

An Study Applied In Banking Sector About The Relationship Between Perfectionism And Burnout

Aygül KAKIRMAN

Marmara Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
İngilizce İşletme Anabilim Dalı
Organizational Behavior Bilim Dalı
aygulkakirman@hotmail.com

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Melek BİRSEL

Marmara Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
İngilizce İşletme Anabilim Dalı
Organizational Behavior Bilim Dalı
melekbirsel@gmail.com

Abstract

The main aim of this study was to investigate the association between perfectionism and burnout. In this context, the impact of perfectionism dimensions on burnout dimensions was explored. The study was carried out in different banks which were located in Turkey. Participants were selected from these banks on a voluntary basis for the sample of the research. Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, Maslach Burnout Inventory and demographic information form were administered 212 banking sector employees. According to results, perfectionism was seen to have no significant influence on burnout. However, the findings show that negative significant relationship between achievement-oriented perfectionism and burnout. The research is expected to be beneficial for the literature, especially in the context of the relationship between perfectionism and burnout for banking sector employees.

Key Words: Perfectionism, Burnout, Banking Sector, Banking Sector Employees.

JEL Classification Codes: I1, I12, I3, Z21

Bankacılık Sektöründe Mükemmeliyetçilik ve Tükenmişlik Arasındaki İlişkiyi İnceleyen Bir Çalışma

Özet

Bu çalışmanın başlıca amacı mükemmeliyetçilik ve tükenmişlik arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktır. Bu bağlamda, mükemmeliyetçiliğin alt boyutlarının tükenmişliğin alt boyutları üzerindeki etkisi araştırılmıştır. Çalışma, Türkiye' de bulunan farklı bankalarda yürütülmüştür. Katılımcılar, araştırmanın örneklem grubu için gönüllülük esasına dayalı olarak bu bankalardan seçilmiştir. 212 banka çalışanına; Çok Boyutlu Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği, Maslach Tükenmişlik Ölçeği ve demografik bilgi formu uygulanmıştır. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, mükemmeliyetçiliğin tükenmişlik üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi olmadığı görülmüştür. Bununla birlikte, bulgular başarı odaklı mükemmeliyetçilik ile tükenmişlik arasında negatif anlamlı bir ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarının, özellikle banka çalışanlarının mükemmeliyetçilik ve tükenmişlik arasındaki ilişki bağlamında literatür için yararlı olması beklenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mükemmeliyetçilik, Tükenmişlik, Bankacılık Sektörü, Banka Sektörü Çalışanları.

INTRODUCTION

Burnout is one of the most important subject in industrial psychology and organizational behavior literature. The use of the term which is burnout started to begin in the 1970s at the United States, particularly among people working in the human services (Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter, 2001: 398). In industrialized countries, the term of burnout has been popular in public interest in recent years. There is a great discrepancy between the opinion of public and the certain knowledge even the subject has enjoyed a boom in the media (Weber and Jaekel-Reinhard, 2000: 512). For many years, burnout was described as a problem of individual; whereas current researches indicate that burnout is a concept which is related to organizational environment as well as individuality. In the literature, burnout is described as a metaphor that is mostly used to explain a state or process of mental exhaustion. It is kind of smothering of a fire or the extinguishing of a candle (Schaufeli and Buunk, 1996: 311). One of the most frequently cited definitions of burnout is coming from Maslach and Jackson (1981: 99). According to them, burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do 'people-work' of some kind.

In this context, it may be accepted that banking sector employees are susceptible to burnout. Banking sector is one of the sectors in which most intense stress, interpersonal relationships and workload are experienced. As this sector involves face-to-face work with people and carries financial risks, the employees are required to do a perfect job. As a result, this necessity for long-term perfectionist behaviour may cause burnout.

In the literature, there are different antecedents of burnout which is accepted one of them is perfectionism. Perfectionism is a personality trait which affect an individual's social, family and work life. One opinion was about that term is, idealistic workers experience burnout, because they dedicate passionately toward their ideal. That's why, they could experience exhaustion and cynicism unless they achieve their goals (Angerer, 2003: 100).

Burnout and perfectionism are considerable concepts which affecting the career in terms of both individual and organizations. For this reason, burnout and perfectionism are researched as considerable subject by researchers currently. Despite perfectionism being most prevalent in the work domain, it has been researched so far has mainly focused on students, athletes and clinical samples paying relatively little attention to employees (Stoeber and Damian, 2015: 14). For this reason, in the present study aims to investigate the relationship between perfectionism and burnout in banking sector.

1. Literature Review

1.1. Burnout

1.1.1. Defining the Burnout

"...I'm under a lot of stress, ...completely burned out..., I'd like to pack it in..., my battery is flat...!" Who has not gotten identical criticism while people are talking about their work? (Weber and Jaekel-Reinhard, 2000: 512).

The time over 35 years ago, when a practitioner and a researcher started to compose about unrecognized phenomenon, burnout turned into an affair of

importance (Maslach, Leiter and Jackson, 2012: 296). Freudenberger (1974) describes burnout on the point of exhaustion case that conclusion of failure, fatigue, loss of energy power or unmet demands on one's inner assests (Arabacı, 2010: 2802).

In 1981, Maslach and Jackson defined burnout as syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do 'people-work' of some kind (Maslach and Jackson, 1981: 99). Because of that, burnout is in their aspects that confined to the helping professionals, including health care, education and the human services (Schaufeli and Buunk, 1996: 314). Nonetheless, by the late 1980s, researchers and practitioners started to recognized that burnout existed outside of the human services as among managers, entrepreneurs and white-and blue collar workers. Hence, the burnout metaphor was broaden from the acute requirements of client service to other work requiring creativity, problem solving or mentoring. For this reason, in this more general form, Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (1996) defined as '...a state of exhaustion in which one is cynical about the value of one' s occupation and doubtful of one' s capacity to perform' (Schaufeli, Leiter and Maslach, 2009: 206).

Consequently, burnout shares at least five common elements:

1. There could be seen symptoms such as mental or emotional exhaustion, fatigue and depression.
2. While some authors indicate mental and behavioral symptoms, the others mention physical complaints.
3. The syndrome of burnout occurs in the work environmnet.
4. The symptoms of burnout occurs in "normal" persons who did not have the symptoms of psychopathology before.
5. Because of negative beliefs and behaviours, decreased effectiveness and work performances are existed (Schaufeli and Buunk, 1996: 315).

1.1.2. The Dimensions of Burnout

According to Maslach and Jackson (1986, 1984a), more specifically, definition of burnout is that syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment (Maslach and Leiter, 1988: 297).

