

Impact of Stress due to Environmental Factors on Professional Burnout of University Teachers

* Lokanadha Reddy, G ; **Shailaja, M ; *** Vijaya Anuradha, R ; ****
Susmitha, G

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

Corresponding Author

**Dr.M.Shailaja, Associate Professor, St. Mary's College of Education, Buchireddypalyam-524305, Nellore Dist., A.P.State

***Dr.R.Vijaya Anuradha, Associate Professor, Indian College of Education, Katpadi –Tiruvalam Road, Katpadi, Vellore-14.

**** Dr.G.Susmitha, Scholar, Dept. of Education, Dravidian University, Kuppam- 517 426.

ABSTRACT

The effects of stress and burnout of teachers are costly to both the teacher as well as the organization if left unattended within a given time frame. Stress and burnout of job life can be conveniently managed, to a large extent, at different stages through institutional interventions. So, in this study, the investigators made an attempt to find out the relationship between professional burnout and occupational stress due to the environmental factors of teachers working at the state universities of Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. Rating Scales were administered on a sample of 955 teachers from 9 universities chosen by using Simple Random Sampling Technique. The statistical techniques employed were percentage, mean, SD, mean \pm 1SD, and also correlations computed to analyse the obtained data. Results of the study revealed that around 86.70% and 62.52% of university teachers are experiencing moderate and high levels of professional burnout and occupational stress due to the environmental factors, respectively. Further, correlation studies revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between professional burnout and occupational stress due to the environmental factors. It is observed that the first step towards tackling stress is to acknowledge its existence. Recognizing the manifestation of stress among teachers and identifying the major stressors could go a long way in ameliorating the menace of occupational stress and burnout while designing suitable stress coping mechanism for teachers. Both 'direct action' and/or 'palliative techniques' could be employed, and the same are discussed at the end.

KEY WORDS –Occupational Stress, Environmental Factors, Professional Burnout, University Teachers

Date of Submission: 10-09-2020

Date of Acceptance: 25-09-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

The progress, welfare and prosperity of a nation mainly depend on rapid, planned, and sustained growth in the quality and extent of education. It is the only field where knowledge passes through all walks of life from person to person with varying degrees. It has viewed as an instrument to develop the cognitive qualities, intelligence, tolerance and understanding of people. It should prepare the younger generation to understand and face the challenges of the world. Teachers are the crucial elements in preparing the young people, not only to face the future with confidence but to build it with purpose and accountability. Their role as an agent of change has never been more obvious and critical than today. The teacher today must be versatile, continuously learning with wide interests and looking at every problem as a challenge. The changing role of teachers and the changing definitions of teacher effectiveness have been increasingly studied and analyzed, with research undertaken and the outcomes being feedback into the system to facilitate the process of educational reform. The current focus of researchers, policy makers and practitioners with regard to teacher education is on the development of professional competencies by reducing the stress & burnout among teachers and on the most effective ways of achieving higher levels of commitment, motivation and higher-level performance on the part of teachers in general and university teachers in particular.

Need and Importance of the Study

Stress and burnout have become pervading features in most of the professionals' life in modern world. Despite tremendous advancements in science and technology, and remarkable growth of economy and sources

of luxury, majority of people all over the world seem to be experiencing moderate to high degree of psychological stress and burnout in various spheres of their lives. According to Lazarus (1966), stress is a condition or feeling experienced when a person perceives that demands exceed the personal and social resources the individual can mobilize. In fact, stress has been widely described as a person- environment relationship (Folkman, 1984; Quick et.al., 1986; Baron and Byrne, 1997). It refers to situations where the well-being of individuals is detrimentally affected by their failure to cope with the demands of their environment (Erkutlu and Chafra, 2006). Caplan et al. (1975) have accordingly defined occupational stress as 'any characteristics of job environment which poses a threat to the individual'.

Managing the interface between one's job and various roles and responsibilities off the job is another potential source of strain for teachers (O'Driscoll, 1996). Sometimes referred to as work / non-work conflict, this issue received considerable attention from researchers in recent years (Cooper and Lewis, 1998). Changes in family structures, increased

participation by women in the workforce, and technological changes that enable job tasks to be performed in a variety of locations have blurred the boundaries between the job and life of the job for many teachers and have created the potential for conflict to occur between job and off - job roles (Hill et al., 1998). This inter-role conflict has consistently been linked with psychological strain and burnout among teachers (Frone, Russel, and Cooper, 1992; O'Driscoll, Ilgen, and Hildreth, 1992). The quality of relationships that teachers have at work has consistently been linked to job stress (Payne, 1985). It is apparent that most causes are related to how work is organized and following that are societal and personal pressures related to the teaching profession. Furthermore, education policy reform and political restructuring tend to bring a heavy burden upon teachers particularly at university level, not only relating to the implementation of changes but also in terms of job security.

