



A study of burnout among university teachers in relation to their personality with reference to their experience

Dr. Sapna

Assistant Professor, Tirupati College of Education, Ratia, Haryana, India

Abstract

Burnout is a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job. The past 25 years of research has established the complexity of the construct, and places the individual stress experience within a larger organizational context of people's relation to their work. Recently, the work on burnout has expanded internationally and has led to new conceptual models. The focus on engagement, the positive antithesis of burnout, promises to yield new perspectives on interventions to alleviate burnout. The social focus of burnout, the solid research basis concerning the syndrome, and its specific ties to the work domain make a distinct and valuable contribution to people's health, well-being and job. This study attempted to pin point the factors which contribute to the high rate of burnout among teachers of university and its relationship with personality. (Eysenk, H.J Manual).

Keywords: burnout, university teachers, personality, their experience

Introduction

The kind and quality of overall atmosphere of working place is an index of the nature of work, that prevails there. In educational institutions, a healthy environment is all the more very important for an effective process of education to take place. The teacher is the top most academic and professional person in the educational pyramid under whose charge, the destiny of our children is placed by the parents and society. The success of any educational system depends much on the requisite qualities of a teacher. Teaching is very demanding job. Unlike many profession success in teaching is hard to measure and varies by individual. Further, teachers are often expected to fulfil many roles and teachers have many pressures on them and these overloads lead them to burnout. (Fletcher, M., and Dione, V) ^[1].

Review of the Related Literature

- **Kumari (2002)** ^[6] investigated the relationship of burnout with personality, occupational stress and self-related cognitions in 364 female teachers, randomly drawn from the govt. high/senior secondary schools of Haryana. Obtained data were analyzed by apply t-ratios, Pearson's correlations and Principal Component Factor Analysis. Results revealed that high burnout teachers scored significantly high on all three measures of personality i.e., psychoticism, neuroticism and introversion.
- Spickard *et al.* (2002) ^[8] examined the burnout with the observation that there was a growing awareness within medicine that physicians and other health care professional were at risk of burnout, which threatens the sustainability of the health care enterprise. This article reviewed the definition of burnout and its sources, examined the interaction of physician personality factors and the unique stressors, they encounter in the workplace and at home, and highlights resources for preventing burnout and promoting well being in physicians and within their organizations.
- Salami (2011) investigated the relationship of job stress, personality and social support to burnout among college of education lecturers. The second purpose was to examine the extent to which personality and social support can buffer the negative effects of stress on burnout. Survey methodology was used for this study. Job stress, personality and social support were used to predict emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment. Findings showed that job stress, personality dimensions and social support jointly and separately predicted dimensions of burnout. Personality and social support interacted with job stress to predict personal accomplishment. Results support the view that, environmental (job stress and social support) and personal factors (personality traits) have influence on burnout. The papers findings imply that interventions designed to improve lecturers' classroom management skills, social network and assessment of their personality traits may have positive impact in combating burnout.
- Kokkinos (2007) ^[5] investigated the association between burnout, personality characteristics and job stressors in 447 primary school teachers from Cyprus. Undertaken study also investigated the relative contribution of these variables on the three facets of burnout- emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal personality and job stressors along with demographic and professional data. Surveys were delivered by courier to schools and were associated with burnout dimensions. Neuroticism was a common predictor of all dimensions of burnout although personal accomplishment had a different direction. It was further observed that managing students

misbehavior and time constraints were found to systematically predict dimensions of burnout. On the basis of the major findings, the authors recommended that teacher's individual characteristics as well as job related stressors should be taken into consideration when studying the burnout phenomena. The fact that each dimension of the syndrome is predicted by different variables should not remain unnoticed. Especially when designing and implementing intervention programs to reduce burnout in teachers.

