# Job Stress and Burnout among Lecturers: Personality and Social Support as Moderators

Dr. Samuel O. Salami
Department of Guidance and Counselling
Kampala International University, Kampala- Uganda
E-mail: drsosalami2002@yahoo.co.uk

Received: September 15, 2010 Accepted: November 6, 2010 doi:10.5539/ass.v7n5p110

**Abstract**

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of job stress, personality and social support to burnout among college of education lecturers. The second purpose was to examine the extent to which personality and social support can buffer the negative effects of stress on burnout. Survey methodology was used for this study. Job stress, personality and social support were used to predict emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment. Findings showed that job stress, personality dimensions and social support jointly and separately predicted dimensions of burnout. Personality and social support interacted with job stress to predict personal accomplishment. Results support the view that, environmental (job stress and social support) and personal factors (personality traits) have influence on burnout. The papers findings imply that interventions designed to improve lecturers' classroom management skills, social network and assessment of their personality traits may have positive impact in combating burnout.

**Keywords:** Job stress, Personality, Social networks, Burnout

## 1. Introduction

Burnout is defined as a chronic affective response pattern to stressful work conditions that feature high levels of interpersonal contact, Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (1996) conceptualized burnout as consisting of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion refers to the feeling of being emotionally over-extended, tired and fatigued. Depersonalization refers to the tendency to develop negative, cynical, callous or detached attitudes towards the people with whom one works. The Third component is the loss of or reduced feeling of personal accomplishment derived from jobs and employees often evaluate themselves negatively (Maslach, Schauefeli & Leiter, 2001).

Burnout as an individual negative experience occurring as a result of chronic work stress has become prominent in teaching professional literature since the mid-1970s'. There is a general view that teacher burnout may have a negative impact on the teachers themselves leading , for instance, to emotional and physical ill-health , and on the students as burned out teachers may be relatively impaired in the quality of teaching and commitment, may give less information and less praise as well as interact less with students. Job stress and burnout serve as impediments to the lecturers' research functions in higher education. The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of job-related stress, personality and social support to burnout among a previously unstudied element of the population, college of education lecturers. A secondary objective was to examine the extent to which personality and social support can buffer the negative effects of stress on burnout in the lecturers.

Studying stress and burnout among the college of education lecturers has implications for improving understanding of job-stress and burnout as well as for enhancing their working life. Understanding environmental and personal influences on burnout may hold benefits for institutions and lecturers. Appreciating the environmental and personal factors that influence burnout can help human resource specialists and career counsellors forecast burnout as well as factors related to early manifestation of burnout. From such information, appropriate intervention strategies that will combat burnout and enhance employee and organizational wellness can be developed. Although considerable research has studied stress and burnout, further research is warranted to identify new factors that might mediate job stress-burnout link.

The work of a typical university, polytechnic or college of education lecturer could be divided into four groups namely, teaching, conducting research, civil obligation and administration (Makinde & Alao, 1987). The intensity and frequency of influence of involvement in any of the broad groups of job activities depend on the rank of the lecturer. With increasing number of roles that students, parents and employers demand from lecturers, it is no wonder that lecturers' stress and burnout are on steady increase. This has invariably affected the research functions of the lecturers in tertiary institutions.

Colangelo (2004) defined teacher stress as an unpleasant feeling that teachers experience as a result of their work. Stress has effects on a person's physical, emotional and psychological well-being. Past research on job stress among postsecondary lecturers has identified numerous sources and variables affecting stress levels as well as burnout (Brewer & McMahan, 2004). For example, researchers have consistently reported time pressure (Barnes, Agago & Combs, 1998), high self expectations (Smith, Anderson & Lovrich, 1995), research and publication demands (Blix, Cruise, Mitchell & Blix, 1994) as significant sources of job stress. Salami (2006) also identified heavy workload, working under pressure, large classes, students' disruption of lectures and delayed and inadequate salaries as sources of stress among college of education lecturers in Nigeria.