The environmental factors refer to the stressors in work setting causing stress in university teachers that are related to the violence and danger caused by the pupils and co-workers, reward structure and recognition, negative publicity, and physical working environment. Kelchtermans (1999) observed that despite the teacher's efforts to cope with the multiple and changing demands and duties, they often feel undervalued by parents, administrators and society in general. The loss of social prestige in teaching thus seems to constitute an important de-motivation. These sentiments contribute to experiences of stress or eventual burnout, accompanied by a feeling of frustration (Kelchtermans, 1993). The student's indiscipline is seen as one of the major stressors among teachers (Abel and Sewell, 1999; Borg et al., 1991; Chan and Hui, 1998; Dorman, 2003; Kelly and Berthelsen, 1995; Makinen and Kinnunen, 1986; Manassero et al., 2006; Newmann et al., 1989; Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1978b). In Indian context, now a days, some students at university level are involving in violence, strike, doing politics and causing stress in teachers. Sometime, co-workers are involved in such things for the benefit of their community and such things evoke stress in teachers. Evidence presented by Cooper and Marshall (1978), Cartwright and Cooper (1997) show a link between poor mental health and unpleasant work conditions for teachers including aspects of the physical environment such as class sizes, unsuitable buildings, noise levels and inadequate resources. In this background, the investigators in this study tried to know what other aspects are leading the teachers at universities to stress out and burnout in their profession.

Objectives of the Study

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

Hypotheses of the Study

1. There exists a significant difference in the professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their gender, age, educational qualification, community, designation, nature of the department they are

working in, years of experience, nature of job, average number of working hours per week and the universities they are working-in.

2. There exists a significant difference in the occupational stress resulting from environmental factors of university teachers due to variations in their gender, age, educational qualification, community, designation, nature of the department they are working- in, years of experience, nature of job, average number of working hours per week and the universities they are working-in.

3. There is a significant relationship between professional burnout and occupational stress resulting from environmental factors of university teachers.

Methodology: Survey method was used in the present study.

Development of Research Tools: After reviewing the tools available both in western and Indian context, the investigators developed Rating Scale with 14 statements to assess the Occupational Stress of University Teachers caused due to environmental factors based on the ‘Occupational Stress of Special Education Teachers Rating Scale’ developed by Reddy (2007). Further, the Professional Burnout Rating Scale developed by Reddy (2007) on Special Education Teachers was adopted and modified according to the requirements of the study with 20 statements under 3 dimensions such as Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment. Against each item of Occupational Stress due to Environmental Factors rating scale, five gradations were given namely Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Undecided (UD), Agree (A), Strongly Agree (SA) having the scores 1,2,3,4 and 5 respectively. Similarly, in Professional Burnout Rating Scale, against each statement five gradations were given namely - Few Times a Year (FTY), Once a Month or Less (OM), Few Times a Month (FTM), Once a Week (OW) and Every Day (ED) having the scores 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. To find out the reliability and the validity of the rating scales, the developed tools were administered to 76 university teachers (8 % of the total sample) randomly selected from two universities from both the states. The university teachers were oriented to rate the statements of the rating scales to indicate their responses using the gradations. The completed Rating Scales were collected and statistically analysed to establish the reliability and validity of the tools. The calculated half test and whole test reliability of the Rating Scales on Occupational Stress due to Environmental Factors (0.73 and 0.86) and Professional Burnout (0.78 and 0.87) are high by using Split-half method, and hence the tools used in the study are reliable. The content validity, face validity and intrinsic validity of the tools have been established using scientific procedure.

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

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The major objectives of the present study were to find out the level of professional burnout and the level of occupational stress caused due to the environmental factors of university teachers. The mean and SD of professional burnout and occupational stress caused due to the environmental factors scores have been calculated for each teacher working at the university level. By using mean \pm 1 SD, the number and percentage of university teachers falling under low, moderate and high levels of professional burnout scores and occupational stress caused due to the environmental factors scores have been calculated and the same are presented in table-1.

Table-1: Number and Percentage of University Teachers with Low; Moderate and High Levels of Professional Burnout (PB) and Occupational Stress (OS) due to the Environment Factors (EF)

	Number and Percentage of Teachers with Low, Moderate and High Level of PB and OS in due to EF		
	Low	Moderate	High
Professional Burnout as a Whole	127 (13.30)	675 (70.68)	153 (16.02)
OS due to Environment Factors	358 (37.49)	445 (46.60)	152 (15.92)

Note: Number mentioned in the brackets are in percentage.

