CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION

The development of a nation depends upon its system of education. The system of Education of a country reflects the level of prosperity, welfare and security of the people. In a way the success of democracy and secularism depends upon the quality of people coming out of schools and colleges as a product. Education promotes the development of democratic citizenship and makes an individual socially efficient by making the society worth living. In democratic country like India lot of stress is laid upon education, and role of a teacher. Success of any system of Education depends on the quality, competence and the character of the teacher, as suggested by Education Commission (1952-53), “The most important factor in the contemplated educational reconstruction is the teacher - his personal qualities, his educational qualifications his professional training and the place that he occupies in the school as well as in the community. The reputation of a school and its influence on the life of the community, invariably depend on the kind of teachers working in it”.

A teacher is a person of great social status and prestige. The National Policy on Education (1986) has remarked that status of the teacher reflects the socio-cultural ethos of the society; it is said that no people can rise above the level of their teachers. It is an effective teacher who stimulates, motivates the learners, guides them to develop their potentialities, skill, attitude, knowledge, puts efforts to make them sensitive human beings and maintains a harmonious relationship with the students and extends it beyond the realms of conventional class room.
There is no substitute for a teacher as a human engineer, architect of the society and nation builder. The role he plays is vast, unique and unmatchable. According to Kabir, "Without good teacher even the best of the system is bound to fail. With good teacher even the defects of a system can be largely over come”. Aristotle was of the view that the teacher who educated children deserves more honour than parents, who merely gave them birth, for the latter provided mere life, while the former ensured a good life.

Education given by the teacher has three fold functions to perform. Firstly it is an agency for the development of knowledge and skills. Secondly, it is an agency for inculcating moral values such as rationality, secularism, and achievement orientation, equality; lastly it is an agency for socialization, thus preparing the individual for future adult roles and responsibilities.

According to Kabir "The teachers are arbiters of nation's destiny. It may sound a truism, but still it needs to be stressed that the teacher is the key to any educational reconstruction". It is he who gives shape to the personality of the students. According to Nepal Education Commission, "The teacher is the foundation stone in an educational setup and it is he who can make the education meaningful and shape the educational climate". The teacher has a powerful abiding influence in the formation of the character of every future citizen. He acts as a pivot for the transmission of intellectual and technical skills and cultural traditions from one generation to the other. The responsibility of the teacher is therefore very great.

In this time of transformation, when the nation is aspiring to take quantum jump into the club of developed nations, teacher has been subjected to increased pressures of the society, as the students and parents are becoming excessively demanding. Apart from covering the course content with adequate
speed and precision and taking care of inter and inter-individual differences of students with wide range of abilities, interacting and guiding parents, the teacher is required to perform behavior needed by institution which goes beyond the requirements and in complete disregard to the social forces impinging upon the system as a whole.

Moreover the changing perception of national bodies like University Grants commission and National Assessment and Accreditation Council about the higher education scenario has made the job of the teacher more demanding and challenging. He/she is expected to perform multiple roles of research, development of learning resources, extension and management of different activities. The factors such as over expectations both quantitatively and qualitatively are deteriorating teaching competencies, depleting envisaged role of teachers and producing stress and burnout behaviour. The occurrence of job stress and burnout among professionals working in human service organizations has been accumulated and documented over the last two decades. Burnout is a socio-psychological syndrome grounded in the complexities of people’s relationship with work.

The role of teacher is very significant in achieving the objectives of education. In ancient Indian society teacher was considered next to God. He alone can transform the students, community and society. So the teaching profession is regarded as the most important profession as its social value lies in its significant contribution to the improvement of the quality of life and betterment of society at large. Shamsuddin, “From the time immemorial, the teacher has been enjoying a high status and esteem in society. He has been termed the torchbearer of the race, the one, who, by light of his knowledge, removes the darkness of ignorance. He moulds the lives of thousands of children, and is known as the builder of the nation.”
The occurrence of Job Stress and burnout among professionals working in human service organizations has been accumulated and documented over the last two decades (Dewe, Leiter and Cox, 2000). Various studies have projected burnout as an international phenomenon and the huge research literature on burnout shows that teachers are particularly at risk (Rigby and Bennett, 1996; Pithers and Soden 1998; Baggaley and Sulwe, 1999; Jacobsson, Pousette and Thyelfors 2001; Chan 2002; Brown, Ralph and Bember, 2002).

Various studies have indicated that teaching is a stressful occupation (Boyle, Borg, Falzon and Baglioni, 1995; Chan and Hui, 1995). Everyday comes as a challenge for teacher as he faces many problems inside and outside the classroom while interacting with the recipients of his service i.e. students. Student’s misbehaviour is listed as one of the major causes of stress, which includes noisy behaviour, impoliteness, poor attitude towards school work (Brog, Ridung and Falzon, 1991), discipline problems (McCormick, 1997). There are other serious stressors such as lack of motivation (Burke and Greenglass, 1993), apathy and low achievement (Byrne, 1994), community and parental expectations (Gaziel, 1993; McCormick 1997), disruptive students, violence and apathy on the part of students, poor relations between teacher and student (Farber 1991; Friedman, 2000), change in student and community attitudes towards educators and lack of job mobility (Gold 2001), that potentially lead towards onset and growth of burnout syndrome.

The report of the Commonwealth Conference (1974) point out that, "The teacher must have knowledge of child development, of the material to be taught and suitable methods of teaching it, of the culture of his pupils and of some interest of his own; his skills must enable him to teach, advise and guide his pupils, community and culture with which he is involved; his attitudes should be positive without being aggressive, so that his example is likely to be
followed as he transmits explicitly and implicitly the national aims and ideals and moral and social values”.

The teacher has more than one role to play. He has to play the role of a facilitator, a leader of a cooperative enterprise in which development occurs through reciprocal give-and-take. He is expected to arouse enthusiasm and be a source of inspiration to his pupils. *Verma (1991)* mentioned that if teacher is not enthusiastic about his work, if he does not have a set of values, if he is not a communicator of love, knowledge, power and beauty, he would neither be able to put new life and energy into those who follow him nor to approve honest endeavor, and cheer those who find their burdens heavy.

The quality of teacher educators is very important for bringing about foundational improvement in teacher education institutions and consequently in school education. *Adiseshiah (1978)*, “Those that are entrusted with the responsibility of teaching the teacher have naturally to be the men and women of high caliber whose influence would prove to be the greatest assets for prospective teacher”. Teacher educator, like a teacher, must possess the knowledge, skills and attitudes, which will enable him to work with confidence.

Teacher educator can be called builder of nation builders. He gives shape to the teacher, who later shapes the future of students. The quality of teachers very much depends upon the quality of those who educate them. Thus the quality of citizens indirectly depends upon the quality of teacher educators.

Researches have repeatedly corroborated the fact that the progress of a nation squarely rests on the teachers. That is why the first sentence of *Education Commission (1964-66)* report stated that. “Thus destiny of a nation
is being shaped inside the classrooms”. Therefore a teacher is shaping the
destiny of a nation. Education is looked upon as an instrument to develop a
man and to build a society based on justice and equality. Wells has rightly said,
“Human history becomes more and more a race between education and
catastrophe.”

Well qualified, competent psychologically, socially adjusted teacher can
build a nation. On the contrary unsatisfied maladjusted teacher cannot
contribute much to the system of Education as well as the nation regarding to
be a burnout teacher, in spite of having a sound academic career and
professional training will do much harm than good. A burnt-out teacher will
neither work whole heartedly nor will try to contribute to education; he will not
be able to develop desirable attitude, values, work habits and adequate personal
adjustment in his staff and students.

