

# A Study on Professional Burnout of University Teachers with respect to their Intra and Interpersonal Interactions

<sup>1</sup> Dr.M.Shailaja, Associate Professor, St. Mary's College of Education, Buchireddypalyam-524305, Nellore Dist.,A.P.State,

<sup>2</sup> Dr.R.Vijaya Anuradha, Associate Professor, Indian College of Education, Katpadi –Tiruvalam Road, Katpadi, Vellore-14.

<sup>3</sup> Dr.G.Susmitha, Scholar, Dept. of Education, Dravidian University, Kuppam- 517 426.

<sup>4</sup> Prof. G.Lokanadha Reddy, Former Vice-Chancellor (FAC), Dravidian University, Kuppam- 517 426, Chittoor Dist., A. P. State, India.

## Abstract

*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. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between professional burnout and occupational stress due to intra & interpersonal interactions of teachers working at the state universities of Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. Rating Scales were administered on a sample of 955 teachers from 9 universities chosen by using Simple Random Sampling Technique. The statistical techniques employed were percentage, mean, SD, mean  $\pm$  1SD, and also correlations computed to analyze the obtained data. The results of the study shows that around 86% and 62.09% of university teachers are experiencing moderate and high levels of professional burnout and occupational stress respectively due to intra & interpersonal interactions. Correlation studies also revealed a significant positive relationship between professional burnout and occupational stress due to intra & interpersonal interactions. It is observed that job stress and burnout has multiple causes, and so as to have multiple solutions. Conflict, frustration, stress and burnout are often caused by interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships at the workplace. There are, however, means of reducing workplace problems and enhancing personal wellbeing by improving communication skills, setting up and maintaining clear boundaries, and preventing conflict etc. Further, there is a need to improve the self-efficacy of the university teachers which acts as a personal resource, reflects the persons optimistic self-beliefs about being able to deal with critical demands by means of adaptive actions not only in work place but also outside the workplace.*

*Key Words –Occupational Stress, Personal & Professional Efficiency, Professional Burnout, University Teachers.*

## **Introduction**

Education in all its forms and at levels is the single most potential instrument of social, economic, political and cultural transformation of any society. Education in general and higher education in particular is fundamental to the construction of a knowledge based society. The education system whether it is primary, secondary, higher secondary, collegiate or university level, the teachers play a vital role. The globalization and privatization of the education system in India forced the higher education to be more competent so as to produce the stakeholders with better knowledge, accommodativeness, skills and competencies which are essential for survival in the world market. The increasing role played by latest knowledge, skills, innovation and research in economic growth and development, the emergence of the information society and the need for quality education results in increased pressure on the higher education system and teachers in particular. It is the duty of every management of the educational institutions to identify and reduce the stressors in order to extract optimal performance from their teachers. Continuous stress leads to strain which in turn make the individual to burnout in their workplace.

## **Need and Importance of the Study**

Teaching is a time honored profession. Studies have consistently concluded that teaching is a stressful occupation, and that a significant number of teachers, perhaps even a majority, are affected by work-related stress (Dunham, 1998; Kyriacou, 1987). Some of the common responses listed by Brown and Ralph (1998) include reduction in work performance and output, feelings of alienation and inadequacy, loss of confidence and motivation, increasing introversion, irritability with colleagues, unwillingness to cooperate, frequent irrational conflicts at work, withdrawal from supportive relationships, inappropriate cynical humor and persistent negative thoughts. The studies by Abouserie (1996) in tertiary sector found that

74.1% of the university teaching staff was moderately stressed, and 10.4% severely stressed; and Blix et al. (1994) found that 66% of the university teachers experiencing stress leading to burnout at work place. 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. It is usually characterized by apathy, detachment, and indifference in interpersonal relations, and feelings of emotional exhaustion related to a lack of psychic resources and helplessness (Ozdemir, 2006).

Intra and Interpersonal conflicts are very prevalent in occupational settings and have often been identified as a leading source of workplace stress (Narayanan et al., 1999; Spector and Jex, 1998). Such interpersonal conflicts could be caused by injustice, inequity, unfairness, or incompetence of the employees. Persistent conflict at work has been shown to be detrimental to the work climate and to negatively affect the physical and psychological well-being of employees.

Conflict in the workplace has been identified as a significant source of stress for some teachers, as reflected by the fact that stress can be linked with the mismanagement of conflict at work, negative interpersonal interactions with co-workers, and negative reactions to management decisions (Cotton & Fisher, 1995; Shergold, 1995). Toohey (1994) defined conflict as a serious, on-going occurrence of strife between teachers or between the teachers and those in supervisory or management positions leading to the severe consequences on the psychological well-being of the teachers. Conflict is pervasive across all types of organizations and can manifest itself in a variety of ways including emotional turmoil (i.e., anxiety, tension, and frustration), increased absenteeism, job turnover, violence and, from a group conflict perspective - strikes and demonstrations (Cooper & Payne, 1988; Toohey, 1994). Furthermore, conflict can include both overt situations, whereby a teacher may be the victim of an aggressive or violent act, or more subtle forms of disagreement such as differences of opinion or expectations with the co-workers, head of the department / management, students and the community people which cause stress and lead to burnout in them (Robbins et al., 1994). To a certain extent, poor relationships with colleagues can cause academics to withdraw from the job and organization (Taris et al., 2001).

Another major stressor and burnout causing factor for teachers is their lack of involvement in decisions that bear directly on the quality of their work life (Farber, 1991; Ginsberg and Bennett, 1981; Iwanicki, 1983; Lortie, 1975; Natale, 1993; Ricken, 1980). Cooley and Laviki (1981) concluded that individual, interpersonal and organizational factors were all strongly associated with stress and burnout among teachers. With this background, investigators made an attempt to know the Professional Burnout of university teachers caused due to their Intra & Interpersonal Interactions.