Empirical evidence have shown that, teachers experiencing more stress were burned out (Ganster& Schaubroeck, 1991, Kokkinos, 2007; Moore, 2007). The manifestation of burnout is a function of stressors engendered at both the environmental organization and personal levels. Kokkinos (2007) found that managing student misbehaviour, teachers' appraisal by students, workload, and time constraints were predictors of burnout. Byrne & Hall, (1989) found out that role conflict, work overload, classroom climate and decision making are all organizational factors that contributed to teachers stress and eventual burnout. In a recent study, Lue, Chen, Wang, Cheng and Chen (2010) found that job stress and work hours predicted burnout among first postgraduate year residents. Furthermore, researchers have found that job stress particulary role stress and other role-related problems were moderately to highly correlated with burnout (Bakker, Demerouti & Verbeke, 2004; Demerouti Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2001; Maslach et al. 2001; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).; Thomas & Jankau,2009). Therefore, it was expected that job stress will predict burnout.

Personality stands for a person's values, preferences, needs, stable dispositions or emotional characteristics. The use of five- factor model of personality developed by Costa and McCrae (1992) to study the process of burnout has been applied to various populations. The five-factor model of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992) described adult personality in terms of neuroticism (susceptibility to psychological distress), extraversion (the disposition towards positive emotions, sociability and high activity), openness (the proclivity toward variety, intellectual curiosity), agreeableness (the inclination towards interpersonal trust and consideration for others), and conscientiousness (the tendency towards persistence, industriousness and organization).

Research on personality correlates of teacher burnout indicated that neuroticism was associated with burnout (Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996). Kokkinos (2007) found that teachers' personality traits were significant predictors of three burnout dimensions. According to him, high levels of neuroticism and low levels of agreeableness were predictive of emotional exhaustion, for depersonalization, neuroticism was the most important predictor whereas personal accomplishment was predicted by low levels of neuroticism and high levels of extraversion and conscientiousness. Similarly, Lue et al., (2010) reported that introversion, conscientiousness and having negative affectivity predicted burnout. However, Kokkinos (2007) found that neuroticism was a predictor of personal accomplishment in a different direction. These results were not consistent because different personality instruments were used to measure personality traits. For example, some authors used the five- factor personality model by Costa and McCrae (1992) while others used Eysenck's model of personality measures, thus making interpretation of the results difficult. Therefore, it was expected that the lecturer's personality will predict dimensions of burnout with the use of the five-factor personality measure by Costa and McCrae (1992).

Social support is the physical and emotional comfort given to an individual by his/her family, co-workers and others times of need. It has been found that social support can buffer the negative effects of stress ( e.g. Bonfiglio, 2005; Cheuk, Wong & Rose, 1994; Wong & Cheuk, 2005), although such positive effects of social support have not been identified in some other studies (e.g. Kahn & Byosiere, 1992). Consequently, results from these studies were not conclusive. For this has made the investigation into the effects of social support in buffering the relationship between job stress and burnout warranted. Therefore, it was expected that social support will predict burnout and interact with job stress to predict burnout.

In studying burnout among postsecondary lecturers, researchers have identified some demographic characteristics. For example, Byrne and Hall (1989) found that demographic variables had a stronger impact on

postsecondary educators than they had on educators at other levels. (i.e. primary, intermediate and secondary). Jackson (1993) and Kim-Wan (1991) found significant differences in levels of burnout among teachers relative to demographic factors such as gender, age, marital status, tenure status, academic rank and workload. However, Dillon and Tanner (1995) did not report such findings.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

This study was based on person- environment (PE) Fit theory and the transactional model of stress and burnout. These are the most widely accepted frameworks for conducting research on job-stress and burnout (Brewer& McMahan, 2004; Edwards, Caplan & Harrison, 1998; Edwards& Cooper, 1990; Kokkinos, 2007; Spielberger& Vagg, 1999). Person-environment fit is the degree to which individual characteristics harmonise with those of his or her environment (Meyer & Dale, 2010). PE Fit theory and transactional model of burnout assert that the interaction between an individual and his or her environment determines whether or not a situation is stressful for that person. It assumes that human behaviour is a function of the person and the environment, and that a person's vocational satisfaction, stability and achievement depend on the congruence or fit between the person's personality and the environment in which the person works (Herr,Cramer,& Niles, 2004;Kokkinos,2007; Salami,2006). In work situations, higher degrees of fit predict positive work outcomes (Hoffman & Woehr 2006; Vogel & Feldman, 2009. According to Clark- Murphy, (2010), the person-environment approaches suggest that for optimal productivity, individuals should be compatible with their environments. Early researchers Streufert & Swezey(1986). Concluded that decision-making performance reaches an optimal level when an individual's cognitive capability matches the complexity of their environment, Jacques (1989) argued that for optimal productivity organisations should be designed on the person-environment fit based on individual cognitive capacity at every level of the organisation. According to the Person-environment fit researchers (Jacques, 1989; Meijer, Muitjens & Vander Vleuten, 1999), individual, decision-making. Performance reaches an optimal level when the decision-makers' cognitive complexity matches the complexity of the decision environment.

