

## Influence of Organizational Role Stress and Personality Hardiness on Teachers' Burnout

Dr. Syed Mohammad Azeem

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Yanbu University College  
Saudi Arabia

E-mail address: syed.azeem@yuc.edu.sa

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v3-i7/90>

Published Date: 26 July 2013

### Abstract

The present study investigates the influence of organizational role stress and personality hardiness on university teachers' burnout. 300 teachers were randomly selected from one of the central universities in India and divided equally into three groups based on the university ranks (lecturer, reader and professor). Organizational role stress scale (ORS), Maslach burnout inventory (MBI), and personality hardiness scale were used to collect the data. The results indicate that organizational role stress is highly correlated with job burnout among all the three groups of teachers (lecturers, readers and professors). Lecturers have highest level of role stress as compared to other two counterparts and are found to be significantly different from readers and professors on demographic variables and their level of role stress and emotional exhaustion. Readers are found to be significantly different on role erosion, role overload, self-role distance, resource inadequacy and total ORS from professors but not found to be significantly different on the level of job burnout. Professors are found to have least amount of stress and burnout as compared to readers and lecturers. The groups were not found significantly different on hardiness. Hardiness dimensions are also found correlated with burnout dimensions. Commitment was found positively related with emotional exhaustion in all the groups, with depersonalization in lecturers and professors. Challenge was found positively related with emotional exhaustion in case of lecturers and professors. Control dimension of personality hardiness was found positively with emotional exhaustion in all the groups but negatively with personal accomplishment in groups of readers and professors. Stepwise multiple regression analyses suggested that total ORS, role erosion, role overload, resource inadequacy, role isolation, role ambiguity, commitment, control and challenge are common significant predictors of job burnout among these three groups.

**Key Words:** Organizational role stress, personality hardiness, job burnout.

### 1.0 Introduction

Over more than 2 decades stress and burnout among teachers are widely studied by researchers (Holt et. al, 1987; Kyriacou, 1978; Boyle et.a., 1995 Venkatammal, 1998; Dick & Wagner, 2001; Cooper & Travers, 1996; Farber, 2000; Kokkinos, 2007; Azeem,S.M. & Nazir, NA, 2008; Lue et.al,

2010). These researches demonstrated that teachers are prone to stress and burnout due to the nature of this profession where they have to deal with students on a regular basis through teaching, they have to deal with students' academic as well as personal problems, and apart from teaching they have other administrative responsibilities. It is clear that teachers can be exposed to a number of sources of stress. Kyriacou (2001) reported that the main sources of teacher stress are teaching students who lack motivation, maintaining discipline in the classroom, confronting general time pressures and workload demands, being exposed to a large amount of change, being evaluated by others, having challenging relationships with colleagues, administration, and management, and being exposed to generally poor working conditions. Prolonged stress can lead to burnout among teachers (Holt et.al 1987). Burnout is a work-related syndrome that stems from an individual's perception of the instability between demands and resources over a long period of time.

Role stress, role conflict, and workload as antecedents of burnout were revealed by Lee and Ashforth (1996). Job stress particularly role stress and other role-related problems were moderately to highly correlated with burnout (Bakker, Demerouti & Verbeke, 2004; Demerouti Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2001; Maslach et al. 2001; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).; Thomas & Lankau,2009). Therefore, it was expected that job stress will predict burnout.

The term burnout was first used among health workers by Freudenberger (1974). Freudenberger (1980) identified burnout as a "state of fatigue or frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, way of life, or relationship that failed to produce the expected reward". Burnout is a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors at work, and is defined by the three dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and loss of a sense of personal accomplishment (Maslach et al., 2001). Emotional exhaustion, the central dimension of burnout, is characterized by a feeling that one's emotional resources are used up. Depersonalization refers to a cynical, callous and detached attitude toward clients, co-workers and organization. The third dimension of burnout, decreased personal accomplishment, is marked by a sense of ineffectiveness and inadequacy in relation to job performance accompanied by negative self-evaluation (Togia, 2005). Burnout exists when too much workload, lack of personal control, inadequate rewards, breakdown of the working community, shortage of fairness or conflicting values (Maslach and Leiter, 1999).

During the last few years, some personality variables have attracted the attention of researchers in the correlates of job stress and burnout. Despite a common acknowledgement that personality factors play a critical role in mediating stress, these factors have been overlooked in a majority of empirical studies of stress. A notable exception has been a series of studies carried by Kobasa (1979; 1982a,). Kobasa, et.al. (1982) explored the concept of "personality Hardiness" as a resistance resource that mediate the negative consequences of high level stress. Concept of hardiness focuses on the person that remains relatively healthy after experiencing high amounts of stressful life events. Kobasa argues that persons who experience high degree of stress without falling ill have a personality structure differentiating them from person who becomes sick under stress. This personality difference is best characterized by the term "Hardiness". Hardiness reflects the individual's response to life events both personally and professionally (Kobasa, 1979). Three factors, commitment, control and challenge, measure hardiness (Kobasa, Maddi & Kahn 1982). Commitment reflects a dedication to oneself and to one's work. Control is the extent to which an individual influences life events to ensure a particular outcome. Challenge refers to life events and one's response to those events. Individuals who are hardy cope with various stressors, both personal (e.g., life cycle, family) and

professional (e.g., occupational roles and relationships), better than those individuals who are not hardy (Simoni & Paterson, 1997).