Burnout is a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity. In the present study, when it comes to the university teachers, majority of them are experiencing moderate level of professional burnout due to emotional exhaustion (68.38%), depersonalization (66.07%), reduced personal

accomplishment (64.82%) and also professional burnout as a whole (70.68%). Overall, 16.02% of teachers i.e. 153 out of 955 teachers are experiencing high level of professional burnout, 70.68% with moderate level of burnout and 127 teachers i.e. 13.30% are showing low level of professional burnout. Further it is noted that, majority of the university teachers i.e. 445 (46.60%) out of 955 are experiencing moderate level of stress followed by 358 (37.49%) teachers with low level of stress and 152 (15.92%) teachers with high level of occupational stress caused due to the environmental factors.

To identify the level of professional burnout of university teachers, mean and SD for each stressor of the professional burnout dimension has been calculated for the whole sample of teachers working at university level. By using mean \pm 1 SD, the low, moderate, and high-level stressors have been identified. The same procedure is followed to assess the level of occupational stress caused due to the environmental factors of the university teachers and the results are presented in table-2 and 3.

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

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

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

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

The table also reveals that under the depersonalization dimension, the university teachers felt that their teaching does not earn lot of respect (S.No.8) from the society which leads to their depersonalization resulting in higher rates of burnout in them. All the other factors under this dimension have created moderate level of burnout among university teachers. Regarding the third dimension i.e. reduced personal accomplishment, the university teachers experience high level of professional burnout in only one aspect (S.No.17) where the

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

Table- 3: Mean Scores and Level of Occupational Stress of University Teachers due to the Environmental Factors

S.No.	Occupational Stress due to Environmental Factors	Mean Scores and Level of OS of University Teachers	
		MOS	LOS
1.	Bullying and frightening by the students	2.36	L
2.	Complaints by the students for the things which the teacher is not responsible	2.40	L
3.	Frequent complaints by other staff members	2.52	M
4.	Problems with indiscipline of the students	2.59	M
5.	Limited opportunities to utilize the abilities and experience independently	2.90	M
6.	Lack of respect for the teaching profession by the pupils, parents, and the society	2.81	M
7.	Conflicts due to outside pressures	2.97	M
8.	Seldom rewarded for the hard labour and good performance	3.15	H
9.	Problems due to damage of the property by the students	2.59	M
10.	Problem faced with drug abuse by the students and the staffs	2.21	L
11.	Problems arising out of fraud and financial mismanagement within the department	2.35	L
12.	Polluted work environment within the university	2.61	M
13.	Formal rules and regulations / instructions within the university	2.88	M
14.	Grants for the development of my department are usually inadequate	2.98	M

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

From table 3, it is observed that the potential stressor which is causing high level of stress among university teachers due to environmental factors is that they are seldom rewarded for the hard labour and good performance (S.No.8) contrary to some aspects related to students and management such as bullying and frightening by the students (S.No.37), complaints by the students for the things for which the teacher is not responsible (S. No. 38), problem faced by drug abuse by the students and staff (S.No.46) and problem arousing out of fraud and financial mismanagement within the department and the university (S.No.47) are the stressors causing low level of occupational stress among university teachers. Apart from this, some issues like frequent complaints by other staff members (S.No.3), problems with indiscipline of the students (S.No.4), limited opportunities to utilize the abilities and experience independently (S.No.5), lack of respect for the teaching profession by the pupils, parents and the society (S.No.6), conflicts due to outside pressures (S.No.7), problems due to damage of the property by the students (S.No.9), polluted work environment within the university (S.No.12), formal rules and regulations / instructions within the university (S.No.13) and grants for the development of the department are usually inadequate (S.No.14) are the stressors that are evoking moderate level of stress among university teachers.

