

Adapting the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) Instrument for Elementary School Teachers Working with Gifted Students

Gretta Ludwina, Fitriani Yustikasari Lubis

Professional Psychology Master Study Program, Faculty of Psychology, Padjadjaran University, Bandung

Abstract. The burnout phenomenon is prevalent in the teaching profession, and it significantly impacts teachers' ability to cater to the unique needs of gifted students. Such burnout led to undesirable consequences for both teachers and students alike. A reliable instrument capable of measuring teachers' burnout concerning gifted students' education is necessary. The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) is a suitable instrument for measuring burnout. It specifically focuses on pure exhaustion rather than considering burnout as a syndrome. However, this instrument has not yet been adapted to the Indonesian language. This study aimed to validate and determine the reliability of the Indonesian adaptation of the CBI. Content Validity Index (CVI) was utilized to assess the instrument's validity, while Classical Test Theory (CTT) was employed to evaluate the reliability. A total of 76 elementary school teachers with experience in teaching gifted students were included in the research. The results showed that the adaptation of the instrument was valid and effectively measured relevant constructs related to burnout. The instrument exhibited a very high level of reliability, indicating strong dependability. Subsequent discussions should explore suggested adjustments for this adaptation, drawing insights from CTT findings.

Keywords: burnout, Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, elementary school teachers, gifted students, instrument adaptation

Adaptasi Alat Ukur Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) untuk Guru SD yang Bekerja dengan Siswa Berbakat

Abstrak. Profesi guru merupakan profesi yang rawan akan *burnout*. Dalam pendidikan siswa berbakat, *burnout* dapat menghambat guru untuk memenuhi kebutuhan siswa-siswa tersebut. *Burnout* pada guru juga dapat menimbulkan berbagai dampak negatif lainnya, baik terhadap guru maupun siswa. Oleh karena itu, dibutuhkan sebuah alat ukur yang dapat mengukur *burnout* guru dalam kaitannya dengan pengajaran siswa berbakat. Salah satu alat ukur yang dapat mengukur *burnout* adalah Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI). Tidak seperti alat ukur *burnout* lainnya, CBI memandang *burnout* sebagai suatu bentuk kelelahan, dan bukan sebagai sebuah sindrom. Akan tetapi, alat ukur ini belum diadaptasi ke dalam Bahasa Indonesia dan disesuaikan dengan konteks. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengevaluasi validitas dan reliabilitas alat ukur CBI dalam Bahasa Indonesia. Validitas konten alat ukur dievaluasi dengan menggunakan Content Validity Index (CVI). Classical Test Theory (CTT) digunakan untuk mengevaluasi reliabilitas alat ukur. Partisipan dalam penelitian ini adalah guru Sekolah Dasar (SD) yang pernah atau sedang mengajar siswa berbakat ($n = 76$). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa hasil adaptasi ini valid dan mengukur konstruk yang relevan. Hasil adaptasi ini juga menunjukkan nilai reliabilitas yang sangat tinggi, yang berarti pengukuran dengan adaptasi alat ukur ini sangat dapat diandalkan. Saran modifikasi alat ukur berdasarkan hasil uji CTT akan dijelaskan dalam penelitian ini.

Kata Kunci: adaptasi alat ukur, burnout, Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, guru SD, siswa berbakat

Correspondence: Gretta Ludwina. Email: gretta16001@mail.unpad.ac.id

Gifted students are individuals who show superior performance in specific fields compared to other peers (Worrell et al, 2019). The exceptional intellectual abilities contribute to a higher likelihood of achieving greater accomplishments (Rohali & Wahab, 2019). In Indonesia, such students are also referred to as special intelligent and gifted (*cerdas istimewa bakat istimewa/CIBI*) students (Srikandi, 2015). CIBI students exhibit diverse abilities, interests, perseverance, and a strong enthusiasm for their work (Nurfadhilah et al, 2022). They not only possess high academic abilities but also excel in attitude and personality traits (Munawaroh et al., 2015). The distinct characteristics of gifted students naturally lead to different learning needs. Studies indicated that they generally preferred innovative teaching methods over standardized learning systems (Stoltz et al., 2015). The existing education system needs to consider these unique needs (Hodges et al., 2018). Various factors contribute to the special requirements, such as above-average intelligence, high reasoning productivity, a strong sense of responsibility, and a determined drive to achieve success (Chairiah et al, 2020).

Fulfilling the needs of gifted students is paramount because neglecting the pupil leads to apathy, laziness, or underachievement, particularly when the provided teaching lacks challenge (Astuti et al, 2022; Nurfadhilah et al, 2022). Teachers play a crucial and irreplaceable role in identifying and educating gifted students

(Altintas & Ilgun, 2016). In reality, most gifted students are placed in regular classes alongside students with diverse abilities (Benny & Blonder, 2016; Gomez-Arizaga et al., 2020; Hornstra et al, 2020; Laine & Tirri, 2016; Mhlolo, 2017; Pomortseva, 2014; Yuen et al, 2018). In other words, to meet the needs of gifted students, teachers face the challenge of employing different teaching methods within the regular classroom setting. Cao et al. (2017) highlighted the importance of providing appropriate teaching programs and methods for gifted students, while Callahan et al. (2015) emphasized the necessity of suitable instructional techniques for their education. One such effective method is differentiation, which requires teachers to consider the diverse needs, interests, and abilities of their students (Laine & Tirri, 2016). For teachers to effectively implement differentiation, having a strong motivation to teach is paramount (De Corte, 2013).