### Objectives of the Study

1. To find out the number and percentage of university teachers with low, moderate and high levels of professional burnout and occupational stress caused due to their intra & interpersonal interactions.
2. To identify the level of professional burnout of university teachers.
3. To assess the level of occupational stress of university teachers caused due to their intra & interpersonal interactions.
4. To find out the significant difference, if any, in the professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their gender, age, educational qualification, community, designation, nature of the department they are working- in, years of experience, nature of job, average number of working hours per week and the state universities they are working-in.
5. To find out the significant difference, if any, in the occupational stress of university teachers caused due to their intra & interpersonal interactions due to variations in their gender, age, educational qualification, community, designation, nature of the department they are working - in, years of experience, nature of job, average number of working hours per week and the state universities they are working-in.
6. To find out the relationship between the occupational stress caused due to intra & interpersonal interactions and professional burnout of university teachers.

### Hypotheses of the Study

1. There exists a significant difference in the professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their gender, age, educational qualification, community, designation, nature of the department they are working in, years of experience, nature of job, average number of working hours per week and the state universities they are working-in.
2. There exists a significant difference in the occupational stress resulting from intra & interpersonal interactions of university teachers due to variations in their gender, age, educational qualification, community, designation, nature of the department they are working- in, years of experience, nature of job, average number of working hours per week and the state universities they are working-in.
3. There is a significant relationship between occupational stress resulting from intra & interpersonal interactions and professional burnout of university teachers.

**Methodology:** Survey method was used in the present study.

**Development of Research Tools:** After reviewing the tools available both in western and Indian context, the investigators developed a Rating Scale with 10 statements to assess the occupational stress of university teachers caused due to intra & interpersonal interactions based on the 'Occupational Stress of Special Education Teachers Rating Scale' developed by Reddy (2007). Further, the Professional Burnout Rating Scale developed by Reddy (2007) on Special Education Teachers was adopted and modified according to the requirements of the study with 20 statements under 3 dimensions such as Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment. Against each item of Occupational Stress due to Intra & Interpersonal Interactions rating scale, five gradations were given namely Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Undecided (UD), Agree (A), Strongly Agree (SA) having the scores 1,2,3,4 and 5 respectively. Similarly, in Professional Burnout Rating Scale, against each statement five gradations were given namely - Few Times a Year (FTY), Once a Month or Less (OM), Few Times a Month (FTM), Once a Week (OW) and Every Day (ED) having the scores 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. To find out the reliability and the validity of the rating scales, the developed tools are administered to 76 university teachers (8 % of the total sample) randomly selected from two universities from both the states. The university teachers were oriented to rate the statements of the rating scales to indicate their responses using the gradations. The completed Rating Scales were collected and statistically analyzed to establish the reliability and validity of the tools. The calculated half test and whole test reliability of the Rating Scales on Occupational Stress due to Intra & Interpersonal Interactions (0.71 and 0.88) and Professional Burnout (0.78 and 0.87) are high by using Split-half method, and hence the tools used in the study are reliable. The content validity, face validity and intrinsic validity of the tools have been established using scientific procedure.

**Sample and Statistical Techniques used in Study:** For the purpose of the study, out of 1500 administered tools, the investigator selected usable responses of 955 (66%) university teachers in the faculties of Humanities, Social Science and Sciences from 9 State universities of A.P. State (5) and T.N. State (4) by using simple random sampling technique. The collected data were analyzed by using appropriate statistical techniques such as mean, SD, mean  $\pm$  1SD, percentage, t/F test and correlations.

## Results and Discussion

The major objective of the present study was to find out the level of professional burnout and occupational stress caused due to the intra & interpersonal interactions of university teachers. The mean and SD of professional burnout and occupational stress caused due to the intra & interpersonal interactions scores have been calculated for each teacher working at the university level. Based on mean and SD, the number and percentage of university teachers falling under low, moderate and high levels of professional burnout scores and occupational stress caused due to the intra & interpersonal interactions scores have been calculated and the same are presented in table-1.

**Table-1: Number and Percentage of University Teachers with Low; Moderate and High Levels of Professional Burnout (PB) and Occupational Stress (OS) due to their Intra & Interpersonal Interactions (I & I)**

| <b>Number and Percentage of Teachers with Low, Moderate and High Level of PB and OS due to Intra &amp; Interpersonal Interactions</b> |             |                 |             |
|---|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
|   | <b>Low</b>  | <b>Moderate</b> | <b>High</b> |
| Professional Burnout as a Whole   | 127 (13.30) | 675 (70.68)     | 153 (16.02) |
| Intra & Interpersonal Interactions  | 357 (37.38) | 455 (47.64)     | 143 (14.45) |

*Note: Numbers mentioned in the brackets are in percentage*

Burnout is a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity. In the present study, majority of university teachers are experiencing moderate level of professional burnout due to emotional exhaustion (68.38%), depersonalization (66.07%), reduced personal accomplishment (64.82%) and also professional burnout as a whole (70.68%). On the whole, 16.02% of teachers i.e. 153 out of 955 teachers are experiencing high level of professional burnout and 127 teachers i.e. 13.30% are showing low level of professional burnout. Further it is noted that, majority of the university teachers i.e. 455 (47.64) out of 955 are experiencing moderate level of stress followed by 357 (37.38) teachers with low level of stress and 143 (14.45%) teachers with high level of occupational stress caused due to their intra & interpersonal interactions.

To identify the level of professional burnout of university teachers, mean and SD for each stressor of the professional burnout dimension has been calculated for the whole sample of teachers working at university level. By using mean  $\pm$  1 SD, the low, moderate and high levels of stressors have been identified. The same procedure is followed to assess the level of



occupational stress caused due to the intra & interpersonal interactions of the university teachers and the results are presented in table-2 and 3.