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

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

Independent Variables / Groups	Dimensions of Professional Burnout											
	(PB ₁)			(PB ₂)			(PB ₃)			PB as a whole		
	Mean	SD	t/F Values	Mean	SD	t/F Values	Mean	SD	t/F Values	Mean	SD	t/F Values
Gender Men (682) Women (273)	13.70 12.88	5.75 5.41	2.03*	13.15 12.97	4.66 4.75	0.52 [®]	13.84 13.20	5.54 5.28	1.63 [®]	40.69 39.05	13.93 12.98	1.67 [®]
Age 28 to 37yrs (334) 38 to 47yrs (252) 48 & above (369)	14.09 13.37 12.96	6.06 5.73 5.18	3.55*	13.82 12.96 12.53	5.12 4.56 4.26	6.80**	14.15 14.03 12.96	5.87 5.91 4.68	5.00**	42.06 40.36 38.46	14.81 13.86 12.23	6.17**
Ednl Qualification PG with NET/ SLET/M.Phil. (190) PG with Ph.D. (765)	13.79 13.39	5.90 5.60	0.88 [®]	13.64 12.96	4.99 4.60	1.78 [®]	13.93 13.59	5.93 5.36	0.76 [®]	41.35 39.94	14.69 13.42	1.28 [®]
Community OC (326) BC (307) MBC (93) SC / ST (229)	12.83 13.78 15.37 13.19	5.00 6.03 6.46 5.52	5.44**	12.70 12.92 14.35 13.38	4.18 5.05 4.83 4.73	3.45*	12.98 13.66 15.51 13.86	4.76 5.69 6.08 5.71	5.37**	38.51 40.36 45.23 40.42	11.65 14.83 15.15 13.69	5.96**
Designation Asst. Professor (472) Asso. Professor (199) Professor (284)	13.92 12.90 13.11	5.97 5.14 5.44	3.12*	13.50 13.03 12.47	4.94 4.37 4.39	4.33*	13.97 13.81 13.04	5.79 5.28 5.02	2.68 [®]	41.39 39.73 38.61	14.47 12.68 12.85	3.83*
Nature of Dept. Humanities (221) Social Sciences (262) Sciences (472)	12.73 13.68 13.69	5.28 6.20 5.50	2.42 [®]	12.89 13.01 13.24	4.63 5.17 4.42	0.49 [®]	13.62 13.79 13.60	5.76 6.21 4.88	0.11 [®]	39.24 40.48 40.54	12.1 15.38 12.89	0.74 [®]
Years of Experience 1-10 years (389) 11-20 years (267) 20 years & above (299)	13.89 13.03 13.29	6.04 5.11 5.60	2.04 [®]	13.55 12.70 12.86	5.01 4.48 4.38	3.15*	13.92 13.60 13.37	5.91 5.24 5.08	0.86 [®]	41.36 39.34 39.52	14.54 12.87 13.17	2.30 [®]
Nature of Job Permanent (905) Temporary (51)	13.46 13.63	5.67 5.46	0.21 [®]	13.09 13.63	4.68 5.46	0.07 [®]	13.67 13.49	5.49 5.119	0.22 [®]	40.22 40.25	13.74 12.79	0.02 [®]
No. of working hours/week 14 hrs & below (552) 15 hrs & above (403)	13.43 13.52	5.69 5.62	0.25 [®]	13.13 13.05	4.68 4.70	0.26 [®]	13.76 13.52	5.40 5.58	0.68 [®]	40.32 40.08	13.63 13.76	0.26 [®]
State A.P. State (492) TN State (463)	12.87 14.10	5.39 5.87	3.37**	12.46 13.78	4.37 4.91	4.39**	12.88 14.49	4.83 5.98	4.58**	38.20 42.36	12.80 14.26	4.75**

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

From table-4, it is clear that professional burnout experienced by the university teachers owing to emotional exhaustion (PB₁) differs significantly due to variation in their gender, as the calculated t-value (92.03) is significant at 0.05 level; whereas, the t-value with respect to depersonalization (PB₂), reduced personal accomplishment (PB₃) and professional burnout (PB) as a whole is 0.52, 1.63 and 1.67 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the stated hypothesis, 'there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their gender' stands rejected with respect to PB₂, PB₃ and professional burnout as a whole but accepted only in case of PB₁. The mean values indicate that men teachers are burning out at high rates than their women counterparts due to emotional exhaustion. The findings of the studies by Anderson and Iwanicki (1984) and Reddy (2007) on special education teachers corroborate with the present findings where the male teachers experience higher levels of emotional exhaustion than their female counterparts though opposed by the study results of Maslach and Jackson (1981b) on human service professionals and Byrne (1991a) on elementary and university educators where the female teachers show higher levels of emotional exhaustion than their male counterparts.