- Martinez *et al.* (2008) [7] investigated the presence of 'burnout' syndrome and characteristic personality patterns in 78 dentists of three different departments (Oral Surgery and Implantology, Orthodontics and integrated Dentistry) University of Barcelona. Subjects were evaluated by using the Maslach Burnout Inventory, social-demographic variables and the personality test (IPDE) i.e., International Psychological Disturbance Examination. Descriptive univariate analysis and multivariate analysis yielded results, which suggested that Oral Surgeons constituted the group of high-level burnout. Narcissistic and borderline are the types of personality most frequently found in the individuals that present 'burnout' syndrome. Major findings suggested that in general, no high levels of 'burnout' were registered in the studied population, only 2-3% if applying strict definition of 'burnout' and 10% if these criteria were amplified.
- Toppo (2011) investigated that the concept of burnout was seen in almost all the profession such as-managerial work, nursing, teaching etc. This paper focused on the burnout study of para-teachers' in India. Para-teachers were untrained, less paid and employed up to secondary school on contractual basis. Government is silently promoting them as 'Money Saving Approach' in current education system. Para-teachers agitation throughout the country indicated towards the serious psycho-social problems among teachers community. Hence, the attempt was to presented the cross sectional study of the sample of 100 Para-teachers from Jharkhand (India) To measure the Burnout level among para-teachers, Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) Educational Survey was used as a tool. Apart from the three constituents of burnout like Emotional exhaustion, Depersonalization, reduced Personal Accomplishment, another three variables like the low Self Efficacy, Environmental factors and Job dissatisfaction were taken as additional scales. It explored the different causal factors for burnout to study the problems in Indian context. The correlation matrix and the general to specific modeling of multiple regressions analysis showed that gender, teaching experiences, student populations and financial insecurity were significantly contributing to burnout. Thus the background for burnout has been created by economical, social and psychological aspects among para-teachers.

Burnout

Burnout is a type of psychological stress. Occupational burnout or job burnout is characterized by exhaustion, lack of enthusiasm and motivation, feelings of ineffectiveness, and also may have the dimension of frustration or cynicism, and as

a result reduced efficacy within the workplace. Burnout is a state of emotional, mental, and physical exhaustion caused by excessive and prolonged stress. It occurs when you feel overwhelmed, emotionally drained, and unable to meet constant demands.

Personality

Personality refers to individual differences in characteristic patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving. The study of personality focuses on two broad areas: One understands individual differences in particular personality characteristics, such as sociability or irritability. The other understands how the various parts of a person come together as a whole. Personality is a set of individual differences that are affected by the socio-cultural development of an individual: values, attitudes, personal memories, social relationships, habits and skills.

Definitions of Related Variables

Burnout: Burnout is a state of mental, physical and emotional exhaustion that often results from a combination of very high expectation and persistent situational stress. It may reflect in a continued dissatisfaction with the situation, ranging from mild boredom to severe depression, irritation, exhaustion and physical ailment. The expression of too much pressure and too few sources of satisfaction can develop in to feeling of exhaustion leading to burnout.

Personality

Personality is a complex concept and to define, it is very difficult task. Psychologically speaking personality is all that a person is, it is the totality of one's behaviour towards oneself and other as well.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the present study is to examine the relationship between the burnout with personality among the university teachers in Haryana. To achieve the main objective, sub-objectives are framed in the study as follows:

1. To study the burnout and personality of university teachers with reference to their experience.
2. To compare the burnout of university teachers with reference to their experience.
3. To compare the personality of university teachers with reference to their experience.
4. To analyze the relationship between the burnout variable and personality among the university teachers in Haryana.

Hypotheses of the Study

- There is no significant difference of burnout of university teachers with reference to their experience.
- There is no significant difference of personality of university teachers with reference to their experience.
- There is no significant relationship between the burnout variable and personality among the university teachers in Haryana.

Delimitations of the Study

- The study has been limited to present university in Haryana only.

- The study has limited to the use of only ten psychological variables viz. eight of burnout, two of personality.
- The study has been limited to only 350 university teachers from university present in Haryana were taken in final analysis and comparison.

Research Method

In the present study under descriptive survey methods universities survey were done to know about burnout and personality of university teachers in Haryana state. For this purpose five universities of Haryana state i.e. Guru Jambheshwar University Science and Technology, Hisar, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Bhagat Phool Singh Mahila Vishvavidhalya, Khanpur, Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa are selected.

