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>12978</td>
<td>49.534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure and Expectations</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>22466</td>
<td>44.93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5168</td>
<td>2928</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>13776</td>
<td>52.580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Computed and calculated through questionnaire*

### Interpretation

It is known from the above table that according to Garett’s ranking the factors which induces the respondents to show the factors responsible for burnout are in this order namely Pressure and Expectations, Isolation, Fitting in the environment, Hefty Syllabus and Lack of Proper Communication. It is resulted that Pressure and Expectation is ranked as first and Isolation is ranked second.

### CONCLUSION

An array of emotive overwork and ensuing emotional exhaustion is at the soul of the burnout syndrome. People often get involved emotionally and feels overwhelmed by the emotional demands imposed by other people. The response to this situation is emotional exhaustion. Nowadays, Students are facing a lot of emotional exhaustion through various ways which makes really burned out. So the students must have a pre-planned life and they must learn to improve their communication skills and mainly reduce their pressure & expectations, which will avoid unwanted exhaustion and burnout.

### HOW THE PRESENT STUDY CAN BE EXTENDED?

The future scope for the current study can be supported further on “Factors responsible for burnout among IT sector Employees”.

Dr. M. Surya Kumar
REFERENCES


[8] Prof. Dr. Dale, Melek Eker, Dr. Adam Anbar. Determining The Factors That Affect Burnout Among Academicians, Ankara University