The integral of exhaustion refers that basic personel anxiety dimension of burnout. The dimension of emotional exhaustion means that being overextended and wasting emotional and physical sources (Maslach and Leiter, 2008: 500). When emotional resources of workers are depleted, they cannot cope with this current psychological level (Maslach and Jackson, 1981: 99).

The other burnout component is called depersonalization or cynicism. It produces the aspect of interpersonal dimension of burnout and represents to a negative, apathetic or extremely unrelated responses to the job' s several forms (Maslach and Leiter, 2008: 500). While workers are in the depersonalization level, they begin to see clients as objects rather than people and may display detached behaviors and an emotional callousness. They may be cynical toward co-workers, clients and the organization (Cordes and Dougherty, 1993: 623).

A third component of the burnout syndrome, reduced personal accomplishment or inefficacy. It indicates to awareness of incompetence and the lack of accomplishment and productivity at work (Maslach, *et al*, 2001: 399). Individuals experience in a failure of job competence in their work or communications with people (Cordes and Dougherty, 1993: 624). As a result workers do not feel happy about themselves and they are not satisfied with their accomplishments on their jobs (Maslach and Jackson, 1981: 99).

1.1.3. Consequences of Burnout

The consequences of burnout are conceptualized in two aspects: organizational consequences and individual consequences. In regard to organizational consequences, variety variables are found relation with burnout. Particularly, it has been related to decreased job satisfaction, organizational commitment, lowered productivity, turnover and absenteeism (Schaufeli, Taris and Rhenen, 2008: 191; Schaufeli and Buunk, 1996: 323; Swider and Zimmerman, 2010: 502).

Researches show that burnout leads to individual consequences as well as organizational consequences. Common somatic symptoms are headaches, gastro-intestinal disorders (irritable stomach, diarrhoea) or cardio-vascular disturbances are related to burnout. Also the development of addictions (e.g. alcohol, medicines) have been related to burnout (Weber and Jaekel-Reinhard, 2000: 514). A similar research indicated that workers tend to use psychotropic medication and especially antidepressants if they had shifted toward burnout (Leiter, Hakanen, Ahola, Tanner, Koskinen and Vaananen, 2013: 969).

1.1.4. Burnout in Banking Sector

The range of literature, in spite of the theory of burnout seems to relate to wider range of occupations, there was still the hypothesis that the emotional stressors are more intensified on people-oriented occupations (Maslach, *et al*, 2001: 400).

The employees who work at the human service institutions often need to spend considerable time with other people. Generally, the staff-client interaction is centred on the client's current problems (psychological, social, and/or physical) and so it is charged with feelings of anger, embarrassment, fear or despair (Maslach and Jackson, 1981: 99). In this context, banking sector is accepted one of these industries. The employees in banking sector are likely to be affected in a negative way because of having intense stress sources, financial risks and working with people face to face (Ok, 2004: 58). Moreover, the working conditions (e.g. long working hours, intense workload) and negative changes (e.g. the closure of banks or merging) in the sector are likely to affect mood of employees (Siliğ and Ceyhan, 2005: 44). To conclude, burnout is an important issue to research for organizations effectiveness as well as for employees in banking sector.

1.2. Perfectionism

Perfectionism is a personality characteristic that is related to stress and burnout (Childs and Stoeber, 2012: 348). In scientific research, although the term of perfectionism has not been definite, there are some important features. Perfectionism is characterized by setting of excessively high personal standards of performance, striving want to be perfect in all domains

of their lives, tending to engage in all-or-none thinking and failures tend to be overgeneralized (Frost, Marten, Lahart and Rosenblate, 1990: 451; Hewitt, Flett, Turnbull-Donovan and Mikail, 1991: 464; Stoeber and Stoeber, 2009: 531).

The studies indicate that when individuals strive for perfection, it may enhance their performances and lead to performance increments, avoiding engaging in negative, self-focused reactions to imperfection, experiencing less anxiety and more self-confidence during competitions (Stoeber, Otto, Pesheck, Beckek and Stoll, 2007: 964; Stoeber, Stoll, Pesheck and Otto, 2008: 103; Stoll, Lau and Stoeber, 2008: 621). However, according to Flett and Hewitt (2006), striving for perfection causes motivation go awry. As a result, perfectionism induces a rigid adherence to excessively high goals and an irrational belief in the importance of their attainment. This makes perfectionist individuals criticize themselves and think overly focusing on their personal-interpersonal incompetence especially if there is a wide discrepancy between their aspired goals and attained performance (Appleton, Hall and Hill, 2009: 458). Based on previous findings, it could be say that the research literature is complex and confusing whether perfectionism is positive or negative.

In the scientific inquiry on perfectionism, the other controversial issue is whether perfectionism is one-dimensional or multidimensional. At the beginnings of the 1990' s, perfectionism was demonstrated as multidimensional construct with intrapersonal and interpersonal content (Bieling, Israeli and Antony, 2004: 1374). Frost and colleagues (1990: 449) proposed that six dimensions. The major dimension was excessive concern over making mistakes. Five other dimensions were including high personal standards, the perception of high parental expectations, the perception of high parental criticism, the doubting of the quality of one' s actions and a preference for order and organization. Hewitt and Flett (1991a: 457), on the other hand, described the dimensions of perfectionism: self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism.

Self-oriented perfectionism is an intrapersonal dimension that involves requiring perfection of oneself. Self-oriented perfectionists have personal motivation which motivate them in order to be perfect. Also, they set exacting standards for oneself and highly evaluating one' s own behavior if they are not able to accomplish the expectations (Hewitt and Flett, 1991a: 457). Self-oriented perfectionism is more controversial dimension whether is maladaptive or adaptive. There is evidence that self-oriented perfectionism has the potential to lead to positive motivational consequences. Stoeber and Otto (2006: 295) proposed that if perfectionists are not overly concerned about their mistakes and negative evaluations of others, self-oriented perfectionism can be positive. On the other hand, according to Hewitt and Flett (1991b: 99) self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism are the dimensions most relevant to depression.

Other-oriented perfectionism is an interpersonal dimension that one' s need for other people to be perfect. Other-oriented perfectionists demand unrealistic expectations from significant others and stringently evaluates others' performance. The dimension is similar with self-oriented perfectionism; the difference is the perfectionistic behavior is directed

outward (Hewitt and Flett, 1991a: 457). Other-oriented perfectionism is described the "dark" side of perfectionism and should be considered a negative form of perfectionism. Regarding social goals, there are negative relationships between the other-oriented perfectionism and intimacy goals and social development goals. That is, people who are high in other-oriented perfectionism are less interested in helping and supporting others. That's why, there is a negative relationship between other-oriented perfectionism and emotionality, altruism. Moreover, other-oriented perfectionists are less sympathetic and more hard-hearted towards who are weak or in need of help. In addition, there is positive relationship between other-oriented perfectionism and narcissism, Machiavellianism and (subclinical) psychopathy (Stoeber, 2014: 336).