**Table – 2: Mean Scores and Level of Professional Burnout of University Teachers**

| S.No        | Dimensions of Professional Burnout   | Mean Scores and Level of PB of University Teachers |     |
|-------------|--|--|-----|
|             |  | MPB  | LPB |
| <b>I</b>    | <b>Emotional Exhaustion</b>  |  |     |
| 1.          | I am emotionally exhausted and as a result it affects my personal life                           | 1.69   | M   |
| 2.          | My job often needs assessment from head, which makes me emotional                                | 1.67   | M   |
| 3.          | My job demands interactions with parents, students and colleagues                                | 2.02   | M   |
| 4.          | Due to continuous responsibility for students, I am often emotionally exhausted                  | 1.88   | M   |
| 5.          | I feel that work burden thrust on me leads to strain and emotional exhaustion                    | 2.03   | M   |
| 6.          | As a result of entire day's work, I am really feeling tired to work for the next day             | 2.14   | M   |
| 7.          | The stress in working situations leads me to complete burn out condition                         | 2.03   | M   |
| <b>II.</b>  | <b>Depersonalization</b>   |  |     |
| 8.          | My job earns a lot of respect from the society for me  | 3.03   | H   |
| 9.          | Lack of resources at the departmental level leads to personal dissatisfaction                    | 2.29   | M   |
| 10.         | Continuous assessment in my job by superiors also leads to personal dissatisfaction              | 1.72   | M   |
| 11.         | The varied nature of work leads to insufficient time to take individual care for students        | 1.94   | M   |
| 12.         | Too much responsibilities trusted on me  | 2.12   | M   |
| 13.         | Increased degree of risk taking  | 1.99   | M   |
| <b>III.</b> | <b>Personal Accomplishment</b>   |  |     |
| 14.         | I have less interest to work as a university teacher   | 1.52   | L   |
| 15.         | I am less enthusiastic about my work at university level   | 1.60   | M   |
| 16.         | I am cynical about my teaching, training and research contributions                              | 1.67   | M   |
| 17.         | I won't involve much in the work assigned to me in the university and not bothered much about it | 3.19   | H   |
| 18.         | I have a doubt on the significance of my work in the university                                  | 1.86   | M   |
| 19.         | Anger on those who make demands  | 1.76   | M   |
| 20.         | Feeling of helplessness  | 2.03   | M   |

*Note: Low-1.57 and below; Moderate - 1.58 to 2.43; & High - 2.44 and above*

In table-2, the mean burnout scores and level of burnout of teachers working at university level in south India are presented. The table clearly reveals that under the dimension emotional exhaustion, the aspects such as - the feeling of emotional exhaustion that affects their personal life (S.No.1), need for assessment of their job by the head (S.No.2), nature of job that demands interaction with parents, students and colleagues (S.No.3), continuous responsibility for students (S. No.4), over workload (S.No.5), feeling tired due to entire day's work (S.No.6) and stress in the working situations (S.No.7) makes the university teachers to burnout moderately.

The table also reveals that under the depersonalization dimension, the university teachers felt that their teaching does not earn lot of respect (S.No.8) from the society which leads to their depersonalization resulting in higher rates of burnout in them. All the other factors under this dimension have created moderate level of burnout among university teachers. With regard to the third dimension i.e. reduced personal accomplishment, the university teachers experience high level of

professional burnout in only one aspect (S.No.17) where the teachers do not show much involvement in the assigned work. In contrast, the university teachers possess high level of personal accomplishment and disregard the statement that they have less interest to work as a university teacher (S.No.14) showing low level of burnout; whereas, in all the other aspects they possess moderate level of burnout.

**Table- 3: Mean Scores and Level of Occupational Stress of University Teachers due to their Intra & Interpersonal Interactions (III)**

| S.No. | Occupational Stress caused due to Intra & Interpersonal Interactions       | Mean Scores and Level of OS of University Teachers |     |
|-------|--|--|-----|
|       |  | MOS  | LOS |
| 1.    | Lack of healthy interactions or adjustments between / among the colleagues | 2.88   | M   |
| 2.    | Lack of understanding with the non-teaching staff members                  | 2.70   | M   |
| 3.    | Difficulty in understanding the students behaviour in different situations | 2.61   | M   |
| 4.    | Difficulty in satisfying the requirements of the administration            | 2.66   | M   |
| 5.    | Misunderstood the organizational values and goals                          | 2.57   | M   |
| 6.    | Lack of pro-active communication with the administration                   | 2.79   | M   |
| 7.    | Poor quality of feedback and supervision that address teacher concerns     | 2.97   | M   |
| 8.    | Misconduct of colleagues   | 2.60   | M   |
| 9.    | Biased nature of the management  | 2.69   | M   |
| 10.   | Defaming and maligning by the subordinates                                 | 2.67   | M   |

*Note: Low-2.47 and below; Moderate – 3.00 to 2.48; & High – 3.01 and above*

From table-3, it is clear that, all the aspects related to intra & interpersonal interactions i.e. lack of adjustment and understanding among colleagues (S. No. 1) & non-teaching staff members (S. No. 2), difficulty in understanding the students' behavior (S. No. 3) & satisfying the requirements of administration (S. No. 4), misunderstanding of values and goals of the organization (S. No. 5), lack of proactive communication with administration (S. No. 6), poor quality of feedback for teacher concerns (S. No. 7), misconduct of colleagues (S. No. 8) & biased nature of management (S. No. 9) and defaming and maligning by the subordinates (S. No. 10) are causing moderate level of stress among university teachers.