In the context of the workplace, the individual's attributes are interests, transferrable skills, career motives and values, personality preferences, career orientations, self-concept and sense of self-efficacy. The work environment include individual's expectations and perceptions regarding workload, control over one's work, tangible and intrinsic rewards of work, the relationship and sense of community among co-workers ,perceptions of fairness in the workplace and the role of personal and organizational values (Herr *et al,* 2004). If the fit between an individual and his environment is incompatible, the result is stress. Similarly, lack of fit between the demands placed on individuals and their abilities to meet those demands can result in stress. Though, there are evidences that burnout occurs as a result of complex interaction between individual characteristics and issues in the work environment, research has not systematically considered the role of person variables in this direction especially studying the manifestation of burnout among college of education lecturers.

## 3. Statement of the Problem

Research evidence have shown that there is high stress and burnout among lecturers in higher educational institutions. Given that there is paucity of studies that investigated the relationship between job stress and burnout among college of education lecturers and the moderating roles of personality and social support in the relationship, there is need to investigate how job stress is related to burnout among the lecturers. That, there are inconsistencies in the findings obtained by previous researchers on the relationship between job stress and burnout among higher education lecturers indicates that research into the effects of job stress on lecturers' burnout is not conclusive. Furthermore, the negative consequences of job stress and burnout on the work of the lecturers calls for further research on the job stress-burnout linkage in order to increase our understanding on how to stem the tide of increasing stress and burnout among lecturers.The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of job-related stress, personality and social support to burnout among a previously unstudied element of the population, college of education lecturers. A secondary objective was to examine the extent to which personality and social support can buffer the negative effects of stress on burnout in the lecturers.

## 4. Hypotheses

Based on the review of related literature the following hypotheses were tested:

$H_1$: Job-related stress, personality and social support will jointly predict dimensions of burnout.

$H_2$: Job-related stress will significantly predict dimensions of burnout.

$H_3$: Personality characteristics will significantly predict dimensions of burnout.

$H_4$: Personality characteristics will interact with job stress to predict dimensions of burnout.

$H_5$: Social support will predict dimensions of burnout.

$H_6$: Social support will interact with job stress to predict dimensions of burnout

## 5. Method

### *5.1 Research Design*

This study adopted a survey research design that utilised questionnaires to obtain data from the respondents.

### *5.2 Participants*

The participants were 340 lecturers (Male-240 (70.58%), Female -100 (29.41%) randomly selected from the three colleges of education in Kwara state, Nigeria. The mean age of the sample was 36.70years (S.D. = 4.50), range=21-59 years).Highest level of education of the lecturers include B.A. Ed. /B.SC. Ed.B.Ed. B.A. /BSC. PGDE. M.Ed, and Ph.D. The teaching experience of the lecturers ranged from 2 to 28 years. Academic ranks were Assistant Lecturer 30(8.82%), Lecturer 111 64(18.82), Lecturer 11 75(22.05%), lecturer 1 70(20.58%), Senior lecturer 63(18.52%), Principal Lecturer 20 (5.88%), Chief Lecturer or Senior Principal Lecturer 18(5.29%); Marital status-married=129(37. 94%), single = 200(58.82%) Divorce= 3(0.88%), Widow/Widower= 8(2.35%).

### *5.3 Measures*

Personality. The NEO-FFI (Form S, Costa & McCrae, 1992) was used to assess the five personality dimensions. It consists of five 12- item scales developed through factor analyses as a short form of the NEO- PI-R to assess Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C). The item response adopted a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from strongly disagree (I) to strongly agree (5). For the reliability of NEO- FFI, Costa and McCrae (1992) reported Cronbach's alpha Coefficients of 0.86, 0.77, 0.73, 0.68, and 0.81 respectively for the N, E, O, A, and C scales. Costa and McCrae (1991) have reported the construct validity of NEO-FFI. For the present study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from 0.70 to 0.87 for the N, E, O, A and C scales.