Teachers should maintain a strong motivation to implement differentiation and provide teaching methods that cater to the needs of gifted students. The teaching profession faces a significant challenge known as burnout (Pyhältö et al., 2021), which is a prevalent problem worldwide and a subject of extensive study (García-Carmona et al, 2019; Park & Shin, 2020; Rumschlag, 2017). Burnout has been found to have a negative correlation with teacher motivation (Caruso, 2019; Roohani & Dayeri, 2019; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2020).

Teachers experience low teaching motivation due to the likelihood of facing high burnout, which hinders the successful use of differentiation to meet the learning needs of gifted students.

Burnout is a state of physical and psychological exhaustion experienced by individuals (Kristensen et al, 2005). Teaching, being an interactive and highly stressful profession, makes teachers susceptible to burnout (Fahmi et al, 2019; Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2015). Apart from the aforementioned needs, burnout in teachers has other negative impacts on their mental health (Schonfeld & Bianchi, 2016; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2020), self-efficacy (Saloviita & Pakarinen, 2021), self-regulation (Ghanizadeh & Ghonsooly, 2014), motivation (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2020), and commitment (Akdemir, 2019), leading to absenteeism (Kipps-Vaughan, 2013). It increases teacher's intention to exit the profession (Buchanan et al, 2013; Rajendran et al, 2020; Shackleton et al, 2019; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017), potentially reducing the number of teachers meeting students' needs in the future. For students, burnout in teachers negatively impacts their achievement (Herman et al, 2018; Klusmann et al, 2016; Madigan & Kim, 2021; Ronfeldt et al, 2013), motivation (Madigan & Kim, 2021; Shen et al, 2015), and adaptation (Hoglund et al, 2015; Oberle & Schonert-Reichl, 2016). In summary, burnout in teachers has various negative consequences that deserve attention as it significantly affects

the teaching and learning process, including towards gifted students.

Currently, there is a lack of descriptive data on burnout among teachers coaching gifted students in Indonesia. To address this, an instrument capable of measuring burnout among teachers is needed. The most commonly used instrument for investigating burnout is the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Campos et al, 2013), which measures burnout as a construct consisting of emotional exhaustion and cynicism, typically prevalent in professions dealing with others. Kristensen et al. (2005) argued that burnout is not limited to certain professions but affects anyone, regardless of their job's involvement with others. According to Kristensen et al. (2005), the main essence of burnout is the feeling of exhaustion and fatigue, which led to the development of a new instrument called the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI).

The CBI comprises three scales, namely personal, work-related, and client-related burnout. Personal burnout measures the extent of physical and psychological exhaustion experienced by individuals. Work-related burnout assesses the level of fatigue related to individuals' jobs, while client-related gauges the degree of lethargy and mental exhaustion related to their interaction with clients. In the context of this study, the term "clients" is replaced with "gifted students."

Given the differences in burnout definitions, this study is interested in using the

CBI instrument to gather data related to burnout among teachers coaching gifted students in Indonesia. Unlike MBI, there is currently no existing adaptation of the CBI in the Indonesian language. Language is a crucial aspect of any instrument, as it influences readability and comprehension (Azwar, 2015). Therefore, to the aforementioned needs, it is essential to adapt the CBI to the Indonesian language. The adaptation process aligns with the Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests issued by the International Test Commission (ITC) (2018), encompassing several stages, such as pre-condition, test conceptualization, forward and backward translation, synthesis, expert judgment, cognitive interview, and instrument administration.

The focus of the instrument adaptation is to measure burnout, particularly among elementary school teachers working with gifted students, and to facilitate the education process for geniuses in the future. This study aims to evaluate the validity and reliability of the CBI to ensure a robust adaptation process.

Method

Participants

The participants of this study were 76 elementary school teachers with experience in teaching or currently having gifted students in their classes. The number of participants met the minimum requirement of 50 individuals set by Sapnas and Zeller (2002) for evaluating the psychometric components of a social construct

measurement. Among them, there were 17 males representing 22.4% and 59 females measuring 77.6%. The majority resided in West Java Province having a 75% population, while the remaining 25% were from various locations, including Jakarta, Lampung, Makassar, Magelang, Tangerang, Surabaya, and West Kalimantan. The participant's ages ranged from 23 to 59 years, with varying percentages in different groups. The age groups are below 30, between 30 and 39, 40 and 49, and above 50 years representing 35.5%, 27.6%, 25.0%, and 11.8% respectively. The majority representing 88.16% had less than 20 years of teaching experience, with 48.68% having less than 10, 39.47% having 10 to 19 years, 7.89% having 20 to 29 years, and 3.95% having 30 years or more. This study employed a convenience sampling technique that selects easily accessible samples (convenient) (Kempf-Leonard, 2005). Data collection was carried out by distributing a questionnaire in the form of a Google form through various social media platforms, such as Instagram, WhatsApp, Facebook, and LINE. Before participating in the study, participants provided their informed consent.