To know the significant differences, if any, in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their personal and demographic variables (gender, age, educational qualification, community, designation, nature of the department they are working-in, years of experience, nature of job, and average number of working hours per week); mean and SD has been calculated for each group in a variable and t / F-tests has been used appropriately to know the significant differences between/among the groups in a variable. The same procedure is adopted for occupational stress caused due to intra & interpersonal interactions of university teachers and the obtained results are presented in table - 4 and 5.

**Table-4: Mean and SD of the Professional Burnout of University Teachers and the Calculated t/F-values with Respect to Certain Independent Variables**

| Independent Variables / Groups | Dimensions of Professional Burnout |      |            |                    |      |                   |                    |      |                   |               |       |                   |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|------|------------|--------------------|------|-------------------|--------------------|------|-------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------|
|                                | (PB <sub>1</sub> )                 |      |            | (PB <sub>2</sub> ) |      |                   | (PB <sub>3</sub> ) |      |                   | PB as a whole |       |                   |
|                                | Mean                               | SD   | t/F Values | Mean               | SD   | t/F Values        | Mean               | SD   | t/F Values        | Mean          | SD    | t/F Values        |
| <b>Gender</b>                  |                                    |      |            |                    |      |                   |                    |      |                   |               |       |                   |
| Men (682)                      | 13.70                              | 5.75 | 2.03       | 13.15              | 4.66 | 0.52 <sup>@</sup> | 13.84              | 5.54 | 1.63 <sup>@</sup> | 40.69         | 13.93 | 1.67 <sup>@</sup> |
| Women (273)                    | 12.88                              | 5.41 | *          | 12.97              | 4.75 |                   | 13.20              | 5.28 |                   | 39.05         | 12.98 |                   |
| <b>Age</b>                     |                                    |      |            |                    |      |                   |                    |      |                   |               |       |                   |
| 28 to 37yrs (334)              | 14.09                              | 6.06 |            | 13.82              | 5.12 |                   | 14.15              | 5.87 |                   | 42.06         | 14.81 |                   |

|                                       |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| 38 to 47yrs (252)<br>48 & above (369) | 13.37<br>12.96 | 5.73<br>5.18 | <b>3.55*</b>             | 12.96<br>12.53 | 4.56<br>4.26 | <b>6.80**</b>            | 14.03<br>12.96 | 5.91<br>4.68 | <b>5.00**</b>            | 40.36<br>38.46 | 13.86<br>12.23 | <b>6.17**</b> |
| <b>Ednl<br/>Qualification</b>         |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| PG with NET/<br>SLET/M.Phil.(19<br>0) | 13.79<br>13.39 | 5.90<br>5.60 | <b>0.88</b><br>@         | 13.64<br>12.96 | 4.99<br>4.60 | <b>1.78@</b>             | 13.93<br>13.59 | 5.93<br>5.36 | <b>0.76@</b>             | 41.35<br>39.94 | 14.69<br>13.42 | <b>1.28@</b>  |
| PG with<br>Ph.D.(765)                 |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| <b>Community</b>                      |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| OC (326)                              | 12.83          | 5.00         |                          | 12.70          | 4.18         |                          | 12.98          | 4.76         |                          | 38.51          | 11.65          |               |
| BC (307)                              | 13.78          | 6.03         |                          | 12.92          | 5.05         |                          | 13.66          | 5.69         |                          | 40.36          | 14.83          |               |
| MBC (93)                              | 15.37          | 6.46         | <b>5.44</b>              | 14.35          | 4.83         | <b>3.45*</b>             | 15.51          | 6.08         | <b>5.37*</b>             | 45.23          | 15.15          | <b>5.96**</b> |
| SC / ST (229)                         | 13.19          | 5.52         | <b>**</b>                | 13.38          | 4.73         |                          | 13.86          | 5.71         | <b>*</b>                 | 40.42          | 13.69          |               |
| <b>Designation</b>                    |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| Asst.                                 | 13.92          | 5.97         |                          | 13.50          | 4.94         |                          | 13.97          | 5.79         |                          | 41.39          | 14.47          |               |
| Professor(472)                        | 12.90          | 5.14         | <b>3.12</b>              | 13.03          | 4.37         | <b>4.33*</b>             | 13.81          | 5.28         | <b>2.68@</b>             | 39.73          | 12.68          | <b>3.83*</b>  |
| Asso.                                 | 13.11          | 5.44         | <b>*</b>                 | 12.47          | 4.39         |                          | 13.04          | 5.02         |                          | 38.61          | 12.85          |               |
| Professor(199)                        |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| Professor (284)                       |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| <b>Nature of Dept.</b>                |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| Humanities (221)                      | 12.73          | 5.28         |                          | 12.89          | 4.63         |                          | 13.62          | 5.76         |                          | 39.24          | 12.1           |               |
| Social                                | 13.68          | 6.20         | <b>2.42</b>              | 13.01          | 5.17         | <b>0.49@</b>             | 13.79          | 6.21         | <b>0.11@</b>             | 40.48          | 15.38          | <b>0.74@</b>  |
| Sciences(262)                         | 13.69          | 5.50         | <b>@</b>                 | 13.24          | 4.42         |                          | 13.60          | 4.88         |                          | 40.54          | 12.89          |               |
| Sciences (472)                        |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| <b>Years of<br/>Experience</b>        |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| 1-10 yrs (389)                        | 13.89<br>13.03 | 6.04<br>5.11 | <b>2.04</b>              | 13.55<br>12.70 | 5.01<br>4.48 | <b>3.15*</b>             | 13.92<br>13.60 | 5.91<br>5.24 | <b>0.86@</b>             | 41.36<br>39.34 | 14.54<br>12.87 | <b>2.30@</b>  |
| 11-20 yrs (267)                       | 13.29          | 5.60         | <b>@</b>                 | 12.86          | 4.38         |                          | 13.37          | 5.08         |                          | 39.52          | 13.17          |               |
| 20 yrs & above ( 299)                 |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| <b>Nature of Job</b>                  |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| Permanent (905)                       | 13.46          | 5.67         |                          | 13.09          | 4.68         |                          | 13.67          | 5.49         |                          | 40.22          | 13.74          |               |
| Temporary (51)                        | 13.63          | 5.46         | <b>0.21</b><br>@         | 13.63          | 5.46         | <b>0.07@</b>             | 13.49          | 5.11<br>9    | <b>0.22@</b>             | 40.25          | 12.79          | <b>0.02@</b>  |
| <b>No.of working<br/>hrs/week</b>     |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| 14 hrs & below<br>(552)               | 13.43<br>13.52 | 5.69<br>5.62 | <b>0.25</b><br>@         | 13.13<br>13.05 | 4.68<br>4.70 | <b>0.26@</b>             | 13.76<br>13.52 | 5.40<br>5.58 | <b>0.68@</b>             | 40.32<br>40.08 | 13.63<br>13.76 | <b>0.26@</b>  |
| 15 hrs & above<br>(403)               |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |
| <b>State</b>                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                | <b>4.75**</b> |
| A.P. State (492)                      | 12.87<br>14.10 | 5.39<br>5.87 | <b>3.37</b><br><b>**</b> | 12.46<br>13.78 | 4.37<br>4.91 | <b>4.39*</b><br><b>*</b> | 12.88<br>14.49 | 4.83<br>5.98 | <b>4.58*</b><br><b>*</b> | 38.20<br>42.36 | 12.80<br>14.26 |               |
| TN State (463)                        |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |              |                          |                |                |               |