The first factors we will examine come from the organizational
category. Role conflict, the first variable, involves the quantity of work that
teachers are expected to get done and the quality of work that could be
achieved in that time (a large discrepancy exists here). Another conflict is
when teachers try to meet the demands of each individual student, in a large
diverse class of different ability levels. Finally, teachers are stuck in conflict
over discipline problems, where support is limited from parents and principals.
Role conflict is one of the key factors of job stress and burnout in teachers.

A second organizational factor associated with burnout is role
ambiguity. Teachers who constantly struggle with this feel as though there are
inconsistent school policies in regards to student behavior, there are constantly
changing curriculum and teaching methodologies, and they feel as though no
one cares about the work they are doing. When teachers are unsure of their
A third organizational factor associated with burnout is work overload. Teachers experience excessive paperwork, oversized classes filled with students of different academic abilities and the need for teachers to complete tasks beyond their knowledge base.

Classroom climate is a fourth organizational factor. When the working environment is less than ideal stress occurs. Teachers, who have student discipline problems, student apathy, low student achievement, and face verbal and physical abuse from students, become overwhelmed.

"Another major stressor for teachers is their lack of involvement in decisions that bear directly on their quality of work life" (Byrne, 1994). Teachers who are involved in the decision making process are said to have higher morale, motivation, and self-esteem. Nevertheless, in general, teachers are minimally involved in the decisions of their school. They feel a declining sense of morale, lack of job satisfaction, and loss of control and self-esteem. These factors form a cumulative relationship with stress and burnout.

The final organizational factor that leads to burnout is lack of social support. Teachers who constantly feel as though their administrators are judging their work are not confident in themselves. They feel as though anything new that they try to do will not be supported by their administration, so why bother to try.

Other factors associated with burnout fit into the category of personality. The first factor is locus of control. Teachers who are experiencing burnout
tend to feel as though all the events in their classroom are beyond their control, due to fate, luck or other people. In other words they see their teaching as completely out of their control. The second factor is self-esteem. Teachers low in self-esteem are more threatened by rejection, and therefore more vulnerable to stress and burnout.

Burnout is a socio-psychological syndrome grounded in the complexities of people’s relationship with work. It progresses due to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job and leads towards dampening of enthusiasm to work and erosion of engagement with job, slackening performance and sometimes a promising human resource is nipped in the bud due to experience of burnout.

Job burnout is a problem in many professions, but it significantly more prevalent in the helping professions. Teachers, as well as administrators, counselors, doctors, nurses, police officers, and so on have the additional burden of extreme responsibility for the well being of others on top of the multitude of stressors that stem from routine job activities. This heavy responsibility combined with limited resources, long hours, marginal working conditions, and often unreasonable demands from those receiving services, lead to chronic stress, and ultimately, burnout.

Teacher burnout was found to be associated to organizational factors such as imposition of measurable goal achievement standards on teachers, lack of trust in teachers’ professional adequacy, a disagreeable physical environment and inadequacy access to facilities and the intrusion of schoolwork into out of school hour’s time. The interactions taking place between teachers, teachers and principal, teachers and students knit a web of social environment, which is constituent of organizational climate. Various
other aspects of organizational set up such as time demands, clerical duties, difficulties with students, large classrooms, control of students, financial constraints and lack of educational supplies have been listed as stress inducing causes.

It is not only the personality variables or the organizational variables alone that predict the occurrence of burnout syndrome but a combination or inter-action between two sets of variables. In a social setup it sounds impossible to live without interactions, so personality and situational variables cannot be viewed in isolation and interaction comes as the most plausible interpretation for the burnout phenomenon to develop.

According to Frisinger (2006) Burnout is a multidimensional psychological syndrome that evolves as a reaction to chronic stress in the workplace. It results in an irrevocable depletion of a person’s energies and emotional resources with various negative consequences for individuals and organizations. In the past 30 years researchers tried to understand the burnout construct in its complexity and offered diverse answers to questions of why burnout appears and how it can be measured. But despite the broad academic research on burnout, the knowledge base is still lacking a comprehensive approach on how to prevent burnout from happening and how to alleviate organizations from its the negative implications. (The Burnout Phenomenon Keys for proactive burnout prevention Jetzt bestellen! Robert Frisinger Kategorie: Medizin - Gesundheitswissenschaften Abschlussarbeit August 2006, 51 Seiten, 1,1 MB , Note 2,0, Sprache Englisch Universiteit Maastricht Niederlande)
1.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

1.1.1 Burnout

Burnout first emerged as a social problem, not as a scholarly construct. Thus, the initial conception of burnout was shaped by pragmatic rather than academic concerns. In this pioneering phase of conceptual development, the focus was on clinical descriptions of burnout. Later on, there was a second, emotional phase in which the emphasis shifted to systematic research on burnout and in particular to the assessment of this phenomenon. Throughout these two phases there has been increasing theoretical development in which the concern has been to integrate the evolving notion of burnout with other conceptual frameworks.

The First Phase

The first few articles about burnout appeared in the mid 1970s in the United States (Freudenderger, 1974, 1975; Maslach, 1976). The significance of these first articles was that they provided an initial description of the burnout phenomenon, gave its name, and showed that it was not an aberrant response by a few deviant people but was actually more common.

The way in which the burnout phenomenon was identified and labeled illustrates its social origin. As a psychiatrist, Freudenberger was employed in an alternative health care agency. He observed that many of the volunteers with whom he was working experienced a gradual emotional depletion and a loss of motivation and commitment. Generally, this process took about a year and was accompanied by a variety of mental and physical symptoms. To denote this particular mental state of exhaustion, Freudenberger used a word that was being used colloquially to refer to the effects of chronic drug abuse: “burnout.”
At about the same time, Maslach, a social psychology researcher, was studying the ways in which people cope with emotional arousal on the job. She was particularly interested in such cognitive strategies as “detached concern” and dehumanization in self-defense,” but soon discovered that both the arousal and the strategies had important implications for people’s professional identity and job behaviour. When by chance she described these results to an attorney, she was told that poverty lawyers called this particular phenomenon “burnout”. Once Maslach and her colleagues adopted this term, they discovered that it was immediately recognized by their interviewees; thus, a new colloquial expression was born.

This early burnout literature resulted several noteworthy characteristics, which in turn have had implications for the development of the burnout concept. First, what was meant by the term “burnout” varied widely from one writer to the next? As a result, these writers were sometimes talking about different phenomena rather than the same one. A second, and related, characteristic is that the concept of burnout was stretched and expanded to encompass far more than it did originally. Almost every personal problem that one can think of was described as “burnout” at some point. In some cases, burnout was a somewhat superfluous addition, as in “midlife crisis burnout.” In other cases, it was problem here is that a concept that has been expanded to mean everything ends up meaning nothing at all, an issue that has been discussed elsewhere (Maslach, 1982 & Jackson, 1984).

A third characteristic of the early burnout literature is that it was largely no empirical. Perlman and Hartman (1982) reviewed 48 articles that had been published between 1974 and 1981, all with many ideas, suggestions, and proposals about what causes burnout and what should be done about it. However, only five of these articles (i.e. 10%) had any empirical data beyond
an occasional anecdote or personal case history. Instead, most of these early articles on burnout used a “clinical” approach. Thus, the authors tried to describe and understand the burnout syndrome by means of cautious (but unstandardized) observation and subsequent analyses of individual case studies. In particular, the focus was on symptoms that are found in burned-out individuals.

The Second Phase

During the next phase of the 1980s, the work on burnout entered a more focused, constructive and empirical period. Many books and articles were written about burnout, in which authors outlined their working models of the phenomenon, proposed various ideas and interventions and presented various forms of corroborative evidence (survey and questionnaire and interview response, clinical case studies). Standardized measures of burnout were developed, thus providing researchers with more precise definitions and methodological tools for studying the phenomenon. In particular, the development and widespread acceptance of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1981a, 1981b, 1986) and the Tedium Measure (TM; Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981) fostered systematic research on burnout, resulting in an increased number of articles published in scholarly journals (including several issues devoted entirely to burnout).