Measurement

The instrument used was the Indonesian adaptation of CBI, originally designed by Kristensen et al (2005). The instrument consisted of three scales, namely personal (6 items), work-related (7 items), and client-related burnout (6 items). The adapted questionnaire was presented in a Likert scale format with response options

ranging from 1 to 5. The response options used were translations of the options found in the original instrument. Two types of response options were employed, depending on the nature of the statements. The first type included “never/ almost never,” “rarely,” “sometimes,” “often,” and “always.” Meanwhile, the second type is comprised of “at a very low level,” “at a low level,” “at a moderate level,” “at a high level,” and “at a very high level.”

Study procedure

The CBI developed by Kristensen et al. (2005) underwent adaptation following the ITC Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests (ITC, 2018). The stages involved were preparation, translation, expert review, cognitive interview, and data collection.

In the preparation or pre-conditioning stage, a literature study on the burnout construct was conducted, and permission was obtained from Kristensen to adapt the CBI. After securing permission, the adaptation process proceeded to the translation.

Translation involved forward, synthesis, and backwards, with the participation of four translators. The forward translation was performed by a psychology graduate and a professional psychology master’s student, both of whom had a minimum TOEFL score of 500 and were experienced in instrument translation. The results were synthesized into a single version of the instrument, which underwent the backward translation process.

During the synthesis, four professional psychology master’s students reviewed the instrument. The backward process was performed by two psychology graduates with a minimum TOEFL score of 500, also experienced in instrument translation. A peer review was conducted with four professional psychology master’s students to discuss and select the most appropriate final items that accurately reflected the measured construct. All translation documents were exchanged through email.

The adaptation process then proceeded to the third stage, which aimed to establish content validity through expert judgment. Three psychologists specializing in educational psychology participated in this stage. The expert judgment format was sent through email, and each independently filled it out. The results were processed using the Content Validity Index (CVI) to provide evidence.

In the fourth stage, cognitive interviews were conducted to assess the understandability of the items in the instrument. Two participants who had completed the trial questionnaires were contacted again through social media for the cognitive interview. The questions asked during the interview focused on whether the statements in the questionnaire were easy to comprehend, whether there were any ambiguous or repetitive sentences and any suggestions for improvement. The cognitive interview results concluded that the questionnaire statements were perceived as

easy to understand, straightforward, and did not lead to multiple interpretations.

The fifth stage involved data collection with 76 participants meeting the specific criteria, including elementary school teachers currently teaching academically gifted students. The data collection process utilized a Google form containing information about the study's purpose, voluntary participation, and data confidentiality. Participants had the option to decline participation by pressing the "Not willing" button on the Google form. After indicating willingness by clicking the "Willing" button, participants were requested to provide identity information and complete the CBI questionnaire, which underwent translation and revisions based on peer review and expert judgment feedback. The data collection occurred over approximately one month, from November 10, 2021, to December 12, 2021.

Data analysis method

Validity test

In quantitative studies, validity referred to the accuracy with which an instrument measures the intended construct (Mohajan, 2017). Content validity assessed the appropriateness of the items in representing the components or how well they align with the measured construct (Azwar, 2015). To establish content validity, this study used expert judgment, a method involving seeking opinions from experts to make decisions about an instrument (Benini et al, 2017). The results were

evaluated using the Content Validity Index (CVI) (Rubio et al, 2003). The CVI value was obtained by dividing the total number of experts involved in the judgment process. Davis (1992) recommended a minimum CVI value of .80 for a new measurement scale.

Reliability test

This study assessed reliability using the CTT by measuring internal consistency through Cronbach's alpha. Guilford (1956) criteria were employed to evaluate the reliability of the data. The alpha coefficient was employed for this evaluation, with values ranging between -1.00 and .20, .20 to .40, .41 to .60, .61 to .80, and .81 to 1.00, all indicating very low, minimal, moderate, high, and extreme reliability, respectively. The corrected item-total correlation was calculated based on the CTT model to further assess the discriminating power. Azwar (2016) suggested that a minimum corrected item-total correlation of 0.30 indicated satisfactory discriminating power for an item. All analyses in this stage were conducted using SPSS version 21 for Windows.

Results

The Indonesian version of the CBI was tested on elementary school teachers teaching gifted students. The instrument was previously translated from English to Indonesian by four individuals with a background in psychology, possessing a minimum TOEFL score of 500, and experienced in instrument adaptation and translation. The translation results are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Forward-Backward Translation