Note : \*\* Significant at 0.01 level ; \* Significant at 0.05 level; @ Not significant at 0.05 level

From table-4, it is clear that professional burnout experienced by the university teachers owing to emotional exhaustion (PB<sub>1</sub>) differs significantly due to variation in their gender, as the calculated t-value is 2.03 which is significant at 0.05 level; whereas, the t-value with respect to depersonalization (PB<sub>2</sub>), reduced personal accomplishment (PB<sub>3</sub>) and professional burnout (PB) as a whole is 0.52, 1.63 and 1.67 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the stated hypothesis, 'there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their gender' stands rejected with respect to PB<sub>2</sub>, PB<sub>3</sub> and professional burnout as a whole but accepted only in case of PB<sub>1</sub>. The mean values indicate that men teachers are burning out at high rates than their women counterparts due to emotional exhaustion. The findings of the studies by Anderson and Iwanicki (1984) and Reddy (2007) on special education



teachers corroborate with the present findings where the male teachers experience higher levels of emotional exhaustion than their female counterparts though opposed by the study results of Maslach and Jackson (1981b) on human service professionals and Byrne (1991a) on elementary and university educators where the female teachers show higher levels of emotional exhaustion than their male counterparts.

In case of the university teacher's belonging to various age groups, the calculated F-values with respect to emotional exhaustion ( $PB_1$ -3.55) is significant at 0.05 level and depersonalization ( $PB_2$  - 6.80), personal accomplishment ( $PB_3$  - 5.00) and professional burnout as a whole (6.17) are significant at 0.01 level. This indicates that the university teachers belonging to different age groups significantly differ in their professional burnout. Further, the mean values reveal that the university teachers belonging to lower age group i.e. 28 to 37 years exhibit higher levels of professional burnout owing to  $PB_1$ ,  $PB_2$ ,  $PB_3$  and PB as a whole followed by middle age group and higher age group teachers. From this, one can accept the stated hypothesis, *'there is a significant difference in the dimensions of the professional burnout of the university teachers due to variations in their age'*. The study results of Anderson and Iwanicki, 1984; Maslach and Jackson, 1981b; Russell et al., 1987; Schwab and Iwanicki, 1982; Antoniou et al., 2006 and; Watts and Robertson, 2011, confirm the above findings where the younger teachers show higher levels of emotional exhaustion than their older colleagues. Also, Byrne (1991a) and Maslach and Jackson (1981b) reported similar findings that the elementary and university educators belonging to younger age group have lower perceptions of personal accomplishment. In case of depersonalization, the results of the studies by Maslach and Jackson (1981b) and Pierce and Molloy (1990) are similar in line with the present findings of younger age group experiencing more burnout due to depersonalization.

In case of 'community' of university teachers, the calculated F-values for emotional exhaustion ( $PB_1$  - 5.44), depersonalization ( $PB_2$  - 3.45), personal accomplishment ( $PB_3$  - 5.37) and professional burnout as a whole (5.96) are significant at 0.05 level, indicating the influence of the nature of community of university teachers on their professional burnout owing to  $PB_1$ ,  $PB_2$ ,  $PB_3$  and PB as a whole. In other words, it can be posit that the university teachers with varied community background significantly differ in their professional burnout owing to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, reduced personal accomplishment and professional burnout as a whole. Thus the stated hypothesis, *'there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their nature of community background'* is accepted. The mean values clearly reveal that the university teachers belonging to MBC experience higher levels and the teachers belonging to OC experience low level of professional burnout owing to  $PB_1$ ,  $PB_2$ ,  $PB_3$  and PB dimensions as a whole. In case of the dimensions  $PB_2$ ,  $PB_3$  and PB as a whole, the teachers belonging to SC/ST experience more stress followed by BC; whereas, the teachers belonging to BC experience higher level of professional burnout due to emotional exhaustion when compared to SC /ST teachers.