A general review of the more recent burnout literature indicates several trends. First much of the work has continued to be done within people-oriented human service occupations, although the variety of these occupations has expanded (e.g., police, correctional officers, prison guards, librarians). Although this is general case, the burnout concept has also extended to other types of occupations and other non-occupational areas of life. For example, there
has been discussion about burnout about in the business world, in sports, in political activism, and within the family.

The empirical research on burnout has tended to focus more on job factors than on other types of variables. This is consistent with most of the conceptual models that have been proposed. Thus, researchers have studied such variables as job satisfaction, job stress (workload, role conflict, and role ambiguity), job withdrawal (turnover, absenteeism), job expectations, relations with coworkers and supervisors (social support on the job) relations with clients, caseload type of position and time in job, agency policy and so forth. The personal factors that have been studied are most often demographic variables (sex, age, marital (locus of control, hardiness), personal health, relations with family and friends (social support at home), and personal values and commitment. In general, job factors are more strongly related to burnout than are biographical or personal factors.

However, in recent years much progress has been made on the theoretical front. One factor that has helped facilitate this progress is the greater consensual agreement on an operational definition of burnout, largely because of the development of validated research measures. Good opportunities now exist for integrating empirical results within a particular conceptual framework and for carrying out theory driven research.

Burnout is a malaise of the spirit in which motivation, that mysterious force that gets us moving is damaged or even destroyed. Job burnout could be called job depression. Burnout is not an all-or-nothing proposition. On any particular day enthusiasm for work is increasing or decreasing but it does not remain the same. Even the hottest fires will burn out, so we tend them fanning, stoking, and occasionally adding log. When motivation wanes, we burnt out.
Occasional feelings of frustration, anger, depression, dissatisfaction and anxiety are normal parts of living and working. But people caught in the burnout cycle usually experience these negative emotions more often until they become chronic. In the worst cases, people complain of a kind of emotional fatigue or depletion. While no two people respond in exactly the same way, people tend to experience frustration first that may evolve into anger. In later stages we see anxiety and fear then depression and in extreme cases, despair. These physical symptoms are accompanied by declining performance, withdrawal and interpersonal problems, substance abuse in an attempt to self medicate, illness and absenteeism and feelings of meaninglessness “Why bother? Attitude

The construct of burnout syndrome appeared for the first time around the early 1970s, aimed at explaining the process of physical and mental deterioration in professionals working in areas such as teaching, health care, social work or emergency legal services (Freudenberger, 1974). Subsequently, burnout syndrome was defined as a sustained response to chronic work stress comprising three dimensions: the experience of being emotionally exhausted (emotional exhaustion), negative attitudes and feelings toward the recipients of the service (depersonalization), and feelings of low accomplishment and professional failure (lack of personal accomplishment).

The term burnout came in popular usage by Greene’s novel, ‘A Burnout case’ which appeared in 1961. The initial articulation of burn out phenomenon was done by Freudenburges (1974) a psychiatrist working in an alternative health care agency.

Maslach (1976) Cherniss (1980) and Farber and Miller (1981) hold that burnout teacher are apt to neglect preparation of their classes, they tend to
behave with exaggerated rigidity and in flexibility, display low tolerance, feel emotionally and physically exhausted and display commitment to teaching.

The topic of burn out has been gaining interest since the mid 1970’s. The job stress and burnout have become the buzzwords of our times. It is a current problem in modern society due to interest job tensions and stresses to get more work done in a shorter period of time. It has now become an important topic of study because it has theoretical and practical significance. It was Freudenberger (1974) who firstly evolved this term. Earlier it was called depression.

According to Webster International Dictionary (1976) defines burnout as, “to fail, wear out or became exhausted by making excessive demands on the energy, strength or resources.” It indicates that burnout is the state of Emotional Exhaustion related to overload. So burnout is a decrease of over commitment.

Maslach (1976) referred it as, ‘the loss of concern for the people with whom one is working in response to the job related stress. It was found that burnout linked with numerous variables, which are negative and especially affect those who are dedicated and committed to their work.

In recent years a number of studies have been done and international concern with teacher stress and burnout is reflected in numerous studies conducted in different countries including India, Israel, Australia, Hongkong, U.K. and the U.S.A. Berkley Planning Associates (1977) defined Burnout as, “the extent to which a worker has become separated or withdrawn from the original meaning or purpose of his work, the degree to which a worker expressed estrangement from clients, co-worker and agency.”
According to Reed (1979), “Burnout is the feeling of being locked into a job routine. It disproportionately strikes in the helping professions. The condition of burnout can for years. He further added that there are three levels of burnout. First degree burnout includes bouts of irritability, fatigue, worry and frustration; second degree burnout is similar but can last for two weeks or more; third degree burnout is more severe, physical symptoms which can be long lasting.”

The most common signs and symptoms of burnout have been reported to be: high resistance to going to work every day; a sense of failure; anger and resentment; guilt and blame; discouragement and indifference; negativism; isolation and withdrawal; feeling tired and exhausted all day; frequent clock watching; great fatigue after work; loss of positive feeling towards clients; postponing client contacts; resisting client phone calls and office visits; stereotyping clients; inability to concentrate on or listen to what client is saying; feeling immobilized; cynicism regarding clients; a blaming attitude; increasingly going by the book; sleep disorders; avoiding discussion of work with colleagues; self pre-occupation; more approving of behaviour-control measures such as tranquilizers; frequent colds and flues; frequent headaches and gastrointestinal disturbances; rigidity in thinking and resistance to change; suspicion and paranoia; excessive use of drugs; marital and family conflict and high absenteeism (Schwartz and Will, 1961; Freudenberger, 1974; Maslach, 1976 and Berkely Planning Associates, 1977).

Cherniss (1980) opined that burnout means psychological withdrawal from work in response to excessive stress or dissatisfaction. It refers to the situation in which what was formerly a ‘calling’ becomes merely a ‘job’. In other words burnout means loss of enthusiasm, excitement and a sense of mission in one’s work.
Cherniss (1980) further investigated the signs of burnout:

- Anger and resentment
- Great fatigue after work
- Guilt and blame
- A sense of failure
- Feeling of tiredness
- High resistance for going to work everyday
- Isolation and withdrawal
- Frequent clock watching
- Negativism
- Discouragement of indifference
- Sleep disorders
- Successive use of drugs
- Frequent headaches
- Loss of positive feelings
- Avoiding discussion of work with colleagues

When these signs or symptoms are found in an individual, there is much possibility of burnout.

Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) described that burnout may be explained as “progressive loss of idealism, energy, purpose and concern as a result of conditions of work”.

Clouse and Whitaker (1981) explained burnout as a process which begins with high enthusiasm and dedication then is a drastic reversal in attitude and behaviour when an individual does not receive positive responses and feedback, enthusiasm alters, however, there are who are able to maintain enthusiasm in profession.”
Maslach and Jackson (1981), “burnout included emotional exertion resulting from chronic stress in human service, profession and occurs at any level in all jobs. The investigators considered burnout is another name for job stress.

According to Silverstain (1982), “Burnout is a process where by committing professional disengages from work in repose to job stress.

Paine (1982) observed burnout as “Burnout Stress Syndrome (BOSS) the consequence of high levels of job stress, personal frustration and inadequate coping skills, have major personal, organizational and social costs; and these costs are probably increasing; BOSS is a debilitating psychological condition brought about by unrelieved work stress. Four types of consequences can arise from it: depletion of energy reserves; lowered resistance to illness; increased dissatisfaction and pessimism and increased absenteeism and inefficiency at work.