	Original Items		Forward Translation		Personal Burnout	Backward Translation		Final Items
	Forward 1	Forward 2	Forward 1	Forward 2		Backward 1	Backward 2	
1	How often do you feel tired?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lelah?</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lelah?</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lelah?</i>	How often do you feel tired?	How often do you feel tired?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lelah?</i>	
2	How often are you physically exhausted?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lelah secara fisik?</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lelah secara fisik?</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lelah secara fisik?</i>	How often do you feel physically exhausted?	How often do you feel tired physically?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lelah secara fisik?</i>	
3	How often are you emotionally exhausted?	<i>Anda merasa lelah secara emosional?</i>	<i>Anda merasa lelah secara emosional?</i>	<i>Anda merasa lelah secara emosional?</i>	How often do you feel emotionally exhausted?	How often do you feel tired emotionally?	<i>Anda merasa lelah secara emosional?</i>	
4	How often do you think: "I can't take it any more"?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda berpikir: "Saya sudah tidak sanggup lagi?"</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda berpikir: "Saya sudah tidak sanggup lagi?"</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda berpikir: "Saya sudah tidak sanggup lagi?"</i>	How often do you think: "I cannot take it anymore"?	How often do you think: "I cannot take it anymore"?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda berpikir: "Saya sudah tidak sanggup lagi?"</i>	
5	How often do you feel worn out?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lusuh?</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lusuh?</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa tidak bertenaga?</i>	How often do you feel powerless?	How often do you feel powerless?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa sangat lelah?</i>	
6	How often do you feel weak and susceptible to illness?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lemah dan rentan terhadap penyakit?</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lemah dan rentan terhadap penyakit?</i>	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lemah dan rentan terhadap penyakit?</i>	How often do you feel weak and vulnerable to illness?	How often do you feel weak and at risk of getting infected by a disease?	<i>Seberapa sering Anda merasa lemah dan rentan terhadap penyakit?</i>	
Work-related Burnout								
7	Do you feel worn out at the end of the working day?	<i>Apakah Anda merasa lelah di penghujung hari kerja?</i>	<i>Apakah Anda merasa lusuh di akhir hari kerja?</i>	<i>Apakah Anda merasa tidak bertenaga di akhir hari kerja?</i>	Do you feel powerless at the end of the working day?	Do you feel powerless at the end of the work day?	<i>Apakah Anda merasa sangat lelah di penghujung hari kerja?</i>	
8	Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?	<i>Apakah Anda lelah di pagi hari karena memikirkan hari lain saat bekerja?</i>	<i>Apakah Anda merasa lelah di pagi hari karena memikirkan hari ini harus bekerja kembali?</i>	<i>Apakah Anda merasa lelah di pagi hari karena memikirkan harus bekerja kembali di lain hari?</i>	Do you feel tired in the morning at the thought of having another day to go back to work?	Do you feel tired in the morning thinking of having to go back to work another day?	<i>Apakah Anda merasa lelah di pagi hari karena memikirkan harus bekerja kembali di lain hari?</i>	
9	Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you?	<i>Apakah Anda merasa setiap jam kerja melelahkan bagi anda?</i>	<i>Apakah Anda merasa bahwa setiap jam kerja melelahkan bagi anda?</i>	<i>Apakah Anda merasa bahwa setiap jam kerja melelahkan bagi anda?</i>	Do you feel that every working hour is exhausting for you?	Do you feel that every hour of work is exhausting for you?	<i>Apakah Anda merasa bahwa setiap jam kerja melelahkan bagi Anda?</i>	

Original Items	Forward Translation		Forward Synthesis Items	Backward Translation		Final Items
	Forward 1	Forward 2		Backward 1	Backward 2	
10	Do you have enough energy for family and friends during your leisure time?	Apakah Anda memiliki energi yang cukup untuk keluarga dan teman di waktu senggang?	Apakah Anda memiliki energi yang cukup untuk keluarga dan teman-teman di waktu senggang Anda?	Do you have enough energy for your family and friends during your leisure time?	Do you have enough energy for your family and friends in your free time?	Apakah Anda memiliki energi yang cukup untuk keluarga dan teman di waktu senggang Anda?
11	Is your work emotionally exhausting?	Apakah pekerjaan Anda melelahkan secara emosional?	Apakah pekerjaan Anda melelahkan secara emosional?	Is your work emotionally exhausting?	Is your job emotionally exhausting?	Apakah pekerjaan Anda melelahkan secara emosional?
12	Does your work frustrate you?	Apakah pekerjaan Anda membuat Anda frustrasi?	Apakah pekerjaan Anda membuat Anda frustrasi?	Does your work frustrate you?	Is your job frustrating you?	Apakah pekerjaan Anda membuat Anda frustrasi?
13	Do you feel burnt out because of your work?	Apakah Anda merasa lelah karena pekerjaan Anda?	Apakah Anda merasa sangat lelah karena pekerjaan Anda?	Do you feel very tired because of your work?	Do you feel very tired because of your work?	Apakah Anda merasa sangat lelah karena pekerjaan Anda?
Client-related Burnout						
14	Do you find it hard to work with gifted students?	Apakah Anda merasa sulit untuk bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?	Apakah Anda merasa kesulitan untuk mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan murid berbakat?	Do you find it difficult to teach or work with gifted students?	Do you find it difficult to teach or work with gifted students?	Apakah Anda merasa kesulitan untuk mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?
15	Does it drain your energy to work with gifted students?	Apakah energi Anda terkuras untuk bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?	Apakah mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan murid berbakat menguras energi Anda?	Does teaching or working with gifted students drain your energy?	Does teaching or working with gifted students drain your energy?	Apakah mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan siswa berbakat menguras energi Anda?
16	Do you find it frustrating to work with gifted students?	Apakah Anda merasa frustrasi bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?	Apakah Anda merasa frustrasi dengan mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan murid berbakat?	Do you feel frustrated with teaching or working with gifted students?	Do you feel frustrated teaching or working with gifted students?	Apakah Anda merasa frustrasi dengan mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?

