

Predictors of Burnout Among Academic Family Medicine Faculty: Looking Back to Plan forward

Viola Antao, Paul Krueger, Christopher Meaney, Jeffrey C. Kwong, David White

Dr. Antao is an Associate Professor and Program Director, Mentorship Lead, Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Dr. Krueger is an Associate Professor Emeritus, Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Mr. Meaney is a Biostatistician, Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Dr. Kwong is a Professor, Department of Family and Community Medicine and the Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Dr. White is a Professor Emeritus, Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, in Toronto, Ontario

Correspondence should be addressed to Dr. Viola Antao, 500 University Avenue, 5th Floor, Toronto, Ontario M5G 1V7 Canada; telephone [624-5902]; e-mail: viola.antao@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Objective: To identify the prevalence and predictors of burnout among academic family medicine faculty.

Design: A comprehensive survey of academic family medicine faculty on burnout, perceptions of work life, and practice in 2011.

Setting: A large, distributed Department of Family and Community Medicine at the University of Toronto.

Participants: All 1029 faculty members were invited to participate.

Main outcome measures: Maslach Burnout Inventory three subscales (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, personal accomplishment).

Results: The survey response rate was 66.8% (687/1029). The prevalence of high emotional exhaustion scores was 27.0% and high depersonalization was 9.2%, whereas the prevalence of high personal accomplishment scores was 99.4%. Bivariate analyses identified 27 variables associated with emotional exhaustion and 18 variables associated with depersonalization, including: ratings of the practice setting; leadership and mentorship experiences; job satisfaction; health status; and demographic variables. Multivariate analyses found four predictors of emotional exhaustion: lower ratings of job satisfaction, poorer ratings of workplace quality, working ≥ 50 hrs/week, and poorer ratings of health status. Predictors of depersonalization included lower ratings of job satisfaction, ≤ 5 years in practice, lower ratings of health status, and poor ratings of mentorship received.

Conclusions: This study describes the prevalence and predictors of burnout among physicians prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Predictors that are potentially modifiable at local practice and systems levels include job satisfaction, workplace quality, hours worked, and mentorship

received. New family physicians (≤ 5 years in practice) were at increased risk of depersonalization; strategies specific to this group may limit burnout and address the healthcare workforce crisis. Periodic studies are recommended to identify the impact of strategies implemented, emergent predictors, trends, and mitigating factors associated with burnout. The current crisis in family medicine indicates an urgent need to look back and plan forward.

Keywords

Academic family medicine faculty; burnout, predictors, Maslach Burnout Inventory

INTRODUCTION

Burnout is contributing to the ongoing depletion of the family physician workforce, exacerbating the crisis in primary care^{1,2,3}. In Canada, an estimated 6.5 million adults lack access to primary care⁴ yet 100 family medicine residency positions remained unfilled in 2023⁵. Burnout among family physicians at various career stages and practice settings contributes to decreased interest in providing comprehensive care, increased intentions to leave practice, physician turnover, and early retirement^{6,7}

Burnout is “a work-related syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced feelings of personal accomplishment” first described in the 1970s^{8,9}. Burnout remains prevalent. Despite extensive research and implementation of “wellness and engagement strategies” focused on physician resilience, a cogent understanding of causes and potential solutions is elusive^{10,11}. Burnout may contribute to reduced quality of patient care¹², and significant health system costs¹³, supporting the call to improve the work life of health care providers to optimize health system performance^{14,15,17}

Physicians practicing family medicine have higher rates of burnout compared to physicians in other specialties^{16,17}. Among family physicians, the prevalence ranged from 25-60%¹⁸. Studies have identified higher prevalence among those earlier in practice (<10 years)¹⁷ and females^{19,20}. Large debt, high clinical load, and childcare responsibilities are potential contributors to burnout in new family physicians^{19,21}

In 2011, the Department of Family and Community Medicine (DFCM) at the University of Toronto conducted a “Faculty Work and Leadership Survey” to assess the quality of work life and leadership development for faculty^{23,22,24}. The purpose of this study was to determine the

prevalence and predictors of burnout among academic family medicine faculty, given the limited literature specific to this group. With the growing workforce crisis in primary care, these findings can help to fill the historic gap in the literature, provide a comparative level or baseline for burnout, inform current efforts to mitigate burnout, and plan future research.

METHODS

Setting

In 2011, the DFCM comprised 1029 faculty distributed across 14 family medicine teaching units and numerous community-based practices.

Questionnaire

We conducted a web-based survey of all DFCM faculty. The questionnaire collected information on burnout, perceptions of work life, practice, and demographic information. The questionnaire content, development, survey promotion, and implementation have been described in detail elsewhere²³.

Outcome measure

We used the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)²⁵, a validated instrument for measuring burnout. It consists of 3 subscales: emotional exhaustion, a measure of feeling overextended by work; depersonalization, a measure of unfeeling and impersonal response toward care recipients; and personal accomplishment, a measure of feelings of efficacy and successful achievement in work. Each subscale (outcome) has specific cut-points (Table 1).

Statistical analysis

For the bivariate analyses, we dichotomized the three cut points for emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment into “high” versus “low + moderate”. We used chi-square tests to identify potential predictors of each outcome. We included statistically

significant variables from the bivariate analyses in multivariable logistic regression analyses to identify parsimonious sets of predictors for each of the outcomes. Variables that were highly correlated or alternative ways to measure the same construct were excluded from the regression models to avoid multicollinearity. We report adjusted odds ratios and corresponding 95% confidence intervals. Goodness-of-fit of the final logistic regression models was assessed using various statistical techniques including the rho-square statistic²⁶.