In case of the university teacher's belonging to various age groups, the calculated F-values with respect to emotional exhaustion (PB₁-3.55) is significant at 0.05 level and depersonalization (PB₂ - 6.80), personal accomplishment (PB₃ - 5.00) and professional burnout as a whole (6.17) are significant at 0.01 level. This indicates that the university teachers belonging to different age groups significantly differ in their professional burnout. Further, the mean values reveal that the university teachers belonging to lower age group i.e. 28 to 37 years exhibit higher levels of professional burnout owing to PB₁, PB₂, PB₃ and PB as a whole followed by middle age group and higher age group teachers. From this, one can accept the stated hypothesis, 'there is a significant difference in the dimensions of the professional burnout of the university teachers due to variations in their age'. The study results of Anderson and Iwanicki, 1984; Maslach and Jackson, 1981b;

Russell et al., 1987; Schwab and Iwanicki, 1982; Antoniou et al., 2006 and; Watts and Robertson, 2011, confirm the above findings where the younger teachers show higher levels of emotional exhaustion than their older colleagues. Also, Byrne (1991a) and Maslach and Jackson (1981b) reported similar findings that the elementary and university educators belonging to younger age group have lower perceptions of personal accomplishment. In case of depersonalization, the results of the studies by Maslach and Jackson (1981b) and Pierce and Molloy (1990) are similar in line with the present findings of younger age group experiencing more burnout due to depersonalization.

In case of 'community' of university teachers, the calculated F-values for emotional exhaustion (PB₁ - 5.44), depersonalization (PB₂ - 3.45), personal accomplishment (PB₃ - 5.37) and professional burnout as a whole (5.96) are significant at 0.05 level, indicating the influence of the nature of community of university teachers on their professional burnout owing to PB₁, PB₂, PB₃ and PB as a whole. In other words, it can be posited that the university teachers with varied community background significantly differ in their professional burnout owing to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, reduced personal accomplishment and professional burnout as a whole. Thus, the stated hypothesis, '*there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their nature of community background*' is accepted. The mean values clearly reveal that the university teachers belonging to MBC experience higher levels and the teachers belonging to OC experience low level of professional burnout owing to PB₁, PB₂, PB₃ and PB dimensions as a whole. In case of the dimensions PB₂, PB₃ and PB as a whole, the teachers belonging to SC/ST experience more stress followed by BC; whereas, the teachers belonging to BC experience higher level of professional burnout due to emotional exhaustion when compared to SC /ST teachers.

For 'designation' of university teachers, the calculated F-values with respect to PB₁ (3.12), PB₂ (4.33) and PB as a whole (3.83) are above the table value (3.00). It reveals that the professional burnout exhibited by the university teachers because of PB₁, PB₂ and PB as a whole differ significantly due to variations in their designation. Contrary to this, the variations in the university teacher's designation do not have significant bearing on their professional burnout aroused because of reduced personal accomplishment (PB₃-2.68), as the calculated F-value is below the table value (3.00). Thus the stated hypothesis, '*there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in their designation*' is accepted with respect to PB₁, PB₂ and PB as a whole and rejected only with respect to PB₃. Assistant Professors experience higher level of burnout owing to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and professional burnout as a whole followed by Associate Professors and Professors. In other words, the lower the designation, the higher will be the professional burnout. The present findings with respect to burnout are similar to the findings of the studies by Azeem and Nazir (2008) on university teachers which reports that Lecturers exhibit high levels of emotional exhaustion compared to the Readers and Professors.

The professional burnout of university teachers owing to emotional exhaustion (PB₁), personal accomplishment (PB₃) and professional burnout as a whole do not vary due to variations in their years of experience; whereas, the professional burnout owing to depersonalization (PB₂) vary based on the variations in their years of experience. Accordingly, the calculated F-values are not significant at 0.05 level with respect to PB₁ (2.04), PB₃ (0.86) and PB as a whole (2.30), except PB₂ (3.15) which is significant at 0.05 level. Thus the stated hypothesis, '*there is a significant difference in the dimensions of the professional burnout of the university teachers due to variations in their years of experience*' is accepted only with respect to PB₂ and rejected in case of PB₁, PB₃ and PB as a whole. Further, the mean values prove that the university teachers having 1- 10 years of experience show higher levels of burnout owing to depersonalization followed by teachers having 20 and above years and 11-20 years of experience.

Further, the calculated t-values of the university teachers working in A.P. State and T.N. States with respect to PB₁ (3.37), PB₂ (4.39), PB₃ (4.58) and PB as a whole (4.75) are significant at 0.01 level. It reveals the fact that the professional burnout experienced by the university teachers owing to PB₁, PB₂, PB₃ and PB as a whole differ significantly due to variations in the States they are working - in. Thus, the formulated hypothesis, '*there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in the states they are working*' is accepted. Further, the mean values reveal that the teachers who are working in the T.N. State universities (12.87, 12.46, 12.88 & 38.20) experience higher level of professional burnout due to PB₁, PB₂, PB₃ and PB as a whole when compared to the teachers working in A.P. State universities (14.10, 13.78, 14.49 & 42.36).

