



## A STUDY OF BURNOUT AMONG UNIVERSITY TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THEIR PERSONALITY

**Dr. Sapna**

Assistant Professor, Tirupati College of  
Education, Ratia

### Abstract

One of the banes of modern stressful life style is the occurrence of burnout syndrome among the educated people. Most of the educated people, who opt to be a teacher, cope with the heavy demands of the professional obligations and may suffer from the burnout syndrome sooner than later. Because of this malady, one becomes indifferent and listless towards one's profession and consequently happens to grow larger pathological apathy towards one's profession. This study attempts to pinpoint the factors, which contribute to the high rate of burnout among teachers of Universities. Burnout amongst teachers does not affect themselves alone but their students as well. Teacher's burnout has become an area of interest among researchers and practitioners in many fields during the past decade. The researchers have investigated personality, source of stress, burnout, organizational behaviour and emotional intelligence of the educators who appear to be experiencing burnout to a greater degree than their colleagues. Research findings have indicated the gaps in findings. Keeping in view these gaps in mind, the present study has been designed to understand more systematically, the complex and multifaceted nature of burnout and its relationship with personality.

### Introduction

"A teacher can never truly teach unless he is still learning himself. A lamp can never light another light unless it continues to burn its own."

Dr. Rabindra Nath Tagore

In the above line Dr. Rabindra Nath Tagore has described the role of teacher in teaching profession which formally takes place in university. The kind and quality of overall atmosphere of working place is an index of the nature of work, that prevails there. In educational institutions, a healthy environment is all the more very important for an effective process of education to take place. The teacher is the top most academic and professional person in the educational pyramid under whose charge, the destiny of our

children is placed by the parents and society. The success of any educational system depends much on the requisite qualities of a teacher. Teaching is very demanding job. Unlike many profession success in teaching is hard to measure and varies by individual. Further, teachers are often expected to fulfil many roles and teachers have many pressures on them and these overloads lead them to burnout.

### Review of the Related Literature

- ▶ Pruaner (2005) investigated a very interesting study on teacher burnout, locus of control and early morning free control level in teachers. The evaluation of the parameters revealed the close correlation between the number of bodily complaints, locus of control and degree of burnout found in the teachers. The result revealed that unmarried, untrained but having few ever years of teaching experience has a high level of burnout. Moreover teaching experience bring stress more.
- ▶ Malik (2005) explored the relationship of burnout among nurses with personality, organizational commitment and emotional intelligence.
- ▶ Duggal (2006) investigated the sample of 300 female school teacher from government, private and public school of Chandigarh and Punjab and tested then on the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) and found that teacher belongs to rural areas showed significant difference on the three dimensions of burnout when compared with teachers belonging to urban areas.
- ▶ Salami (2011) investigated the relationship of job stress, personality and social support to burnout among college of education lecturers.

### Burnout

Burnout is a type of psychological stress. Occupational burnout or job burnout is characterized by exhaustion, lack of enthusiasm and motivation, feelings of ineffectiveness, and also may have the dimension of frustration or cynicism, and as a result reduced efficacy within the workplace. Burnout is a state of emotional, mental, and physical exhaustion caused by excessive and prolonged stress. It occurs when you feel



overwhelmed, emotionally drained, and unable to meet constant demands.

### **Personality**

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

### **Definitions of Related Variables**

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

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

### **Objectives of the Study**

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

- To study the burnout and personality of university teachers with reference to their gender.
- To compare the burnout of university teachers with reference to their gender.
- To compare the personality of university teachers with reference to their gender.
- To analyze the relationship between the burnout variable and personality among the university teachers in Haryana.

### **Hypotheses of the Study**

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

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

### **Delimitations of the Study**

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

### **Research Method**

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

### **Population and Sample**

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

### **Tools Used**

Following tools are applied in this study

- A) Burnout Inventory by Dr. Karuna Shankar Misra



B) Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI) by  
Dr. S.S. Jalota and S.D. Kapoor  
**Data analysis**

### Demographic Profile of Respondents

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

**Table 1: Gender Groups of Respondents**

Gender groups	Frequency	Per cent
Male	182	52.0
Female	168	48.0
Total	350	100.0

**Source:** Survey

Table 1 shows the gender profile of the respondents of the study. Majority of respondents i.e. 52 per cent are males and remaining respondent are females i.e. 48 per cent in the study.