Socially prescribed perfectionism is an interpersonal dimension comprising one's belief that others have excessively high standards from oneself. Socially prescribed perfectionists believe that others exact unrealistic standards and exert pressure on them to be perfect; also others evaluate them stringently when they fail to meet these expectations (Hewitt and Flett, 1991a: 457). Therefore, socially prescribed perfectionism should be considered a negative form of perfectionism like other-oriented perfectionism.

On the contrary, as previously noted, according to some authors perfectionism is one-dimensional. In this context; Shafran, Cooper and Fairburn (2002) provided a cognitive-behavioural analysis of perfectionism. They emphasize the primacy of cognition and they focused on self-oriented perfectionism. They claimed that other-oriented perfectionism and socially-prescribed perfectionism may be associated perfectionism rather than integral elements of perfectionism (Hewitt, Flett, Besser, Sherry and McGee, 2002: 1223). However, a long time ago, Horney (1950) emphasized the interpersonal aspects of perfectionism. As regards other-oriented perfectionism, she noted that: "*...a person may primarily impose his standards upon others and make relentless demands as to their perfection. The more he feels himself to be the measure of all things, the more he insists—not upon general perfection but upon his particular norms being measured up to. The failure of others to do so arouses his contempt or anger*" (Horney, 1950, p.78, cited in Hewitt, *et al.*, 2002: 1224).

According to Hewitt and Flett (1991a: 467), the construct of perfectionism is multidimensional which consists of personal and social factors and the factors cause to severe levels of psychopathology. In conclusion, the dimensions of perfectionism have been linked variety of interpersonal and intrapersonal problems. In this context, it may be more rational to indicate that perfectionism is primarily maladaptive.

2. Method and Analysis

2.1. The Aim of the Study

The study aims to investigate the effect of perfectionism on burnout.

The hypothesis of the study is stated below.

Hypothesis: Perfectionism influences burnout.

For this purpose, burnout levels of employees from different banks were examined and sought to answer the following questions:

- What is the burnout level of banking sector employees?
- How do burnout levels of banking sector employees change in terms of demographic variables?
- Which sub-dimensions of burnout is seen in more of banking sector employees ?
- What are the reasons of burnout for banking sector employees?

2.2. Participants and Procedure

The study was carried out in different private and state banks which were located in Turkey. The reason for this is that as it is stated by Maslach and Jackson (1981: 99), the employees in human service institutions are prone to suffer from burnout. In this context, banking sector is accepted one of these industries.

Population of the study consists of 201,481 banking sector employees (www.tbb.org.tr, 05.05.2015). A total 212 (87 females and 125 males) banking sector employees participated in the study. 38 banking sector employees who had participated in the study from private banks and 174 banking sector employees from state banks. Participants were selected from these banks on a voluntary basis for the sample of the research. The link of the survey, together with an introductory statement about the content and purpose of the study was sent to about 10000 participants to different regions of Turkey which is randomly selected. 214 surveys are sent back having answered. Among these, 2 surveys were excluded from the study as they had some unfilled questions. As a result, the total of 212 surveys are used in the study.

2.3. Measures

In order to conduct the study; Maslach Burnout Inventory (1981), Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (1991) and demographic form were used.

2.3.1. Maslach Burnout Inventory

Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was used to measure burnout which was developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981: 100). There are 22 items which were written in the form of statements about personal feelings or attitudes. The subscale of Emotional Exhaustion contains 9 items that describe feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one's work. The 5 items in the Depersonalization subscale describe an unfeeling and impersonal response towards recipients of one's care or service. For both the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales, higher mean scores correspond to higher degrees of experienced burnout. The 8 items in the Personal Accomplishment subscale describe feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people. On the contrary to the other two dimensions, higher total scores on this dimension correspond to lower degrees of experienced burnout (Maslach and Jackson, 1981: 101).

The Turkish version of Maslach Burnout Inventory was translated and adapted by Ergin in 1992. In this study, a sixpoint Likert-type scale was used which is ranging from almost always to almost never.

2.3.2. Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale

Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS) developed by Hewitt and Flett (1991a). The scale contains 45 items and 3 subscales. The subscale of Self-Oriented Perfectionism contains 15 items that describe unrealistic standards and perfectionistic motivation for the self (*e.g., One of my goals is to be perfect in everything I do*). The 15 items in the Other-Oriented Perfectionism subscale describe unrealistic standards and perfectionistic motivations for others (*e.g., I have high expectations for the people who are important to me*). The subscale of Socially Prescribed Perfectionism contains as others 15 items that describe the belief that significant others expect oneself to be perfect (*e.g., My family expects me to be perfect*). Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS) was used a sevenpoint Likert-type scale which is ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). In this study, a sixpoint Likert-type scale was used which is ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The Turkish version of Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS) was translated and adaptated by Oral in 1999. In this study, correspondingly, after conducted discussion by organizational behavior academicians, as a consensus, the scale was administered as 15 items.

2.4. Statistical Data Analysis

The research which was conducted by using statistical program. Initially, descriptive statistics were used for the data analysis to investigate the general characteristics of the sample. Reliability and factor analysis were carried out. Reliability of the surveys was measured by Cronbach alpha. Subsequently; correlation and simple regression were conducted to investigate the association between independent and dependent variables. Lastly, to test the demographic variables whether there are significant differences between groups, independent T-test and one-way ANOVA were used.