In contrast, the calculated t/F values with respect to the 'educational qualification' (PB₁- 0.88; PB₂- 1.78; PB₃- 0.76 & PB-1.28); 'nature of the department' (PB₁ - 2.42; PB₂ - 0.49; PB₃ - 0.11 & PB -0.74); 'nature of job' (PB₁ - 0.21; PB₂ - 0.07; PB₃ - 0.22 & PB - 0.02); and 'number of working hours/week' (PB₁-0.25; PB₂- 0.26; PB₃-0.68 & PB - 0.26) are below the table values and hence the stated hypothesis '*there is a significant difference in the dimensions of professional burnout of university teachers due to variations in the educational qualification ; nature of the department; nature of job and number of working hours/week*' stands rejected.

Table-5: Mean and SD of the Occupational Stress of University Teachers caused due to Environmental Factors and the calculated t / F-values with respect to Certain Independent Variables

Independent Variables / Groups	Occupational Stress due to Environmental Factors		
	Mean	SD	t/F Values
Gender			
Men (682)	37.83	12.31	2.08*
Women (273)	36.04	11.32	
Age Groups			
28 to 37yrs (334)	37.44	12.31	1.67[@]
38 to 47yrs (252)	36.19	11.79	
48 & above (369)	37.98	11.98	
Educational Qualification			
PG with NET/SLET/M.Phil. (190)	37.38	11.28	0.08[@]
PG with Ph.D. (765)	37.30	12.25	
Community			
OC (326)	38.28	12.09	4.52**
BC (307)	35.68	11.83	
MBC (93)	40.24	11.81	
SC / ST (229)	36.96	12.13	
Designation			
Assistant Professor (472)	36.83	11.42	0.89[@]
Associate Professor (199)	38.14	12.93	
Professor (284)	37.55	12.45	
Nature of Dept.			
Humanities (221)	35.11	12.13	6.14**
Social Sciences (262)	37.04	12.12	
Sciences (472)	38.51	11.85	
Years of Experience			
1-10 years (389)	36.89	12.12	1.95[@]
11-20 years (267)	36.67	12.33	
20 years & above (299)	38.45	11.67	
Nature of Job			
Permanent (905)	37.44	12.15	1.37[@]
Temporary (51)	35.08	10.02	
No. of working hours/week			
14 hours & below (552)	37.54	12.13	0.66[@]
15 hours & above (403)	37.02	11.96	
State			
A.P. State (492)	36.49	11.53	2.19*
TN State (463)	38.20	12.54	

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

From table-5, it is clear that the occupational stress of university teachers due to the environmental factors differ significantly due to variations in certain independent variables as the calculated t/F values for gender (2.08), community (4.52), nature of department they are working-in (6.14) and the state university they are working-in (2.19) are significant at 0.05 level. Whereas the same teachers do not differ significantly in their occupational stress caused due to the environmental factors in certain variables as the calculated t/F values with respect to age (1.67), educational qualification (0.08), years of experience (0.89), designation (1.95), nature of job (1.37) and number of hours working/week (0.66) are below the table value. Hence the stated hypothesis 'there is a significant difference in the Occupational Stress caused due to the Environmental Factors of the university teachers due to variations in certain variables like age, educational qualification, years of experience, designation, nature of job and number of working hours/week' stands rejected; and accepted for the remaining variables such as 'gender', 'community', 'nature of the department' and 'the state university they are working-in'.

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

Table-6: Correlation between the Dimensions of Professional Burnout of University Teachers and the Occupational Stress due to the Environmental Factors

O.S.	P.B.	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonalization	Personal Accomplishment	Professional Burnout as a Whole
Environmental Factors		0.241**	0.230**	0.232**	0.271**

Note: ** Significant at 0.01 level

From table-6 it is observed that, occupational stress caused due to the environmental factors of university teachers has significant and positive relationship with all the dimensions of the professional burnout i.e. emotional exhaustion (0.241), depersonalization (0.230), personal accomplishment (0.232) and professional burnout as a whole (0.271) as the calculated r-values are significant at 0.01 level. Thus, the stated hypothesis, 'there is a significant positive relationship between the occupational stress caused due to the environmental factors and the dimensions of the professional burnout of the teachers working in the universities of south India' is accepted. It means, higher the occupational stress caused due to the environmental factors, higher will be the professional burnout of university teachers.

Implications/Conclusions of the Study

The effects of stress and burnout of teachers are costly to both the teacher as well as the organization if left unattended within a given time frame. These can lead to poor teaching performance, lowered self-esteem, poor job satisfaction, increased absenteeism, poor decision making and bad judgment (Quick and Quick, 1984). This indicates the need for interventions in strengthening and reinforcing teacher's self-confidence and positive attitude, and weakening the stress and burnout creating factors. Stress and burnout of job life can be conveniently managed, to a large extent, at different stages through institutional interventions.