Original Items	Forward Translation		Forward Synthesis Items	Backward Translation		Final Items
	Forward 1	Forward 2		Backward 1	Backward 2	
17 Do you feel that you give more than you get back when you work with gifted students?	Apakah Anda merasa bahwa Anda memberi lebih dari yang Anda dapatkan ketika Anda bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?	Apakah Anda merasa bahwa lebih memberi dibandingkan menerima ketika Anda mengajar atau bekerja dengan murid berbakat?	Apakah Anda merasa bahwa Anda memberi lebih dari yang Anda dapatkan atau bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?	Do you feel that you give more than you get when you teach or work with gifted students?	Do you feel that you give more than you received by teaching gifted students?	Apakah Anda merasa lebih banyak memberi daripada menerima ketika Anda bekerja dengan/mengajarakan siswa berbakat?
18 Are you tired of working with gifted students?	Apakah Anda lelah bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?	Apakah Anda lelah mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan murid berbakat?	Apakah Anda lelah mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?	Are you tired of teaching or working with gifted students?	Do you feel tired of teaching or working with gifted students?	Apakah Anda mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?
19 Do you sometimes wonder how long you will be able to continue working with gifted students?	Apakah Anda terkadang bertanya-tanya berapa lama Anda akan dapat terus bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?	Apakah Anda terkadang memikirkan sampai berapa lama Anda bisa terus mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan murid berbakat?	Apakah Anda terkadang bertanya-tanya berapa lama Anda akan dapat terus mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?	Do you sometimes wonder how long you will be able to continue teaching or working with gifted students?	Are you wondering how many how long you will be able to teach or work with gifted students?	Apakah Anda terkadang bertanya-tanya berapa lama Anda akan dapat terus mengajarkan atau bekerja dengan siswa berbakat?

Following the translation process, a trial was conducted to assess the validity and reliability of the instrument. The validity test involved expert judgment, and their evaluations

were analyzed using the CVI. According to Davis (1992), the minimum CVI value of .80 was recommended for a new measurement. The results using CVI are presented in Table 2.

Table 2*CVI Analysis Results*

Items/Scale	CVI Value
Personal Burnout Scale	.963
Item 1 Personal Burnout	.889
Item 2 Personal Burnout	1.000
Item 3 Personal Burnout	1.000
Item 4 Personal Burnout	1.000
Item 5 Personal Burnout	.889
Item 6 Personal Burnout	1.000
Work-related Burnout Scale	.984
Item 1 Work-related Burnout	1.000
Item 2 Work-related Burnout	1.000
Item 3 Work-related Burnout	1.000
Item 4 Work-related Burnout	1.000
Item 5 Work-related Burnout	1.000
Item 6 Work-related Burnout	1.000
Item 7 Work-related Burnout	.889
Client-related Burnout Scale	1.000
Item 1 Client-related Burnout	1.000
Item 2 Client-related Burnout	1.000
Item 3 Client-related Burnout	1.000
Item 4 Client-related Burnout	1.000
Item 5 Client-related Burnout	1.000
Item 6 Client-related Burnout	1.000

Note. All items were valid

Based on the data presented in Table 2, it was observed that the CVI value for each adaptation of the CBI scales ranged from .963 to 1.000, and each item also had an I-CVI above .80. According to Davis (1992), the adaptation of the three CBI scales was deemed valid and capable of measuring their respective constructs, namely personal,

work-related, and client-related burnout. This was adapted in the context of elementary school teachers teaching gifted students.

Moving to the CTT test results, the reliability values of Cronbach's alpha and the corrected-item total correlation are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3*Reliability Test Results*

Scale	α
Personal Burnout	.853*
Work-related Burnout	.850**
Client-related Burnout	.850*

Note. *very high reliability, **extreme reliability

Based on the data presented in Table 3, the alpha coefficient for each scale of the CBI ranged from .850 to .853. According to Guilford (1956) criteria, this coefficient indicated very high reliability. It was concluded that the adaptation of the CBI showed highly reliable

results for measuring burnout among teachers teaching gifted students.

The data processing findings, which involved assessing the discriminating power using the corrected item-total correlation, are presented in Table 4.

Table 4*Corrected Item-Total Correlation Test Results*

Scale	Item Correlation Coefficient						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Personal Burnout	.690	.790	.631	.651	.710	.401	
Work-related Burnout	.516	.615	.791	.172	.767	.749	.780
Client-related Burnout	.768	.646	.786	.290	.767	.644	

Based on Azwar (2016), a minimum correlation coefficient of .30 indicated a sufficiently large discriminating power for an item. In the personal burnout scale, all items had a correlation coefficient ranging from .401 to .790, showing that each item effectively differentiated participants based on their burnout. As for the work-related burnout scale, all, except item (4), had a correlation coefficient in the range of .516 to .791, indicating their ability to effectively differentiate participants. Similarly, in the client-related burnout scale, all, except item (4), had correlation coefficients in the range of .644 to .786, showing their effectiveness in differentiating participants.