Research Ethics

Ethics approval for this study was obtained from the University of Toronto Research Ethics Board (UTREB #00026748).

RESULTS

Participant Characteristics

Respondents' mean age was 47 years (range 29-82 years); 52% were women; 87% were married or living with a partner; 72% identified as being from a white cultural background; and 76% were Canadian-born. Forty percent of participants reported working at their current site for ≤ 5 years, 30% for 6-15 years, and 30% for ≥ 16 years. Overall, faculty members worked on average 46 hours/week, with 88% having on-call duties.

Prevalence of Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment

Of the 687 respondents, 623 (90.7%) completed the MBI questions. Table 2 describes the percentage of respondents reporting low, moderate, and high levels on the three MBI subscales.

Bivariate Analysis

Bivariate analyses were conducted for two of the subscales, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. We did not analyze the personal accomplishment subscale due to lack of

variation in that outcome, as almost all respondents (99%) scored high on personal accomplishment, similar to other studies²⁷. Of the 27 statistically significant predictors of emotional exhaustion, 11 were faculty ratings of their local department, one was related to their main practice, two were leadership and mentorship experience variables, four were related to job satisfaction, six were related to health status variables, and three were related to demographic and practice variables (Table 3). Of the 18 statistically significant predictors of depersonalization, eight were faculty ratings of their local department, one was related to mentorship experience, four were related to job satisfaction, three were related to health status variables, and two were related to demographic and practice variables (Table 4).

Multivariable Analyses

The logistic regression model for emotional exhaustion identified lower ratings of job satisfaction, poorer ratings of workplace quality, working ≥ 50 hours per week, and poorer ratings of health status as predictors of emotional exhaustion (Table 5). The logistic regression model for depersonalization identified lower ratings of job satisfaction, shorter duration in practice, lower ratings of health status, and poorer ratings of mentorship received as predictors of depersonalization (Table 6).

DISCUSSION

Understanding the prevalence, predictors, and implications of burnout is vital for a profession that requires empathy and engagement, and especially so given its current state of crisis. Among academic family medicine faculty, the prevalence of high emotional exhaustion was 27% and high depersonalization was 9%, even with almost universal high personal accomplishment (99%).

A metaanalysis demonstrated immense variability in the prevalence of burnout (0%-80%), as well as variability for each of the MBI subscales (emotional exhaustion: 0-86.2%; depersonalization: 0-89.9%; and personal accomplishment: 0-87.1%) partly due to the inconsistent and unclear use of the term burnout^{27,10}. This complicates interpretation and comparisons across studies^{28,29,30}. In our study, the prevalence estimates of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization fall in the lower range of published studies, raising the possibility that these 2011, pre-pandemic, levels are indicative of “unavoidable” burnout inherent in physician work¹¹. The explosion in the burnout literature and the current health workforce crisis suggest that burnout prevalence is increasing over time, and that current levels of burnout pose a greater challenge to physicians. Even when adjusted for hours worked, studies illustrate increasing levels of physician burnout, and higher levels of burnout among physicians compared to the general population^{31,18}. Despite the wide variability in prevalence studies, all report burnout as a persistent issue impacting the physician workforce and potentially patient outcomes. Emphasizing the importance of a nuanced understanding of avoidable and unavoidable burnout predictors¹¹, a framework of avoidable and unavoidable burnout among family physicians further underpins the necessity for a detailed understanding of modifiable and unmodifiable predictors.

Predictors of Emotional Exhaustion

The four independent predictors of emotional exhaustion – lower ratings of job satisfaction, poorer ratings of workplace quality, working ≥ 50 hours/week, and poorer ratings of health status – are supported in the literature and could be used to inform system-level changes, program development, and workplace policies that mitigate avoidable burnout^{16,17,19,32}.

We found that low job satisfaction is a strong predictor for both emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Job satisfaction is a multidimensional construct that includes both unmodifiable factors (born in Canada) and modifiable factors²³. Numerous other studies have identified time pressures, chaos, lack of work control, poor career fit, and loss of meaning in work due to high administrative burden as contributors to lower ratings of job satisfaction, burnout, and intent to leave practice¹⁷. Based on our identified predictors, efforts aimed at improving overall job satisfaction by leveraging teamwork and mentorship opportunities would help address burnout.

Poor rating of workplace quality was also identified as a predictor of emotional exhaustion. Workplace quality is a composite variable based on ratings of the following three items: being a comfortable place to practice, being free from operational and bureaucratic difficulties; and being a fun and positive place to work. Those who did not rate their workplace highly were more likely to be emotionally exhausted. Programs such as the American Medical Association's Steps Forward Program to create "Joy in Medicine" provide a framework to address workplace quality by highlighting three crucial steps: culture change, addressing clinical inefficiencies, and initiatives to enhance health provider resilience^{33,34}. It is notable that we did not identify remuneration (either low or high) as a predictor of burnout in our multivariate analysis. Pay increases and financial incentives often appear to be the panacea for improving workplace quality. However, providing financial incentives alone without addressing workplace quality has been shown to contribute to depersonalized care and hamper practice³⁵. Intrinsic factors that support well-being include autonomy with respect to time spent in patient care, competence to exercise clinical judgement, relatedness to patients and the organization, and noted appreciation

for academic and administrative duties^{36,37}. In challenging fiscal times, leaders and organizations can leverage an understanding of workplace quality as a predictor to actively mitigate burnout.