The first step towards tackling stress is to acknowledge its existence. Recognizing the manifestation of stress among teachers and identifying the major stressors could go a long way in ameliorating the menace of occupational stress while designing suitable stress coping mechanism for teachers. Both 'direct action' and/or 'palliative techniques' could be employed. Direct action or problem focused approach concerns itself with the stressors and is a powerful proactive way of handling stress related problems by developing effective communication skills, engaging in creative activities, reviewing priorities on a regular basis and seeking professional help, if necessary. Palliative techniques or emotion focused strategy involves attempting to limit the emotional fallouts of stress. These coping strategies need to be incorporated on a priority basis so that the teachers are well prepared to deal with job stress as and when it surfaces. These measures can go a long way in reducing stressful work situations and improving the effectiveness of the teachers.

To reduce the stressors arising out of the environmental factors, the university administration should introduce reward structure to motivate the individuals for their good performance. Nadler and Lawler (1983) established linkages between efforts and rewards that provide motivation for the teachers to face role stressors. Also, the university administration should take measures to curtail student's indiscipline and should not show any favouritism towards any particular student and teacher's community. Further, the activities of the university administration should be transparent.

Regarding the professional burnout, 86% of the university teachers are experiencing moderate and high levels of burnout. For this, the university should develop mechanisms to detect the stressors causing strain in university teachers. Further, to reduce professional burnout, Greenglass and Burke (2003) suggested for social support, where it is seen as the exchange of information leading a person to believe that he /she is cared for. It can also involve provision of information, tangible, practical and for emotional help. Social support may also moderate the impact of stressors on burnout so as to assist people with high stress to cope better.