Population and Sample

All the government university teachers of Haryana state are included in the population of the study. In present study, a random sampling technique is used for selection the sample. A sample of 400 university teachers from various universities of Haryana State is selected in this study. These universities are Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Maharishi Dayanada University, Rohtak, Bhagat Phool Singh Mahila Vishvavidhalya, Khanpur and Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa. But from 400 questionnaires, 350 questionnaires are selected because 50 questionnaires are rejected due to inadequate data. And from 350 respondents there were 182 male respondents and 168 female respondents.

Tools Used

Following tools are applied in this study

- A) Burnout Inventory by Dr. Karuna Shankar Misra
- B) Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI) by Dr. S.S. Jalota and S.D. Kapoor

Data analysis

Demographic Profile of Respondents

The following section explains the demographic profile of the respondents of the present study.

Section A: Demographic Profile of Respondents

The following section explains the demographic profile of the respondents of the present study.

Table 1: Experience Group of Respondents

Experience groups (in Years)	Frequency	Per cent
0-5	60	17.1
6-10	135	38.5
11-15	90	25.8
above 15	65	18.6
Total	350	100.0

Source: Survey

Regarding the experience of the respondents, from Table 1 found that majority of the respondents i.e. 38.5 per cent having experience of 6-10 years, 25.8 per cent respondents are having experience of 11-15 years, 18.6 per cent respondents having experience above 15 years and remaining respondents i.e. 17.1 per cent are having total experience of 0-5 years.

Burnout of University Teachers with Reference to their experience.

- There is no significant difference of burnout of university teachers with reference to their experience.

Table 2: Descriptive Analysis of Burnout Variable (Experience-wise)

Particulars	Experience-groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
NA	0-5	37	15.14	4.826	.793
	6-10	121	12.39	4.398	.400
	11-15	98	13.72	5.343	.540
	above 15	94	10.87	3.059	.316
DEP	0-5	37	16.73	5.347	.879
	6-10	121	14.33	4.286	.390
	11-15	98	15.92	3.955	.400
	above 15	94	14.98	3.439	.355
EE	0-5	37	13.84	3.693	.607
	6-10	121	12.31	4.119	.374
	11-15	98	13.17	3.932	.397
	above 15	94	11.73	3.319	.342
FR	0-5	37	11.65	3.182	.523
	6-10	121	10.25	3.650	.332
	11-15	98	12.09	5.061	.511
	above 15	94	11.30	2.755	.284
TA	0-5	37	13.84	5.042	.829
	6-10	121	11.94	4.304	.391
	11-15	98	13.39	4.434	.448
	above 15	94	10.98	3.486	.360
DIS	0-5	37	14.57	5.014	.824
	6-10	121	12.67	4.424	.402
	11-15	98	14.31	4.904	.495
	above 15	94	14.15	5.029	.519
NE	0-5	37	16.30	5.201	.855
	6-10	121	13.34	4.178	.380
	11-15	98	14.09	4.671	.472
	above 15	94	11.32	2.799	.289
EG	0-5	37	15.46	8.649	1.422
	6-10	121	13.92	4.425	.402
	11-15	98	14.01	3.921	.396
	above 15	94	11.81	3.139	.324
Burnout	0-5	37	117.51	35.100	5.770
	6-10	121	101.14	26.247	2.386
	11-15	98	110.56	28.514	2.880
	above 15	94	97.30	15.512	1.600

Source: Survey

Analysis of the respondents viewpoint with regard to burnout variable is given in Table 2, in which mean value of 6-10 experience-wise group of respondents was greater than other experience-wise group of respondents.