The connection between quality of the workplace culture, values, leadership, and physician well-being is well documented in the literature^{38,39}.

Respondents who reported working ≥ 50 hours/week (excluding on-call) were more likely to have high emotional exhaustion than those working < 50 hours/week. Long work hours, high workload, and overnight call have been associated with burnout (8). Beyond hours worked, physicians who spent at least 20% of their time on tasks they found meaningful were at lower risk of burnout^{40,38}. Actively addressing modifiable predictors of emotional exhaustion including job satisfaction, workplace quality, hours spent at work, and meaningful work could mitigate avoidable burnout, and provide essential levers for leaders and institutions.

Our study also highlights poor health status as a predictor of both emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Specific health diagnoses associated with burnout are not identified in most studies, however the literature does describe an overlap between depression, psychiatric illness, and burnout^{19,29,41}. Stigma of disclosing illness, mental health conditions, and addictions continues to predominate in physician culture. Fear of loss of licensure prevents many physicians from seeking care for treatable health issues¹¹. Institutions could examine strategies, policies, and practices that reduce the stigma associated with reporting illness and incorporate workplace modifications for those affected. Strategies that delicately balance privacy and a fulsome understanding of health status as a burnout predictor may potentially provide workforce-sustaining improvements.

Predictors of Depersonalization:

The four independent predictors of depersonalization in our study were: lower ratings of job satisfaction (discussed previously), shorter duration (<5 years) in practice, lower ratings of health status (discussed previously), and poorer ratings of mentorship received. Early career family physicians are at risk for burnout because transition to independent practice is a time of additional stress⁴². A steep practice management learning curve, misalignment in career fit, adapting to new practice sites, and new family responsibilities are potential contributors. Given that academic departments are the context for training future family physicians, research with recent graduates is an important area for further study. Burnout among family physicians may dissuade trainees from entering the discipline or pursuing comprehensive family medicine after graduation⁴³.

Our findings suggest that improving the modifiable factors of job satisfaction, health status when possible, and mentorship received may help reduce depersonalization for all family physicians and perhaps more potently for new graduates. The impact of high-quality mentorship is documented in the literature^{24,44}. The College of Family Physicians of Canada has examined needs of Early Career Family Physicians (ECFPs) and identified gaps around mentorship related to practice management issues, lack of awareness among ECFPs on how to connect with a mentor, and issues with sustaining mentor capacity^{45,46}. Both national and provincial family medicine regulatory bodies have launched mentorship programs to address the needs of ECFPs to support this stage in the healthcare workforce⁴⁷. Reflection on these predictors could provide trainees, family physicians, leaders, and departments of family medicine opportunities to mitigate avoidable burnout and create optimum recovery initiatives to address unavoidable burnout.

Strengths and Limitations

The strengths of this research include the comprehensive questionnaire, the rigorous approach to survey design and implementation, the high response rate, and the sequential application of bivariate analysis followed by multivariable analysis. The limitation that it was conducted at a single academic department of family medicine may be diminished given the large number of participants in multiple diverse sites, suggesting that the findings may be generalizable to many family medicine settings. Another limitation relates to the age of these data, which reflect a snapshot in time and may not represent the current situation. However, these historical data provide important information for addressing burnout among Canadian family physicians, an issue that is important today. A final limitation is that cross-sectional studies, although informative about associations, generally cannot prove causation.

Conclusion

This study identified that 27% of academic family physicians self-reported high levels of emotional exhaustion and 9% reported high levels of depersonalization, despite 99% reporting high levels of personal accomplishment. Identifying independent predictors of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization point to practice- and systems-level interventions to mitigate these avoidable components of burnout. These data from 2011 provide relevant comparators for assessing the impact of subsequent healthcare system changes, including the COVID-19 pandemic, information and digital technology, and declining numbers of family physicians. Ongoing assessments of the prevalence of burnout and its correlates are warranted. Recent changes in medical practice including the rise of artificial intelligence, the evolution of electronic medical records, and changes in health teams and practice models support a longitudinal

examination of family physician burnout and the impact of these emergent factors. This study provides an opportunity to look back to plan forward.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' Contributions

VA contributed to the conception, interpretation, writing and editing of the manuscript. PK contributed to the conception, design, implementation, data analysis, interpretation, writing and editing of the manuscript. DW contributed to the conception, design, implementation, and interpretation of findings as well as critically revising the manuscript. CM contributed to the data analysis, and interpretation of findings as well as critically revising the manuscript. JK contributed to the conception, design, implementation, and interpretation of findings as well as critically revising the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Dr. Lynn Wilson, Professor and Past Chair of the Department of Family & Community Medicine for her support of the Departmental Academic Leadership Task Force and this research, as well as the Peer Support Writing Group at Womens College Hospital. No funding support was obtained for this project.