Rush, et al. (1995) found negative relations between hardiness and self-reported illness as a result of stress or burnout. Chan (2003) assessed hardiness and burnout among teachers and found that hardiness has significant impact on emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. McCrainie et al. (1987) found that hardiness has beneficial main effects in reducing burnout but does not prevent high level of job stress from leading to high level of burnout. Maslach et al. (2001) found that people who display low levels of hardiness (involvement in daily activities, a sense of control over events, and openness to change) have higher burnout scores, particularly on the exhaustion dimensions.

Azeem, S.M. (2010) found that Commitment, Challenge, control and total personality hardiness are found to be negatively related with emotional exhaustion. Commitment and total personality hardiness are also found to be negatively related with depersonalization among university teachers. Stepwise multiple regression analyses summarize that commitment and total personality hardiness are the predictors of burnout among teachers.

### 1.1 Purpose

Many researches have been carried out to explore the relationship between personality hardiness and burnout among teachers at school level, health care professionals, corporate managers and so on but there are very few studies conducted on university teachers. The present study aims to study the influence of role stress and personality hardiness on job burnout among university teachers.

## 2.0 Methodology

### 2.1 Sample:

In the present study the sample was randomly selected from one of the central university in India. It consisted of 300 teachers from different faculties of the University. The sample has been classified into three groups of 100 each as Lecturers, Readers and Professors. The gender of the sample was not taken into consideration. Mean and range of age and tenure are given in the table below:

GROUP	MEAN AGE	RANGE	MEAN TENURE	RANGE
LECTURERS	37.13	24 – 48	8.47	1 – 17
READERS	50.36	38 – 58	23.02	12 – 29
PROFESSORS	44.5	44 – 59	20.1	15 - 32

### 2.2 Tools:

The present study incorporates three variables, namely, organizational role stress, personality hardiness and job burnout. The description of each is as follows:

#### 2.2.1 Burnout Scale:

The Maslach Burnout Inventory was used in order to measure the burnout among teachers in the present study (MBI, Maslach and Jackson, 1981). The MBI consist of 22 items that are divided into three subscales:

**1. Emotional Exhaustion (EE)**-It is a state caused by excessive psychological and emotional demands made on people in helping professions.

**2. Depersonalization (DP)**-This refers to treating people like object and development of negative attitude toward one's self, toward work and life.

**3. Personal Accomplishment (PA)**-The de-motivational effects of feeling of inefficiency about their ability related to recipients and this may results in a self -imposed verdict of failure.

Each item is rated 1(very mild) to 7(very strong). A place is provided for the respondent to check "never" if the feeling or attitude described is never experienced. According to Maslach & Jackson, person with higher scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization sub scales and with low scores on Personal Accomplishment sub scale would be perceiving themselves as burnout. Thus, a person is not classified as "burnout" or "not burnout" but rather placed on a continuum from "more burnout" to "less burnout". Maslach & Jackson reported alpha co-efficient for the three sub scales as presented below:

Sub Scales	N= 469 (teachers)	N= 1025 (people in helping profession)
Emotional Exhaustion	.89	.87
Depersonalization	.75	.77
Personal accomplishment	.79	.75

Alpha reliabilities for teachers and people in helping profession are supporting the validity of the measures.

### 2.2.2 Organizational role stress:

Pareek's (1983) organisational role stress scale (ORS) was used to measure individuals' "role stress" within an organisation. This scale is comprised of the following role stress dimensions.

1. Inter Role Distance (IRD)
2. Role Stagnation (RS)
3. Role expectation conflict (REC)
4. Role Erosion (RE)
5. Role Overload (RO)
6. Role Isolation (RI)
7. Personal Inadequacy (PI)
8. Self-Role Distance (SRD)
9. Role Ambiguity (RA)
10. Resource Inadequacy (RIn)

### 2.2.3 Personality Hardiness Scale:

The short version of hardiness scale developed by S.C.Kobasa and S.R.Maddi (1982) was used to assess the Hardiness level of the subject. This scale contains 12, 16, and 8 items for measuring commitment, control and challenge, respectively. Kobasa and Maddi, stated that the scale has a correlation of .89 with full scale and show a reliability co-efficient alpha of .86. Hull et al.1987 also reported a correlation of .76 between 36 item revised Hardiness scale and its original form.

## 3. Results and Discussions

### Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (All the group)]

In descriptive analysis, mean and standard deviation scores for all three groups are shown in table 1. We find that mean scores of the three components of job burnout in the lecturers are, 11.05 (for emotional exhaustion (EE), 3.99 for depersonalization (DP) and 39.48 for personal accomplishment (PA). Here it is worth mentioning that for personal accomplishment low score

is indicative of high burnout and high scores show low burnout. The mean score for role stress (total) is 52.9. Further the obtained mean of role stress dimensions show that lecturers have highest mean (7.80) for role erosion factor or role stress and second highest mean is 6.67 for resource inadequacy.

Other factors on which the mean scores are higher are 5.93 for self-role distance (SRD), 5.50 for role isolation (RI), 5.20 for inter role distance (IRD) and 5.15 for personal inadequacy. In other words lecturers experience highest amount of stress with regard to role erosion, Resource Inadequacy, self-role distance and role isolation and comparatively low stress with regard to role ambiguity and role expectation conflict.

The mean for the three sub-scales of hardiness variable is 19.26 for commitment, 19.35 for challenge and 36.79 for control. Here it is worth mentioning that for hardiness sub scales lower the scores, higher the hardiness one poses. Therefore, the below than average mean scores on all of these three sub scales show hardiness in somewhat high degree.