***Job stress***. Job stress was measured by means of occupational stress scale (OSS, Salami, 2003). OSS is a 50-item questionnaire that measures occupational stress factors viz: workload, interpersonal problems, time pressure, working conditions, leadership problems, inadequate facilities and personal problems. Items are responded to on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Range of score is 50-250. The coefficient of international consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of the scale was r = 0.85. The OSS has impressive norms and correlated highly (r=0.75) with the stress scale by Cooper, Cooper and Eaker (1988).

Teachers Burnout. Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Services. Survey (MBI- HSS; Maslach, Jackson & Schwab, 1996) was used to assess the three aspects of teachers' burnout. The scale consists of 22 items that fall on the three subscales: emotions exhaustion (9 items), depersonalization (5items), and lack of a sense of personal accomplishment (8 items). Some amendments were made to the items for suitability for lecturers at the postsecondary level. Respondents indicate the frequency that they experience feeling related to each of the subscale items on a 7-point scale ranging from Never (o) to every day (6). The internal consistency ranges from .76 to .90 (Iwaniki & Schwab, 1981). For the current study, Cronbach's alphas were .86, for emotional exhaustion, .70 for depersonalization and .72 for personal accomplishment.

Social Support. The type of Social support received by the teachers was assessed by the social provisions scale (SPS) developed by Cutrona and Russell (1987). It measures the six relational provisions as obtained from the teachers' current social relationships. The respondents are to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement if they feel the statements are true of their current relationships with friends, family members, colleagues, college organization, and community members. The six provisions are (1) attachment, (2) social integration, (3) reassurance of worth, (4) reliable alliance, (5) guidance, advice (6) opportunity for nurturance, The cronbachs's alpha coefficient for this study for the six sub-scales were .75, .60, .75, .72, .68 respectively

***Demographics***: Data on demographic characteristics of respondents were collected via a demographic questionnaire developed by the researcher. Characteristics addressed by the questionnaire were (a) age, (b) gender, (C) academic qualifications, (d) teaching experience, (e) academic ranks, and marital status. There characteristics were chosen based upon a review of related literature.

### *5.4 Procedure*

The survey forms containing all the four scales( Personality Inventory ( NEO-FFI), Occupational Stress Scale, Social Support Scale, Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Services Survey(MBI-HSS),and the Demographic Questions were administered to the randomly selected lecturers in the institutions that participated in the study.

Six research assistants who were three undergraduates and three postgraduate students, who had been provided with instructions regarding the administration protocol, administered the survey forms. The lecturers completed the survey forms anonymously and the purpose of the study, which was research, was explained to them. The participants were assured that their responses were confidential.

*5.5 Data Analysis*

Data collected were analysed using hierarchical multiple regression analysis.

Personality traits, job stress, social support and interactions between job stress and personality traits and social support served as independent variables while three components of teacher burnout served as the dependent variables.

**6. Results**

Correlational analyses

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for the variables under study as well as the bivariate correlations between job stress, teachers' personality, social support and burnout dimensions.

The bivariate correlations on Table 1 (see appendix1) showed that job stress significantly correlated with all the three dimensions of burnout – emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment (correlations ranged from r=.19 to .20, p< .05).Social support had significant negative correlations with emotional exhaustion (r= -.20, p<.05) and depersonalization (r= -.19, p<.05) except with personal accomplishment.

Of the personality variables, neuroticism was positively correlated with emotional exhaustion (r=.35, p< .05) and depersonalization (r=.24, p<.05) and negatively correlated with personal accomplishment (r=-.23, p< .05). Extraversion was negatively correlated with emotional exhaustion (r=-.20, p<.05) whereas it was positively correlated with personal accomplishment (r=.30, p<.05).Openness was negatively significantly correlated with depersonalization (r=-.19, p<.05) and personal accomplishment (r=-.20, p<.05) but not with emotional exhaustion. Agreeableness had no significant correlation with all the dimensions of burnout. Conscientiousness had negative significant correlation with depersonalization (r=-.30, p<.05) and positive correlation with personal accomplishment (r=.32, p<.05). None of the demographic characteristics (age, gender, experience, rank and marital status) had significant correlations with any of the dimensions of burnout.

