Validation of the Brazilian Portuguese version of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) in healthcare professionals

Carolina M. Moser[1,2]; Bárbara Tietbohl-Santos[1,2]; Daniel Luccas Arenas[1,2]; Aurora Xavier[2]; Felipe Ornell[1,4]; Rogerio Boff Borges[3]; Simone Hauck[1,2].

[1]Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psiquiatria e Ciências do Comportamento, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

[2]Laboratório de Psiquiatria Psicodinâmica, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (PPRL/UFRGS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

[3]Unidade de Bioestatística, Grupo de Pesquisa e Pós-graduação (GPPG), Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre (HCPA). Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

[4]Centro de Pesquisa em Álcool e Drogas, Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre / Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (HCPA/UFRGS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

Corresponding author:

Carolina M. Moser, MD, MSc

Rua Ramiro Barcelos, 2400 2^0 andar. Zip Code: 90035-003, Porto Alegre-RS, Brazil, Phone: +555133085624, Email: cmeiramoser@gmail.com

Validation of the Brazilian Portuguese version of The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) in healthcare professionals

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was the validation of the Brazilian Portuguese version of The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI). The study sample consisted of 1.256 Brazilian health professionals. Data were collected during one month (May-2020 to June-2020) through an online self-administered questionnaire, including the CBI and the Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9) to evaluate depressive symptoms. All consistency measures showed values > 0.90. The split-half correlation values with Spearman-Brown reliability were higher than 0.8. The parallel analysis suggested two factors: the items of CBI's personal burnout (PB) and work-related burnout (WB) sub-dimensions that were associated with factor 1 (personal and work-related fatigue and exhaustion) and the items of CBI's client-related burnout (CB) sub-dimension were associated with factor 2 (exhaustion that emerges while working with people). The correlation between the PHQ-9 score and factor 1 was 0.76 (0.73; 0.79) and with factor 2, 0.49 (0.43; 0.55). Our study provides a valid and reliable Brazilian Portuguese version of CBI, encouraging the expansion of the burnout research field in our country.

Keywords: Copenhagen Burnout Inventory; Cross-cultural; Validity; Reliability; Healthcare professionals

Introduction

Burnout Syndrome (BS) is an emerging condition worldwide that can emerge in response to constant and prolonged stressors in the work environment, generating physical, emotional and mental exhaustion, leading to reduced performance. The devastating effects of burnout and its clinical significance have been vastly reported in the literature and health professionals are among the most affected [1]. BS has been associated with a higher frequency of medical errors, suboptimal care of patients, reduced empathy in general, absenteeism, reduced quality of life and higher costs for health care systems [2]. However, there is not a consensus about BS diagnostic criteria and about standardized measurement tools to assess it. In fact, the substantial disagreement on what constitutes burnout precludes conclusions even about the phenomena's prevalence [1, 3].

The instrument most commonly used to evaluate burnout is the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)[4]. It consists of a three-factor questionnaire that assesses emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and low sense of personal accomplishment. Some authors have pointed out that the three dimensions assessed by MBI are not weighted equally, and that there is no accuracy between the three subscales. Moreover, depersonalization could be regarded as an exhaustion coping mechanism, whilst lower personal accomplishment could be viewed as a consequence of exhaustion, rather than a dimension of burnout itself [5, 6].

In this context, The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) was developed by Kristensen and colleagues to be a more straightforward measurement that considers fatigue and exhaustion as the core constructs of burnout [6]. The CBI differentiates three life domains from which emotional exhaustion may arise: personal, work-related, and client-related. Personal burnout is the degree of physical and psychological exhaustion one can experience, unrelated to their occupation. Work-related burnout is the degree to which physical and psychological exhaustion is perceived in relation to work activities. Client-related burnout is the level of exhaustion that stems from the professional relationship with clients.

The CBI assesses burnout in a less complex manner then the MBI. Moreover, the CBI is a public domain tool that assesses the same overall construct in different contexts, as opposed to mixing burnout and its consequences in the same construct as the MBI does. Also, a greater range of occupations can be evaluated using the CBI, in contrast with the MBI, which evaluates only the human services sector [6]. The CBI has been translated, validated, and used in many countries and contexts across the world with a growing evidence base of good psychometric properties for measuring occupational burnout [7-9]. Therefore, the aim of this study was to validate a CBI Brazilian version.