Table 3: Experience-wise Responses on Burnout Variable

Particulars		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
NA	Between Groups	656.91	3	205.57	11.075	.005*
	Within Groups	699.07	346	10.91		
DEP	Between Groups	433.29	3	75.848	5.957	.045*
	Within Groups	6851.79	346	18.715		
EE	Between Groups	459.22	3	55.714	4.840	.022*
	Within Groups	4651.15	346	15.049		
FR	Between Groups	205.91	3	67.350	3.365	.005*
	Within Groups	3052.27	346	12.653		
TA	Between Groups	353.09	3	126.780	6.534	.010*
	Within Groups	6074.45	346	18.456		
DIS	Between Groups	261.09	3	73.270	2.675	.024*
	Within Groups	7738.89	346	23.324		
NE	Between Groups	732.74	3	255.401	24.846	.010*
	Within Groups	5413.36	346	15.019		
EG	Between Groups	467.04	3	153.405	5.065	.023*
	Within Groups	7649.06	346	20.432		
Total	Between Groups	14107.70	3	5296.013	3.168	.005*
	Within Groups	248267.47	346	595.723		

Source: Survey

* at 0.05 level of Significance

Analysis of the respondents viewpoint with regard to burnout variable is given in Table 3, in which experience-wise ANOVA result shows there is significant association (at 0.05 level of significance), in different dimensions of burnout variable i.e. Non-accomplishment (NA) (F=11.075, p=0.005), Depersonalization (DEP) (F=5.957, p=0.045), Emotional Exhaustion (EE) (F=4.840, p=0.022) Friction (FR) (F=3.365, p=0.005), Task avoidance (TA) (F=6.534, p=0.010), Distancing (DIS) (F=2.675, p=0.024), Neglecting (NE) (F=24.846, p= 0.010), Easy going (EG) (F=5.065, p= 0.023), and total Burnout score (F=3.168, p=0.005).

On the basis of the above result, it can be concluded that the

null hypothesis is rejected in different dimensions of burnout variable i.e. NA, DEP, EE, FR, TA, DIS, NE, EG, and total Burnout score, as p-value is less than 0.05 level of significance, therefore alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means mean value of 6-10 experience-wise group of university teachers was greater than other experience-wise group of university teachers.

Section D: Personality of University Teachers with Reference to their Gender, Age and Experience.

- There is no significant difference of personality of university teachers with reference to their experience.

Table 4: Descriptive Analysis of Personality Variable (Experience-wise)

Particulars	Experience- groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
N	0-5	37	29.27	8.269	1.359
	6-10	121	23.40	9.335	.849
	11-15	98	22.58	9.500	.960
	above 15	94	23.62	10.631	1.096
E	0-5	37	24.78	6.201	1.019
	6-10	121	20.02	7.534	.685
	11-15	98	17.15	6.363	.643
	above 15	94	18.71	6.383	.658
Personality	0-5	37	54.05	10.290	1.692
	6-10	121	43.41	13.037	1.185
	11-15	98	39.73	13.216	1.335
	above 15	94	42.33	12.370	1.276

Source: Survey

Analysis of the respondents viewpoint with regard to personality variable is given in Table 4, in which mean value

of 6-10 experience-wise group of respondents was greater than other experience-wise group of respondents.

Table 5: Experience-wise Responses on Personality Variable

Particulars		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
N	Between Groups	1304.213	3	398.996	3.789	.003*
	Within Groups	33011.102	346	95.622		
E	Between Groups	1456.023	3	568.646	10.702	.032*
	Within Groups	16101.062	346	49.099		
Total	Between Groups	49978.547	3	1795.567	12.489	.090
	Within Groups	54284.327	346	189.745		

Source: Survey

* at 0.05 level of Significance

Table 5 depicts the experience-wise response of the respondents toward personality variable. It is noticed that there is significant association in personality dimensions i.e. Neuroticism (N) ($F= 3.789, p=0.003$) and Extraversion (E) ($F=10.702, p=0.032$) where as insignificant association in total personality score ($F=12.489, p=0.090$).

On the basis of above result it may concluded that null hypothesis is rejected in case of personality variable N and E as p-value is less than 0.05 level of significance. And null hypothesis is accepted in total personality score, as p-value is greater than 0.05 level of significance. It means mean value of 6-10 experience-wise group of university teachers was greater than other experience-wise group of university teachers.