For 'designation' of university teachers, the calculated F-values with respect to  $PB_1$  (3.12),  $PB_2$  (4.33) and PB as a whole (3.83) are above the table value (3.00). It reveals that the professional burnout exhibited by the university teachers because of  $PB_1$ ,  $PB_2$  and PB as a whole differ significantly due to variations in their designation. Contrary to this, the variations in the university teacher's designation do not have significant bearing on their professional burnout aroused because of reduced personal accomplishment ( $PB_3$ -2.68), as the calculated F-value is below the table value (3.00). Thus the stated hypothesis, *'there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their designation'* is accepted with respect to  $PB_1$ ,  $PB_2$  and PB as a whole and rejected only with respect to  $PB_3$ . Assistant Professors experience higher level of burnout owing to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and professional burnout as a whole followed by Associate Professors and Professors. In other words, the lower the designation, the higher will be the professional burnout. The present findings with respect to burnout are similar to the findings of the studies by Azeem and Nazir (2008) on university teachers which reports that Lecturers exhibit high levels of emotional exhaustion compared to the Readers and Professors.

The professional burnout of university teachers owing to emotional exhaustion ( $PB_1$ ), personal accomplishment ( $PB_3$ ) and professional burnout as a whole do not vary due to variations in their years of experience; whereas, the professional burnout owing to depersonalization ( $PB_2$ ) vary based on the variations in their years of experience. Accordingly, the calculated F-values are not significant at 0.05 level with respect to  $PB_1$  (2.04),  $PB_3$  (0.86) and PB as a whole (2.30), except  $PB_2$  (3.15) which is significant at 0.05 level. Thus the stated hypothesis, *'there is a significant difference in the dimensions of the professional burnout of the university teachers due to variations in their years of experience'* is accepted only with respect to  $PB_2$  and rejected in case of  $PB_1$ ,  $PB_3$  and PB as a whole. Further, the mean values prove that the university teachers having 1- 10 years of experience show higher levels of burnout owing to depersonalization followed by teachers having 20 and above years and 11-20 years of experience.

Further, the calculated t-values of the university teachers working in A.P. State and T.N. States with respect to  $PB_1$  (3.37),  $PB_2$  (4.39),  $PB_3$  (4.58) and PB as a whole (4.75) are significant at 0.01 level. It reveals the fact that the professional burnout experienced by the university teachers owing to  $PB_1$ ,  $PB_2$ ,  $PB_3$  and PB as a whole differ significantly due to variations in the States they are working - in. Thus the formulated hypothesis, *'there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in the states they are working'* is accepted. Further, the mean values reveal that the teachers who are working in the T.N. State universities (12.87, 12.46, 12.88 & 38.20)

experience higher level of professional burnout due to PB<sub>1</sub>, PB<sub>2</sub>, PB<sub>3</sub> and PB as a whole when compared to the teachers working in A.P. State universities (14.10, 13.78, 14.49 & 42.36).

In contrast, the calculated t/F values with respect to the 'educational qualification' (PB<sub>1</sub>- 0.88; PB<sub>2</sub>-1.78; PB<sub>3</sub>- 0.76 & PB-1.28); 'nature of the department' (PB<sub>1</sub> - 2.42; PB<sub>2</sub> - 0.49; PB<sub>3</sub> - 0.11 & PB -0.74); 'nature of job' (PB<sub>1</sub> - 0.21; PB<sub>2</sub> - 0.07; PB<sub>3</sub> - 0.22 & PB - 0.02); and 'number of working hours/week' (PB<sub>1</sub>-0.25; PB<sub>2</sub>-0.26; PB<sub>3</sub>-0.68 & PB - 0.26) are below the table values and hence the stated hypothesis 'there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in the educational qualification ; nature of the department; nature of job and number of working hours/week' stands rejected.

**Table-5: Mean and SD of the Occupational Stress of University Teachers caused due to Intra & Interpersonal Interactions and the calculated t / F-values with respect to Certain Independent Variables**

| Independent Variables / Groups   | Occupational Stress due to Intra & Interpersonal Interactions |                              |                         |
|--|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|
|  | Mean  | SD                           | t/F Values              |
| <b>Gender</b><br>Men (682)<br>Women (273)  | 27.39<br>26.55  | 8.69<br>8.11                 | <b>1.37<sup>@</sup></b> |
| <b>Age Groups</b><br>28 to 37yrs (334)<br>38 to 47yrs (252)<br>48 & above (369)                | 26.99<br>26.21<br>27.93                                       | 8.94<br>8.21<br>8.31         | <b>3.14*</b>            |
| <b>Educational Qualification</b><br>PG with NET/SLET/M.Phil.(190)<br>PG with Ph.D.(765)        | 26.54<br>27.30  | 8.22<br>8.61                 | <b>1.10<sup>@</sup></b> |
| <b>Community</b><br>OC (326)<br>BC (307)<br>MBC (93)<br>SC / ST (229)                          | 27.63<br>26.35<br>29.26<br>26.68                              | 8.28<br>8.83<br>8.47<br>8.37 | <b>3.41*</b>            |
| <b>Designation</b><br>Assistant Professor(472)<br>Associate Professor(199)<br>Professor (284)  | 26.49<br>28.40<br>27.37                                       | 8.33<br>8.70<br>8.67         | <b>3.67*</b>            |
| <b>Nature of Dept.</b><br>Humanities (221)<br>Social Sciences(262)<br>Sciences (472)           | 26.36<br>26.36<br>27.95                                       | 8.28<br>8.77<br>8.45         | <b>4.18*</b>            |
| <b>Years of Experience</b><br>1-10 years (389)<br>11-20 years (267)<br>20 years & above ( 299) | 26.73<br>26.93<br>27.89                                       | 8.61<br>8.75<br>8.21         | <b>1.69<sup>@</sup></b> |
| <b>Nature of Job</b><br>Permanent (905)<br>Temporary (51)                                      | 27.25<br>25.43  | 8.60<br>7.14                 | <b>1.48<sup>@</sup></b> |
| <b>No. of working hours/week</b><br>14 hours & below (552)<br>15 hours & above (403)           | 27.06<br>27.27  | 8.54<br>8.54                 | <b>0.36<sup>@</sup></b> |



|       |                  |       |      |              |
|-------|------------------|-------|------|--------------|
| Note: | <b>State</b>     |       |      | **           |
|       | A.P. State (492) | 26.56 | 8.10 |              |
|       | TN State (463)   | 27.77 | 8.94 | <b>2.20*</b> |