3. Findings

The analyses results of the profile and distribution of 212 participants are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis Statistics Results of the Sample Group

| | Frequency | % | Standard Deviation | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---|-----------|------|--------------------|----------|----------|
| Gender | | | ,49307 | -,367 | -1,883 |
| Female | 87 | 41 | | | |
| Male | 125 | 59 | | | |
| Age | | | ,92951 | ,448 | -,645 |
| 20-30 | 59 | 27,8 | | | |
| 31-40 | 86 | 40,6 | | | |
| 41-50 | 47 | 22,2 | | | |
| 51 and above | 20 | 9,4 | | | |
| Marital Status | | | ,44922 | -,996 | -1,017 |
| Single | 59 | 27,8 | | | |
| Married | 153 | 72,2 | | | |
| Education | | | ,45606 | ,636 | ,752 |
| High School | 7 | 3,3 | | | |
| License | 162 | 76,4 | | | |
| Graduate | 43 | 20,3 | | | |
| Institution | | | ,38447 | -1,684 | ,845 |
| Private | 38 | 17,9 | | | |
| State | 174 | 82,1 | | | |
| Title | | | ,49470 | -,327 | -1,911 |
| Executives | 89 | 42,0 | | | |
| Employees | 123 | 58,0 | | | |
| The Most Exhausting Issues in The Profession | | | 1,70933 | ,918 | -,558 |
| None | 35 | 16,5 | | | |
| Organizational/Job | 91 | 42,9 | | | |
| Interpersonal | 33 | 15,6 | | | |
| Work Environment | 8 | 3,8 | | | |
| Individual | 5 | 2,4 | | | |
| Psychological | 40 | 18,9 | | | |
| Current Here Working Time | | | 1,59209 | -,115 | -1,182 |
| 1 year and below | 32 | 15,1 | | | |
| 2-3 years | 36 | 17,0 | | | |
| 4-5 years | 33 | 15,6 | | | |
| 6-10 years | 42 | 19,8 | | | |
| 11-20 years | 49 | 23,1 | | | |
| 21 years and above | 20 | 9,4 | | | |
| The Total Working Time | | | 1,06088 | -,093 | -1,211 |
| 0-5 years | 41 | 19,3 | | | |
| 6-10 years | 58 | 27,4 | | | |
| 11-20 years | 61 | 28,8 | | | |
| 21 an above | 52 | 24,5 | | | |

As it is seen from the Table 1, 87 participants are female and 125 participants are male. The majority of the participants are between the ages of 31-40.

59 of the participants are single and 153 of them are married. 7 of the participants are graduated from high school and 162 of the participants have license degree, 43 of the participants have graduate degree. 38 participants are from a private bank and 174 participants are from a state bank. 89 participants are working as an executive and 123 participants are working as an employee.

While 35 of the participants have not any exhausting work-related issues ; 91 of the participants have organizational/job issues (task demands, role

demands, workload, target pressure, organizational structure and organizational justice); 33 of the participants have interpersonal issues (lack of social support, poor interpersonal relationship with customer and customer complaints); 8 of the participants have work environment issues (technical problems and working conditions); 5 of the participants have individual issues (family and economic problems) and 40 of the participants have psychological issues (mobbing, stress and risk management).

The number of participants who have the experience of one to less than one year in current working is 32, two to three years is 36, four to five years is 33, six to ten years is 42, eleven to twenty years is 49 and twenty-one to above is 20. 41 of the participants have 0-5 years, 58 of the participants have 6-10 years, 61 of the participants have 11-20 years and 52 of the participants have 21 and above total working time.

The results of the descriptive analysis of the variables show that the results are approximately normally distributed.

3.1. Factor and Reliability Analyses

Multidimensional Perfectionism Survey was divided into two factors. Due to the low load factor and low reliability coefficient of 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13 and 15 questions were eliminated. 8 questions left were divided into two factors. Total cumulative variance was % 56,271.

Depending on the content, factors was named as "Achievement-Oriented" and "Socially-Oriented", respectively.

For achievement-oriented cronbach' s alpha was 0,775 and for socially-oriented cronbach' s alpha was 0,659. Total cronbach' s alpha coefficient of the survey was 0,798. Factor analysis results are below:

Table 2: Perfectionism Survey Factor Analysis Results

| Factor 1: Achievement Oriented , Cronbach's Alpha = ,775 (% variance % 30,629) | | Component |
|---|--|-----------|
| 12. If I ask someone to do something, I expect it to be done flawlessly. | | ,855 |
| 10. I am perfectionistic in setting my goals. | | ,767 |
| 9. I expect others to excel at whatever they do. | | ,746 |
| 1. When I am working on something, I cannot relax until it is perfect. | | ,585 |
| Factor 2: Socially Oriented , Cronbach's Alpha = ,659 (% variance % 25,642) | | Component |
| 3. The people around me expect me to succeed at everything I do. | | ,767 |
| 5. The better I do, the better I am expected to do. | | ,715 |
| 14. My family expects me to be perfect. | | ,666 |
| 2. It is very important for me that people I am close with are successful. | | ,517 |
| Cumulative Variance | | %56,271 |
| Total Cronbach's Alpha | | ,798 |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | | ,766 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | | 482,104 |
| df | | 28 |
| Sig | | ,000 |

Maslach Burnout Survey was divided into three factors in the study. Due to the low load factor and low reliability coefficient of 9, 13, 14, 17, 20 and 22 questions were eliminated. 16 questions left were divided into three factors. Total cumulative variance was % 62,394.

Depending on the content, factors was named as "Emotional Exhaustion", "Empathy" and "Vigor", respectively.

For emotional exhaustion cronbach's alpha was 0,924, for empathy cronbach's alpha was 0,734 and for vigor it was 0,621. Total cronbach's alpha coefficient of the survey was 0,893. Factor analysis results are below:

Table 3: Burnout Survey Factor Analysis Results

| Factor 1: Emotional Exhaustion, Cronbach's Alpha = ,924 (% variance % 37,312) | | Component |
|--|---|-----------|
| 12. I feel burned out from my work. | | ,894 |
| 5. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job. | | ,843 |
| 6. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally. | | ,809 |
| 4. I feel used up at the end of the workday. | | ,782 |
| 1. I feel emotionally drained from my work. | | ,765 |
| 11. I feel like I'm at the end of my rope. | | ,754 |
| 8. Working with people all day is really a strain for me. | | ,735 |
| 15. I feel frustrated by my job. | | ,712 |
| 2. I've become more callous toward people since I took this job. | | ,684 |
| 21. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me. | | ,616 |
| Factor 2: Empathy, Cronbach's Alpha = ,734 (% variance % 14,067) | | Component |
| 18. I deal very effectively with the problems of my recipients. | | ,809 |
| 19. I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work. | | ,805 |
| 16. I can easily understand how my recipients feel about things. | | ,733 |
| 10. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job. | | ,525 |
| Factor3: Vigor, Cronbach's Alpha = ,621 (% variance % 11,015) | | Component |
| 3. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my recipients. | | ,829 |
| 7. I feel exhilarated after working closely to my recipients. | | ,760 |
| | Cumulative Variance | %62,394 |
| | Total Cronbach's Alpha | ,893 |
| | Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | ,877 |
| | Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | 1769,121 |
| | df | 120 |
| | Sig | ,000 |

3.2. Correlation Analyses

To investigate the relationships among the variables, correlation analyses was conducted. The results are presented below:

Table 4: Correlation Between Variables

| | Emotional Exhaustion | Empathy | Vigor | Achievement Oriented | Socially Oriented | Perfectionism Total | Burnout Total |
|----------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Emotional Exhaustion | 1 | | | | | | |
| Empathy | -,225(**) | 1 | | | | | |
| Vigor | -,327(**) | ,428(**) | 1 | | | | |
| Achievement Oriented | -,059 | ,272(**) | ,259(**) | 1 | | | |
| Socially Oriented | ,059 | ,262(**) | ,161(*) | ,523(**) | 1 | | |
| Perfectionism Total | -,002 | ,306(**) | ,242(**) | ,881(**) | ,864(**) | 1 | |
| Burnout Total | ,943(**) | -,509(**) | -,536(**) | -,158(*) | -,042 | -,117 | 1 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As it is seen in the table, there is a significant positive relationship between achievement-oriented perfectionism and empathy ($r=.272$; $p<.01$). There is a significant positive relationship between socially-oriented perfectionism and empathy ($r=.262$; $p<.01$). There is also a significant positive relationship between total perfectionism and empathy ($r=.306$; $p<.01$).

As it is seen in the table, there is a significant positive relationship between achievement-oriented perfectionism and vigor ($r=.259$; $p<.01$). There is a significant positive relationship between socially-oriented perfectionism and vigor ($r=.161$; $p<.05$). There is also a significant positive relationship between total perfectionism and vigor ($r=.242$; $p<.01$).

When the relationship among achievement-oriented perfectionism and total burnout was examined; it was seen that there is a significant negative relationship ($r=-.158$; $p<.05$).

3.3. Regression Analyses

In this analysis, the independent variable which is perfectionism and the dependent variable, burnout, were analyzed.

Table 5: Results of Simple Linear Regression Analysis of Perfectionism for Independent Variable

| Model | R | R ² | R ² _{adj} | pΔF | F | β | t | p |
|-------|------|----------------|-------------------------------|------|-------|-------|--------|------|
| 1 | ,117 | ,014 | ,009 | ,089 | 2,914 | -,117 | -1,707 | ,089 |

Independent Variable: Perfectionism

Dependent Variable: Burnout

As it is seen in the regression analysis table, perfectionism was found to have no significant influence on burnout ($p>0,05$). In other words, the regression analysis conducted showed that there is no significant relationship between perfectionism and burnout.

Table 6: Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Factors of Perfectionism for Independent Variables

| Model | R | R ² | R ² _{adj} | ΔR ² | pΔF | F | P _{model} | β | t | p | |
|-------|------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|------|-------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|------|
| 1 | ,165 | ,027 | ,018 | ,027 | ,055 | 2,936 | ,055 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Achievement Oriented | -,187 | 2,324 | ,020 |
| | | | | | | | | Socially Oriented | ,056 | ,696 | ,487 |

Independent Variables: The Factor of Achievement-Oriented Perfectionism, The Factor of Socially-Oriented Perfectionism

Dependent Variable: Burnout

As it is seen in the Table 6, when the factor of achievement-oriented perfectionism and the factor of socially-oriented perfectionism were analyzed together, they were found to have no significant influence on burnout. However, the factor of achievement-oriented perfectionism was found to have significant influence on burnout [$(\beta = -.187)$; ($p<0,05$)]. In this context, the hypothesis is partially supported.

3.4. Demographic Analyses

In the demographic analyses, it was aimed to examine whether the variables of the research model differ with respect to demographics or not.

Table 7: Results of Difference test for Gender

| | Groups | N | \bar{x} | SD | $SE_{\bar{x}}$ | t Test | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|----------------|--------|-----|------|
| | | | | | | t | df | p |
| Emotional Exhaustion | Female | 87 | 29,2299 | 10,714 | 1,149 | 1,935 | 210 | ,054 |
| | Male | 125 | 26,4000 | 10,310 | ,922 | | | |
| Empathy | Female | 87 | 16,7701 | 3,146 | ,337 | -1,859 | 210 | ,064 |
| | Male | 125 | 17,6000 | 3,233 | ,289 | | | |
| Vigor | Female | 87 | 8,2184 | 1,794 | ,192 | -1,894 | 210 | ,060 |
| | Male | 125 | 8,7280 | 2,0136 | ,180 | | | |
| Burnout Total | Female | 87 | 46,2414 | 12,718 | 1,364 | 2,392 | 210 | ,018 |
| | Male | 125 | 42,0720 | 12,315 | 1,102 | | | |

T-test conducted to find out whether there is a difference between the gender groups' level of burnout or not. As it seen in the table, there is a difference between female and male participants in terms of total burnout level ($p < .05$). That is, total burnout level of females is higher than the total burnout level of males ($\mu_{\text{female}}=46,24$; $\mu_{\text{male}}=42,07$).

Table 8: Results of Difference test for Marital Status

| | Groups | N | \bar{x} | SD | $SE_{\bar{x}}$ | t Test | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----|-----------|--------|----------------|--------|-----|------|
| | | | | | | t | df | p |
| Emotional Exhaustion | Single | 59 | 30,848 | 11,229 | 1,462 | 2,865 | 210 | ,005 |
| | Married | 153 | 26,294 | 10,022 | ,810 | | | |
| Empathy | Single | 59 | 16,305 | 3,287 | ,428 | -2,723 | 210 | ,007 |
| | Married | 153 | 17,628 | 3,122 | ,252 | | | |
| Vigor | Single | 59 | 7,932 | 1,999 | ,260 | -2,780 | 210 | ,006 |
| | Married | 153 | 8,745 | 1,873 | ,151 | | | |
| Burnout Total | Single | 59 | 48,610 | 13,418 | 1,747 | 3,552 | 210 | ,000 |
| | Married | 153 | 41,922 | 11,827 | ,956 | | | |

As it seen in the table, there is a difference between single and married participants in terms of burnout level ($p < .05$). That is, singles have higher

total burnout and emotional exhaustion than marrieds. On the other hand, marrieds have higher empathy and vigor than singles.