References:

1. Rick Glazier: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9873296/>
2. Bodenheimer & Pham <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2010.0026>
3. McKinlay & Marceau <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.06.034>,
4. Kiran T, Pham T *Healthy Debate*. 2023 [cited 2023 Apr 19]. Available from: <https://healthydebate.ca/2023/03/topic/millions-adults-lack-canada-primary-care/>,
5. CARMS match data, <https://www.carms.ca/news/2023-r-1-match-data-snapshot/2023> CaRMS Match Results | The College of Family Physicians of Canada (cfpc.ca)
6. Susan E. Schultz and Richard H. Glazier Identification of physicians providing comprehensive primary care in Ontario: a retrospective analysis using linked administrative data. December 19, 2017 5 (4) E856-E863; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9778/cmajo.20170083>
7. Grudniewicz, A., Randall, E., Lavergne, M.R. et al. Factors influencing practice choices of early-career family physicians in Canada: a qualitative interview study. *Hum Resour Health* 21, 84 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-023-00867-9>
8. Maslach C, Jackson SE, Leiter MP. *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual*, 3rd ed. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1996
9. Freudenberger HJ. Staff burnout. *J Soc Issues* 1974; 30:159–65.
10. Evangelia Demerouti, Arnold B. Bakker, Maria C.W. Peeters & Kimberley Breevaart "New Directions in Burnout Research" (2021) See <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1359432X.2021.1979962>
11. Card AJ. Physician Burnout: Resilience Training is Only Part of the Solution. *Ann Fam Med*. 2018 May;16(3):267-270. doi: 10.1370/afm.2223. PMID: 29760034; PMCID: PMC5951259.
12. Hodkinson et al., Associations of physician burnout with career engagement and quality of patient care. A systemic review *BMJ* 2022
13. Shanafelt T, Goh J, Sinsky C. The Business Case for Investing in Physician Well-being. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2017 Dec 1;177(12):1826-1832. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.4340. PMID: 28973070.
14. Bodenheimer T, Sinsky C. From triple to quadruple aim: care of the patient requires care of the provider. *Ann Fam Med*. 2014;12(6):573–6.
15. Grumbach K, Knox M, Huang B, Hammer H, Kivlahan C, Willard-Grace R. A Longitudinal Study of Trends in Burnout During Primary Care Transformation. *Ann Fam Med*. 2019 Aug 12;17(Suppl 1):S9-S16. doi: 10.1370/afm.2406. PMID: 31405871; PMCID: PMC6827663.
16. Sterling R, Rinne ST, Reddy A, Moldestad M, Kaboli P, Helfrich CD, et al. Identifying and Prioritizing Workplace Climate Predictors of Burnout Among VHA Primary Care Physicians. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2022 Jan;37(1):87–94
17. Del Carmen MG, Herman J, Rao S, Hidrue MK, Ting D, Lehrhoff SR, et al. Trends and Factors Associated With Physician Burnout at a Multispecialty Academic Faculty Practice Organization. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019 Mar 1;2(3):e190554.
18. Shanafelt TD, Hasan O, Dyrbye LN, Sinsky C, Satele D, Sloan J, West CP. Changes in Burnout and Satisfaction With Work-Life Balance in Physicians and the General US Working Population Between 2011 and 2014. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2015 Dec;90(12):1600-13. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2015.08.023. Erratum in: *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2016 Feb;91(2):276. PMID: 26653297.
19. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Shanafelt TD. Physician burnout: contributors, consequences and solutions. *J Intern Med*. 2018 Jun;283(6):516–29.

20. Eden AR, Jabbarpour Y, Morgan ZJ, Wilkinson E, Peterson LE. Burnout Among Family Physicians by Gender and Age. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2020 May-Jun;33(3):355-356. doi: 10.3122/jabfm.2020.03.190319. PMID: 32430366.
21. Pisaniello MS, Asahina AT, Bacchi S, *et al* Effect of medical student debt on mental health, academic performance and specialty choice: a systematic review *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e029980. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029980
22. White D, Krueger P, Meaney C, Antao V, Kim F, Kwong JC. Identifying potential academic leaders: Predictors of willingness to undertake leadership roles in an academic department of family medicine. *Can Fam Physician Med Fam Can*. 2016 Feb;62(2):e102-109.
23. Krueger P, White D, Meaney C, Kwong J, Antao V, Kim F. Predictors of job satisfaction among academic family medicine faculty: Findings from a faculty work-life and leadership survey. *Can Fam Physician Med Fam Can*. 2017 Mar 1;63:e177-85.
24. Stubbs B, Krueger P, White D, Meaney C, Kwong J, Antao V. Mentorship perceptions and experiences among academic family medicine faculty. *Can Fam Physician [Internet]*. 2016 Sep [cited 2024 Jan 30];62(9):e531-9. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5023363/>
25. Schaufeli WB, Leiter MP, Maslach C. Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Dev Int* 2009; 14: 204-20.
26. Quantitative Methods: Diagnostics Revisited - Neil Wrigley, 1984 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 12]. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/030913258400800404>
27. Rotenstein LS, Torre M, Ramos MA, Rosales RC, Guille C, Sen S, *et al*. Prevalence of Burnout Among Physicians: A Systematic Review. *JAMA*. 2018 Sep 18;320(11):1131-50.
28. Summers RF. The Elephant in the Room: What Burnout Is and What It Is Not. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2020 Oct 1;177(10):898-899. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.19090902. Epub 2020 Jul 14. PMID: 32660298.
29. Schwenk TL, Gold KJ. Physician Burnout-A Serious Symptom, But of What? *JAMA*. 2018 Sep 18;320(11):1109-10.
30. Eckleberry-Hunt, Jodie PhD, ABPP; Kirkpatrick, Heather PhD, ABPP, MSCP; Barbera, Thomas PhD. The Problems With Burnout Research. *Academic Medicine* 93(3):p 367-370, March 2018. | DOI: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000001890
31. Dyrbye LN, West CP, Satele D, Boone S, Tan L, Sloan J, Shanafelt TD. Burnout among U.S. medical students, residents, and early career physicians relative to the general U.S. population. *Acad Med*. 2014 Mar;89(3):443-51. doi: 10.1097/ACM.000000000000134. PMID: 24448053
32. Chênevert, D., Kilroy, S., Johnson, K. *et al*. The determinants of burnout and professional turnover intentions among Canadian physicians: application of the job demands-resources model. *BMC Health Serv Res* 21, 993 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06981-5>
33. Sinsky C, Shanafelt T, Murphy Mary Lou <https://edhub.ama-assn.org/steps-forward/module/2702510#:~:text=The%20AMA%E2%80%99s%20Joy%20in%20Medicine%E2%84%A2%20health%20system%20recognition,looking%20to%20reduce%20burnout%20and%20improve%20physician%20satisfaction.>
34. Du M, Tak HJ, Yoon JD. Association of Intrinsic Motivating Factors and Joy in Practice: A National Physician Survey. *South Med J*. 2021 Sep;114(9):583-590. doi: 10.14423/SMJ.0000000000001297. PMID: 34480191.
35. Ahmed K, Hashim S, Khankhara M, Said I, Shandakumar A, Zaman S, Veiga A. Achieving better quality care in general practice: are incentives the answer? *Br J Gen Pract*. 2020 Jun;70(suppl 1):bjgp20X711461. doi: 10.3399/bjgp20X711461. PMID: 32554670.
36. Hartzband P, Groopman J. Physician Burnout, Interrupted. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Jun 25;382(26):2485-7.