Mean and standard deviation scores of readers for emotional exhaustion (EE), 5.05 for depersonalization (DP) and 36.96 for personal accomplishment (PA). The mean score of role stress (total) is 45.54. Further the obtained mean of role stress factors show that readers have highest mean (7.09) for resource inadequacy and the second highest mean is 6.49 for role erosion. Other mean scores are 5.59 for role isolation, 4.80 for self-role distance, 4.6 for inter role distance, 3.95 for personal inadequacy, 3.65 role expectation conflict, 3.55 for role overload, 3.42 for role stagnation and 2.36 for role ambiguity.

In other words readers experience highest amount of stress with regard to resource inadequacy, role erosion, role isolation, self-role distance and inter role distance and comparatively lower stress with regard to role ambiguity. Mean scores for the three sub-scales of hardiness variable are 16.74 for commitment, 19.04 for challenge and 36.51 for control and 50.12 for total personality hardiness score.

Professors' group mean scores of the three component of burnout are 7.6 for emotional exhaustion, 3.9 for depersonalization and 37.9 for personal accomplishment. These scores indicate that those professors have very mild level of burnout. The mean score for role stress (Total) is 37.3, which indicates a low level of stress. The mean score for other factors of role stress show that professors have highest mean for resource inadequacy factor (5.5), and 4.7 for role isolation and 4.5 for role erosion as next highest stressors. Three lowest mean scores are 1.8 for role ambiguity, 3.0 for role overload and 3.4 for personal inadequacy. In other words professors experience highest amount of stress with regard to resource inadequacy, role erosion and role isolation and least stress with regard to role ambiguity, role overload and personal inadequacy. The mean for the three sub-scales of hardiness variables are, 16.5 for commitment, 18.7 for challenge and 35.4 for control and 50.0 for total personality hardiness. These scores indicate that professors are quite high on hardiness.

### **Table 2. Correlation Matrix (Independent and dependent variable) in all three groups**

Correlation between independent and dependent variables is shown in table 2. Table shows that tenure and age has no significant relation with any job burnout dimension in case of lecturer and professors. In the group of readers, tenure was found negatively and significantly related with emotional exhaustion ( $r = -.25$ ). Similarly age was also found negatively and significantly with emotional exhaustion ( $r = -.26$ ) and depersonalization ( $r = -.21$ ).

The table reveals that in the group of lecturers a significant and positive relationship exists between inter role-distance and emotional exhaustion( $r=.31$ ) and depersonalization ( $r=.26$ ). Inter role distance is not significantly related with personal accomplishment.

It can be observed from the table that role stagnation( $r=.44$  and  $.30$ ), role overload ( $r=.59$  and  $.40$ ), role isolation ( $r=.59$  and  $.43$ ), personal inadequacy ( $r=.42$  and  $.39$ ), self-role distance( $r=.48$  and  $.25$ ), resource inadequacy( $r=.36$  and  $.37$ ), role expectation conflict ( $r=.46$  and  $.44$ ), role ambiguity ( $r=.45$  and  $.37$ ) and total ORS ( $r=.62$  and  $.44$ ) are positively and significantly correlated with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

Role ambiguity ( $r=-.21$ ) and role expectation conflict ( $r=-.23$ ) were found negatively and significantly related to personal accomplishment. Role erosion shows a positive and significant correlation with personal accomplishment ( $r=.31$ ) and does not show significant relationship with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization in this group of teachers. A significant positive relationship is however observed between commitment and emotional exhaustion ( $r=.49$ ). Commitment also shows a positive and significant correlation with depersonalization( $r=.62$ ). Challenge shows a significant and positive correlation with emotional exhaustion only ( $r=.23$ ).

The table also shows that control is associated positively and significantly with emotional exhaustion ( $r=.26$ ) and shows no significant correlation with depersonalization and personal accomplishment. Total personality hardiness reveals a positive and significant correlation with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization ( $r=.45$  and  $.32$ ).

In the group of readers, inter-role distance dimension shows a significant and positive relationship with all three dimensions of burnout ( $r=.67$ ,  $.50$  and  $.24$ ). Role stagnation with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization ( $r=.59$  and  $.44$ ), role expectation conflict with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization ( $r=.43$  and  $.21$ ), role erosion with all three dimensions ( $.52$ ,  $.36$  and  $.38$ ), role overload is positively and significantly related with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization ( $r=.72$  and  $.48$ ). Role isolation, personal inadequacy and self-role distance are positively and significantly related with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization ( $r=.56$ ,  $.37$ ;  $.46$ ,  $.46$ ;  $.43$ ,  $.39$ ).

Role ambiguity, role inadequacy and total ORS are positively and significantly related to all three dimensions of job burnout ( $r=.68$ ,  $.59$  and  $.24$ ;  $.50$ ,  $.44$  and  $.20$ ;  $.75$ ,  $.58$  and  $.21$ ). Commitment shows a significant and positive relationship with emotional exhaustion( $r=.32$ ). Challenge shows no relationship with all three dimensions of burnout. Control shows a significant and positive relationship with emotional exhaustion ( $r=.28$ ) and a significant and negative correlation with personal accomplishment( $r=-.29$ ). Total personality hardiness is associated negatively and significantly with emotional exhaustion( $r=-.31$ ).

In case of professors the inter-role distance, role stagnation, role erosion, and role overload show positive and significant correlation with emotional exhaustion ( $r=.55$ ,  $.50$ ,  $.28$ ,  $.62$ ), but no significant correlation with depersonalization and personal accomplishment. Role expectation conflict, role isolation, resource inadequacy, personal inadequacy and total ORS show positive and significant correlation with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization ( $r=.45$ ,  $.31$ ;  $.57$ ,  $.32$ ;  $.43$ ,  $.21$ ;  $.32$ ,  $.20$ ;  $.68$ ,  $.32$ ).