Table 9: Results of Difference test for Title

| | Groups | N | \bar{x} | SD | $SE_{\bar{x}}$ | t Test | | |
|-----------------------------|------------|-----|-----------|----------|----------------|--------|-----|------|
| | | | | | | t | df | p |
| Emotional Exhaustion | Executives | 89 | 25,9326 | 10,47160 | 1,10999 | -1,925 | 210 | ,056 |
| | Employees | 123 | 28,7398 | 10,48249 | ,94517 | | | |
| Empathy | Executives | 89 | 17,8427 | 3,02977 | ,32116 | 2,268 | 210 | ,024 |
| | Employees | 123 | 16,8374 | 3,29275 | ,29690 | | | |
| Vigor | Executives | 89 | 8,9775 | 1,86461 | ,19765 | 2,985 | 210 | ,003 |
| | Employees | 123 | 8,1870 | 1,93055 | ,17407 | | | |
| Burnout Total | Executives | 89 | 41,1124 | 12,43934 | 1,31857 | -2,658 | 210 | ,008 |
| | Employees | 123 | 45,7154 | 12,44563 | 1,12218 | | | |

As it seen in the Table 9, the difference among executives and employees is significant in terms of burnout level ($p < 0,05$), except emotional exhaustion ($p > 0,05$). That is, executives have higher empathy and vigor than employees. On the other hand, employees have higher total burnout than executives ($\mu_{employees} = 45,71$; $\mu_{executives} = 41,11$).

Table 10: Results of Difference test for Age (ANOVA)

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Emotional Exhaustion | Between Groups | 1749,340 | 3 | 583,113 | 5,586 | ,001 |
| | Within Groups | 21712,863 | 208 | 104,389 | | |
| | Total | 23462,203 | 211 | | | |
| Empathy | Between Groups | 277,279 | 3 | 92,426 | 10,089 | ,000 |
| | Within Groups | 1905,452 | 208 | 9,161 | | |
| | Total | 2182,731 | 211 | | | |
| Vigor | Between Groups | 44,046 | 3 | 14,682 | 4,078 | ,008 |
| | Within Groups | 748,878 | 208 | 3,600 | | |
| | Total | 792,925 | 211 | | | |
| Burnout Total | Between Groups | 4019,998 | 3 | 1339,999 | 9,420 | ,000 |
| | Within Groups | 29588,021 | 208 | 142,250 | | |
| | Total | 33608,019 | 211 | | | |

One-Way ANOVA conducted to find out whether there is a difference among groups' level of burnout in terms of their age. According to results, there is significant difference for level of burnout among groups in terms of their age. In order to present which age group is different than others, Scheffe test is used.

Table 11: Results of Total Burnout Difference test for Age (Scheffe)

| Groups (i) | Groups (j) | $\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$ | $SE_{\bar{x}}$ | <i>p</i> |
|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| 20-30 | 31-40 | 4,94482 | 2,01621 | ,114 |
| | 41-50 | 7,34511(*) | 2,33187 | ,021 |
| | 51 and above | 15,69831(*) | 3,08602 | ,000 |
| 31-40 | 20-30 | -4,94482 | 2,01621 | ,114 |
| | 41-50 | 2,40030 | 2,16349 | ,746 |
| | 51 and above | 10,75349(*) | 2,96084 | ,005 |
| 41-50 | 20-30 | -7,34511(*) | 2,33187 | ,021 |
| | 31-40 | -2,40030 | 2,16349 | ,746 |
| | 51 and above | 8,35319 | 3,18420 | ,079 |
| 51 and above | 20-30 | -15,69831(*) | 3,08602 | ,000 |
| | 31-40 | -10,75349(*) | 2,96084 | ,005 |
| | 41-50 | -8,35319 | 3,18420 | ,079 |

According to results, there is significant total burnout mean difference between the group of 20-30 age ($\mu=48,9$) and the group of 41-50 age ($\mu=41,6$) ($p=.021<.05$), the group of 20-30 age ($\mu=48,9$) and the group of 51 and above age ($\mu=33,2$) ($p=.000<.05$). That is, the group of 20-30 ages have higher burnout than the group of 41-50 and 51 and above. Additionally, the group of 31-40 ages' total burnout is higher than the group of 51 and above ($p=.005<.05$).

Table 12: Results of Difference test for The Most Exhausting Issues in The Profession (ANOVA)

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Emotional Exhaustion | Between Groups | 2419,895 | 5 | 483,979 | 4,738 | ,000 |
| | Within Groups | 21042,308 | 206 | 102,147 | | |
| | Total | 23462,203 | 211 | | | |
| Empathy | Between Groups | 57,562 | 5 | 11,512 | 1,116 | ,353 |
| | Within Groups | 2125,170 | 206 | 10,316 | | |
| | Total | 2182,731 | 211 | | | |
| Vigor | Between Groups | 33,985 | 5 | 6,797 | 1,845 | ,106 |
| | Within Groups | 758,939 | 206 | 3,684 | | |
| | Total | 792,925 | 211 | | | |
| Burnout Total | Between Groups | 3021,726 | 5 | 604,345 | 4,070 | ,002 |
| | Within Groups | 30586,293 | 206 | 148,477 | | |
| | Total | 33608,019 | 211 | | | |

One-Way ANOVA conducted to find out whether there is a difference among groups' level of burnout in terms of the most exhausting issues. According to results, there is significant difference for level of total burnout and emotional exhaustion among groups in terms of exhausting work-related issues. In order to present which exhausting work-related issues group is different than others, Scheffe test is used.

Table 13:Results of Total Burnout Difference test for The Most Exhausting Issues in The Profession (Scheffe)

| Groups (i) | Groups(j) | $\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$ | $SE_{\bar{x}}$ | <i>p</i> |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| None | Organizational | -9,79780(*) | 2,42360 | ,007 |
| | Interpersonal | -11,28831(*) | 2,95660 | ,014 |
| | Environmental | -5,24286 | 4,77513 | ,944 |
| | Individual | -7,54286 | 5,82560 | ,891 |
| | Psychological | -6,29286 | 2,82031 | ,421 |
| Organizational/Job | None | 9,79780(*) | 2,42360 | ,007 |
| | Interpersonal | -1,49051 | 2,47607 | ,996 |
| | Environmental | 4,55495 | 4,49347 | ,960 |
| | Individual | 2,25495 | 5,59706 | ,999 |
| | Psychological | 3,50495 | 2,31161 | ,806 |
| Interpersonal | None | 11,28831(*) | 2,95660 | ,014 |
| | Organizational | 1,49051 | 2,47607 | ,996 |
| | Environmental | 6,04545 | 4,80197 | ,902 |
| | Individual | 3,74545 | 5,84763 | ,995 |
| | Psychological | 4,99545 | 2,86553 | ,694 |
| Work Environment | None | 5,24286 | 4,77513 | ,944 |
| | Organizational | -4,55495 | 4,49347 | ,960 |
| | Interpersonal | -6,04545 | 4,80197 | ,902 |
| | Individual | -2,30000 | 6,94659 | 1,000 |
| | Psychological | -1,05000 | 4,71928 | 1,000 |
| Individual | None | 7,54286 | 5,82560 | ,891 |
| | Organizational | -2,25495 | 5,59706 | ,999 |
| | Interpersonal | -3,74545 | 5,84763 | ,995 |
| | Environmental | 2,30000 | 6,94659 | 1,000 |
| | Psychological | 1,25000 | 5,77991 | 1,000 |
| Psychological | None | 6,29286 | 2,82031 | ,421 |
| | Organizational | -3,50495 | 2,31161 | ,806 |
| | Interpersonal | -4,99545 | 2,86553 | ,694 |
| | Environmental | 1,05000 | 4,71928 | 1,000 |
| | Individual | -1,25000 | 5,77991 | 1,000 |

According to results, there is significant total burnout mean difference between the group of none ($\mu=36,25$) and the group of organizational/job ($\mu= 46,05$) ($p=.007<.05$), the group of none ($\mu=36,25$) and the group of interpersonal ($\mu= 47,54$) ($p=.014<.05$). That is, the group of organizational/job have higher burnout than the group of none and the group of interpersonal have higher burnout than the group of none.