Discussion

This study aimed to assess the validity and reliability of the Indonesian adaptation of CBI. The adaptation process involved stages of preparation, translation, expert review, cognitive interviews, and data collection. Permission was obtained from the original instrument designer to adapt it to Indonesian, and the translation was carried out by qualified individuals with experience in psychological instruments. The instrument underwent expert review by educational psychologists and was refined based on their feedback. Cognitive interviews with elementary school teachers indicated that the adapted instrument was easily understandable.

Following data collection, the adapted instrument underwent validity and reliability assessments using the CVI and CTT, respectively. The CVI scores confirmed the validity of all scales, indicating their effective measurement of burnout as intended. The reliability test using Cronbach's alpha coefficient demonstrated exceptionally high reliability, ensuring consistent and dependable measurement of burnout across different contexts. To further analyze the discrimination power, a corrected item-total correlation was calculated.

Following the completion of the test, the CVI score confirmed the validity of all scales in the CBI. This means that each scale accurately measures the intended construct, specifically, burnout. The reliability test, using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, showed the exceptional reliability of the instrument. This indicates that the CBI consistently measures the same construct reliably across different locations, times, or conditions. A discriminating power analysis was subsequently performed, which involved calculating the corrected item-total correlation. All items in the personal burnout scale exhibited strong discriminating power, effectively distinguishing participants based on their personal burnout experiences. In the work-related and client-related burnout scales, there was one item in each with relatively weak discriminating power. To ensure the overall effectiveness of the adapted instrument in measuring the intended construct, it is recommended to remove these two items. The

elimination would result in the adaptation of CBI consisting of 17 items in total, comprising 6 items in both the personal and work-related each, and 5 items in the client-related burnout scale. This would increase the reliability of the work-related and client-related burnout scale to .893 and .890 respectively. It is worth noting that eliminating the two items from the work-related burnout scale would lead to a slight decrease in the CVI from .984 to .981, while the CVI of the client-related would remain unchanged at 1.00.

The study's limitations include the relatively small and potentially unrepresentative population of elementary school teachers in Indonesia. The majority of participants were from a single province, West Java, with limited representation from regions outside of Java. The population was heavily skewed towards female participants, leading to an imbalanced gender representation. However, future research should address the limitations by increasing the number and diversity of participants to achieve a more representative population. This study would benefit from a larger number of participants in the trial related to the response process. This would provide more robust insights into the participants' understanding and interpretation of the instrument, leading to better instrument adaptation. The study's reliance on classical test theory for data analysis should be supplemented with other methods, such as factor technique, in future study. Factor analysis offers a more comprehensive

examination of the validity of the adapted instrument, contributing to a deeper understanding of the underlying constructs and their interrelationships.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study aimed to evaluate the validity and reliability of the Indonesian adaptation of the CBI. The adaptation exhibited exceptional reliability, with Cronbach's alpha coefficient ranging from .850 to .853 for each scale, indicating strong internal consistency. However, the corrected item-total correlation test found that one item in the work-related and client-related burnout scale displayed poor discriminating power, potentially affecting their ability to accurately measure the intended constructs. Careful consideration should be given to eliminating these two items from the adaptation. On the positive side, the remaining items in the adapted CBI showed robust discriminating power, with coefficients ranging from .401 to .791. This indicated their efficacy in measuring the constructs of personal, work-related, and client-related burnout.

Based on the comprehensive test results, the Indonesian version of CBI was deemed a valid and reliable instrument for assessing burnout, specifically among elementary school teachers teaching gifted students. To enhance construct measurement accuracy, the removal of the aforementioned items was strongly recommended. It was important to acknowledge

some limitations in the adaptation process and address these by suggesting further study with a more diverse and representative population. Additionally, exploring alternative validity and reliability testing methods could strengthen the overall credibility and applicability of the adapted instrument.

Suggestion

Addressing the limitations identified in this study can significantly enhance the validity and reliability of the adapted CBI. In future study, it is crucial to employ a larger and more diverse size of elementary school teachers in Indonesia. By including participants from various demographic backgrounds, such as different gender, age groups, and geographical location, the adaptation's findings can be more generalizable and representative of the population of interest. Furthermore, conducting a wide array of validity and reliability tests will offer a comprehensive evaluation of the adapted instrument.

References

- Akdemir, Ö. A. (2019). The effect of teacher burnout on organizational commitment in Turkish context. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 7(4), 171-179. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v7i4.4067>
- Altintas, E. & Ilgun, S. (2016). The term "gifted child" from teachers' view. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(10), 957-965. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2016.2762>
- Astuti, W., Hanafi, I., & Sarkadi. (2022). Program akselerasi belajar anak Cerdas Istimewa Bakat Istimewa. *Jurnal Imiah Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 6(3), 524-535.

