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METHODOLOGY

Burnout has most often been discussed and written about in relation to teaching and teachers. Teaching has been identified as a particularly stressful occupation Cocha, 1981; Farber & Miller, 1981; Landsman, 1978; Paine, 1981). Negative aspects of the job such as disciplinary problems, student's apathy, overcrowded classroom, excessive paperwork, inadequate salaries, demanding or unsupportive parents and lack of administrative support are among the stressors that confront teachers. These stressful aspects of teaching resulted, in burnout among teachers expressed in physical (e.g. depression, anger) and behavioural (e.g. deteriorating in work performance, absenteeism) symptoms (Cummingham, 1982). Informal surveys have found that many teachers continue to teach, but that their level of satisfaction has diminished dramatically. They talk of constant frustration and diminished community support. Studies indicating dissatisfaction among teachers and a reluctance to stay in the profession have contributed to the concern that teachers are "burning out", in reaction to increased stress. There are very few studies of this nature on Indian teachers. The scenario, in case of University teachers is somewhat different and there is complete dearth of researches on this sample.

Burnout, like stress is a complex phenomenon, for which there are no simple cause-effects or solutions. Literature on burnout concentrates on job in organisational characteristics that contribute to the development of this syndrome. Little attention has
been paid to the repeated observation of stress researches that response to stress differ among individuals, that stress is determined by the perception of events, rather than by the events themselves and that the degree of stress depends partly on the capacity of the individual to cope. It is important therefore, to study ways in which individuals can successfully mediate potentially stressful events. The researchers should examine the ways of dealing with negative consequences of stress once they have occurred and identify those personal characteristics that can provide a certain degree of "stress resistance". In order to fulfil these requirements the present study focussed on the Influence of Organisational Role Stress, Job Involvement and Personality Hardiness on employees' Job Burnout.

Thus, the purpose of the present research is to study "burnout" in case of University-level teachers as related to role stress, job involvement and personality hardiness. The study also aims at finding out the relationship between some personal characteristics of the teachers which could also contribute to the level of burnout they experienced, for example, age and tenure of services.

HYPOTHESES:

In the light of the available literature related to the study following hypotheses are formulated.

1. There is no significant difference between Lecturers, Readers and Professors on Role Stress and its ten dimensions.
2. There is no significant difference between Lecturers, Readers and Professors on the level of Job Involvement.

3. There is no significant difference between Professors and Readers on the level of commitment, Challenge, Control and Total Personality Hardiness.

4. There is no significant difference between Professors and Lecturers on the level of Commitment, Challenge, Control and Total Personality Hardiness.

5. There is no significant difference between Readers and Lecturers on the level of Commitment, Challenge, Control and Total Personality Hardiness.

6. There is no significant difference between Professors and Readers on the level of Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment.

7. There is no significant difference between Professors and Lecturers on the level of Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment.

8. There is no significant difference between Readers and Lecturers on the level of Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment.

9. The relationship between Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, Personal Accomplishment and Demographic variables will be negative.

10. The relationship between Emotional Exhaustion and Role Stress (including its ten dimensions) will be positive.

11. The relationship between Depersonalization and Role Stress (including its ten dimensions) will be positive.

12. The relationship between Personal Accomplishment and Role Stress (including its ten dimensions) will be positive.
13. The relationship between Emotional Exhaustion and Job Involvement will be negative.
14. The relationship between Depersonalization and Job involvement will be negative.
15. The relationship between Personal accomplishment and Job Involvement will be negative.
16. The relationship between Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, Personal Accomplishment and Commitment will be negative.
17. The relationship between Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, Personal Accomplishment and Challenge will be negative.
18. The relationship between Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, Personal Accomplishment and Control will be negative.
19. The relationship between Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, Personal Accomplishment and Total Personality Hardiness will be negative.
20. Age and Tenure will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment among Professors, Readers and Lecturers.
22. Job Involvement will acts as a predictor of emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal accomplishment among Professors, Readers and Lecturers.
23. Personality Hardiness and its three dimensions will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment among Professors, Readers and Lecturers.
SAMPLE:

In the present study the sample was randomly selected from Aligarh Muslim University. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>MEAN AGE</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>MEAN TENURE</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LECTURERS</td>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>24 – 48</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>1 – 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READERS</td>
<td>50.36</td>
<td>38 – 58</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>12 – 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSORS</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>44 – 59</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>15 – 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VARIABLES AND MEASURE:

The present study incorporates four variables, namely, Organisational Role stress, Job Involvement, Personality Hardiness and Job Burnout. Below is presented a brief description and the measure of these variables.
BURNOUT:

Maslach defines burnout as the loss of concern for the people with whom one is working in response to job related stress and came to treat them in detached or even dehumanized manner.

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 demotivational effects of feeling of inefficiency about their ability to related to recipients and this may result in a self-imposed verdict of failure.