*6.1 Regression analyses*

A series of regression analyses were performed to find out the joint and relative/ separate contributions of various factors in predicting burnout dimensions among college education lecturers. Three separate hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted regressing each burnout dimension on lecturers' demographics, personality characteristics, job stress and social support. Results are shown on Tables 2 to 4 (see appendices 2-4) in a manner consistent with the hypotheses.

On the joint contribution of all the independent variables (stress, personality and social support) to the prediction of dimensions, of burnout, as hypothesized, results of hierarchical multiple regression analyses on Tables 2 to 4 showed that all the independent variables jointly predicted emotional exhaustion ($R^2$=.44, F(1,328)=10.32, p<0.05) (see Table 2); depersonalization ($R^2$=.27, F(1,328)=8.97, p<0.05) (see Table 3) and personal accomplishment ($R^2$=.23, F(1,328= 5.73,p<0.05) ( see Table 4).

It was hypothesized that job stress will predict all the three dimensions of burnout. As expected, job stress significantly predicted emotional exhaustion (Beta=.24, t=14.20, p<0.03) (see Table 2). Job stress was also a significant predictor of depersonalization (Beta=.21, t=7.60, p<.05) (see Table 3[appendix3]) and personal accomplishment (Beta=.19, t=4.43, p<.05) (see Table 4).

It was hypothesized that personality characteristics would also predict emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment dimensions of burnout. Emotional exhaustion was predicted by neuroticism, extraversion, openness and conscientiousness (See Table2 [appendix 2]). Regarding depersonalization, neuroticism, openness and conscientiousness were the strong predictors of this dimension of burnout. Extraversion and agreeableness did not make any significant contribution to the prediction of depersonalization (see Table 3 [appendix 3). Personal accomplishment was predicted by neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness but not by openness and agreeableness (see Table 4 [appendix 4]).

It was hypothesized that social support will predict all dimensions of burnout. As anticipated, social support was a strong predictor of emotional exhaustion (Beta=.22. t=8.9, p<0.05) (see Table 2), depersonalization (Beta=.27, t=9.45, p<.05) (see Table3) and personal accomplishment (Beta=.19, t=4.20,p<.05) (see Table 4 [appendix 4]).

*6.2 Interaction of stress with personality and social support*

Results of the analyses indicated that, there were no significant interaction effects of stress with personality dimension and social support in predicting emotional exhaustion and depersonalization dimensions of burnout (see Table 2and 3).However, stress interacted with extraversion ($R^2$ change=.17, Beta=.23, t=9.06, p<. 05) and conscientiousness ($R^2$ change= .17, Beta= .25, t=11.09, p< .05) to predict personal accomplishment. Stress did not interact with neuroticism; openness and agreeableness to predict personal accomplishment (see Table 4 [appendix 4]). Finally, all the demographic characteristics did not predict any dimension of burnout (see Table 2,3and 4 [appendices 2, 3 & 4]).

**7. Discussion**

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between job stress, personality characteristics, social support and dimensions of burnout in a sample of college of education lecturers. Results from this study showed that stress, personality and social support were correlated with burnout dimensions, thus providing support for the PE-fit theory and transactional model of burnout in which in order to understand its process. There is need to consider both the environmental and person variables. These findings are in agreement with those of Schaefeli, Enzmann and Girault (1993), and Kokkinos (2007). Emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were more related to environmental stressors and social support while personal accomplishment was related to personality variable.

As expected, job stress played a central role in predicting dimensions of burnout among the lecturers. This finding is consistent with those of previous researchers who reported similar results (Ganster & Schanbroek, 1991; Kim-Wan, 1991; Kokkinos, 2007; Moore, 2001). An explanation for this finding is that there are certain issues in the lecturers' job that cause them more concern, stress and eventually burnout. Examples of issues in the lecturers' job that served as sources of stress included workload, time pressure, working conditions, inadequate facilities and students' misbehaviour. Stress arises when a lecturer appraises the environment as one that taxes or exceeds his/ her resources and therefore is perceived as threatening. Lecturers who have high expectations and want to achieve may be prone to stress and burnout (Kokkinos, 2007).