37. Friedberg MW, Chen PG, Van Busum KR, Aunon F, Pham C, Caloyeras J, Mattke S, Pitchforth E, Quigley DD, Brook RH, Crosson FJ, Tutty M. Factors Affecting Physician Professional Satisfaction and Their Implications for Patient Care, Health Systems, and Health Policy. *Rand Health Q.* 2014 Dec 1;3(4):1. PMID: 28083306; PMCID: PMC5051918.
38. Shanafelt TD, Noseworthy JH. Executive Leadership and Physician Well-being: Nine Organizational Strategies to Promote Engagement and Reduce Burnout. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2017 Jan;92(1):129–46
39. Shanafelt, Tait MD; Trockel, Mickey MD, PhD; Rodriguez, Ashleigh MSN, MMM, APRN; Logan, Dave PhD. Wellness-Centered Leadership: Equipping Health Care Leaders to Cultivate Physician Well-Being and Professional Fulfillment. *Academic Medicine* 96(5):p 641-651, May 2021. | DOI: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000003907
40. Shanafelt TD, West CP, Sloan JA, Novotny PJ, Poland GA, Menaker R, Rummans TA, Dyrbye LN. Career fit and burnout among academic faculty. *Arch Intern Med.* 2009 May 25;169(10):990-5. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2009.70. PMID: 19468093.
41. Bianchi R, Schonfeld IS, Laurent E. Burnout-depression overlap: a review. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2015 Mar;36:28–41.
42. Weidner AKH, Phillips RL Jr, Fang B, Peterson LE. Burnout and Scope of Practice in New Family Physicians. *Ann Fam Med.* 2018 May;16(3):200-205. doi: 10.1370/afm.2221. Erratum in: *Ann Fam Med.* 2018 Jul;16(4):289. PMID: 29760022; PMCID: PMC5951247.
43. Kabir M, Randall E, Mitra G, et al. Resident and early-career family physicians' focused practice choices in Canada: a qualitative study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2022;72:e334-
44. Walensky RP, Kim Y, Chang Y, Porneala BC, Bristol MN, Armstrong K, et al. The impact of active mentorship: results from a survey of faculty in the Department of Medicine at Massachusetts General Hospital. *BMC Med Educ.* 2018 May 11;18(1):108.
45. Hernandez-Lee J, and Pieroway A. Mentorship for early career family physicians. Is there a role for the First Five Years in Family Practice Committee and the CFPC? *Can Fam Physician* 2018 Nov;64(11): 861-862.
46. Walsh K, Passi K, Shaw N, Reed K, Newbery S. Starting out rural: a qualitative study of the experiences of family physician graduates transitioning to practice in rural Ontario. *Sep 2023, 11 (5) E948-E955*
47. Côté L, Deschênes D, Hudon É, Galarneau S, Bolduc G. Quebec College of Family Physicians' new formal mentorship program. *Can Fam Physician.* 2019 Nov;65(11):e481-e486.3.

Predictors of Burnout Among Academic Family Medicine Faculty: Looking Back to Plan forward

Viola Antao, Paul Krueger, Christopher Meaney, Jeffrey C. Kwong, David White

Dr. Antao is an Associate Professor and Program Director, Mentorship Lead, Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Dr. Krueger is an Associate Professor Emeritus, Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Mr. Meaney is a Biostatistician, Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Dr. Kwong is a Professor, Department of Family and Community Medicine and the Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Dr. White is a Professor Emeritus, Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, in Toronto, Ontario

Correspondence should be addressed to Dr. Viola Antao, 500 University Avenue, 5th Floor, Toronto, Ontario M5G 1V7 Canada; telephone [624-5902]; e-mail: viola.antao@gmail.com

Table 1: Cut points for determining low, moderate, and high emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

Likelihood of burnout	Scores		
	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonalization	Personal Accomplishment*
Low	0-16	0-8	39-56
Moderate	17-26	9-13	32-38
High	27-63	14-35	0-31

*Personal accomplishment is scored in the opposite direction to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization such that lower scores indicate less personal accomplishment and higher likelihood of burnout.

Table 2: Prevalence of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment scores among family medicine faculty (n=623).