Self-role distance and role ambiguity are correlated positively and significantly with emotional exhaustion ( $r=.39$ ,  $.63$ ) and depersonalization ( $r=.24$ ,  $.37$ ). This role stress also shows negative and significant correlation with personal accomplishment ( $r=-.22$ ,  $-.21$ ). Commitment shows positive and significant relationship with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization ( $r=.51$ ,  $.45$ ). This dimension of personality hardiness shows also negative and significant

correlation with personal accomplishment( $r=-.20$ ). Challenge shows positive and significant correlation with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization ( $r=.33, .22$ ). Control shows a positive and significant relationship with emotional exhaustion ( $r=.40$ ) and negative relationship with personal accomplishment( $r=-.21$ ). Total personality hardiness reveals a positive and significant correlation with emotional exhaustion only ( $r=.48$ ).

### **3.1 Mann-Whitney Test for Significance of Difference:**

The present investigation had three sub samples namely professors, readers and lecturers. The Mann-Whitney test was used for different variables in order to find out the significance difference. This test was used because the scores on each variable were not normally distributed as is evident from high standard deviation in some cases.

This test was used separately for three sets of groups: professors vs. lecturers, professors vs. readers and readers vs. lecturers. Results of each group are presented in the table 3, 4 & 5. The Mann-Whitney nonparametric test was found to be most appropriate for testing for significance of difference. The Mann-Whitney test is useful for determining the differences irrespective of their distribution.

#### **Table 3. Mann -Whitney for Professors and Lecturers**

Table 3 shows that professors and lecturers are significantly differ on both the demographic variables (tenure and age) at .01 and .05 level. It is obvious and quite understandable that professors should be having more work experience and age than the lecturers.

Both the groups differ significantly on IRD, RS, RE, RO, RI, PI, SRD, RIn and total ORS. Furthermore, Table reveals that lecturers have high scores on almost all the dimensions of role stress scale. There is no significant difference between both the groups as far as the personality hardiness is concerned. They are equally hardy. Lecturers are differ significantly on emotional exhaustion (EE) from their counterpart (professors) but both the groups do not differ on depersonalization and personal accomplishment.

#### **Table 4. Mann -Whitney for Professors and Readers**

Table 4 indicates that professors and readers do not differ significantly on both the demographic variables (Tenure and Age) although their mean and SD scores are apparently different from each other.

Both the groups are differ significantly on role erosion (at .01 and .05 level), role overload (.05 level), self-role distance (.05 level), resource inadequacy (.05 level) and the total ORS (.05 level). Readers have somewhat high scores on almost all the role stress dimensions.

The table above indicates that there is no significant difference between both the groups on personality hardiness .It means that both professors and readers are equally hardy. Professors and readers are not significantly different on all the three component of job burnout. Although, readers' scores are slightly higher than the professors' scores.

#### **Table 5. Mann -Whitney for Readers and Lecturers**

Table 5 shows that readers and lecturers are significantly differ on both the demographic variables (tenure and age) at .01 and .05 level. Readers having high mean and S.D. scores on both the variables.

The table indicates that both the groups are significantly differ on inter role distance (.05 level), role stagnation (.01 and .05 level), role erosion (.05 level), personal inadequacy (.05 level), self-role distance (.05 level) and role ambiguity (.05 level). It is quite apparent from the table that lecturers have higher levels of stress in comparison with the readers.

Both the groups do not significantly differ on personality hardiness scale. Readers and lecturers are significantly differing on emotional exhaustion only. Lecturers having high scores than their counterpart.

### 3.2 Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis:

To find out the relative contribution of each independent variable on each component of burnout, the stepwise multiple regression analysis is computed. It is worth mentioning here that the dependent variable (burnout) has three components, therefore the regression analysis is computed three times for each component in each group of subjects.

#### Table 6. Stepwise Regression Analysis (Lecturers)

The table reveals that total ORS has the strongest contribution to emotional exhaustion ( $F=62.31, P<.0000$ ). It means that because of the combination of different organizational role stressors in their role, lecturers experienced the feeling of emotional exhaustion. The second most contributive predictor is role overload ( $F=12.41, P=.0002$ ) which denotes that the feeling of emotional exhaustion among them depends on the load(work) assigned to them.

Role isolation, another dimension of role stress is found to be the next factor, which enters into the regression equation. This indicates that role isolation also influences the emotional exhaustion. The F value is 14.86 ( $P<.0002$ ).

Role erosion, another role dimension predicted emotional exhaustion ( $F=8.56, P<.004$ ). Thus it describes that emotional exhaustion is dependent on role erosion experienced by lecturers.

Commitment, a component of hardiness is found to be the next factor, which contributed to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization among lectures. The F value is 5.16 ( $P<.02$  and 60.96 ( $P<.0000$ ) respectively. The second most contributed predictor is total personality hardiness. F value for this variable is found to be 13.21 ( $P<.0005$ ) which denotes that the hardy personality leads to the feeling of depersonalization.

Resource inadequacy, a dimension of role stress is found to be the next factor which contributed to depersonalization. This indicates that lack of resources influences the feeling of depersonalization. The F value is 21.29 ( $p<.0001$ ). Other role factors role erosion and role overload are found to be significant predictors of depersonalization. F values are found to be 13.80 ( $P<.0004$ ) and 13.31 ( $P<.0004$ ). It means that role erosion and role overload influences the depersonalization.

From the table 6, it is obvious that role erosion is significantly regressing the criterion variable that is the personal accomplishment. F value is found to be 10.42 ( $P.0017$ ). It means that role erosion has an influence upon the personal accomplishment. The second variable, which is contributing to personal accomplishment, is role ambiguity among lecturers. F value is found to be 8.44 ( $P<.0046$ ).