The results also showed that, as hypothesized, personality characteristics were associated with burnout dimensions. The results were in line with the findings of previous researchers who reported that emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were predicted by neuroticism and conscientiousness (Kokkinos, 2007; Lue et al., 2010). Similarly Kokkinos (2007) found that personal accomplishment was predicted by high scores in conscientiousness and extraversion and low scores in neuroticism. Kim-Wan (1991) reported that Type A personality predict burnout especially personal accomplishment .These results could be attributed to the fact that lecturers' with high scores in conscientiousness and extraversion or Type A personality more often work harder, put greater efforts and commitment to their jobs and accomplish more in their work even at the cost of their health.

As hypothesized in this study, the results revealed that social support had significant correlations with dimensions of burnout. These results corroborated the findings of previous researchers who reported that teachers who possessed higher levels of social support were less burned out (Bonfiglio, 2005; Kim -Wan, 1991). Results from this study also corroborated the work of Thomas and Lankau (2009) who found that workplace social support in the form of high lead-member exchange (LMX) and mentoring served as resources that minimize emotional exhaustion through increased socialization and deceased role stress. Possible explanation for these findings could be that when lecturers face specific job- related difficulty or stress, social support from their supervisors, friends, families, co-workers and others would help minimize emotional distress and boost their self-esteem both of which, in turn, enhance their abilities in coping effectively with job-related problems they are confronted with.

The results in relation to the buffering effects of personality and social support in the hypotheses indicated that personality and social support were effective in reducing adverse effects of job stress on reduced personal accomplishment but not on emotional exhaustion and depersonalization dimensions of burnout. These results, are in line with the work of Kim-Wan (1991) who reported that Type A personality and social support buffered the relation between job stress and reduced accomplishment of their teacher sample. Possible explanation for these findings could be that, in the case of personality, lecturers who had high scores on extraversion and

conscientiousness worked harder and put in more efforts and commitment. In the case of social support, lecturers who had more social support from their supervisors, friends, coworkers, and family members reported less burnout and therefore had more personal achievement.

## 8. Implications of the Findings

Results reported in this study have implications for career counselling practice and assessment. The findings suggest that dimensions of burnout have different predictors when personality and environmental factors (job stress and social support) are considered simultaneously. The preponderance of environmental factors in the prediction of burnout dimension of emotional exhaustion is heart-warming because it is easier to control or change job-related conditions causing stress than personal characteristics. Therefore, employers should provide more conducive working environments devoid of stress for the lecturers. This will remove some of the impediments to the lecturers' research functions in higher education.

Appropriate intervention strategies that will emphasise improvement of the lecturers' skills in classroom management should be developed by career counsellors and adopted for the professional development of the lecturers. These strategies could be adopted during preparation for higher teaching and after training. This can be a sure way of combating burnout. Since stress could also emanate from work overload and students' disruption of classroom lectures, lecturers should be taught principles of handling group behaviour and time management. This will assist the lecturers in having a more balanced distribution of time for their work.

Also lecturers need to know their personality characteristics so that they will be aware of their own personal dispositions that may reduce or aggravate stress. In this regard, personality assessment should be conducted by career counsellors for all lecturers and appropriate coping responses they use in dealing with work-related stress noted for improvement or retention as appropriate. Career counsellors should work with college management to conduct stress audits that assess the levels of stress in different parts of the institution, the particular stressor of concern and ways to enhance employee and institutional wellness within the college. In this respect, career counsellors need to teach the lecturers appropriate coping strategies in order to reduce the use of maladaptive coping strategies. Self efficacy training, cognitive behavioural and rational emotive behavioural therapies and problem –solving techniques are intervention strategies that could be used to reduce burnout among lecturers. Also the lecturers should improve their social networks so that they will have access to appropriate social support when they have job-related problems.

This study is a cross-sectional research and it used self-report measures. These are obvious limitations. Future researchers could embark on longitudinal studies in order to establish causal relationship. In addition to self –report measures, interview techniques and focus group discussions could be used to complement the data collection instruments. Despite these limitations, the present study has contributed to the body of literature on stress and burnout in lecturers.

## References

Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resources Management, 34*, 83-104.

Barnes, L.L.B., Agago, M.O & Coombs, W.T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education*. 39, 457-469.

Blix, A.G., Cruise, R.J., Mitchell, B.M. & Blix, G.G. (1994). Occupational stress among university teachers. *Educational Research*, 36, 157-169.