Likelihood of burnout	Emotional Exhaustion N (%)	Depersonalization N (%)	Personal Accomplishment* N (%)
Low	267 (42.9)	427 (68.5)	619 (99.4)
Moderate	188 (30.2)	139 (22.3)	3 (0.5)
High	168 (27.0)	57 (9.2)	1 (0.2)

*Personal accomplishment is scored in the opposite direction such that the low score range denotes a high level of personal accomplishment

Table 3. Potential predictors of emotional exhaustion among family medicine faculty (n=623).

Potential Predictor Variables	Emotional Exhaustion (EE) ¹		P-value ²	Odds Ratio ³	95% CI
	High EE (n=168)	Low/Moderate EE (455)			
Faculty Ratings of Local Department⁴					
Rating of overall <i>support</i> for teaching, research, leadership, mentorship, and career (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	71 (36.0)	126 (64.0)	<0.001	1.91	(1.32, 2.76)
Very good/excellent	97 (22.8)	329 (77.2)		1.00	-
Rating of overall <i>recognition</i> of teaching, research, leadership, mentorship and career support (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	95 (34.2)	183 (65.8)	<0.001	1.93	(1.35, 2.77)
Very good/excellent	73 (21.2)	272 (78.8)		1.00	-
Rating of communication (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	88 (35.3)	161 (64.7)	<0.01	2.01	(1.40, 2.88)
Very good/excellent	80 (21.4)	294 (78.6)		1.00	-
Rating of leadership (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	53 (32.9)	108 (67.1)	0.048	1.48	(1.00, 2.19)
Very good/excellent	115 (24.9)	347 (75.1)		1.00	-
Rating of mission, vision and values (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	95 (35.1)	176 (64.9)	<0.001	2.06	(1.44, 2.95)
Very good/excellent	73 (20.7)	279 (79.3)		1.00	-
Rating of workload and practice (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	81 (39.1)	126 (60.9)	<0.001	2.43	(1.69, 3.50)
Very good/excellent	87 (20.9)	329 (79.1)		1.00	-
Rating of teamwork (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	84 (39.1)	131 (60.9)	<0.001	2.47	(1.72, 3.56)
Very good/excellent	84 (20.6)	324 (79.4)		1.00	-
Rating of physician involvement in programs and planning (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	98 (34.6)	185 (65.4)	<0.001	2.04	(1.43, 2.93)
Very good/excellent	70 (20.6)	270 (79.4)		1.00	-
Rating of resource distribution for clinical work, teaching and research (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	104 (32.5)	216 (67.5)	0.001	1.80	(1.25, 2.58)
Very good/excellent	64 (21.1)	239 (78.9)		1.00	-
Rating of remuneration (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	108 (37.9)	211 (66.1)		2.08	(1.44, 3.00)

Very good/excellent	60 (19.7)	244 (80.3)	<0.001	1.00	-
Rating of respect (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	81 (37.9)	133 (62.1)		2.25	(1.57, 3.24)
Very good/excellent	87 (21.3)	322 (78.7)	<0.001	1.00	-
Faculty Ratings of Main Practice Setting³					
Rating of main practice setting with regards to infrastructure support (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	39 (35.5)	71 (64.5)		1.64	(1.06, 2.54)
Very good/excellent	129 (25.1)	384 (74.9)	0.027	1.00	-
Leadership and Mentorship Experiences					
Rating of importance of barriers in taking on a leadership role (n=623):					
Somewhat/very important	93 (30.9)	208 (69.1)		1.47	(1.03, 2.10)
Not at all/not very/neutral	75 (23.3)	247 (76.7)	0.033	1.00	-
Rating of the overall quality of mentoring received (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	95 (35.2)	175 (64.8)		2.08	(1.45, 2.98)
Very good/excellent	73 (20.7)	280 (79.3)	<0.001	1.00	-
Job Satisfaction					
Rating of overall job satisfaction (n=623):					
Very dissatisfied to satisfied	146 (47.7)	160 (52.3)		12.24	(7.51, 19.93)
Very satisfied	22 (6.9)	295 (93.1)	<0.001	1.00	-
Rating of the quality of local department as a place to work (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	94 (42.2)	129 (57.8)		3.21	(2.23, 4.63)
Very good/excellent	74 (18.5)	326 (81.5)	<0.001	1.00	-
Rating of the likelihood to recommend local department as a place to work (n=623):					
Other response	108 (39.6)	165 (60.4)		3.16	(2.19, 4.58)
Very likely	60 (17.1)	290 (82.9)	<0.001	1.00	-
Rating of the likelihood to leave local department in the next 5 years (n=623):					
Somewhat/very likely	57 (44.5)	71 (55.5)		2.78	(1.85, 4.17)
Other response	111 (22.4)	384 (77.6)	<0.001	1.00	-
Health Status Variables					
Self rated health status (n=623):					
Poor/fair/good	43 (47.8)	47 (52.2)		2.98	(1.88, 4.72)
Very good/excellent	125 (23.5)	407 (76.5)	<0.001	1.00	-
Number of days <i>physical health</i> was not good in the last month (n=622):					