Relationship between the Burnout with Personality

Table 6: Relationship between Burnout with Neuroticism (N)

Statements	r-value	Sign.
Non-accomplishment (NA)	0.170	0.016*
Neuroticism (N)		
Depersonalization (DEP)	0.229	0.001*
Neuroticism (N)		
Emotional Exhaustion (EE)	0.346	0.000*
Neuroticism (N)		
Friction (FR)	0.183	0.009*
Neuroticism (N)		
Task Avoidance (TA)	0.174	0.14
Neuroticism (N)		
Distancing (DIS)	0.065	0.361
Neuroticism (N)		
Neglecting (NE)	0.332	0.000*
Neuroticism (N)		
Easy Going (EG)	0.314	0.000*
Neuroticism (N)		
Total Burnout Score	0.296	0.000*
Neuroticism (N)		

Source: Survey Total Sample Size: 350 0.05 level of Significance

Table 6 It is found that there is significant difference in Non-accomplishment (NA) with N ($r =0.170, p= 0.016$), Depersonalization (DEP) with N ($r =0.229, p=0.001$), Emotional Exhaustion (EE) with N ($r =0.346, p= 0.000$), Friction (FR) with N ($r =0.183, p=0.009$), Neglecting (NE) with N ($r =0.332, p=0.000$), Easy going (EG) with N ($r=0.314, p=0.000$) and total burnout score with Neuroticism (N) ($r = 0.296, p=0.000$) where as insignificant difference found in the Task avoidance (TA) with N ($r =0.174, p=0.14$) and Distancing (DIS) with N ($r =0.065, p=0.361$). On the basis of above result it may concluded that null hypothesis is rejected in Non-accomplishment (NA) with N ($r =0.170, p= 0.016$), Depersonalization (DEP) with N ($r =0.229, p=0.001$), Emotional Exhaustion (EE) with N ($r =0.346, p= 0.000$), Friction (FR) with N ($r =0.183, p=0.009$), Neglecting (NE) with N ($r =0.332, p=0.000$), Easy going (EG) with N ($r=0.314, p=0.000$) and total burnout score with N ($r = 0.296, p=0.000$) because the p-value is less than 0.05 level of significance, therefore alternative hypothesis is accepted. And null hypothesis is accepted in Task avoidance (TA) with N ($r =0.174, p=0.14$) and Distancing (DIS) with N ($r =0.065, p=0.361$), as p-value is greater than 0.05 level of significance.

Further, the value of coefficient of correlation i.e. r- value in the table 4.29, shows that there is positive correlation in the different dimensions of the burnout with Neuroticism (N), dimension of personality.

On the basis of above, it may conclude that there is negligible correlation found in the NA, FR, TA, DIS, with respect to Neuroticism (N) where as low correlation found in DEP, EE, NE,EG, total burnout with regards to Neuroticism (N).

Table 7: Relationship between Burnout with Personality

Statements	r-value	Sign.
Non-accomplishment (NA)	0.375	0.008*
Total Personality		
Depersonalization (DEP)	0.456	0.006*
Total Personality		
Emotional Exhaustion (EE)	0.564	0.000*
total Personality		
Friction (FR)	0.281	0.010*
Total Personality		
Task Avoidance (TA)	0.452	0.002*
total Personality		
Distancing (DIS)	0.220	0.770
Total Personality		
Neglecting (NE)	0.489	0.003*
total Personality		
Easy Going (EG)	0.432	0.000*
total Personality		
Total Burnout Score	0.798	0.005*
Total Personality		

Source: Survey Total Sample Size: 350 0.05 level of Significance

Analytical result of correlation in Table 7 presents the relationship between the burnout with personality of the respondents of the study. It is found that there is insignificant difference in Distancing (DIS) with personality ($r =0.220, p=0.770$) where as significant difference in Non-accomplishment (NA) with personality ($r =0.375, p= 0.008$), Depersonalization (DEP) with personality ($r =0.456, p=0.006$), Emotional Exhaustion (EE) with personality ($r =0.564, p= 0.000$), Friction (FR) with personality ($r =0.281, p=0.010$), Task avoidance (TA) with personality ($r =0.452, p=0.002$), Neglecting (NE) with personality ($r =0.489, p=0.003$), Easy going (EG) with personality ($r=0.432, p=0.000$) and total burnout score with personality ($r = 0.798, p=0.005$).