#### Table 7. Stepwise Regression Analysis (Readers)

The results presented in the above table 7 clearly indicate that total ORS emerges as an important predictor of emotional exhaustion among readers. The F value is found to be 127.92 ( $P < .0001$ ) which is quite high. The next variable is role overload, predicting the criterion variable (EE). The F value is 10.36 ( $P > .0018$ ) which is significant at .01 level. It means that the feeling of emotional exhaustion among readers depends on the load (work) assigned to them.

The table also reveals that role ambiguity, inter role distance, control, role expectation conflict have emerged as predictors of emotional exhaustion but commitment, personal inadequacy and role stagnation are not predicting to emotional exhaustion significantly. The table reveals that role ambiguity has the strongest contribution to depersonalization among readers ( $F = 53.53, P < .0001$ ). It means that because of role ambiguity in their role readers experienced the feeling of depersonalization.

The second factor contributing to depersonalization in this group is inter-role distance. F value is 8.75 ( $P < .0039$ ). Self-role distance is found to be the next factor, which contributed to dependent variable (depersonalization). The F value is 6.06, which is significant at .05 level. Role erosion emerges as a significant predictor of personal accomplishment. The next variable, which is contributing to personal accomplishment, is control dimension of personality hardiness. The F value is found to be 11.09 ( $P < .001$ ).

#### **Table 8. Stepwise Regression Analysis (Professors)**

Table 8 indicates that total ORS is strongly contributing emotional exhaustion as the F value is found to be the highest (83.94,  $P < .0000$ ). Role overload is predicting the emotional exhaustion among professors. The F value is 8.90 ( $P < .004$ ). Role ambiguity, total personality hardiness and role stagnation are also predicting the emotional exhaustion among professors.

Commitment dimension of personality hardiness is contributing to depersonalization among Professors. The F value is 25.09 ( $P < .0001$ ). None of the role dimensions contributing significantly to depersonalization in this group. Only role erosion is contributing to personal accomplishment in this group. The F value is found to be 6.09 ( $P < .015$ ).

#### **4. Conclusion**

The findings of the present study show that university teachers have a lower level of burnout. They have low feeling of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and high feeling of personal accomplishment, which reflects a low burnout in them. They have a stronger feeling of being capable of attaining their goals and therefore, not becoming much depersonalized and emotionally exhausted. We can say that these teachers have lower burnout because of their ability to deal with the multifarious problems of students and other type of problems effectively and efficiently. Due to these feelings they do not feel bad about themselves and about others and about the job they have. Thus the feeling of competence and self-worth are high enabling them to counteract burnout.

Teaching is a highly noble profession and teachers are always a boon to society. Through their intelligence, patience and wisdom, they attempt to not only hone the learner's intellect and aptitude but also, create a well-rounded personality. Teaching has an influence in developing one's mind and character and also gives the satisfaction of having sparked the light of knowledge and dispelled the clouds of ignorance. If they are stressed or burned out

the above said qualities will be affected and the students in particular and the society in general will deprive of those characteristics required for successful and bright future. The educational institutions must continuously monitor the factors which may have adverse effects on the effectiveness of teachers and take remedial actions to improve learning.

### **Acknowledgement**

This study was conducted in one of the central universities in India. I am thankful to those who helped me in the collection of data for this present study. I am also thankful to those respondents who spared their valuable time in filling out the given questionnaires.

### **References:**

- Azeem, S.M., Nazir, N.A. (2008). A study of job burnout among university teachers. *Psychology Developing Societies*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 51-64.
- Azeem, S.M. (2010). Personality hardiness, job involvement and job burnout among teachers. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education* Vol. 2(3), pp. 36-40, July 2010.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resources Management*, 34, 83-104.
- Boyle, G. J., Borg, M. G., Falzon, J. M. & Baglioni, A. J. (1995). A structural model of the dimensions of teacher stress. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65, 49-67.
- Chan DW (2003). Hardiness and its role in the stress-burnout relationship among prospective Chinese teachers in Hong Kong. *Teaching and teacher Education*, (19)4: 381-395.
- Cooper, C. & Travers, C. (1996). *Teachers Under pressure: Stress in the Teaching Profession*. Routledge, New York.
- Demerout, E., Bakker, A.B.; Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). The job demands- resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499-512.
- Dick, V.R., Wagner, U. (2001). Stress and strain in teaching: a structural equation approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 71, pp. 243-259.
- Farber, B.A. (2000) Treatment Strategies for Different Types of Teacher Burnout. *Journal of Clinical Psychology/In Session: Psychotherapy in Practice*, 56, 675-689.
- Freudenberger, H. J.(1980). *Burnout*. New York: Doubleday.
- Freudenberger, H.J. (1974). Staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 159-165.
- Freudenberger, H.J. (1977). Burnout: Occupational hazard of the child care worker. *Child Care Quarterly*, vol. 6, pp. 90-99.
- Holt, P., Marvin, J. & Tollefson, N. (1987). Mediating Stress : Survival of the Hardy. *Psychology in Schools*, 24, 51.
- Kobasa, S.C. (1979). Stressful life events, personality and health: An inquiry into hardiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1-11.
- Kobasa, S.C. (1982). Commitment and coping in stress resistance among Lawyers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 702-717.
- Kobasa, S.C., & Maddi, S.R., & Kahn, S. (1982). Hardiness and health: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 168-177.
- Kyriacou, C. & Sutcliffe, J. (1978). A model of teacher stress. *Educational Studies*, 4, 1-6.
- Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 53(1), 27-35.