Cunningham (1983) considered burnout as a syndrome resulting from prolonged stress, primarily fractured by physical emotional and attitudinal exhaustion.

Farber (1984) stated that burnout is usually defined as behaviorally manifest emotional and physical exhaustion deserved from stressful situational events not adequately met by effective coping strategies.

Maslach and Jackson (1986) define, “Burnout is syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind.”
Burnout is a term used to describe people who are physically and psychologically burnt out. Maslach & Jackson (1986), both researchers in this field, defined burnout according to three criteria: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment. People experiencing these criteria usually feel as though they were unable to assist their students, and even more negative attitudes toward students, parents, and colleagues. The teachers also felt as though they were unable to accomplish any goals. Burned out teachers also felt less committed to creating good lessons and correcting work as well as less tolerance for classroom disruptions. There are two types of variables that effect burnout: personality and organizational.

Brezniak and Ben-Yair (1989) described that burnout may be conceived as a mismatch between an individual’s resources, values and expectations and the demands of the environment. The negative psychological experience which involves feelings, attitudes, expectations and motivation is expressed in terms of exhaustion and passive regressive behaviour. Burnout is a psychological strain which results in the symptoms of physical depletion, emotional and mental exhaustion, chronic fatigue and feelings of disillusionment and hopelessness accompanied by negative attitude towards oneself and others.

Shirom (1989) viewed burnout as an affective reaction to ongoing stress whose core content is the gradual depletion over time, of individuals’ intrinsic energetic resources including the expression of emotional exhaustion, physical fatigue and cognitive weariness.

Shirom (1989) viewed burnout as an affective state characterized by one’s feeling of being depleted of one’s physical, emotional and cognitive energies. The Shirom-Melamed Burnout Model (S-MBM) conceptualizes burnout on the basis of conservation of resources (COR) theory, which says...
that people have a basic motivation to obtain, retain and protect that which they value. When circumstances at work or otherwise threaten people’s obtaining or maintaining resources, stress ensues. COR theory postulates that stress occurs less than one of three conditions: when resources are threatened; when resources are lost; and when individuals invest resources and do not reap the anticipated rate of return. The things that people value are called resources of different types, e.g. material, social and energetic resources. The Shirom’s model (1989) based upon Hobfoll’s (1989, 1998) conservation of resources theory encompasses the energetic resources (physical, emotional and cognitive energies).

Lee and Ashforth (1990) formulated that burnout refers to the feeling of emotional exhaustion associated with prolonged strain, plus two models of coping with it namely depersonalization of people as sources of stress and learned helplessness that results in reduced accomplishment.

Santinello (1990) stated burnout as psycho-physical state accompanied by apathy, detachment and coolness in interpersonal relations by feelings of emotional exhaustion of one’s psychic resources and of helplessness.

Wallace and Brinkerhoff (1991) referred burnout as individual worker’s inability to respond adequately to perceived demands and to their accompanying anticipation of negative consequences for such inadequate responses.

Though burnout is defined and explained in many different ways but the Maslach’s model of burnout is the most popular and immensely studied model. This model is based upon multi-dimensional theory, which conceptualizes burnout in three dimensions namely emotional exhaustion, depersonalization
and personal accomplishment (Maslach and Jackson, 1981, 1986; Maslach, 1993). The multi-dimensional theory highlights that burnout is an individual stress experience embedded in a context of complex social relationships, and it involves the person’s conception of both self and others. In other words it can be interpreted that burnout does not develop in isolation, it emerges out of the intricate web of self-social-work situation, relationships surrounding the individual. The three dimensions of burnout as explained by Maslach and Jackson (1986, 1998) are:

Emotional Exhaustion (EE) which is the basic individual stress dimension (Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter, 2001) refers to feelings of being emotionally over extended and exhausted by one’s work. It signifies depletion of one’s emotional resources. Workers feel drained and used up without any source of replenishment. They lack enough energy to face another day or another person in need.

Depersonalization refers to a negative cynical or excessively detached response to other people i.e. the recipients of one’s service. It is an unfeeling and impersonal response, which often includes loss of idealism. It usually develops in response to overload of emotional exhaustion. The depersonalization dimension represents the interpersonal dimension of burnout.

Reduced personal accomplishment refers to a decline in feelings of competence and productivity at work. Workers experience a growing sense of inadequacy about their ability to help clients and this may result in a self-imposed verdict of failure. The personal accomplishment dimension represents the self-evaluation dimension of burnout.
On the basis of empirical data based on work characteristics (autonomy, role conflict, role ambiguity and work load), professionalism (job involvement, intrinsic motivation and higher order needs satisfaction) and burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment), Wallace and Brinkerhoff (1991) found only emotional exhaustion to be reliable and valid measure of burnout.

Maslach (1992) stated three components of burnout that are emotional exhaustion, a sense of depression and a sense of being less productive & professionally. The burnout person may show the following signs.

Fatigue, headaches, irritation, physical tiredness, back pain, coming late to work, completing less task in long hours, quick to anger, rigid, continuous use of drugs irritation with co-workers.

Many definitions of burnout have been given but Maslach’s definition is the most popular and widely used.

“Burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do work of same kind.”

While examining the conceptualization and psychometric properties of three dimensional model given by Maslach and Jackson (1981), Densten (2001) identified five factors of burnout. The depersonalization dimension of burnout was retained as such whereas emotional exhaustion dimension was split into two factors i.e. ‘psychological’ and ‘somatic strain’ and lack of personal accomplishment dimension of burnout was cracked into two aspects i.e. ‘self’ and ‘others’. Though the five factor structure of burnout supported
multi-dimensional nature of the construct but is an expanded version of the traditional burnout model.

Salanova (2005) have suggested four-factor model of burnout on the basis of factor-analytical study conducted on teachers and blue-collar workers in which cynicism, depersonalization, exhaustion and professional efficacy emerged as unique dimensions of burnout.

In a similar vein, Kristensen et al. (2005) have presented an alternative tool to measure burnout, namely Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) that exclusively focuses on exhaustion (which includes physical and mental fatigue) and extended burnout phenomenon to the entire non-work domain as well. Earlier too, burnout has been assessed through single factor scales reducing it to exhaustion (e.g. Pines and Aronson 1981; Shirom, 2003). Bekker, Croon and Bressers (2005) even used only emotional exhaustion sub-scale of Maslach burnout inventory to measure occurrence of burnout. But Schaufeli and Taris (2005) evaluated all these uni-dimensional and multi-dimensional measures of burnout and have conclusively favoured burnout as a work-related syndrome comprising of three dimensions.

Till date conceptualization of burnout is mainly based on three dimensional model (Maslach,2003), and its measurement is through three versions of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) namely MBI-Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS), MBI-Educator’s Survey (MBI-ES) and MBI-General Survey (MBI-GS).

The phenomenon of burnout is not an isolated one. It is developed in psycho-social climate of an organization. There is significant relationship of different aspects of climate and burnout. Although much progress has been
made, and there is the promise of more, some issues pertaining to the specificity of burnout still need to be addressed. In particular, there are three important questions. First, is burnout a distinctive syndrome that can be distinguished from other concepts, such as job stress, depression, or job dissatisfaction? Second, is the experience of burnout limited to human services professions, or is it a more general phenomenon that is also found in other occupations or even outside the work sphere? Third, are there diagnostic criteria that allow burnout to be identified within an individual?

1.1.2 Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction is an individual phenomenon and it is measured by ascertaining certain attitudes. These attitudes results from the summation of many likes and dislikes in connections with job. Attitudes of an employer can be considered as readiness to act in one way rather than another in connection with specific factors related to job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is in regard to one's feelings or state-of-mind regarding the nature of their work. Job satisfaction can be influenced by a variety of factors, e.g. the quality of one's relationship with their supervisor, the quality of the physical environment in which they work, degree of fulfillment in their work, etc.