1 to 30 days 0 days	88 (33.3) 80 (22.3)	176 (66.7) 278 (77.7)	0.002	1.74 1.00	(1.22, 2.48) -
Number of days <i>mental health</i> was not good in the last month (n=622): 1 to 30 days 0 days	134 (38.3) 34 (12.5)	216 (61.7) 238 (87.5)	<0.001	4.34 1.00	(2.86, 6.60) -
Number of days poor physical or mental health prevented doing usual activities (n=622): 1 to 30 days 0 days	70 (40.2) 98 (21.9)	104 (59.8) 350 (35.4)	<0.001	2.40 1.00	(1.65, 3.50) -
Self rated stress at <i>work</i> in the past year (n=622): Extremely/quite stressful Other	84 (64.6) 84 (17.1)	46 (35.4) 408 (82.9)	<0.001	8.85 1.00	(5.78, 13.70) -
Self rated stress <i>in life</i> in the past year (n=622): Extremely/quite stressful Other	74 (66.1) 94 (18.4)	38 (33.9) 416 (81.6)	<0.001	8.62 1.00	(5.49, 13.51) -
Demographic and Practice Variables					
Rating of the stress related to on-call responsibilities: (n=539): Extremely/very stressful Other	36 (43.9) 118 (25.8)	46 (56.4) 339 (74.2)	<0.001	2.25 1.00	(1.39, 3.65) -
Number of hours worked per week, excluding on-call (n=622): 50 or more hours Less than 50 hours	52 (38.8) 116 (23.8)	82 (61.2) 372 (76.2)	<0.001	2.03 1.00	(1.36, 3.05) -
Faculty member marital status (n=616): Other Married/living with partner	29 (36.3) 138 (25.7)	51 (63.7) 398 (74.3)	0.049	1.64 1.00	(1.00, 2.69) -

¹Emotional exhaustion is a 9-item subscale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory designed to measure feelings of being overextended and exhausted by work.

²Using χ^2 test

³Unadjusted odds ratios for categorical variables represent comparisons with the referent group (odds ratio=1.00). An odds ratio greater than 1.00 indicates increased likelihood of high emotional exhaustion. For example, those working 50 or more hours per week were 2.03 times more likely to have high emotional exhaustion than those working less than 50 hours per week.

⁴Location of primary local department affiliation

⁵Location of main practice setting.

Table 4. Potential predictors of depersonalization among family medicine faculty (n=623).

Potential Predictor Variables	Depersonalization ¹		P-value ²	Odds Ratio ³	95% CI
	High (n=57)	Low/Moderate (n=566)			
Faculty Ratings of Local Department⁴					
Rating of overall <i>support</i> for teaching, research, leadership, mentorship, and career (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	26 (13.2)	171 (86.8)	0.017	1.94	(1.12, 3.36)
Very good/excellent	31 (7.3)	395 (92.7)		1.00	-
Rating of communication (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	31 (12.4)	218 (87.6)	0.020	1.90	(1.10, 3.29)
Very good/excellent	26 (7.0)	348 (93.0)		1.00	-
Rating of workload and practice (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	27 (13.0)	180 (87.0)	0.017	1.93	(1.11, 3.34)
Very good/excellent	30 (7.2)	386 (92.8)		1.00	-
Rating of teamwork (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	28 (13.0)	187 (87.0)	0.015	1.96	(1.13, 3.39)
Very good/excellent	29 (7.1)	379 (92.9)		1.00	-
Rating of physician involvement in programs and planning (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	34 (12.0)	249 (88.0)	0.024	1.88	(1.08, 3.28)
Very good/excellent	23 (6.8)	317 (93.2)		1.00	-
Rating of resource distribution for clinical work, teaching and research (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	38 (11.9)	282 (88.1)	0.015	2.01	(1.13, 3.58)
Very good/excellent	19 (6.3)	284 (93.7)		1.00	-
Rating of remuneration (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	37 (11.6)	282 (88.4)	0.030	1.86	(1.06, 3.29)
Very good/excellent	20 (6.6)	284 (93.4)		1.00	-
Rating of respect (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	27 (12.6)	187 (87.4)	0.030	1.82	(1.05, 3.16)
Very good/excellent	30 (7.3)	379 (92.7)		1.00	-
Leadership and Mentorship Experiences					
Rating of the overall quality of mentoring received (n=623):					
Good/fair/poor	33 (12.2)	237 (87.8)	0.020	1.91	(1.10, 3.31)
Very good/excellent	24 (6.8)	329 (93.2)		1.00	-
Job Satisfaction					
Rating of overall job satisfaction					

(n=623): Very dissatisfied to satisfied Very satisfied	47 (15.4) 10 (3.2)	259 (84.6) 307 (96.8)	<0.001	5.59 1.00	(2.76, 11.24) -
Rating of the quality of local department as a place to work (n=623): Good/fair/poor Very good/excellent	28 (12.6) 29 (7.2)	195 (87.4) 371 (92.8)	0.028	1.84 1.00	(1.06, 3.18) -
Rating of the likelihood to recommend local department as a place to work (n=623): Other response Very likely	40 (14.7) 17 (4.9)	233 (85.3) 333 (95.1)	<0.001	3.36 1.00	(1.86, 6.08) -
Rating of the likelihood to leave local department in the next 5 years (n=623): Somewhat/very likely Other response	21 (16.4) 36 (7.3)	107 (83.6) 459 (92.7)	0.001	2.50 1.00	(1.40, 4.46) -
Health Status Variables					
Self rated health status (n=623): Poor/fair/good Very good/excellent	18 (20.0) 39 (7.3)	72 (80.0) 493 (92.7)	<0.001	3.16 1.00	(1.72, 5.82) -
Self rated stress at <i>work</i> in the past year (n=622): Extremely/quite stressful Other	32 (24.6) 25 (5.1)	98 (75.4) 467 (94.9)	<0.001	6.10 1.00	(3.46, 10.75) -
Self rated stress <i>in life</i> in the past year (n=622): Extremely/quite stressful Other	21 (18.3) 34 (6.9)	94 (81.7) 456 (93.1)	<0.001	2.99 1.00	(1.66, 5.41) -
Demographic and Practice Variables					
Length of time licensed for independent practice (n=605): 5 years or less 6 or more years	21 (18.3) 34 (6.9)	94 (81.7) 456 (93.1)	<0.001	3.00 1.00	(1.67, 5.39) -
Faculty member's age (n=604): Less than 50 years of age 50 years of age or older	43 (11.7) 13 (5.5)	323 (88.3) 225 (94.5)	0.009	2.30 1.00	(1.21, 4.38) -

¹Depersonalization is a 5-item subscale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory that measures unfeeling and impersonal response toward recipients of instruction or care.