Table 14: Results of Difference test for The Total Working Time (ANOVA)

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Emotional Exhaustion | Between Groups | 2630,632 | 3 | 876,877 | 8,755 | ,000 |
| | Within Groups | 20831,570 | 208 | 100,152 | | |
| | Total | 23462,203 | 211 | | | |
| Empathy | Between Groups | 225,292 | 3 | 75,097 | 7,980 | ,000 |
| | Within Groups | 1957,439 | 208 | 9,411 | | |
| | Total | 2182,731 | 211 | | | |
| Vigor | Between Groups | 38,923 | 3 | 12,974 | 3,579 | ,015 |
| | Within Groups | 754,001 | 208 | 3,625 | | |
| | Total | 792,925 | 211 | | | |
| Burnout Total | Between Groups | 4782,650 | 3 | 1594,217 | 11,504 | ,000 |
| | Within Groups | 28825,369 | 208 | 138,584 | | |
| | Total | 33608,019 | 211 | | | |

One-Way ANOVA conducted to find out whether there is a difference among groups' level of burnout in terms of the total working time. According to results, there is significant difference for level of burnout among groups in terms of the total working time. In order to present which the total working time group is different than others, Scheffe test is used.

Table 15: Results of Total Burnout Difference test for The Total Working Time (Scheffe)

| Groups (i) | Groups (j) | $\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$ | $SE_{\bar{x}}$ | <i>p</i> |
|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| 0-5 years | 6-10 years | 9,00000(*) | 2,40197 | ,003 |
| | 11-20 years | 7,75410(*) | 2,37738 | ,015 |
| | 21 and above | 14,36538(*) | 2,45869 | ,000 |
| 6-10 years | 0-5 years | -9,00000(*) | 2,40197 | ,003 |
| | 11-20 years | -1,24590 | 2,15899 | ,954 |
| | 21 and above | 5,36538 | 2,24821 | ,131 |
| 11-20 years | 0-5 years | -7,75410(*) | 2,37738 | ,015 |
| | 6-10 years | 1,24590 | 2,15899 | ,954 |
| | 21 and above | 6,61129(*) | 2,22192 | ,034 |
| 21 and above | 0-5 years | -14,36538(*) | 2,45869 | ,000 |
| | 6-10 years | -5,36538 | 2,24821 | ,131 |
| | 11-20 years | -6,61129(*) | 2,22192 | ,034 |

According to results, there is significant total burnout mean difference between the group of 0-5 year ($\mu=52,0$) and the group of 6-10 year ($\mu=43,0$) ($p=.003<.05$), the group of 0-5 year ($\mu=52,0$) and the group of 11-20 year ($\mu=44,2$) ($p=.015<.05$), the group of 0-5 year ($\mu=52,0$) and the group of 21 and above ($\mu=37,6$) ($p=.000<.05$). That is, the group of 0-5 years have the

highest burnout than the other groups. Additionally, the group of 11-20 years have higher burnout than the group of 21 and above ($p=.034<.05$).

CONCLUSION

In accordance to the results of the analyses, the issue that perfectionism is multidimensional construct has been supported. Although the original scale has three subscales, the results of factor analysis indicated that two subscales. One of them was named "Achievement-Oriented" and the other was named "Socially-Oriented", respectively. In this context, the subscale of "Socially-Oriented" may be accepted as the original subscale of Socially Prescribed Perfectionism. Also, the subscale of "Achievement-Oriented" may be accepted as the original subscale of Self-Oriented Perfectionism. Hewitt and Flett (1991a: 457), also identified self-oriented perfectionism as an achievement-based dimension that supports the issue.

According to results, contrary to expectations, perfectionism was found to have no significant influence on burnout; nothing but there is a negative significant relationship between achievement-oriented perfectionism and burnout. Moreover, the results indicated that there is a positive relationship between perfectionism and the subscales of empathy and vigor. It could be say that, when the banking sector employee' s perfectionism level is increased, the level of empathy and vigor will be increase, simultaneously. The result may indicate that, in the banking sector, perfectionism is attributed with achievement. Also, it seems that perfectionist behavior facilitate achieving goals in the sector that diminishes the syndrome of burnout. In literature, studies can be found that perfectionism was described as an adaptive construct (Stoeber, Otto, Pesheck, Beckek and Stoll, 2007: 964; Stoeber, Stoll, Pesheck and Otto, 2008: 103; Stoll, Lau and Stoeber, 2008: 621). When the sample is considered, the findings of the study depend on the responses of the participants who are banking sector employees. It is clear that banking sector involves face-to-face work with people and carries financial risks; the employees are required to do a perfect job. That is, perfectionism is attributed positive and required disposition in banking sector, contrary to negative effects. For this reason, it seems that perfectionism eliminates emotional exhaustion and improves the level of empathy and vigor among the banking sector employees.

The results of the demographic analyses are expected to be beneficial for the literature. The findings showed that female participants and single participants display higher burnout levels than male participants and married participants. These findings are also compatible with the study of Maslach and Jackson (1981: 111). In respect of title, employees experience higher burnout levels than executives. On the other hand, executives experience higher empathy and vigor levels than employees. In this context, it could be say that, the higher positions the banking sector employees are in, the lower the experience of burnout level is. In respect of the age variable, the findings show that younger people scored higher than old people on burnout. Respectively, it may be inferred that the people who are in the early years in their career have unreal expectations on what leads to burnout. On the other side, the levels of empathy and vigor have seen higher among older people. The result indicates that experience is an important issue in the context of burnout.