Methods

This is an instrument validation study. The cross-cultural adaptation and translation process of CBI to Brazilian Portuguese involved a series of standardized steps according to the protocol developed by our research group [10]. This protocol is in compliance with both the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR) Task Force's Principles of Good Practice for the Translation and Cultural Adaptation Process for Patient-Reported Outcomes [11] and the European Regulatory Issues on Quality of Life Assessment Group (ERIQ-A)'s advice towards a multistep approach [12]. Data collection was initiated after the HCPA Ethics Committee approved by CAAE number 30745020.5.0000.5327). Recruitment was through an online snowball method via email and social media and directed to Brazilian health professionals during one month (May-2020 to June-2020). Acceptance and completion of the questionnaire occurred entirely online and all participants had agreed with the online informed consent. The questionnaire was available in a platform widely used for research purposes since it guarantees the anonymity of the subjects involved (Survey Monkey TM).

Participants

The total sample was composed of 1.256 Brazilian health professionals that work in Brazil: 32,32% were physicians (n=406), 20.22% were nursing technicians (n=254), 13.61% were nurses (n=171),12.18% were psychologists (n=153) and 21,67% were other health workers (n=272). Subjects with incomplete or missing questionnaires were excluded.

Materials

Level of burnout was assessed with *The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) (Supplemental Material 1)*, a 19-item questionnaire that measures three burnout sub-dimensions: personal burnout (6 items), work-related burnout (7 items), and client-related burnout (6 items). It is a self-reported questionnaire answered by a Likert scale of five points: “Always” or “To a very high degree” (100 points), “Often” or “To a high degree” (75 points), “Sometimes” or “Somewhat” (50 points), “Seldom” or “To a low degree” (25 points) and “Never/almost never” or “To a very low degree” (0 points). The CBI items in each subscale are summed and averaged to obtain the scores. The higher the scores, the higher the level of burnout [6].

Depressive symptoms were assessed with Brazilian version of Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9), a widely used 9-item questionnaire for screening of major depressive episodes. The frequency of each symptom in the past two weeks is assessed on a Likert scale from 0 (“not at all”) to 3 (“nearly every day”) [13].

Data Analysis

The reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and split-half correlation with Spearman-Brown reliability. The suitability of data for factorisation was performed by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure and Bartlett’s test of sphericity. Construct validity was established by exploratory factor analysis with oblique rotation. The number of factors was determined using the method of parallel analysis. All of these analyzes were performed using the polychoric correlation between the items. The concurrent criterion validity was analyzed by assessing Spearman's correlation coefficient between PHQ-9 score. The analyzes were performed in the R program using the psych version 1.9.12 and multicon version 1.6 packages. Where necessary, a significance level of 5% was adopted [14-16].

Results

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure was 0.95 and Bartlett’s test of sphericity rejected the null hypothesis ($p < 0.001$). The parallel analysis suggested two factors. Table 1 shows the factorial loads: the items of CBI’s personal burnout (PB) and work-related burnout (WB) that were associated with factor 1 (personal and work-related fatigue and exhaustion) and the items of client-related burnout (CB) were associated with factor 2 (exhaustion that emerges while working with people).

All consistency measures showed values > 0.90. The split-half correlation values with Spearman-Brown reliability were higher than 0.8 (Table 2). The correlation between the PHQ score and factor 1 was 0.76 (0.73; 0.79) and with factor 2 was 0.49 (0.43; 0.55).

Discussion

The CBI's Brazilian Portuguese version developed by our group had an excellent internal consistency reliability (Cronbach alpha coefficient >0.9) and an adequate concurrent validity with the PHQ-9 (moderate to strong positive correlation with depressive symptoms) in healthcare professionals.

However, instead of the 3 factor loads of the original instrument, our analysis suggested 2 factor loads. This is in line with other CBI validation studies that pointed out a good discriminant validity between client-related burnout and both work-related and personal related burnout, but did not establish a satisfactory discriminant validity between personal and work-related burnout [7-9]. These findings can be explained by an essential overlap between the two constructs that assess the fatigue and exhaustion dimensions of Burnout Syndrome.

Our results may contribute to the debate regarding the BS construct. In fact, through our findings, one could hypothesize that the MBI's exhaustion and depersonalization dimensions could correspond respectively to the PB + WB and the CB CBI factors, at least partially. Indeed, the MBI depersonalization dimension refers to the effect of the BS on the client-related relationship. Further studies should explore this hypothesis, aiming at clarifying the BS criteria which would be of great value to this field of research.