(To my knowledge, there is no strong acceptance among researchers, consultants, etc., that increased job satisfaction produces improve job performance -- in fact, improved job satisfaction can sometimes decrease job performance. For example, you could let sometime sit around all day and do nothing. That may make them more satisfied with their "work" in the short run, but their performance certainly...
The happier people are within their job, the more satisfied they are said to be. Job satisfaction is not the same as motivation, although it is clearly linked. Job design aims to enhance job satisfaction and performance; methods include job rotation, job enlargement and job enrichment. Other influences on satisfaction include the management style and culture, employee involvement, empowerment and autonomous work groups. Job satisfaction is a very important attribute which is frequently measured by organizations. The most common way of measurement is the use of rating scales where employees report their reactions to their jobs. Questions relate to rate of pay, work responsibilities, variety of tasks, promotional opportunities the work itself and co-workers. Some questioners ask yes or no questions while others ask to rate satisfaction on 1-5 scale (where 1 represents "not at all satisfied" and 5 represents "extremely satisfied").

Job satisfaction has been defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job; an affective reaction to one’s job; and an attitude towards one’s job. Weiss (2002) has argued that job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect (emotion), beliefs and behaviours. This definition suggests that we form attitudes towards our jobs by taking into account our feelings, our beliefs, and our behaviors.

Models of Job Satisfaction

Affect Theory

Edwin A. Locke’s Range of Affect Theory (1976) is arguably the most famous job satisfaction model. The main premise of this theory is that satisfaction is determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. Further, the theory states that how much one values a given facet of work (e.g. the degree of autonomy in a position) moderates...
how satisfied/dissatisfied one becomes when expectations are/aren’t met. When a person values a particular facet of a job, his satisfaction is more greatly impacted both positively (when expectations are met) and negatively (when expectations are not met), compared to one who doesn’t value that facet. To illustrate, if Employee A values autonomy in the workplace and Employee B is indifferent about autonomy, then Employee A would be more satisfied in a position that offers a high degree of autonomy and less satisfied in a position with little or no autonomy compared to Employee B. This theory also states that too much of a particular facet will produce stronger feelings of dissatisfaction the more a worker values that facet.

**Dispositional Theory**

Another well-known job satisfaction theory is the Dispositional Theory. It is a very general theory that suggests that people have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies toward a certain level of satisfaction, regardless of one’s job. This approach became a notable explanation of job satisfaction in light of evidence that job satisfaction tends to be stable over time and across careers and jobs. Research also indicates that identical twins have similar levels of job satisfaction.

A significant model that narrowed the scope of the Dispositional Theory was the Core Self-evaluations Model, proposed by Timothy A. Judge in 1998. Judge argued that there are four Core Self-evaluations that determine one’s disposition towards job satisfaction: self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism. This model states that higher levels of self-esteem (the value one places on his/her self) and general self-efficacy (the belief in one’s own competence) lead to higher work satisfaction. Having an internal locus of control (believing one has control over her/his own life, as opposed to outside forces having control) leads to higher job satisfaction. Finally, lower levels of neuroticism lead to higher job satisfaction.
Two-Factor Theory (Motivator-Hygiene Theory)

*Frederick Herzberg’s* two factor theory (also known as Motivator Hygiene Theory) attempts to explain satisfaction and motivation in the workplace. This theory states that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are driven by different factors – motivation and hygiene factors, respectively. An employee’s motivation to work is continually related to job satisfaction of a subordinate. Motivation can be seen as an inner force that drives individuals to attain personal and organization goals (*Hoskinson, Porter, & Wrench*). Motivating factors are those aspects of the job that make people want to perform, and provide people with satisfaction, for example achievement in work, recognition, promotion opportunities. These motivating factors are considered to be intrinsic to the job, or the work carried out. Hygiene factors include aspects of the working environment such as pay, company policies, supervisory practices, and other working conditions.

While *Hertzberg’s* model has stimulated much research, researchers have been unable to reliably empirically prove the model, with Hackman & Oldham suggesting that Hertzberg's original formulation of the model may have been a methodological artifact. Furthermore, the theory does not consider individual differences, conversely predicting all employees will react in an identical manner to changes in motivating/hygiene factors. Finally, the model has been criticized in that it does not specify how motivating/hygiene factors are to be measured.

**Job Characteristics Model**

*Hackman & Oldham* proposed the Job Characteristics Model, which is widely used as a framework to study how particular job characteristics impact job outcomes, including job satisfaction. The model states that there are five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) which impact three critical psychological states (experienced
meaningfulness, experienced responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of the actual results), in turn influencing work outcomes (job satisfaction, absenteeism, work motivation, etc.). The five core job characteristics can be combined to form a motivating potential score (MPS) for a job, which can be used as an index of how likely a job is to affect an employee's attitudes and behaviors. A meta-analysis of studies that assess the framework of the model provides some support for the validity of the JCM.

Job Satisfaction is a combination of two words: JOB and SATISFACTION, job is an occupational activity performed by an individual in return for a reward while satisfaction is such a work which is difficult to define with the keep of a single definition.

*New Webster's Encyclopedia Dictionary of English Language (1981)* defines the act of satisfying or the state of being satisfied as contentment, possession and enjoyment and to satisfy is to gainfully, the wants, the wishes or desires to the full extent with what is wished for. Therefore Job Satisfaction is nothing but the state of organism, when the currently dominant motivation tendencies have attained their goals through his work situation or work position while performing various tasks while serving in an institution.

According to *Milton (1951)* “Job Satisfaction is a generalized attitude resulting from many specific attitudes in three areas being specific job factors individual adjustments and group relationships.”

*Blum and Naylor (1968)* considered job satisfaction as something that result from several attitude possessed by a worker (in the context of work, supervision, pay promotional opportunities, etc.) towards his job. *Smith (1963)* considers job satisfaction as function of the perceived characteristics of a job in relation to an individual’s frame of reference. *Gilmer (1966)* explains, job
satisfaction as “the result of various attitudes the person holds towards his job, towards related factors and towards life in general.” And this viewpoint was taken into consideration by Gupta and Srivastava while developing their Teacher’s Job Satisfaction scale. Schultz (1973) also refers to job satisfaction as “a set of attitudes that employee’s have out of their jobs.”

According to Porter and Lawler (1968) "satisfaction is the extent to which reward actually received, meet or exceeds the perceived equitable level of rewards. The greater the failure of actual reward to meet or exceed the perceived equitable rewards, the more dissatisfied a person is considered to be in a given situation"

According to Munford (1970), "Job Satisfaction can be defined in terms of the degree of 'fit' between organizational demands and individual needs and that the employee satisfaction with his job and the employers satisfaction with work performance will only be high when ‘fit’ is good one"

According to Ronan (1970), “Satisfaction is expressed opinion concerning the job, the organization and variable related to job content.”

According to James Prince (1972) describes a broader definition and states satisfaction is a degree to which members of social system have affective orientation towards membership in a system. Members who have a position affective orientation are satisfied, whereas members who have negative affective orientation are dissatisfied."

According to Russell (1975), “Job Satisfaction is a function of the importance attached by the workers to the extent to which needs are generally
met in the work situation, relative to the way in which those workers have ordered their wants and expectations.”

According to Kalleberg (1977), “Job Satisfaction refers to an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals towards work roles which they are presently occupying.”

According to Hackman (1977), “Job Satisfaction refers to a person’s affective attitudes or orientation towards a job. It is one measure of the quality of life in organization. There is an acceptance of the view that material possessions and economic growth do not necessarily produce a high quality of life. Recognitions are now being given to the importance of the kinds of affective reaction that people experience on the Job.”