- <https://doi.org/10.23887/jipp.v6i3.54411>
- Azwar, S. (2015). *Dasar-dasar psikometrika* (2nd Ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Azwar, S. (2016). *Penyusunan skala psikologi* (2nd Ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Benini, A., Chataigner, P., Noumri, N., Parham, N., Sweeney, J., & Tax, L. (2017). *The use of expert judgment in humanitarian analysis—Theory, methods, applications*. Assessment Capacities Project – ACAPS. https://aldo-benini.org/Level2/HumanitData/Benini_EtAl_Expert_Judgment_Full_study_Aug_2017.pdf
- Benny, N., & Blonder, R. (2016). Factors that promote/inhibit teaching gifted students in a regular class: Results from a professional development program for chemistry teachers. *Education Research International*, 2016, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/2742905>
- Buchanan, J., Prescott, A., Schuck, S., Aubusson, P., Burke, P., & Louviere, J. (2013). Teacher retention and attrition: Views of early career teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(3), 112–129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n3.9>
- Callahan, C. M., Moon, T. R., Oh, S., Azano, A. P., & Hailey, E. P. (2015). What works in gifted education: Documenting the effects of an integrated curricular/instructional model for gifted students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(1), 137–167. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214549448>
- Campos, J. A. D. B., Carlotto, M. S., & Marôco, J. (2013). Copenhagen Burnout Inventory - student version: Adaptation and transcultural validation for Portugal and Brazil. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 26(1), 87–97. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-79722013000100010>
- Cao, T. H., Jung, J. Y., & Lee, J. (2017). Assessment in gifted education: A review of the literature from 2005 to 2016. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 28(3), 163–203.
- <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X17714572>
- Caruso, G. (2019). Facing EL teachers' burnout through motivation. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 3(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.2019.0>
- Chairiah, M. N., Rohaeti, E. E., & Fatimah, S. (2020). Pengambilan keputusan karier siswa Cerdas Istimewa Bakat Istimewa (CIBI). *FOKUS (Kajian Bimbingan and Konseling dalam Pendidikan)*, 3(2), 72–79. <https://doi.org/10.22460/fokus.v3i2.5040>
- Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, 5(4), 194–197. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0897-1897\(05\)80008-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0897-1897(05)80008-4)
- De Corte, E. (2013). Giftedness considered from the perspective of research on learning and instruction. *High Ability Studies*, 24(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2013.780967>
- Fahmi, A. Z., Alfarizi, F., Widiasmara, N., Muthia, W. S., & Wangsadikrama, M. G. (2019). Kebersyukuran dan burnout pada guru Sekolah Dasar di Yogyakarta. *Psikologika: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Psikologi*, 24(2), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.20885/psikologi.vol24.iss2.art1>
- García-Carmona, M., Marín, M. D., & Aguayo, R. (2019). Burnout syndrome in secondary school teachers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Social Psychology of Education*, 22(1), 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-9471-9>
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Ghonsooly, B. (2014). A tripartite model of EFL teacher attributions, burnout, and self-regulation: Toward the prospects of effective teaching. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 13(2), 145–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-013-9155-3>
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2015). Teacher burnout: A review of sources and ramifications. *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural*

- Science*, 6(1), 24–39. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJESBS/2015/15162>
- Gomez-Arizaga, M. P., Valdivia-Lefort, M., Castillo-Hermosilla, H., Hébert, T. P., & Conejeros-Solar, M. L. (2020). Tales from within: Gifted students' lived experiences with teaching practices in regular classrooms. *Education Sciences*, 10(5), 137. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10050137>
- Guilford, J. P. (1956). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education* (3rd Ed.). McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Herman, K. C., Hickmon-Rosa, J., & Reinke, W. M. (2018). Empirically derived profiles of teacher stress, burnout, self-efficacy, and coping and associated student outcomes. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 20(2), 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300717732066>
- Hodges, J., Tay, J., Maeda, Y., & Gentry, M. (2018). A meta-analysis of gifted and talented identification practices. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 62(2), 147–174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986217752107>
- Hoglund, W. L. G., Klinge, K. E., & Hosan, N. E. (2015). Classroom risks and resources: Teacher burnout, classroom quality and children's adjustment in high needs elementary schools. *Journal of School Psychology*, 53(5), 337–357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2015.06.002>
- Hornstra, L., Bakx, A., Mathijssen, S., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2020). Motivating gifted and non-gifted students in regular primary schools: A self-determination perspective. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 80, 101871. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101871>
- International Test Commission (ITC). (2018). ITC guidelines for translating and adapting tests (2nd Ed.). *International Journal of Testing*, 18(2), 101–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15305058.2017.1398166>
- Kempf-Leonard, K. (2005). Preface. In K. Kempf-Leonard (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social measurement* (Vol. 1 A-G, pp. xli-xliii). Elsevier Science. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-12-369398-5/90006-9>
- Kipps-Vaughan, D. (2013). Supporting teachers through stress management. *The Education Digest*, 79(1), 43–46. https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Resources%20and%20Publications/Handouts/Families%20and%20Educators/January_13_Teacher_Stress.pdf
- Klusmann, U., Richter, D., & Lüdtke, O. (2016). Teachers' emotional exhaustion is negatively related to students' achievement: Evidence from a large-scale assessment study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(8), 1193–1203. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000125>
- Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work and Stress*, 19(3), 192–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500297720>
- Laine, S., & Tirri, K. (2016). How Finnish elementary school teachers meet the needs of their gifted students. *High Ability Studies*, 27(2), 149–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2015.1108185>
- Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021). Does teacher burnout affect students? A systematic review of its association with academic achievement and student-reported outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 105, 101714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101714>
- Mhlolo, M. K. (2017). Regular classroom teachers' recognition and support of the creative potential of mildly gifted mathematics learners. *ZDM-Mathematics Education*, 49(1), 81–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-016-0824-6>
- Mohajan, H. K. (2017). Two criteria for good measurements in research: Validity and reliability. *Annals of Spiru Haret University Economic Series*, 17(4), 59–82. <https://doi.org/10.26458/1746>