### Burnout of University Teachers with Reference to their Gender.

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

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

	Gender group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
NA	male	182	13.21	4.707	.349
	female	168	12.03	4.454	.344
DEP	male	182	15.68	4.610	.342
	female	168	14.69	3.591	.277
EE	male	182	12.67	4.163	.309
	female	168	12.43	3.529	.272
FR	male	182	11.92	4.075	.302
	female	168	10.41	3.584	.276
TA	male	182	12.96	4.335	.321
	female	168	11.57	4.229	.326
DIS	male	182	14.53	5.186	.384
	female	168	12.85	4.263	.329
NE	male	182	13.45	4.424	.328
	female	168	13.18	4.327	.334
EG	male	182	14.57	4.668	.346
	female	168	12.43	4.619	.356
Burnout	male	182	108.98	26.653	1.976
	female	168	99.60	25.442	1.963

**Source:** Survey

Analysis of the respondents viewpoint with regard to burnout variable is given in Table 2,

in which gender-wise mean value of male respondents was greater than female respondents.

**Table 3 Gender-wise Responses on Burnout Variable**

Particulars		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
NA	Between Groups	122.575	1	122.575	5.825	.016*
	Within Groups	7323.494	348	21.045		
	Total	7446.069	349			
DEP	Between Groups	84.819	1	84.819	4.920	.027*
	Within Groups	5999.778	348	17.241		
	Total	6084.597	349			



EE	Between Groups	4.858	1	4.858	.324	.570
	Within Groups	5215.500	348	14.987		
	Total	5220.357	349			
FR	Between Groups	198.364	1	198.364	13.403	.000*
	Within Groups	5150.424	348	14.800		
	Total	5348.789	349			
TA	Between Groups	168.926	1	168.926	9.201	.003*
	Within Groups	6388.928	348	18.359		
	Total	6557.854	349			
DIS	Between Groups	247.087	1	247.087	10.881	.001*
	Within Groups	7902.582	348	22.709		
	Total	8149.669	349			
NE	Between Groups	5.930	1	5.930	.309	.578
	Within Groups	6670.230	348	19.167		
	Total	6676.160	349			
EG	Between Groups	399.088	1	399.088	18.498	.000*
	Within Groups	7507.852	348	21.574		
	Total	7906.940	349			
Total	Between Groups	7699.890	1	7699.890	11.322	.001*
	Within Groups	236675.427	348	680.102		
	Total	244375.317	349			

Source: Survey

\* at 0.05 level of Significance

On the basis of the above result, it can be concluded that alternative hypothesis is accepted. And null hypothesis is accepted in Emotional Exhaustion (EE) (F=0.324, p=0.570) and NE (F=0.309, p=0.578) because p-value is greater

than 0.05 level of significance. It means the mean value of male university teachers was greater than female university teachers in different dimensions of burnout.

greater than female university teachers in different dimensions of burnout.

#### Personality of University Teachers with Reference to their Gender.

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

Table 4: Descriptive analysis of Personality Variable (Gender-wise)

Particulars	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
N	Male	182	24.59	7.862	.583
	female	168	23.05	11.494	.887
E	Male	182	20.22	6.568	.487
	female	168	18.45	7.537	.581
Personality	Male	182	44.81	10.373	.769
	female	168	41.49	15.584	1.202

Source: Survey

Analysis of the respondents viewpoint with regard to personality variable is given in Table

4, in which gender-wise mean value of male respondents was greater than female respondents.

Table 5 : Gender-wise Response on Personality Variable

Particulars		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
N	Between Groups	207.262	1	207.262	2.169	0.142
	Within Groups	33249.712	348	95.545		
E	Between Groups	274.728	1	274.728	5.528	.019*
	Within Groups	17294.727	348	49.697		



<b>Total</b>	Between Groups	959.234	1	959.234	5.561	<b>.020*</b>
	Within Groups	60032.263	348	172.507		

**Source:** Survey

\* at 0.05 level of Significance

On the basis of above result it may concluded that null hypothesis is accepted in case of personality dimension N, as p-value is greater than 0.05 level of significance, where as null hypothesis is rejected in case of personality

dimension E and total personality score, as p-value is less than 0.05 level of significance. It means mean value of male university teachers was greater than female university teachers. There is no Significance Relationship between the Burnout Variable and Personality Variable among the University teachers in Haryana.