²Using χ^2 test

³Unadjusted odds ratios for categorical variables represent comparisons with the referent group (odds ratio=1.00). An odds ratio greater than 1.00 indicates increased likelihood of high depersonalization. For example, those who were in practice for 5 years or less were 3.00 times more likely to have high depersonalization than those who were in practice for 6 or more years.

⁴Location of primary local department affiliation

Table 5. Logistic regression of the most important predictors of emotional exhaustion among family medicine faculty (n=622¹).

Predictors of Emotional Exhaustion	Adjusted Odds Ratio ²	95% Confidence Interval
Rating of overall job satisfaction:		
Very dissatisfied to satisfied	10.21	(6.19, 16.83)
Very satisfied	1.00	-
Rating of the quality of local department as a place to work: ³		
Good/fair/poor	2.14	(1.41, 3.24)
Very good/excellent	1.00	-
Number of hours worked per week, excluding on-call:		
50 or more hours	1.93	(1.20, 3.10)
Less than 50 hours	1.00	-
Self-rated health status:		
Poor/fair/good	1.88	(1.10, 3.19)
Very good/excellent	1.00	-

Final Logistic Regression Model Statistics:

Rho-square = .26 (pseudo R², values between 0.2 and 0.4 suggest a very good model fit)

Cox & Snell R-square = .241; Nagelkerke R-square = .350 (i.e., between 24.1% and 35.0% of variance is explained by this model)

Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness-of-Fit test = 0.295 (values greater than 0.25 indicate good fit)

78.0% correctly classified

¹1 of the 623 participants had missing values for one of the variables included in the final model.

²Odds ratios for categorical variables represent comparisons with the referent group (OR=1.00) after adjustment for all other variables in the model. An odds ratio greater than one indicates increased likelihood for high emotional exhaustion. For example, those who worked 50 or more hours per week were 1.93 times more likely to have high emotional exhaustion than those who worked less than 50 hours per week, after adjusting for all other variables in the model.

³This was a composite variable that asked faculty members to rate the quality of their local department from poor to excellent on the following 3 items: as a place to practice medicine; as a comfortable place to practice, free from operational and bureaucratic difficulties; and as a fun and positive place to work. Given that each of these 3 items were conceptually highly correlated and when tested were found to have high internal consistency, a “quality of local department” construct was created by dichotomizing the mean (from all 3 questions) into ratings of less than 4 (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good) and 4 or more (4=very good, 5=excellent) to come up with an overall rating for the construct (a dichotomized rating for the construct “quality of local department” that represented either very good/excellent or good/fair/poor).

Table 6. Logistic regression of the most important predictors of depersonalization among family medicine faculty (n=605¹).

Predictors of Depersonalization	Adjusted Odds Ratio ²	95% Confidence Interval
Rating of overall job satisfaction		
Very dissatisfied to satisfied	4.71	(2.22, 9.99)
Very satisfied	1.00	-
Length of time licensed for independent practice:		
5 years or less	3.91	(2.03, 7.51)
6 or more years	1.00	-
Self-rated health status:		
Poor/fair/good	2.98	(1.53, 5.88)
Very good/excellent	1.00	-
Rating of the overall quality of mentoring received ³ :		
Good/fair/poor	1.92	(1.04, 3.56)
Very good/excellent	1.00	-

Final Logistic Regression Model Statistics:

Rho-square = .15 (pseudo R², values between 0.2 and 0.4 suggest a very good model fit)

Cox & Snell R-square = .088; Nagelkerke R-square = .193 (i.e., between 8.8% and 19.3% of variance is explained by this model)

Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness-of-Fit test = 0.715 (values greater than 0.25 indicate good fit)

91.1% correctly classified

¹18 of the 623 (2.9%) participants had missing values for length of time licensed for independent practice so final model sample size was 605.

²Odds ratios for categorical variables represent comparisons with the referent group (OR=1.00) after adjustment for all other variables in the model. An odds ratio greater than one indicates an increased likelihood for high depersonalization. For example, those who were in independent practice for 5 years or less were 3.91 times more likely to have high depersonalization than those in independent practice for 6 or more years, after adjusting for all other variables in the model.

³This was a composite variable that asked faculty members to rate the overall quality of the mentoring received in the following 6 areas: overall career; clinical; teaching, leadership; research, and work life balance. Given that each of these 6 items were conceptually highly correlated and when tested were found to have high internal consistency, an “overall quality of mentoring received” construct was created by dichotomizing the mean (from all 3 questions) into ratings of less than 4 (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good) and 4 or more (4=very good, 5=excellent) to come up with an overall rating for the construct (a dichotomized rating for the construct “overall quality of mentoring received” that represented either very good/excellent or good/fair/poor.