Katzell (1980) conceptualizes job satisfaction as “an employee’s own evaluation of his or her job in terms of supervision, co-workers, pay promotions and the itself. This evolutions are actually a comparison between the employee’s expectations about these job related factors and his or her actual experience in the job

Godiyal and Srivastava (1995) define, “Job satisfaction is an attitudinal reaction to the job. It represents the feeling of the employee about how happy or unhappy he or she is with various aspects of job.”

According to Spector (1997), Job satisfaction is defined as "the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs".

Job satisfaction according to Singh (2003) can be explained as, “How happy or unhappy a person is with different aspects of his job”.
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1.1.3 Organizational Climate

Evolution of the Concept

The earliest reference of Organizational Climate is found in the article of Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939). This article is focused on the experimentally created social climates on a number of groups of teenage boys. But astonishingly the authors failed to provide any conceptual framework or the technique of measurement of Organizational Climate. The article mainly emphasized on the relationship between leadership styles and so-called ‘Social Climate’. Climate was again mentioned in an article by Fleishman (1939). This article discussed the development of leadership attitude and its implication through the measurement of behavioural scales. In that article Fleishman discussed ‘Leadership Climate’ as a construct but he did not explain the concept of climate very elaborately. Climate was first very comprehensively defined by Argyris (1958). In his attempt to diagnose the group dynamics in a bank, Argyris introduced the concept of Organizational Climate. In that paper Argyris defined climate in terms of formal organizational policies, employee needs, values, and personalities. This paper also triggered off the popular ambiguity between culture and climate that persisted till late 70’s in the realm of organizational studies. The famous book ‘The Human Side of Enterprise’ (1960) opened a new horizon of management science. It introduced many pioneering concepts of organizational and industrial psychology. McGregor in this book elaborated the concept of managerial climate. He argued that the climate is primarily determined by the managerial assumptions and the relationship between the managers and their subordinates. There were of course drawbacks on the conceptual framework. First, McGregor did not present any technique of measurement of Organizational Climate. Second, it is culture, not climate which are measured by the sets of assumptions. Climate is more
dependent on perceptions rather than assumptions. Apart from these principal research works there were also other studies and the collection of all the research work ultimately provided the initial framework of Organizational Climate. In their research work *Forehand and Gilmer (1964)* defined Organizational Climate as a ‘set of characteristics that (a) describe the organization and distinguish it from other organizations (b) are relatively enduring over time and (c) influence the behaviour of people in the organization.’ *Gregopoulos (1963)* defined Organizational Climate as a ‘normative structure of attitudes and behavioural standards which provided a basis for interpreting the situations and act as a source of pressure for directing activities.’

In their extensive research work *Litwin and Stringer (1966)* introduced a very comprehensive framework of Organizational Climate. They provided six dimensions of Organizational Climate that include i) structure ii) responsibility iii) reward iv) risk v) warmth and vi) support. In another book by *Litwin and Stringer (1968)* emphasis was given on the concept of climate and its influence on the McClelland’s ‘need factors’ of motivation i.e. n. power, n. achievement, and n. affiliation. Attempts were also made to establish the operationalization of climate through the assessment of members’ perceptions. During this time the actual concept of Organizational Climate began to take shape. In a study by *Schneider and Bartlett (1968)*, attempts were made to develop a measure of climate. The authors conducted extensive empirical study on the employees in life insurance companies by developing two sets of separate dimensions, one managerial level and another for the field agents of the companies. During this time the studies of Organizational Climate has established the fact that it can be conceptualized and measured through the shared perceptions of the organizational members and almost all the contemporary studies embraced the concept. Another study titled ‘Managerial behaviour, performance, and
effectiveness’ (1970) made an extensive survey of the existing literature and presented four compact dimensions of Organizational Climate.

In their unique effort, James and Jones (1974) reviewed all the previous relevant researches, definitions, conceptual frameworks, and measurement approaches and differentiated them into three principal categories. According to them, all the major theoretical concerns and relevant researches related to Organizational Climate can be divided into three approaches:

A. Multiple measurement-organizational attribute approach (MMOAA)
B. Perceptual measurement-organizational attribute approach (PMOAA)
C. Perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach (PMIAA)

Each of these approaches carries a number of research works under its belt. The concept of Organizational Climate was established separately under each of these approaches. The categorization has resulted in the re-conceptualization of climate construct and the domains of researches have become differentiated. As recommended by James and Jones, the distinction should be made between organizational attributes and individual attributes approach. They also emphasized on the use of the phrase ‘Psychological Climate’ instead of Organizational Climate in case of individual attribute approach. We can have some overview of the approaches for further elaboration.

The Approaches of Organizational Climate

A. Multiple Measurement- Organizational Attribute Approach (MMOAA)

The most suitable definition of Organizational Climate under this approach was provided by Forehand and Gilmar (1964). They defined
Organizational Climate as a ‘set of characteristics that (a) distinguish the organization from the other organizations, (b) are relatively enduring over time, and (c) influence the behaviour of the people in the organization. Following the model provided by Forehand and Gilmar, it appears that any study focusing on organization or group characteristics would be included in the general area of Organizational Climate. In fact an exhaustive list of studies in the field of Industrial Psychology or Organizational Behaviour is shown to be included under MMOAA. This approach is a much generalized conceptual framework and lacks the degree of precision that can provide the objective measurement of Organizational Climate. The precise nature and implication of Organizational Climate tends to be lost in the jungle of dimensions and parameters, derived from the different areas of Industrial Psychology.

B. Perceptual Measurements-Organization Attribute Approach (PMOAA)

Under this approach the most appropriate definition was given by Campbell et al. (1970). Organizational Climate was defined as: ‘set of attributes specific to a particular organization that may be induced from the organization, deals with its members and its environment. For the individual member within an organization, climate takes the form of a set of attitude and expectancies which describe the organization in terms of both static characteristics and behaviour outcome and outcome-outcome contingencies.’ The researchers proposed four parameters of organizational situations, viz. a) structural properties b) environmental characteristics c) organizational climate and d) formal role characteristics.

The PMOAA model suggested that Organizational Climate is individual perception of the organization and the set of properties governs the individual behaviour. Climate itself was perceived as a situational variable or organizational main effect. The perceptual model based on organizational
attribute raised some difficulties. There may be significant difference between actual and perceived situations in terms of behaviour and attitude. It is also difficult to establish a direct relationship between objective and perceptual factors. The difficulties encountered by the PMOAA model was tried to be resolved through a model proposed by Indik (1965). The ‘linkage model’ stated that the bond between an independent variable and a dependent variable formed by two sets of processes, organizational processes from the side of independent variable and psychological processes from the side of dependent variable. From a long series of studies by various organizational scientists it was established that the perceptually measured Organizational Climate represents a set of responses to the organizational processes, while the characteristics of the responses are Independent determined by the psychological processes. Evidently the responses may or may not be the outcome of the stimuli and in the second situation it may present inconsistent results.

C. Perceptual Measurement- Individual Attribute Approach (PMIAA)

Schneider and his associates was the champion of the third approach in the research domain of Organizational Climate. Schneider and Hall (1972) presented Organizational Climate as a set of global perceptions held by individuals about their organizational environment. The sets of perceptions are basically the result of interactions between personal and organizational characteristics. Schneider et al. used systems approach to explain the concept. They considered individual as an information processor and the inputs used are: a) objective events and characteristics of the organization, and b) characteristics of the perceiver. Organizational Climate was imagined as a summary evaluation of events based upon the interactions between actual events and the perceptions of these events. In another paper, Schneider described climate perceptions as the results of a process of concept formation,
based on macro-observations of the organization. This conceptualization of Organizational Climate bears many resemblances with the PMOAA model discussed earlier. In both the approaches, Organizational Climate is viewed as the sum total of perceptions based on the interaction between the individual perceptions and organizational environment. In fact the proposed model by Schneider et al. was almost identical to the psychological process model proposed by Indik. But, of course, there exist some points of differences. The PMOAA emphasized on Organizational Climate from the viewpoint of the organization and put greater emphasis on organizational attributes. PMIAA on the other hand focused on Organizational Climate as the sum total of the individual attributes neglecting the organizational parts. Apart from Schneider a large number of research works have been conducted supporting the model.