Our study has some limitations. The sample was comprised only of health professionals; hence the instrument must be validated in other populations. Also, other methods of analysis may be applied in the future, including test-retest reliability. However, a public domain tool that evaluates burnout is extremely needed in our milieu, even more considering the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. In this sense, our study provides a valid, reliable, and accessible Brazilian Portuguese version of the CBI that was produced through a very rigorous transcultural adaptation and translation process.

References

1. Rotenstein LS, Torre M, Ramos MA, Rosales RC, Guille C, Sen S, et al. Prevalence of Burnout Among Physicians: A Systematic Review. JAMA. 2018;320(11).

2. Yates SW. Physician Stress and Burnout. The American journal of medicine. 2020;133(2).

3. Moreira DS, Magnago RF, Sakae TM, Magajewski FRL. [Prevalence of burnout syndrome in nursing staff in a large hospital in south of Brazil]. Cadernos de saude publica. 2009;25(7).

4. Maslach C, Leiter MP. Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA). 2016;15(2).

5. Shirom A. Reflections on the study of burnout. Work & Stress. 2007;19:263–70.

6. Kristensen TS, Borritz M, Villadsen E, Christensen KB. The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. Work & Stress. 2007;19:192-207.

7. Andrew-Chin RW, Chua YY, Chu MN, Mahadi NF, Wong MS, Yusoff MSB, et al. Investigating validity evidence of the Malay translation of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory. Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences. 2017;13(1).

8. Fong TC, Ho RT, Ng SM. Psychometric properties of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory-Chinese version. The Journal of psychology. 2014;148(3).

9. Papaefstathiou E, Tsounis A, Malliarou M, Sarafis P. Translation and validation of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory amongst Greek doctors. Health Psychol Res. 2019;7(1).

10. Moser CM, Oliveira LT, Behenck AS, Brunstein MG, Hauck S. Transcultural adaptation and translation process of the instruments Sick Control One Stone Fat Food questionnaire (SCOFF), Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire (EDE-Q) and Clinical Impairment Assessment questionnaire (CIA) to Brazilian Portuguese. Trends Psychiatry Psychother. 2020;In press.

11. Wild D, Grove A, Martin M, Eremenco S, McElroy S, Verjee-Lorenz A, et al. Principles of Good Practice for the Translation and Cultural Adaptation Process for Patient-Reported Outcomes (PRO) Measures: report of the ISPOR Task Force for Translation and Cultural Adaptation. Value in health : the journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research. 2005;8(2).

12. Acquadro C, Conway K, Hareendran A, Aaronson N. Literature review of methods to translate health-related quality of life questionnaires for use in multinational clinical trials. Value in health : the journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research. 2008;11(3).

13. Santos IS, Tavares BF, Munhoz TN, Almeida LS, Silva NT, Tams BD, et al. [Sensitivity and specificity of the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) among adults from the general population]. Cadernos de saude publica. 2013;29(8).

14. R-Core-Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020.

15. Revelle WR. psych: Procedures for Personality and Psychological Research (Software). 2017.

16. Sherman RA. multicon: Multivariate Constructs. R package version 1.6. (Software) 2015 [Available from: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/multicon/index.html.

Table 1. Factor analysis of CBI with oblique rotation

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
PB1	0,800	-0,051
PB2	0,860	-0,094
PB3	0,809	-0,003
PB4	0,834	0,014
PB5	0,910	-0,032
PB6	0,711	0,005
WB1	0,859	-0,054
WB2	0,722	0,120
WB3	0,743	0,049
WB4	-0,558	-0,103
WB5	0,479	0,166
WB6	0,365	0,385
WB7	0,678	0,236
CB1	-0,075	0,883
CB2	0,013	0,860
CB3	-0,060	0,930
CB4	0,131	0,659
CB5	0,056	0,834
CB6	0,175	0,661

Data presented as polychoric correlation between the items

CBI's sub-dimensions- PB(x)= Personal Burnout, WB(x)= Work-related Burnout, CB(x)=Client-related Burnout

Factor 1= personal and work-related fatigue and exhaustion

Factor 2= exhaustion that emerges while working with people

Table2. The split-half correlation values with Spearman-Brown reliability

	Cronbach		**Split-half correlation**		
Sub-dimension	**Alpha**	**CI 95%**	**Correlation**	**Reliability**	**Standard Deviation**
PB + WB	0,9457	0,9407 – 0,9503	0,8837	0,9382	0,0757
CB	0,9296	0,9227 – 0,9359	0,8382	0,912	0,0867

CBI's sub-dimensions- PB= Personal Burnout, WB= Work-related Burnout, CB=Client-related Burnout