On the basis of above result it may concluded that null hypothesis is accepted in DIS with personality ($r =0.220, p=0.770$), as p-value greater than 0.05 level of significance. And null hypothesis is rejected in NA with personality ($r =0.375, p= 0.008$), DEP with personality ($r =0.456, p=0.006$), EE with personality ($r =0.564, p= 0.000$), FR with personality ($r =0.281, p=0.010$), TA with personality ($r =0.452, p=0.002$), NE with personality ($r =0.489, p=0.003$), EG with personality ($r=0.432, p=0.000$) and total burnout score with personality ($r = 0.798, p=0.005$), because the p-value is less than 0.05 level of significance, therefore alternative hypothesis is accepted. Further, the value of coefficient of correlation i.e. r- value in the table 4.31, shows that there is positive correlation in the different dimensions of the burnout with total personality score (N+E).

On the basis of above, it may conclude that there is low correlation found in the NA and FR with total personality where as moderate correlation found in DEP, EE, TA, NE, and EG with regards to total personality. Further, high correlation found in total burnout with total personality and negligible correlation in DIS with total personality.

Major Findings

Major Findings

Demographic Profile of Respondents

- Regarding the experience of the respondents, found that majority of the respondents having experience of 6-10 years, followed by respondents are having experience of 11-15 years, experience above 15 years and remaining respondents are having total experience of 0-5 years.

Burnout of University Teachers with Reference to their experience.

- Analysis of the respondents viewpoint with regard to burnout variables, in which experience-wise ANOVA result show that there is significant association (at 0.05 level of significance.), in different dimensions of burnout variable i.e. Non-accomplishment (NA), Depersonalization (DEP), Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Friction (FR), Task avoidance (TA), Distancing (DIS), Neglecting (NE), Easy going (EG), and total Burnout score. It means mean value of 6-10 experience-wise group of university teachers was greater than other experience-wise group of university teachers.

Section D: Personality of University Teachers with Reference to their Gender, Age and Experience.

The following section explains the experience-wise association of the personality variable.

- Experience-wise response of the respondents towards personality variable, It is noticed that there is significant association in different dimensions of personality variable i.e. Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E). It means mean value of 6-10 experience-wise group of university teachers was greater than other experience-wise group of university teachers, where as insignificant association in total personality score.

Relationship between the Burnout with Personality

- Analytical result of correlation presents the relationship between the burnout with personality of the respondents of the study. It is found that there is insignificant difference in DIS with personality where as significant difference in NA with personality, DEP with personality, EE with personality, FR with personality, TA with personality, NE with personality, EG with personality and total burnout score with personality. Further, the value of coefficient of correlation i.e. r- value, show that there is positive correlation in the different dimensions of the burnout with total personality score (N+E).

References

1. Eysenk HJ. Manual of the Maudsley personality inventory. London; university of London press, 2005.
2. Fletcher M, Dione V. The impact of stress factors and

social support on burnout, 2008. www.lib.ncsu.edu.

3. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
4. [https://www.jad-journal.com/article/S0165-0327\(02\)00101-5/abstract](https://www.jad-journal.com/article/S0165-0327(02)00101-5/abstract)
5. Kokkinos GH. Association between burnout, personality characteristics, and job stressors. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. 2007; 13(1):49-64.
6. Kumari M. A study of burnout among high school female teachers in relation to their personality, occupational stress, and self-related cognitions, Unpublished Thesis, K.U.K, 2002.
7. Martinez AA, Ayteb LB, Escoda CG. The burnout syndrome and associated personality disturbances: the study in three graduate programs in Dentistry at the university of Barcelona, 2008. www.medicinaoral.com
8. Spickard AJR, Gabbe SC, Christensen JR. Mid-career burnout in generalist and specialist physicians. *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2002; 288(12):1447-1450.
9. Stoeber RJ, Rennert P. Perfectionism, stress coping, and burnout, 2008. www.ncsu.com.
10. Toppinen-Tanner S, Kalimo R, Mutanen P. The process of burnout in white-collar and blue-collar jobs: Eight-year prospective study of exhaustion. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. 2002; 23:555-570.