It must be pointed out that a large number of researchers have completely neglected the overlapping of the dimensions borrowed liberally from the various models under the three approaches. They were obsessed with measurement techniques and completely neglected the conceptual models and constructs. But measurement should only come into the picture once a model is established and the boundaries are clearly defined. Moreover the dimensions of the organizational attributes have been mixed up with the dimensions from individual attributes. In order to establish a clear distinction between the two sets of attributes, James and Jones insisted on the use of the term Organizational Climate in case of organizational attributes only. In the other case of individual attributes, they used a new term Psychological Climate. Later, in another paper, Jones and James (1979) derived six dimensions based on the individual attributes and categorized them under Psychological Climate instead of Organizational Climate.
The six dimensions under individual attributes as devised by them are:
a) leadership facilitation and support, b) work group cooperation, friendliness, and warmth, c) conflict and ambiguity, d) professional and organizational spirit, e) job challenge, importance, and variety, f) mutual trust. In the latter research works, the individual attributes approach has gained more importance. Glick, in a study (1985), made another critical review of Organizational and Psychological Climate theories, conceptual models, and measurements and extensively discussed the issue of the level of analysis. Ryder and Southy (1990) in their study explored the usefulness of the measurement scales provided by Jones and James and established the validity of the dimensions provided by them.

The concept of organizational climate has been assessed by various authors, of which many of them published their own definition of organizational climate. For those interested in understanding organizational climate, it is important to make some distinctions. First, climate and culture are both important aspects of the overall context, environment or situation. Culture tends to be shared by all or most members of some social group; is something that older members usually try to pass on to younger members; shapes behavior and structures perceptions of the world. Cultures are often studied and understood at a national level, such as the Indian or Western culture. Culture includes deeply held values, beliefs and assumptions, symbols, heroes and heroines, and rituals. Culture can be examined at an organizational level as well. The main distinction between organizational and national culture is that people can choose to join a place of work, but are usually born into a national culture.
Organizational cultures are generally deep and stable. Climate, on the other hand, is often defined as the recurring patterns of behavior, attitudes and feelings that characterize life in the organization (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2007). Although culture and climate are related, climate often proves easier to assess and change. At an individual level of analysis the concept is called individual psychological climate. These individual perceptions are often aggregated or collected for analysis and understanding at the team or group level, or the divisional, functional, or overall organizational level.

Organizational climate, however, proves to be hard to define. There are two especially intractable and related difficulties: how to define climate and how to measure it effectively on different levels of analysis. Furthermore there are several approaches to the concept of climate, of which two in particular have received substantial patronage: the cognitive schema approach and the shared perception approach.

The first approach regards the concept of climate as an individual perception and cognitive representation of the work environment. From this perspective climate assessments should be conducted at an individual level.

The second approach emphasizes the importance of shared perceptions as underpinning the notion of climate (Anderson, & West, 1998; Mathisen & Einarsen 2004). Reichers and Schneider (1990) define organizational climate as "the shared perception of the way things are around here" (p.22). It is important to realize that from these two approaches, there is no “best” approach and they actually have a great deal of overlap. Organizational Climate (sometimes known as Corporate Climate) is the process of quantifying the “culture” of an organization.

Researchers Hart, Griffin, Wearing & Cooper (1996) have pursued the shared perception model of Organizational Climate. Their model identifies the
variables which moderate an organization’s ability to mobilize its workforce in order to achieve business goals and maximize performance.

Organizational climate is about the perceptions of the climate AND about absolute measures. Climate, as a metaphor is helpful - e.g. temperature is a measurable element of geographic climate, but it is not the absolute temperature that matters as much as human perception of it (is it cold, hot, or comfortable?). It is only after knowing what temperature means in terms of human comfort, that measurement of temperature becomes useful. Complicating perception is the probability that what may be too cool for one person may be too warm for another and just right for someone else.

Similarly for organizations, the ‘climate’ may be regarded in absolute terms and measured by instruments, but is ‘felt’ differently by individuals. The absolute climate may suit one person and not another. “What it’s like to work here” or ‘How I feel when I work here”.

Climate is worthwhile to understand and measure because there are organizational and human benefits a ‘good’ climate, and powerful disadvantages of many kinds of bad climate.

_The Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (1997)_ defines Meteorological Climate as ‘the regular pattern of weather conditions (temperature, amount of rain, wind etc.) of a particular place’. Thus, climate is described in terms of sunshine, clouding, prevailing winds, levels of rainfall, humidity etc. In the same way climate of organizations is described in terms of leadership style, concern with the well being of employees, emphasis on productivity, formalization or bureaucracy, innovation versus traditionalism and commitment to quality in service or production (_International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences 2001_)
In educational settings, Haplin and Crofts (1963) proposed the term ‘personality’ to describe ‘organizational climate’ of the school. Analogously, personality is to the individual what organizational climate is to the organization. In their research work which holds a place of place of monumental importance and prestige, Halpin and Crofts (1963) developed organizational climate description terms of characteristics of the group (disengagement, hindrance, esprit and intimacy), behaviour of the leader (aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration). These eight dimensions (four dimensions mentioned under ‘characteristic of the group’ and the same number of items contained in ‘behaviour of the leader’) helps in classifying the school climate into six types i.e. the ‘open’ the ‘autonomous’, the ‘controlled’, the ‘familiar’, the ‘paternal’ and the ‘closed’.

Forehand and Gilmer (1964) defined organizational climate as the set of characteristics that describes an organization and that (a) distinguishes one organization from other organization, (b) is relatively enduring over time, and (c) influences behaviour of the people in the organization.

Litwin and Stringer (1968) conceptualized organizational climate as a measurable properties of work environment perceived directly by the people who live and work in this environment and assumed to influence their motivation and behavior. They further proposed several important dimensions of organizational climate including structure (perception of formality and constraint in the organization), challenge (perception of challenge, demand for work and opportunity for sense of achievement), reward and support (emphasis on positive reinforcement rather than punishment) and social inclusion (sociability, belonging and group membership). They further added that type of organizational climate was related to employee satisfaction and employee performance.
Renatom (1968) defined organizational climate as a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment that is experienced by the members, influences their behaviour and can be described in terms of values of a particular set of characteristics of the organization.

Taguiri (1968) explained organizational climate as an enduring set of internal characteristics that distinguish one organization from another and influence the behaviour of its members.

Barid (1974) conceptualized organizational climate as the resultant influence of the personal and non-personal aspects of an institution seen in social and psychological contexts, whereas Keefee (1985) viewed climate as the relatively enduring pattern of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members.

Katz and Kahn (1978) defined that organizational climate as a set of perceived attributes of an organization and its sub-systems as reflected in the way an organization deals with its members, groups and issues.

The Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychology (1983) explains, “The basic premise is that organizations have a set of generalized conditions that effects the experience and behavior of people with in that organization, organizational conditions often viewed as dimensions of climate include degree of routine pressure of output, power, hierarchy, risk taking, social support of employees under strain, progressiveness, individual autonomy and reward orientation.”