The colleagues and the head of the department should be motivated to give adequate support to the teachers in their teaching and research activities in order to reduce burnout. Good organizational climate and commitment contributes significantly towards decrease in job burnout (Seyyedmoharrami et al., 2019). Further, the administration should be supportive and facilitative than authoritative.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abel, M. H. and Sewell, J. (1999) Stress and burnout in rural and urban secondary school teachers, *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92 (5), 287-293.
- [2]. Anderson, M.B. and Iwanicki, E.F. (1984) Teacher motivation and its relationship to teacher burnout, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20, 94-132.
- [3]. Antoniou, A.-S., Polychroni, F. and Vlachakis, A.-N. (2006) Gender and age differences in occupational stress and professional burnout between primary and high-school teachers in Greece, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21 (7), 682 - 690.
- [4]. Azeem, S.M. and Nazir, N.A. (2008) A study of job burnout among university teachers, *Psychology & Developing Societies*, 20 (1), 51-64.
- [5]. Baron, A.R. and Byrne, D. (1997) *Social Psychology*, MA, Allyn and Bacon: Boston.
- [6]. Borg, M. G., Riding, R. J. and Falzon, J. M. (1991) Stress in teaching: A study of occupational stress and its determinants, job satisfaction and career commitment among primary school teachers, *Educational Psychology*, 11, 59-75.
- [7]. Byrne, B.M. (1991a) Burnout: Investigating the impact of background variables for elementary, intermediate, secondary and university educators, *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 26, 583-605.
- [8]. Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S. and French, J.R.P. (1975) 'Relationships of cessation of smoking with job stress, personality, and social support', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, Pp. 211-219.
- [9]. Cartwright, S. and Cooper, C. L. (1997) *Managing Workplace Stress*, Sage Publications, London.
- [10]. Chan, D. W. and Hui, E. K. P. (1998) Stress, support and psychological symptoms among guidance and non-guidance secondary school teachers in Hong Kong, *School Psychology International*, 19, 169-178.
- [11]. Cooper, C.L. and Lewis, S. (1998) *Balancing career, family and life*, Kogan Page: London.
- [12]. Cooper, C.L. and Marshall, J. (1978) *Understanding executive stress*, Macmillan, New York.
- [13]. Dorman J. P. (2003) Relationship between school and classroom environment and teacher burnout: A LISREL analysis, *Social Psychology of Education*, 6, 107-127.
- [14]. Erkuclu, H.V. and Chafra, J. (2006) 'Relationship between leadership power bases and job stress of subordinates: Example from boutique hotels', *Management Research News*, 29 (5), Pp.285 - 297.
- [15]. Folkman, S. (1984) 'Personal control and stress and coping process: A theoretical analysis', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, Pp. 839-852.
- [16]. Frone, M.R., Russel, M. and Cooper, M. (1992) 'Prevalence of work-family conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable?', *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 13, Pp. 723-729.
- [17]. Greenglass, E.R. and Burke, R.J. (2003) Teacher stress. In A.F. Dollard, A.H. Winefield, H.R. Winefield (Eds.). *Occupational stress in service professions*. (pp. 213 -236), Taylor and Francis, London and New York.
- [18]. Hill, E., Miller, B., Weiner, S. and Colihan, J. (1998) 'Influences of the virtual office of aspects of work and work / life balance', *Personnel Psychology*, 51, Pp. 667-684.
- [19]. Kelchtermans, G. (1993) Getting the story, understanding the lives. From career stories to teachers professional development, *Teaching and teacher Education*, 9, 443-456.
- [20]. Kelchtermans, G. (1999) Teaching career: Between burnout and fading away?- Reflections from a narrative and biographical perspective. In R. Vandenberghe and A.M. Huberman (1999) (Eds.). *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A source book of international research and practice*. (pp. 176-191), Cambridge university press, UK.
- [21]. Kelly, A. L. and Berthelsen, D.C. (1995) Preschool teacher's experience of stress, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11, 345-357.
- [22]. Kyriacou, C. and Sutcliff, J. (1978b) A model of teacher stress', *Educational Studies*, 4, 1-6.
- [23]. Kyriacou, C. and Sutcliff, J. (1979) Teacher stress and satisfaction, *Educational Research*, 21 (2), 89-96.
- [24]. Lazarus, R. S. (1966) *Psychological stress and the coping process*. McGraw-Hill, New York
- [25]. Makinen, R. and Kinnunen, U. (1986) Teacher stress over a school year, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 30, 55-70.
- [26]. Manassero M., Garcia-Buades E., Torrens G., Ramis C., Vazquez A. and Ferrer V.A. (2006) Teacher burnout: Attributional aspects, *Psychology in Spain*, 10, 66-74.
- [27]. Maslach, C. and Jackson, S. (1981b) The measurement of experienced burnout, *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113.
- [28]. Nadler, D.A. and Lawler, E.E. (1983) Motivation: A diagnostic approach. In J.R. Hackman et al. (Eds.). *Perspective on behaviours in organizations*. (2nd ed. - pp. 67-78), McGraw-Hill, New York.
- [29]. Newmann F. M., Rutter R. A. and Smith M. S. (1989) Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community, and expectations, *Sociology of Education*, 62, 221-238.
- [30]. O'Driscoll, M. (1996) 'The interface between job and off-job roles: Enhancement and conflict', *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 11, Pp. 279-306.
- [31]. O'Driscoll, M., Ilgen, D. and Hildreth, k. (1992) 'Time devoted to job and off-job activities, inter role conflict and affective experiences', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, Pp. 272-279.
- [32]. Payne, R. (1985) 'Job stress and burnout: Research theory and intervention perspectives', *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 57, Pp. 175-176.
- [33]. Pierce, M.B. and Molloy, G.N. (1990) Psychological and biographical differences between secondary school teachers experiencing high and low levels of burnout, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 60, 37-51.
- [34]. Quick, J.C. and Quick, J.D. (1984) *Organizational stress and preventive management*, McGraw-Hill: New York.
- [35]. Quick, J.C., Sekade, L. and Eakin, M.E. (1986) 'Thinking styles and job stress', *Personnel*, 40, 44-48.
- [36]. Reddy, G. L. (2007) Occupational stress, professional burnout and job satisfaction of special education teachers, Major Research Project (Report Submitted to Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Govt., of India, New Delhi), Dept., of Education, Periyar University, Salem.
- [37]. Russell, D.W., Altmaier, E. and Van Velzen, D. (1987) Job-related stress, social support and burnout among classroom teachers', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72 (2), 269-74.
- [38]. Schwab, R.L. and Iwanicki, E.F. (1982) Who are our burned out teachers?, *Educational Research Quarterly*, 7, 5-16.
- [39]. Seyyedmoharrami, I., Dehaghi, B.F., Abbaspour, S., Zandi, A., Tatari, M., Gholamheidar Teimori, G., and Torbati, A.G. (2019) The Relationship between Organizational Climate, Organizational Commitment and Job Burnout: Case Study among Employees of the University of Medical Sciences. *The Open Public Health Journal*, 12, 94-100.
- [40]. Watts, J. and Robertson, N. (2011) Burnout in university teaching staff: a systematic literature review, *Educational Research*, 53 (1), 33 - 50, DOI: 10.1080/00131881.2011.552235.