Another remarkable result points out that, the most exhausting work-related issues are organizational/job and interpersonal which lead to burnout in banking sector employees. The organizational/job issues are consist of task demands, role demands, workload, target pressure, organizational structure and organizational justice and the interpersonal issues are consist of lack of social support, poor interpersonal relationship with customer, customer complaints. As it was stated by Angerer (2003: 99), burnout is not a problem of individuals; it is a problem of the environment in which they work.

On the other hand, according to results, the type of institution (private and state), level of education and the time of current working have not statistically significant effect on their burnout levels. According to results, it could be say that, burnout may be experienced among the banking sector employees regardless of institution.

It is clear that burnout is an important problem to take into consideration, especially in the workplace. In respect of the intervening of workplace techniques, organizations must address the six areas (workload, control, reward, community, fairness, values) of the work life to combat burnout. That is, if employers provide an environment with a sustainable workload, choice and control for employees, rewards and recognition for good work and a sense of community among employers and employees, the employees will find meaning and value in their work that leads to well-being (Angerer, 2003: 105). In the context of the relationship between perfectionism and burnout, perfectionism has been a common personality characteristic that can affect all domains of life, especially in the domain of work. 53% of people in a sample of internet users reporting that they are perfectionistic at work (Stoeber and Stoeber, 2009: 533). For this reason, perfectionism could be examined with more exclusive scales which can be applied to banking sector.

The important limitation of this study is the size of sample. In addition, the generalizability of the present study is limited to banking sector employees in Turkey. In this context, future studies can be conducted a longitudinal research with more sufficient sample. To investigate intervening variables the relation between perfectionism and burnout is suggested. The effect of organizational/job and interpersonal exhausting work-related issues on burnout could be investigated particularly in future studies. In this way, the effect of burnout could be observed in the long run. Moreover, future studies need to differentiate between adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism. So, we are certain to explain why some employees are engaged in their work, why some employees are addicted to work and why some employees burnout. Finally, future studies need to investigate how to help perfectionistic employees in terms of their work-life balance, health and well-being (Stoeber and Damian, 2015: 21).

REFERENCES

- Angerer, J. M. (2003). Job burnout. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 40, (3), 98.
- Appleton, P. R., Hall, H. K., & Hill, A. P. (2009). Relations between multidimensional perfectionism and burnout in junior-elite male athletes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10(4), 457-465.

- Arabacı, B. (2010). The effects of depersonalization and organizational cynicism levels on the job satisfaction of educational inspectors. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 4(13), pp. 2802-2811, 4 October.
- Bieling, P. J., Israeli, A. L., & Antony, M. M. (2004). Is perfectionism good, bad, or both? Examining models of the perfectionism construct. *Personality and individual differences*, 36(6), 1373-1385.
- Childs, J. H., & Stoeber, J. (2012). Do you want me to be perfect? Two longitudinal studies on socially prescribed perfectionism, stress and burnout in the workplace. *Work & Stress*, 26(4), 347-364.
- Cordes, C., Dougherty, T.W. (1993). A Review and an Integration of Research on Job Burnout. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 18, No. 4, 621-656.
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive therapy and research*, 14(5), 449-468.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991a). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 60(3), 456.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991b). Dimensions of perfectionism in unipolar depression. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 100(1), 98.
- Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., Besser, A., Sherry, S. B., & McGee, B. (2003). Perfectionism Is Multidimensional: a reply to Shafran, Cooper and Fairburn (2002). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 41(10), 1221-1236.
- Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., Turnbull-Donovan, W., & Mikail, S. F. (1991). The Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale: Reliability, validity, and psychometric properties in psychiatric samples. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 3(3), 464.
- Leiter, M., Hakanen, J., Ahola, K., Tanner, S., Koskinen, A., Vaananen, A. (2013). Organizational Predictors and Health Consequences of Changes in Burnout: A 12-year cohort study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34, 959-973.
- Maslach C., Jackson S.E. (1981). The Measurement of Experienced Burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 2: 99-113.
- Maslach, C., Leiter, M. (1988). The impact of interpersonal environment on burnout and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol.9, 297-308.
- Maslach, C., Leiter, M. (2008). Early Predictors of Job Burnout and Engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 93, No. 3, 498-512.
- Maslach, C., Leiter, M., & Jackson, S. (2012). Making a significant difference with burnout interventions: Researcher and

- practitioner collaboration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 296-300.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
- Ok, Sibel (2004). Banka Çalışanlarının Tükenmişlik Düzeylerinin İş Doyumu, Rol Çatışması, Rol Belirsizliği ve Bazı Bireysel Özelliklere Göre İncelenmesi, *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, III, 21,57-68.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P, and Maslach C. (2009). Burnout: 35 Years of Research and Practice. *Career Development International*, 14.3, 204-220.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, Burnout, and Work Engagement: Three of a Kind or Three Different Kinds of Employee Well-being?. *Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 173-203.
- Schaufeli, W. B. & Buunk, B. P. (1996). Professional Burnout. *Handbook of Work and Health Psychology*, Chapter 15.
- Siliğ, A., & Ceyhan, A. A. (2005). Banka Çalışanlarının Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri ile Uyum Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkiler. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(2), 43-56.
- Stoeber, J. (2014). How other-oriented perfectionism differs from self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 36(2), 329-338.
- Stoeber, J., & Damian, L. E. (2015). Perfectionism in employees: Work engagement, workaholism, and burnout. In F. M. Sirois & D. S. Molnar (Eds.), *Perfectionism, health, and wellbeing*. New York: Springer.
- Stoeber, J., & Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: Approaches, evidence, challenges. *Personality and social psychology review*, 10(4), 295-319.
- Stoeber, J., & Stoeber, F. S. (2009). Domains of perfectionism: Prevalence and relationships with perfectionism, gender, age, and satisfaction with life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46(4), 530-535.
- Stoeber, J., Otto, K., Pesheck, E., Becker, C., & Stoll, O. (2007). Perfectionism and competitive anxiety in athletes: differentiating striving for perfection and negative reactions to imperfection. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, 959-969.
- Stoeber, J., Stoll, O., Pesheck, E., & Otto, K. (2008). Perfectionism and goal orientations in athletes: relations with approach and avoidance orientations in mastery and performance goals. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 9, 102-121.
- Stoll, O., Lau, A., & Stoeber, J. (2008). Perfectionism and performance in a new basketball training task: does striving for perfection enhance or undermine performance? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 9, 620-629.

- Swider, B. W., & Zimmerman, R. D. (2010). Born to burnout: A meta-analytic path model of personality, job burnout, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(3), 487-506.
- Weber, A., Jaekel-Reinhard, A. (2000). Burnout Syndrome: a disease of modern societies? *Occupational Medicine*, Vol: 50. No:7. 512-517.