- Kokkinos, C.M. (2007). Job Stress, personality and burnout in primary school teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77 (1), 222-43.
- Lee, R., Ashforth, B.E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 81, pp. 123-133.
- Lue, B.H.; Chen, H.J.; Wang, C.W. Cheng, Y. & Cheng, M.C. (2010). Stress, personal characteristics and burnout among first postgraduate year residents: a nationwide study in Taiwan. *Medical Teacher*. 32(5), 400-7.
- McCrairie EW, Lambert VA, Lambert CE (1987). Work stress, hardiness, and burnout among hospital staff nurses. *Nurs. Res.* 36(6): 374-378.
- Maslach, C. (1976). Burned out. *Human Behaviour*, vol. 5, pp. 16-22.
- Maslach, C., Leiter, M.P. (1999). Take this job and ... love it!. *Psychology Today*, vol.32, no. 5, pp. 50-53.
- Maslach, C., Pines, A. (1979). Burnout, the loss of human caring. A. Pines, C. Maslach (eds.) *Experiencing social psychology*, New York: Random House.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter, M. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 52, pp. 397-422.
- Rush MC, Schoel WA, Barnard SM (1995). "Psychological resiliency in the public sector: 'hardiness' and pressure for change". *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*., 46: 17-39.
- Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organization Behaviour*, 25, 293-315.
- Shirom A (1989). Burnout in work organizations. In C. L. Cooper and I. Robertson (Eds.). New York: Wiley. *Int. Rev. industrial Org. psychol.*, pp. 25-48.
- Simoni PS, Paterson JJ (1997). Hardiness, coping, and burnout in the nursing workplace. *Journal of Professional Nursing*., 13(3): 178-185.
- Thomas, C.H. & Lankau, M. (2009). Preventing burnout: The effects of LMX and mentoring on socialization. Roles stress, and burnout. *Human Resource Management*, 48(3), 417-432.
- Togia, A. (2005). Measurement of burnout and the influence of background characteristics in Greek academic librarians. *Library Management*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 130-138.
- Venkatammal, P. Occupational stress among University teachers. *Journal of Psychological Researches*, 1998, vol.42, No.1, 73-76.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (All the group)]**

Variables	Lecturers		Readers		Professors	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
AGE	37.13	5.75	50.36	5.77	44.5	16.1
TENURE	8.47	4.62	23.02	6.73	20.1	9.8
INTER ROLE DISTANCE (IRD)	5.20	3.07	4.66	4.18	3.7	3.2
ROLE STAGNATION (RS)	5.10	3.74	3.42	3.01	3.5	3.3
ROLE EXPECTATION CONFLICT (REC)	4.18	3.43	3.65	2.64	3.4	2.7
ROLE EROSION (RE)	7.80	3.54	6.49	4.21	4.5	3.2
ROLE OVER LOAD (RO)	4.14	3.22	3.55	3.17	3.0	3.6
ROLE ISOLATION (RI)	5.50	3.23	5.59	3.92	4.7	3.4
PERSONAL INADEQUACY (PI)	5.15	3.07	3.95	2.92	3.4	2.8
SELF ROLE DISTANCE (SRD)	5.93	3.77	4.80	3.21	3.8	2.9
ROLE-AMBIGUITY (RA)	2.97	3.22	2.36	3.12	1.8	2.5
RESOURCE-INADEQUACY (RIn)	6.67	3.83	7.09	4.43	5.5	3.6
TOTAL ORS	52.91	22.45	45.54	25.98	37.3	22.1
COMMITMENT	19.26	5.42	16.74	4.04	16.5	4.4
CHALLENGE	19.35	2.66	19.04	2.87	18.7	3.2
CONTROL	36.79	8.75	36.51	7.85	35.4	8.4
TOTAL PERSONALITY HARDINESS	50.35	22.04	50.12	23.09	50.0	22.3
EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION	11.05	8.53	9.02	9.21	7.6	8.0
DEPERSONALIZATION	3.99	4.12	5.05	5.81	3.9	4.2
PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT	39.48	11.49	36.96	9.19	37.9	8.3

**Table 2. Correlation Matrix (Independent and dependent variable) in all three groups**

Variables	Lecturers			Readers			Professors		
	EE	DP	PA	EE	DP	PA	EE	DP	PA
TENURE	-.07	-.02	.05	-.25*	-.19	-.12	-.05	.09	-.10
AGE	-.09	.03	-.02	-.26*	-.21*	-.10	-.05	.11	-.11
INTER ROLE DISTANCE	.31*	.26*	-.15	.67*	.50*	.24*	.55*	.14	-.06
ROLE STAGNATION (RS)	.44*	.30*	-.09	.59*	.44*	.11	.50*	.15	-.03
ROLE EXPECTATION CONFLICT (REC)	.46*	.44*	-.23*	.43*	.21*	.02	.45*	.31*	-.03
ROLE EROSION (RE)	.07	-.07	.31*	.52*	.36*	.38*	.28*	.12	.11
ROLE OVER LOAD (RO)	.59*	.40*	.01	.72*	.48*	.08	.62*	.18	.01
ROLE ISOLATION (RI)	.59*	.43*	.02	.56*	.37*	.17	.57*	.32*	-.06
PERSONAL INADEQUACY (PI)	.42*	.39*	.06	.46*	.46*	.10	.32*	.20*	-.18
SELF ROLE DISTANCE (SRD)	.48*	.25*	.09	.43*	.39*	-.10	.39*	.24*	-.22*