Bonfiglio, D. (2005). The interaction of dispositional optimism and social support in the moderation of cardiovascular responses to acute psychological stress. Ph.D, Dissertation. Graduate School of the Ohio State University.

Brewer, E.W. & McMahan, J. (2004). Job stress and burnout among industrial and technical teacher educators. *Journal of Vocational Education Research,* 28(2), 1-17.

Byrne, B.M. & Hall, L.M. (1989, March). *An investigation of factors contributing to the teacher burnout: The elementary, intermediate, secondary and postsecondary school environments*: Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Cheuk, W.H, Wong, K.S. & Rosen, S. (1994). The effects of spurning and social support on teacher burnout. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 9(4), 657-664.

Clark-Murphy, D. (2010). Do interactive theories really explain public sector managerial decision-making? *Asian Social Sciences, 6*(3), 17-26.

Colangelo, T. M. (2004). *Teachers stress and burnout and the role of physical activity and parent involvement*. M.A Dissertation, department of Psychology, Central Connecticut State University New Britain, Connecticut.

Cooper, C.L. & Cooper, R. & Eaker, L. (1988). *Living with stress*. Hammondsworth: Penguin.

Costa, P.T. Jr. & McCrae. (1992). *The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual*: Odessa. FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Cutrona, C.E.& Russell, D.W. (1987). The provision of social relationships and adaptation to stress, In Jones, W.H., Perlman, D.(Eds), *Advances in Personal Relationships*. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 1, 37-67.

Demerout, E., Bakker, A.B.; Nachrerner, & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). The job demands- resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 499-512.

Dillon, J.F & Tanner, G.R. (1995). Dimensions of career burnout among educators. *Journal of Mass Communication Educator*, 50 (2), 4-13.

Edwards, J.R. & Cooper, C.L. (1990). The person –environment fit approach to stress: Recurring problems and some suggested solutions. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour,* 11, 293-307.

Edwards, J.R., Caplan, R.D. & Harrison, R.V. (1998). Person –environment fit theory: Conceptual foundations, empirical evidence and directions for future research. In C.L Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of organizational stress (pp.28-67).* New York: Oxford University Press.

Eysenck, H.J. & Eysenck, M. (1985). *Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach.* New York: Plenum Press.

Fletcher, B. (1988). The epidemiology of occupational stress, In Cooper, C.L. Payne, R. (Eds). Causes, *coping and consequences of stress at work.* Wiley.

Ganster, D. & Schaubroek, J. (1991). Work stress and employee health. *Journal of Management,* 17, 235-271.

Herr, E.L., Cramer, S.H. & Niles, S.G. (2004). *Career guidance and counseling through the lifespan*. London: Prentice-Hall.

Hoffman, B.J. & Woehr, D.J. (2006). A quantitative review of the relationship between person- organisation fit and behavioural outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 68*(3), 389-399.

Iwanicki, E.F. & Schwab, R.L. (1981). A cross-validation study of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 41, 1167-1174.

Jackson, R.A. (1993). An analysis of burnout among school of pharmacy faculty. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 57(1), 9-17.

Jacques, E. (1989). *Requisite organisations: The CEO'S guide to creative structure and leadership*. Arlington, VA: Cason.

Kahn, R.L. & Byosiere, P. (1992). Stress in organization, In Dunnette, M.D.& Hough, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA, pp.571-650.

Kim-Wan, M.O. (1991). Teacher burnout: Relations with stress, personality, and social support. *Chinese University of Hong Kong Educational Journal*, 19(1), 3-11.

Kokkinos, C.M. (2007). Job stress, personality and burnout in primary school teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(1), 22243.

Lue, B.H.; Chen, H.J.; Wang, C.W. Cheng, Y. & Cheng, M.C. (2010). Stress, personal characteristics and burnout among first postgraduate year residents: a nationwide study in Taiwan. *Medical Teacher. 32*(5), 400-7.

Makinde, O. & Alao, K. (1987). *Profile of career education*. Ibadan: Signal Educational Services Limited.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S.E. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory- Human Services Survey*. Palo Alto CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E. & Leiter, M.P. (1996). *MBI manual* (3rd ed). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Maslach, C.; Schaufeli, W.B. & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.

Meijer, R., Muitjens, A. & Van der Vleuten, C. (1999). Non-parametric person-fit research: Some theoretical issues and empirical examples. *Applied Measurements in Education, 9*, 1, 77-89.