Significant at 0.01 level; \* Significant at 0.05 level; @ Not significant at 0.05 level

From table-5, it is clear that the occupational stress of university teachers due to intra & interpersonal interactions differ significantly due to variations in certain independent variables as the calculated t/F values for age (3.14), community (3.41), designation (3.67), nature of department they are working-in (4.18) and the state university they are working-in (2.20) are significant at 0.05 level. Whereas the same teachers do not differ significantly in their occupational stress caused due to intra & interpersonal interactions in certain variables as the calculated t/F values with respect to gender (1.37), educational qualification (1.10), years of experience (1.69), nature of job (1.48) and number of hours working/week (0.36) are below the table value. Hence the stated hypothesis 'there is a significant difference in the Occupational Stress caused due to the Intra & Interpersonal Interactions of the university teachers due to variations in certain variables like gender, educational qualification, years of experience, nature of job and number of working hours/week' stands rejected; and accepted for the remaining variables such as 'age', 'community' and 'designation', 'nature of the department' and 'the state university they are working-in'.

One of the objectives of the study is to find out the relationship between the occupational stress caused due to intra & interpersonal interactions and professional burnout of university teachers. To realize this objective, Karl Pearson's Co-efficient of correlations has been computed based on university teacher's occupational stress due to intra & interpersonal interactions and professional burnout dimensions and the same has been shown in table-6.

**Table-6: Correlation between the Dimensions of Professional Burnout of University Teachers and the Occupational Stress due to their Intra & Interpersonal Interactions**

| O.S.<br>P.B.                                | Emotional<br>Exhaustion | Depersonali-<br>zation | Personal<br>Accomplish-<br>ment | Professional<br>Burnout as<br>a Whole |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Intra and Interpersonal Interactions</b> | 0.198**                 | 0.185**                | 0.185**                         | 0.219**                               |

Note: \*\* Significant at 0.01 level

From table-6 it is observed that, occupational stress caused due to intra & interpersonal interactions of university teachers has significant and positive relationship with all the dimensions of the professional burnout i.e. emotional exhaustion (0.198), depersonalization (0.185), personal accomplishment (0.185) and professional burnout as a whole (0.219) as the calculated r-values are significant at 0.01 level. Thus the stated hypothesis, 'there is a significant positive relationship between the occupational stress caused due to intra & interpersonal interactions and the dimensions of the professional burnout of the teachers working in the universities of south India' is accepted.

### Implications/Conclusions of the Study

Job stress and burnout has multiple causes, and so as to have multiple solutions. A well designed stress and burnout reduction program addresses both the individual as well as organizational levels. Some of the measures which could prove beneficial to teachers in coping with stress are - improving self-esteem, building self-confidence, working on building emotional intelligence competencies, cognitive behavioral techniques, assertiveness training, relaxation training, practicing yoga and meditation, developing effective communication skills, engaging in creative activities and so on. The quality of human relationships at work plays an important role in the perception of stress and burnout (Cohen and Wills, 1985; Gottlieb, 1983; House, 1981; Zander and Quinn, 1962; Kahn et al., 1964). Both the organization and the individual have the responsibility to actively manage the stress in order to eliminate the stressor or reduce its effects. Primary intervention at the organizational level and secondary intervention at the individual level are essentially appropriate preventive actions to try to eliminate or reduce problems that may cause stress. In the tertiary intervention level, it is a remedial action for those who may already be affected and addresses methods of treating or reducing the stress.

Interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships and communication are dynamic and together impact on our workplace relationships. Problems in the workplace such as - conflict, frustration, stress and burnout are often caused by interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships. There are, however, means of reducing workplace problems and enhancing personal wellbeing. Communication skills, setting up and maintaining clear boundaries, and preventing conflicts are some of these means of reducing workplace problems. Conflict often occurs when there is poor communication. Clearly communicating the

source of the conflict in a professional, friendly, respectful and solution focused way can help people to solve and prevent workplace conflict. There is a need to develop healthy interactions between the teaching and non-teaching staff members, students and administrative people, as good communication will act as a good strategy to solve the problems arising out of the stressors and also will act as a moderator to reduce the stress and burnout in teachers. Moreover, adequate feedback and information from the university from time to time will facilitate them to clarify the goals in teaching and research and also will find appropriate working methods to solve their problems.

Low self-efficacy is a central factor in the etiology of burnout (Cherniss, 1990). High self-efficacy was associated with lower emotional exhaustion, less cynicism, less depression and anxiety (Greenglass and Burke, 2000). Thus there is a need to improve the self-efficacy of the university teachers which acts as a personal resource, reflects the persons optimistic self-beliefs about being able to deal with critical demands by means of adaptive actions. It can also be regarded as an optimistic view of one's capacity to deal with stress (Greenglass and Burke, 2003). In order to reduce burnout, the university teachers should be motivated to set goals and should be supported to achieve the goal. The work should be allotted in such a manner that suits to their skill and interest which will give scope to accomplish the task which in-turn will improve their optimistic behavior. Also, involving the university teachers in group discussions and decision – making process will enhance their social interaction which will lead to accomplish the task allotted.