The items comprising these sub scales are presented on following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALES</th>
<th>ITEMS NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Depersonalization</td>
<td>10,11,12,13,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 and Jackson person with higher scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub scales</th>
<th>N=469(Teachers)</th>
<th>N=1025(People in helping profession)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha reliabilities for teachers and person in helping profession, supporting the validity of the measures. Burnout scores have been found to increase in stressful job setting and to predict job turnover and absenteeism. Maslach & Jackson (1979) in their research on helping professions reported that correlation between the frequency and intensity dimension across subscales ranged from .35 to .73 with a mean of .56 , the correlation between these dimensions for teachers varied from .75 to .94 with a mean of .87,while the helping profession in general, there has been a moderate relationship
between how often one experiences various feelings associated with burnout and how intensely they are felt. Where as for teachers this relationship is fairly strong. On the average the total variance in common between the frequency and intensity scores on a subscale for person in the helping profession was only 31%.

The score on all three subscales were summed separately. Respondents with high scores on the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales and with lower scores on a personal accomplishment subscale would perceive themselves as burnout in the present study as suggested Maslach & Jackson.

**SCORING:**

The scores range from 1 to 7 with corresponding qualitative categories. These are presented below:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some what moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Some what strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A place is provided for the respondent to check "never", and for this score of 0 was
given. Scoring was done separately for each subscale as Maslach & Jackson,
suggests, therefor there will be minimum score of 1 and maximum score of 63 for EE
and 1-35 for DP and 1-56 for PA.

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS:

Pareek's (1976) definition of role as the position occupied by a person as defined by the
expectations of significant persons, including the role occupant, indicates that there are
inherent problems in the performance of a role and therefore stress is inevitable.
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)
The Organisational Role Stress scale is 5 point rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>If you never or rarely feel that way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If you occasionally feel that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If you sometimes feel that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If you frequently feel that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If you frequently or always feel that way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the scores for each role stress dimension range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 20 and total scores range from 0 to 200, as this scale has 10 dimensions and each dimension has five items. Validity was determined by item analysis. Retest reliability of scale has acceptable reliability. Sen (1981) used ORS on the sample of 500 bank employees and retest reliability co-efficient were found for total role stress (.73), and for the dimensions of role stress SRD (.45), IRD (.58), RS (.63), RA (.65), RO (.53), RE (.37), RI (.58).

**SCORING:**

For 5 point scale of ORS, scoring was done as 0,1,2,3 and 4 for the responses categories, if you never or rarely feel that way, if you occasionally feel that way, if you frequently feel that way or if you very frequently or always feel that way, respectively. On the ORS scale individual could get minimum score of 0 and maximum score of 200.
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. The original hardiness scale (The long form) was composed of the six subscales. The dimension of Commitment was measured by the 'Alienation from work and alienation from self scales' (Maddi, Kobasa & Hoover, 1979); control was measured by the external locus of control scale (Rotter, Seeman & Liverant, 1962) and the Powerlessness scale (Maddi, Kobasa and Hoover, 1979). The component of challenge was measured by the security scale of the California Life Goal Evaluation Schedules (Hahn, 1966) and the 'cognitive structure scale' of the personality research form (Jackson, 1974). Later on, Kobasa and Maddi conducted a principal component factor analysis for developing a more refined and shorter composite measure. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A little true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quite true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Completely true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SCORING:**

The responses of the subjects on the 'Hardiness' scale were collected on a 4-point scale ranging from 'not at all true' to 'completely true'. The response categories were assigned codes: 1, 2, 3, 4, respectively. The short form of control scale included in the questionnaire contains both 4-points and 2 point's response items. The simple summation of these items would result in the overweighing of the 4-points items. Therefore, to avoid the confusion the responses to items of the control scale were coded to have the same range as items from the other scales. That is, the subjects either received '1' or '4' for their responses to this scale. Therefore, the raw scores on the subscales were converted into Z scores. Since the items on the scales are negatively keyed for hardiness, subjects falling in upper thirds (+3) were identified as 'low hardy' and subjects falling in lower third (-3) were put in the category of 'high hardy' individuals.

**JOB INVOLVEMENT SCALE:**

The job involvement of the subjects was assessed with the help of Indian adaptation of Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) scale. Akhtar and Bacha (1984) undertook this adaptation. Its reliability co-efficient (Split half) has been reported to be .76. It is a 20 item 5-point rating scale:

1. If you totally disagree
2. If you disagree
3. If you undecided
4. If you agree
5. If you totally agree
Thus the total scores on this scale ranges from 20 to 100.

**SCORING:**

For 5-point rating scale of Job Involvement, scoring was done as 1,2,3,4 and 5 for the response categories. Simple summation of all the items indicates the score of the subject on that particular scale.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:**

First of all descriptive analysis was done to know the Mean and SD of all the variables in each group. Significance of difference was calculated to see whether the groups are differing on each variable by using Mann Whitney test. Further, correlational analysis was utilised for exploring the association between dependent and independent variables. Lastly, Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was computed in order to know the importance of different variables, which predicted criterion variable, that is Burnout.