ROLE AMBIGUITY (RA)	.45*	.37*	-.21*	.68*	.59*	.24*	.63*	.37*	-.21*
ROLE INADEQUACY (RI)	.36*	.37*	.01	.50*	.44*	.20*	.43*	.21*	-.01
TOTAL ORS	.62*	.44*	-.02	.75*	.58*	.21*	.68*	.32*	-.07
COMMITMENT	.49*	.62*	-.19	.32*	.10	.02	.51*	.45*	-.20*
CHALLENGE	.23*	.16	.04	.08	-.08	-.12	.33*	.22*	-.03
CONTROL	.26*	-.09	.08	.28*	.07	-	.40*	.16	-.21*
TOTAL PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT	.45*	.32*	.01	-	.08	-.17	.48*	.16	-.06
EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION	1.00	.54*	-.04	1.00	.58	.13	1.00	.38*	-.16
DEPERSONALIZATION	.54*	1.00	-	.58*	1.00	.02	.38*	1.00	-
PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT	-.04	-	1.00	.13	.02	1.00	-.16	-	1.00

(\*\*significant at .01 and \* at .05 level)

Table 3. Mann -Whitney for Professors and Lecturers

VARIABLES	PROFESSORS (n=100)		LECTURERS (m=100)		N= (n+m)	T n $\sum R (Xi) l = 1$	N 2 $\sum R (Xi) l = 1$	T1
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD				
IRD	3.7	3.2	5.20	3.07	200	8523	2679243	-3.7518**
RS	3.5	3.3	5.10	3.74	200	8680	2679313	-3.3660**
REC	3.4	2.7	4.18	3.43	200	9684.5	2675584	-.9006
RE	4.5	3.2	7.80	3.54	200	7396	2682086	-6.5080**
RO	3.0	3.6	4.14	3.22	200	8656	2675148	-3.4360**
RI	4.7	3.4	5.50	3.23	200	9307	2679405	-1.8255*
PI	3.4	2.8	5.15	3.07	200	8387.5	2679986	-4.0827**
SRD	3.8	2.9	5.93	3.77	200	8340.5	2680691	-4.1961**
RA	1.8	2.5	2.97	3.22	200	8812.5	2644998	-3.1234**
RIn	5.5	3.6	6.67	3.83	200	9155.5	2682269	-2.1929*
ORS	37.3	22.1	52.91	22.45	200	7819.5	2669124	-5.5237**
AGE	44.5	16.1	37.13	5.75	200	14239.5	2685484	+10.248**
TENURE	20.1	9.8	8.47	4.62	200	14817	2685561	+11.658**
COMMT	16.5	4.4	19.26	5.42	200	10081	2684205	+0.7588
CHALL	18.7	3.2	19.35	2.66	200	10176	2683592	+3.3085
CONT	35.4	8.4	36.79	8.75	200	10085	2686180	+0.8555

<b>TOTAL PH</b>	50.0	22.3	50.35	22.04	200	10078.5	2686684	+0.6963
<b>EE</b>	7.6	8.0	11.04	8.5	200	8649	2683395	-3.4313**
<b>DP</b>	3.9	4.2	3.99	4.1	200	9731.5	2636857	-.8091
<b>PA</b>	37.9	8.3	39.48	11.4	200	9681.5	2685641	-.9011

(\*\*significant at .01 and \* at .05 level)

**Table 4. Mann -Whitney for Professors and Readers**

VARIABLES	PROFESSORS (n=100)		LECTURERS (m=100)		N= (n+m)	T n $\sum R$ (Xi) I = 1	N 2 $\sum R$ (Xi) I = 1	T1
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD				
<b>IRD</b>	3.7	3.2	4.6	4.1	200	9529	2678406	-1.28
<b>RS</b>	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.0	200	9925.5	2668946	-.3093
<b>REC</b>	3.4	2.7	3.6	2.6	200	9815.5	2673137	-.5789
<b>RE</b>	4.5	3.2	6.4	4.2	200	8652	2681081	-3.4306**
<b>RO</b>	3.0	3.6	3.5	3.2	200	9232	2670687	-2.0232*
<b>RI</b>	4.7	3.4	5.5	3.9	200	9469.5	2678787	-1.4269
<b>PI</b>	3.4	2.8	3.9	2.9	200	9534.5	2677542	-1.2684
<b>SRD</b>	3.8	2.9	4.8	3.2	200	9040.5	2678294	-2.4827*
<b>RA</b>	1.8	2.5	2.3	3.1	200	9506	2627935	-1.3920
<b>RIn</b>	5.5	3.6	7.0	4.4	200	9069.5	2681980	-2.4043*
<b>ORS</b>	37.3	22.1	45.54	25.9	200	8945.5	2674077	-2.7246*
<b>AGE</b>	44.5	16.1	50.36	5.7	200	9787	2684614	-.6436
<b>TENURE</b>	20.1	9.8	23.02	6.7	200	9683.5	2684585	-0.636
<b>COMMT</b>	16.5	4.4	16.7	4.1	200	10039	2684702	-.0269
<b>CHALL</b>	18.7	3.2	19.1	2.87	200	10268	2684208	+5.336
<b>CONT</b>	35.4	8.4	36.5	7.8	200	10052	2686256	+0.0048
<b>TOTAL PH</b>	50.0	22.3	50.1	23.1	200	10006.5	2686682	+1.1063
<b>EE</b>	7.6	8.0	9.0	9.2	200	9624	2681884	-1.0466
<b>DP</b>	3.9	4.2	5.1	5.8	200	9695.5	2670415	-.8770

PA	37.9	8.3	36.9	9.1	200	10291	2685471	+5.895
----	------	-----	------	-----	-----	-------	---------	--------

(\*\*significant at .01 and \* at .05 level)