## References

- Abouserie, R. (1996). Stress, coping strategies and job satisfaction in university academic staff, *Educational Psychology*, 16 (1), 49-56.
- Anderson, M.B. and Iwanicki, E.F. (1984). Teacher motivation and its relationship to teacher burnout, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20, 94-132.
- Antoniou, A.-S., Polychroni, F. and Vlachakis, A.-N. (2006). Gender and age differences in occupational stress and professional burnout between primary and high-school teachers in Greece, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21 (7), 682 - 690.
- Azeem, S.M. and Nazir, N.A. (2008). A study of job burnout among university teachers, *Psychology & Developing Societies*, 20 (1), 51-64.
- Blix, A.G., Cruise, R.J., McBeth Mitchell, B. and Blix, G. G. (1994). Occupational stress among university teachers, *Educational Research*, 36 (2), Summer, 157 - 169. doi: 10.1080/00131889403 60205.
- Brown, M. and Ralph, S. (1998). Towards the identification of stress in teachers, *Research in Education*, 48, 103-110.
- Byrne, B.M. (1991a). Burnout: Investigating the impact of background variables for elementary, intermediate, secondary and university educators, *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 26, 583-605.
- Cherniss, C. (1990). Organizational negotiation skill and the prevention of burnout : Lessons of a long-term follow-up study, Paper presented at the 98<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston.
- Cohen, S. and Wills, T.A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, Pp. 310–57.
- Cooley, E. and Laviki, V. (1981). *Preliminary investigations of environment and individual aspects of burnout in teachers*, Paper presented at Oregon, Education Association, Otter Rock, Oregon.
- Cooper, C.L. and Payne, R. (1988). *Causes, coping and consequences of stress at work*. Wiley, New York.
- Cotton, P. and Fisher, B. (1995). Current issues and directions for the management of workplace psychological health issues. In P. Cotton (Ed.). (1995), *Psychological health in the workplace*, Australian Psychological Society, Victoria.
- Dunham, J. (1998). *Stress in teaching*, Routledge, New York.
- Farber, B.A. (1991). *Crisis in education : Stress and burnout in the American teacher*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, CA.
- Ginsberg, R. and Bennett, A. (1981). I don't' get no respect, *Vocational Education*, 56, 34-36.
- Gottlieb, B.H. (1983). Social support as a focus for integrative research in psychology. *Am Psychol*, 38, Pp. 278–287.
- Greenglass, E.R. and Burke, R.J. (2000). Hospital downsizing, individual resources and occupational stressors in nurses, *Anxiety, Stress and Coping*, 13, 371-390.
- Greenglass, E.R. and Burke, R.J. (2003). Teacher stress. In A.F. Dollard, A.H. Winefield, H.R. Winefield (Eds.). *Occupational stress in service professions*. (pp. 213 -236), Taylor and Francis, London and New York.
- House, J.S. (1981). *Work Stress and Social Support*, Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc, Reading.
- Iwanicki, E.F. (1983). Toward understanding and alleviating teacher burnout, *Theory into Practice*, 12, 27-32.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quin, R.P., Snoek, J.D., and Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*, John Wiley & Sons Inc: New York.

- Kyriacou, C. (1987). Teacher stress and burnout : An international review, *Educational Research*, 29 (2), 146-152.
- Lortie, D.C. (1975). *School teacher : A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Maslach, C. and Jackson, S. (1981b). The measurement of experienced burnout, *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113.
- Narayanan, I., Menon, S. and Spector, P. (1999) 'Stress in the workplace: A comparison of gender and occupation', *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 20, Pp. 63-74.
- Natale, J. (1993). Why teachers leave, *Executive Educator*, 15 (7), July, 14-18.
- Ozdemir, S. (2006). Burnout levels of teachers of students with AD/HD in Turkey: comparison with teachers of non-AD/HD students. *Education and Treatment of Children*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 693-709.
- Pierce, M.B. and Molloy, G.N. (1990). Psychological and biographical differences between secondary school teachers experiencing high and low levels of burnout, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 60, 37-51.
- Reddy, G. L. (2007). *Occupational stress, professional burnout and job satisfaction of special education teachers*, Major Research Project (Report Submitted to Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Govt., of India, New Delhi), Dept., of Education, Periyar University, Salem.
- Ricken, R. (1980). Teacher burnout-A failure of the supervisory process, *NASSP Bulletin*, 64, 21- 24.
- Robbins, S.P., Waters-Marsh, T., Cacioppe, R. and Millett, B. (1994). *Organizational behaviour: Concepts, controversies and applications*. Prentice Hall, New York.
- Russell, D.W., Altmaier, E. and Van Velzen, D. (1987). Job-related stress, social support and burnout among classroom teachers', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72 (2), 269-74.
- Schwab, R.L. and Iwanicki, E.F. (1982). Who are our burned out teachers ?, *Educational Research Quarterly*, 7, 5-16.
- Shergold, P. (1995). *Managing workplace health*, In Proceedings of the Workplace Health Conference, Sydney.
- Spector, P. E. and Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal conflict at work scale, organizational constraints scale, quantitative workload inventory, and physical symptoms inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health, Psychology*, 3(4), 356-367.
- Taris, T. W., Schreurs, P. J. G. and Van Iersal-Van Silfhout, I. J. (2001). Job stress, job strain, and psychological withdrawal among Dutch university staff: Towards a dual-process model for the effects of occupational stress, *Work and Stress*, 15, 283-296.
- Toohy, J. (1994). *Quality of working life project: Report on a study of occupational stress in commonwealth government employment*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Watts, J. and Robertson, N. (2011). Burnout in university teaching staff: a systematic literature review, *Educational Research*, 53 (1), 33 - 50, DOI: 10.1080/00131881.2011.552235 .
- Zander, A. and Quinn, R. (1962). The social environmental and mental health: A review of past research at the Institute for Social Research, *J Soc Issues*, 18, Pp. 48-67.