**Table 6: Relationship between Burnout with Neuroticism (N)**

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

**Source:** Survey **Total Sample Size:** 350

0.05 level of Significance

On the basis of above result it may concluded that null hypothesis is rejected in Non-accomplishment (NA) with N ( $r = 0.170$ ,  $p = 0.016$ ), Depersonalization (DEP) with N ( $r = 0.229$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), Emotional Exhaustion (EE) with N ( $r = 0.346$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), Friction (FR) with N ( $r = 0.183$ ,  $p = 0.009$ ), Neglecting (NE) with N ( $r = 0.332$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), Easy going (EG) with N ( $r = 0.314$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) and total burnout score with N ( $r = 0.296$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) because the p-value is less than 0.05 level of significance, therefore alternative hypothesis is accepted. And null hypothesis is accepted in Task avoidance (TA) with N ( $r = 0.174$ ,  $p = 0.14$ ) and Distancing (DIS) with N ( $r = 0.065$ ,  $p = 0.361$ ), as p-value is greater than 0.05 level of significance. Further, the value of coefficient of correlation i.e. r-value in the table 4.29, shows that there is positive correlation in the different dimensions of the burnout with Neuroticism (N), dimension of personality. On the basis of above, it may conclude that there is negligible correlation

found in the NA, FR, TA, DIS, with respect to Neuroticism (N) where as low correlation found in DEP, EE, NE, EG, total burnout with regards to Neuroticism (N).

### Major Findings

#### Section A: Demographic Profile of Respondents

The present section discusses the major findings of the demographic profile of the respondents of the study as follows:

- Majority of the respondents are males in comparison to females in the study.

#### Section B: Burnout of University Teachers with Reference to their Gender.

The following section explains the gender-wise association of the Burnout variable.

- Analysis of the respondents viewpoint with regard to burnout variable, in which gender-wise ANOVA result show that there is significant association (at 0.05 level of significance) in different dimension of burnout variable i.e. Non-accomplishment (NA), Depersonalization





(DEP), Friction (FR), Task avoidance (TA), Distancing (DIS), Easy going (EG), and total Burnout score. It means the mean value of male university teachers was greater than female university teachers where as insignificant association in Emotional Exhaustion (EE) and Neglecting (NE).

### **Section C : Personality of University Teachers with Reference to their Gender**

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

- Gender-wise response of the respondents toward personality variable, it is noticed that there is significant association in dimension of personality variable i.e. Extraversion (E) and total personality score. It means mean value of male university teachers was greater than female university teachers. While insignificant association in dimension of personality variable i.e. Neuroticism (N) and total personality score.

### **Section D: Relationship among the Burnout with Personality**

The following section explain the relationship among the Burnout dimensions such as Non-accomplishment, Depersonalization, Emotional Exhaustion, Friction, Task Avoidance, Distancing, Neglecting, Easy Going and total Burnout score with Personality variable.

- The relationship between the burnout dimensions such as NA, DEP, EE, FR, TA, DIS, NE, EG and total Burnout score with Neuroticism (N), dimension of personality of the respondents of the study is consider, it is found that there is significant

difference in NA with N, DEP with N, EE with N, FR with N, NE with N, EG with N and total burnout score with N where as insignificant difference found in the TA with N and DIS with N. Further, the value of coefficient of correlation i.e. r- value, show that there is positive correlation in the different dimensions of the burnout with Neuroticism (N), dimension of personality.

### **References**

- Eysenk, H.J. *Manual of the Maudsley personality inventory*. London; university of London press, 2005.
- Gerits, L.; Derksen, Jan J.L., Verbruggen, A.B. and Katzko, M. (2005). Emotional intelligence profiles of nurses caring for people with severe behaviour problems. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38 (1), 33-43.
- Limori, M., (2008). *Relationship of nurse burnout with personality, characteristics and coping behaviours*. *Industrial Health*, 46, 326-335.
- Kumara, M. (2002). A study of burnout among high school female teachers in relation to their personality, occupational stress, and self-related cognitions, Unpublished Thesis, K.U.K.
- Lennort, S. Littorin, P. (2005). Relationship of emotional intelligence, personality, and work performance. *Scandinavian Journal of organizational Theory and Practice*, 21-37.
- Malik, A. (2005). A study of burnout among nurses in relation to personality, organizational commitment, and emotional intelligence. Unpublished, M.A. Dissertation, K.U.K.
- Miner, M.H. (2007). Burnout in the first year of ministry: Personality and belief style as important predictors. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 10(1), 17-29.
- Norman, W.T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 574-583. Online available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2794272/>
- Perkins, A.M. and Corr, P.J. (2006). Cognitive ability as a buffer to neuroticism: Charchiell's secret weapon? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40 (1), 39-51.
- Rajneesh, (2001). *Emotional intelligence in relation to five factors of personality and cognitive and emotional components of empathy*. M.A. Dissertation, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.
- Singh, U. and Kumari, M. (2006). Relationship among personality dimensions, occupational stress, self-related cognitions and burnout of high school female teachers. *Maharishi Dayanand University Research Journal*, 5, 73-85.