- Munawaroh, M., Kusmayadi, T. A., & Usodo, B. (2015). Studi implementasi pendidikan karakter pada pembelajaran matematika pada kelas Cerdas Istimewa Bakat Istimewa (CIBI) SMP Negeri 2 Surakarta. *Jurnal Pembelajaran Matematika*, 3(2), 179-189. <https://jurnal.fkip.uns.ac.id/index.php/s2math/article/view/5729>
- Nurfadhilah, S., Fitri, A. N., Utami, D., Navyanti, F., J. G. S., Ustianingsih, L., Izzah, N., & Amalia, R. R. (2022). Pendidikan inklusi dengan anak penyandang ketunaan *slow learner* (lambat belajar) dan CIBI (Cerdas Istimewa, Berbakat Istimewa). *ALSYS: Jurnal Keislaman dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 2(1), 84-94. <https://doi.org/10.58578/alsys.v2i1.144>
- Oberle, E., & Schonert-Reichl, K. A. (2016). Stress contagion in the classroom? The link between classroom teacher burnout and morning cortisol in elementary school students. *Social Science and Medicine*, 159, 30-37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.04.031>
- Park, E.-Y., & Shin, M. (2020). A meta-analysis of special education teachers' burnout. *SAGE Open*, 10(2), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020918297>
- Pomortseva, N. P. (2014). Teaching gifted children in regular classroom in the USA. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143, 147-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.377>
- Pyhältö, K., Pietarinen, J., Haverinen, K., Tikkanen, L., & Soini, T. (2021). Teacher burnout profiles and proactive strategies. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 36(1), 219-242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-020-00465-6>
- Rajendran, N., Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2020). Teacher burnout and turnover intent. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 47(3), 477-500. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-019-00371-x>
- Rohali, A., & Wahab, R. (2019). Pemilihan karier berdasarkan gaya belajar model "Kolb" pada siswa cerdas istimewa kelas 12 cerdas istimewa bakat istimewa SMAN 1 Wonosari. *Jurnal Pendidikan Khusus*, 15(1), 9-16.
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 4-36. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831212463813>
- Roohani, A., & Dayeri, K. (2019). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' burnout and motivation: A mixed methods study. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research (IJLTR)*, 7(1), 77-99.
- Rubio, D. M., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., Lee, E. S., & Rauch, S. (2003). Objectifying content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Social Work Research*, 27(2), 94-104. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/27.2.94>
- Rumschlag, K. E. (2017). Teacher burnout: A quantitative analysis of emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, and depersonalization. *International Management Review*, 13, 22. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:148858286>
- Saloviita, T., & Pakarinen, E. (2021). Teacher burnout explained: Teacher-, student-, and organisation-level variables. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 97, 103221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103221>
- Sapnas, K. G., & Zeller, R. A. (2002). Minimizing sample size when using exploratory factor analysis for measurement. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 10(2), 135-154. <https://doi.org/10.1891/jnum.10.2.135.52552>
- Schonfeld, I. S., & Bianchi, R. (2016). Burnout and depression: Two entities or one? *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 72(1), 22-37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22229>
- Shackleton, N., Bonell, C., Jamal, F., Allen, E., Mathiot, A., Elbourne, D., & Viner, R. (2019). Teacher burnout and contextual

- and compositional elements of school environment. *Journal of School Health*, 89(12), 977–993. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12839>
- Shen, B., McCaughy, N., Martin, J., Garn, A., Kulik, N., & Fahlman, M. (2015). The relationship between teacher burnout and student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(4), 519–532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12089>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Still motivated to teach? A study of school context variables, stress and job satisfaction among teachers in senior high school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 20(1), 15–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-016-9363-9>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2020). Teacher burnout: Relations between dimensions of burnout, perceived school context, job satisfaction and motivation for teaching. A longitudinal study. *Teachers and Teaching*, 26(7–8), 602–616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1913404>
- Srikandi, L. (2015). Persepsi siswa CIBI terhadap faktor lingkungan sekolah yang mempengaruhi prestasi belajar di SMA Negeri 1 Padang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Khusus*, 4(3), 163–174.
- Stoltz, T., Piske, F. H. R., de Freitas, M. de F. Q., D'Aroz, M. S., & Machado, J. M. (2015). Creativity in gifted education: Contributions from Vygotsky and Piaget. *Creative Education*, 06(01), 64–70. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2015.61005>
- Worrell, F. C., Subotnik, R. F., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Dixson, D. D. (2019). Gifted students. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70(1), 551–576. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102846>
- Yuen, M., Chan, S., Chan, C., Fung, D. C., Cheung, W. M., Kwan, T., & Leung, F. K. (2018). Differentiation in key learning areas for gifted students in regular classes. *Gifted Education International*, 34(1), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261429416649047>



Received 17 April 2022
Revised 22 June 2023
Accepted 28 July 2023