Chandola (1988) explored the literature on organizational climate in educational institutions to evolve a precise idea about the concept of organizational climate. She asserted that organizational climate could be
viewed as a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization. Two major trends which have been reported are: 1) Each institution has a unique climate of its own and it covers a wide variety of concepts viz. Leadership, personality disposition etc. 2) The quality of organizational climate varied directly in proportion to the quality of leadership and quality of motivation it has.

Selvam (1990) argued that organizational climate mainly consists of three factors – Structural properties, leadership styles and characteristics of organization members. It was asserted that these three factors constitute a triangle and change in any angle between any arms of the triangle brings change in the shape of the triangle resulting in a different kind of organizational climate.

Organizational climate differs from psychological climate. Psychological climate refers to individual descriptions of organizational practices and procedures, which are useful in understanding the influence of the organizational environment on individual performance and satisfaction. Organizational climate on the other hand, refers to collective description of the organizational environment (Baltes, 2001).

Organizational climate is expressed as the degree to which the employees in the organization are consider as ‘human beings’ instead of ‘cogs’ in a machine (Punta, 2004).
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
The problem may be stated precisely as:

STUDY OF BURNOUT AMONG FACE TO FACE AND DISTANCE MODE TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THEIR JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
In India, the ‘guru’ of the olden days enjoyed the highest position in the society and commanded respect from one and all. There was no need for him to bother about the mundane necessities of daily life; the society looked after his needs. But today with the advent of mass education the number of teachers has swelled much and the quality of support and recognition the society gave him seems to have dwindled very fast. The dictum that teaching is the noblest profession seems to remain only in word and not in spirit.

There is growing concern among educators about teachers' mental health. Job-related stress is an important factor in teachers' motivation and retention. Teaching once was considered rather a routine job; however, within the last decade it has become an increasingly complex profession for regular as well as special education teachers (Fimian & Blanton, 1987). Issues such as litigation, liability, accountability, tenure, unions, along with increasingly diverse responsibilities and fast changing ideas have made teaching more stressful. In fact, Duke (1984) estimated that as many as 20 percent of all new teachers leave education during the first few years.

Therefore to ensure good quality of work there is need to have efficient employees who are satisfied with their jobs. A developing country like India
cannot afford wastage and stagnation in view of limited material resources. These objectives can best be realized through a band of satisfied teachers.

Teachers of today are perceived as a person exposed to pressure stemming from variety of sources specially because of changing socio-economic-political scenario of the modern times. An ability to stand with the pressures explains the level of his burnout. Burnout is a byproduct of job satisfaction.

Burnout is very serious problem that needs quick attention and action because Maslach (1982) had told that burnout is linked to many negative variables and seems to especially affect those who are dedicated and committed to their work. It is a syndrome of many negative feelings towards one’s work.

Davis (1981) reported that burnout is injurious to educational institution in terms of loss of money, time, services and job efficiency.

There are other serious stressors such as lack of motivation (Burke and Greenglass, 1993), apathy and low achievement (Byrne, 1994), community and parental expectations (Gaziel, 1993; McCormick 1997), disruptive students, violence and apathy on the part of students, poor relations between teacher and student (Farber 1991; Friedman, 2000), change in student and community attitudes towards educators and lack of job mobility (Gold 2001), that potentially lead towards onset and growth of burnout syndrome.

The present study in its complete form is expected to unravel how job satisfaction and organizational climate, where a teacher is working in face to face and distance mode institutes is related to burnout syndrome. The result of the study may be helpful to the educationist, policy makers and administrators
by pinpointing to various aspects of organizational climate in institutions of higher learning contributing toward development of burnout syndrome, so as to control them in order to reduce, treat and prevent burnout which if not controlled may reach epidemic proportions.

1.4 OBJECTIVES

The study will be conducted with following objective in view.

1 (a) To find the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Burnout among Teachers.
(b) To find the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Burnout among teachers working in face to face mode.
(c) To find the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Burnout among teachers working in distance mode.

2 (a) To find the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Burnout among male teachers.
(b) To find the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Burnout among male Teachers working in face to face mode.
(c) To find the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Burnout among male Teachers working in distance mode.

3 (a) To find the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Burnout among Female Teachers.
(b) To find the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Burnout among Female Teachers working in face to face mode.
(c) To find the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Burnout among Female Teachers working in distance mode.

4 (a) To find the relationship between Organizational Climate and Burnout among Teachers.
(b) To find the relationship between Organizational Climate and Burnout among Teachers working in face to face mode.
(c) To find the relationship between Organizational Climate and Burnout among Teachers working in distance mode.

5  
(a) To find the relationship between Organizational Climate and Burnout among Male Teachers.  
(b) To find the relationship between Organizational Climate and Burnout among male Teachers working in face to face mode  
(c) To find the relationship between Organizational Climate and Burnout among male Teachers working in distance mode

6  
(a) To find the relationship between Organizational Climate and Burnout among Female Teachers.  
(b) To find the relationship between Organizational Climate and Burnout among female Teachers working in face to face mode  
(c) To find the relationship between Organizational Climate and Burnout among female Teachers working in distance mode

7  
(a) To study the prediction of Burnout among Teachers on the basis of conjoint effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate  
(b) To study the prediction of Burnout among teachers working in face to face mode on the basis of conjoint effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate  
(c) To study the prediction of Burnout among Teachers working in distance mode on the basis of conjoint effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate

1.5 DELIMITATIONS

1. Burnout among Face to Face and Distance Mode teachers may be compared with other variables i.e. organizational role stress, effectiveness, non organizational factors etc that have not been considered.
2. The present study was restricted to examine burnout among face to face and distance mode teachers in relation to their Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate variables only.
3. The study was restricted to the Teachers involved in Face to Face and Distance Mode (Correspondence Courses) learning’s only. Some new modes like e learning, tele-conferencing, video conferencing etc. have not been considered.
4. The sample was restricted to College / University Teachers of North India only.

1.6 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE VARIABLES

Burnout

Burnout is an internal psychological experience, a process and a chronic syndrome involving feelings, attitudes motives and expectations; psychologically defined as ‘the loss of concern for people with whom one is working’ to be measured in terms of three dimensions, namely emotional exhaustion (exhibited when one feels being emotionally over extended and exhausted by one’s work), depersonalization (shown in negative, cynical and callous attitude towards recipients of one’s service, care, treatment or instruction) and reduced personal accomplishment (expressed in terms of competence and successful achievements on one’s work with people), as measured by Maslach Burnout Inventory.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is the favourableness with which worker views their job. It results when there is a fit between job requirements and the wants and expectation of employees. In other words it expresses the extent of match
between worker’s expectation and the rewards job provides and the values it creates and gets cherished.

**Organizational Climate**

Organizational climate is defined as a set of perceived attributes of an organization and its sub-systems as reflected in the way an organization deals with its members, groups and issues. Organizational climate is a combination of attributes considered over time. It is the perceived aspect of an organization’s internal environment, but within the same organization there may be different organizational climates.

**Teachers working in Face to Face mode**

Teachers working in face to face mode according to the present study are the teachers involved in conventional type of teaching. Face to Face teaching involves direct interaction with dual participation from teachers / students. It has a profound drawback of making teaching monotonous, time bound and other consideration limitations. It is a mode as per the traditional parameters / values. They teach in colleges and universities where the formal type of education is provided.

**Teachers working in Distance mode**

On the other hand Distance mode is the non conventional mode free from the rigidities of continuous class room study schedules. The Directorates, Departments e.g. Directorate of Distance Education, Institutes of Correspondence Courses, Centre for Distance Study etc. Universities involved in distance mode of education. The teachers working in such modes arrange the counseling sessions and Personal contact Programmes. Moreover distance mode teachers were facilitating the students with SLMs (Self learning material).