**Table 5. Mann -Whitney for Readers and Lecturers**

VARIABLES	PROFESSORS (n=100)		LECTURERS (m=100)		N= (n+m)	T n Σ R (Xi) I = 1	N 2 Σ R (Xi) I =1	T1
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD				
IRD	4.6	4.1	5.20	3.07	200	9268.5	2681324	-1.9173*
RS	3.4	3.0	5.10	3.74	200	8667.5	2679154	-3.3730**
REC	3.6	2.6	4.18	3.43	200	9898.5	2674026	-3.3737
RE	6.4	4.2	7.80	3.54	200	8950	2681874	-2.6974*
RO	3.5	3.2	4.14	3.22	200	9848	2677461	-4.970
RI	5.5	3.9	5.50	3.23	200	9975	2680407	-1.841
PI	3.9	2.9	5.15	3.07	200	8937	2680440	-2.7326*
SRD	4.8	3.2	5.93	3.77	200	9197.5	2681443	-2.0915*
RA	2.3	3.1	2.97	3.22	200	9193	2655955	-2.1441*
RIn	7.0	4.4	6.67	3.83	200	10170	2682848	+2.933
ORS	45.54	25.9	52.91	22.45	200	9060	2686450	-2.4193*
AGE	50.36	5.7	37.13	5.75	200	14523	2685528	+10.939**
TENURE	23.02	6.7	8.47	4.62	200	14711.5	2684580	+11.4084**
COMMT	16.7	4.1	19.26	5.42	200	10002	2684596	-1.174
CHALL	19.1	2.87	19.35	2.66	200	10345	2683340	+7.226
CONT	36.5	7.8	36.79	8.75	200	10176.5	2685598	+3.093
TOTAL PH	50.1	23.1	50.35	22.04	200	10099	2686668	+1.1197
EE	9.0	9.2	11.04	8.5	200	9043	2684416	-2.4651*
DP	5.1	5.8	3.99	4.1	200	10193	2673826	+3.529
PA	36.9	9.1	39.48	11.4	200	9440.5	2685581	-1.4905

(\*\*significant at .01 and \* at .05 level)

**Table 6. Stepwise Regression Analysis (Lecturers)**

Predictors	Emotional Exhaustion				Depersonalization				Personal Accomplishment			
	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P
Commitment	.76	.59	5.16	.0254*	.61	.38	60.06	.000*	.49	.24	2.27	.139
Control	.80	.64	1.37	.2440	.83	.68	1.72	.1912	.47	.23	.67	.105
Total PH					.67	.45	13.21	.0005**				
Rin					.74	.55	21.20	.000* <sup>*</sup>				
RE					.78	.61	13.80	.0004*	.31	.09	104.7*	.001
RA									.41	.16	8.46	.004*
RO	.67	.45	12.41	.0006**	.81	.66	13.21	.0004*				
PI					.81	.66	1.94	.1698				
SRD	.73	.59	3.13	.0800	.82	.67	2.40	.1184				
REC					.82	.68	1.90	.1613	.50	.25	1.16	.282
RI	.72	.52	14.86	.0002**					.51	.26	1.85	17.45
Total ORS	.62	.39	62.31	.0000**								
AGE	.79	.62	2.45	.1209								
TENURE	.80	.64	3.94	.0500								

(\*\*significant at .01 and \* at .05 level)

Table 7. Stepwise Regression Analysis (Readers)

Predictors	Emotional Exhaustion				Depersonalization				Personal Accomplishment			
	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P
Commitment	.84	.71	3.22	.0762								
Control	.83	.68	4.91	.0292*					.49	.24	11.09	.001**
Total PH												
Rin					.71	.50	2.74	.1007				
RE					.70	.48	1.56	.2134	.59	.35	16.67	.000**
RA	.80	.65	5.80	.0181*	.59	.35	53.33	.0000**				
RO	.77	.60	10.36	.0018**					.63	.39	1.69	.2041
PI	.84	.71	1.49	.2249	.69	.48	2.02	.1582				
SRD					.68	.46	6.06	.0156*	.60	.36	2.49	.118
REC	.83	.70	4.17	.0440*	.65	.43	3.98	.0488*				
RI	.82	.67	5.12	.0261*	.63	.41	8.75	.0039*				
RS	.84	.72	1.31	.25554								
Total ORS	.75	.56	127.92	.0000**					.62	.38	2.86	.094
AGE												
TENURE												

(\*\*significant at .01 and \* at .05 level)

Table 8. Stepwise Regression Analysis (Professors)

Predictors	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonalization	Personal Accomplishment
------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------------------

	Multi ple R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P	Multi ple R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P	Multi ple R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P
Commitment	.81	.66	1.93	.168	.45	.20	25.09	.000**				
Control									.44	.24	3.40	.0683
Total PH	.76	.57	5.85	.08*								
Rin	.81	.65	2.27	.136								
RE	.78	.61	2.29	.134					.45	.20	6.09	.0153*
RA	.71	.50	7.92	.006*	.47	.22	2.64	.1071	.39	.15	3.59	.0611
RO	.74	.54	8.90	.004*					.47	.22	1.99	.1607
PI	.79	.62	2.46	.120								
SRD	.78	.60	3.14	.080					.51	.26	1.29	.2671
REC	.80	.64	1.66	.201								
RI	.77	.59	4.64	.034*	.50	.25	1.10	.2954				
RS	.80	.64	2.66	.107	.51	.26	1.56	.2205				
Total ORS	.67	.46	83.44	.000**								
AGE					.49	.24	1.70	.1950	.50	.25	1.19	.2774
TENURE												

(\*\*significant at .01 and \* at .05 level)