Meyer,B.W. & Dale, K. (2010). The impact of group cognitive complexity on group satisfaction: A person-environment fit perspective. Institute of Behavioural and Applied Management.

Moore, K. (2001). Hospital restructuring: Impact on nurses mediated by social support and a percentage of challenge. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 23(4), 20-27.

Salami, S.O. (2000). Person-environment fit as a predictor of job satisfaction and stability at work of secondary school teachers. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues,* 5(2), 174-188.

Salami, S.O. (2003). Occupational Stress Scale. Department of Guidance and Counselling, Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Salami, S.O. (2006). Management of stress among trainee-teachers through cognitive behaviour therapy. *Personality Study and Group Behaviour, 2*6, 1-25.

Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organiation Behaviour, 25*, 293-315.

Schaufeli, W.B., Enzmann, D. & Girault, N. (1993). Measurement of burnout: A review, In W.B Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds). *Professional burnout: Recent developments in search* (pp. 199-215). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

Smith, E. Anderson, J.L. & Lovrich, N.P. (1995). The multiple sources of workplace stress among land-grant university faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 36, 261-282.

Spielberger, C.D. & Vagg, P.R. (1999). *Job stress survey: Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Streufert, S..& Swezey, R. (1986). *Complexity Managers and Organisations*. New York: Academic Press.

Thomas, C.H. & Lankau, M. (2009). Preventing burnout: The effects of LMX and mentiring on socialization. Roles stress, and burnout. *Human Resource Management, 48*(3), 417-432.

Vogel, R.M. & Feldman, D.C. (2009). Integrating the levels of person-environment fit: The roles of Vocational fit and group fit. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 75*(1), 68-81.

Wong, K.S. & Cheuk, W. H. (2005). Job- related stress and social support in kindergarten principals: the case of Macau. *International Journal of Education Management,* 19(3), 183-19.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations and correlation matrix of Job stress, personality, social support, demographic factors and burnout dimensions

| | variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | **EEX** | **-** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2** | **Dep** | **.19*** | **-** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3** | **Pac** | **.08** | **.12** | **-** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **4** | **Social support** | **-.20*** | **.19*** | **.13** | **-** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **5** | **Neuroticism** | **.35*** | **-.24*** | **-23*** | **.03** | **-** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **6** | **Extraversion** | **-.24*** | **-.20*** | **.30*** | **.14** | **.07** | **-** | | | | | | | | | |
| **7** | **openness** | **.14** | **-19*** | **-.20*** | **.15** | **.10** | **.20*** | **-** | | | | | | | | |
| **8** | **Agreeableness** | **.12** | **.09** | **.15** | **.02** | **.04** | **.19*** | **.11** | **-** | | | | | | | |
| **9** | **Conscientious-ness** | **.15** | **-.30*** | **.32*** | **.03** | **.08** | **.07** | **.13** | **.18** | **-** | | | | | | |
| **10** | **stress** | **.19*** | **.25*** | **.20*** | **-.23*** | **-.19*** | **.18** | **.14** | **.08** | **.12** | **-** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **11** | **Age** | **.09** | **.07** | **.07** | **.05** | **.06** | **.10** | **.07** | **.03** | **.04** | **.12** | **-** | | | |
| **12** | **Gender a** | **.05** | **.06** | **.08** | **.10** | **.43** | **.03** | **.02** | **.09** | **.07** | **.04** | **.01** | **-** | | |
| **13** | **Experience** | **.10** | **.09** | **.12** | **.08** | **.07** | **.01** | **.04** | **.05** | **.03** | **.02** | **.06** | **.03** | **-** | |
| **14** | **Rank** | **.12** | **.09** | **.06** | **.03** | **.05** | **.06** | **.03** | **.08** | **.02** | **.03** | **.05** | **.07** | **.04** | **-** |
| **15** | **Marital statusb** | **.05** | **.08** | **.10** | **.07** | **.02** | **.04** | **.02** | **.09** | **.01** | **.04** | **.10** | **.09** | **.05** | **.12** |
| | **Mean** | **18.40** | **6.35** | **36.85** | **22.65** | **30.34** | **31.46** | **32.60** | **36.61** | **43.4** | **36.70** | **-** | **-** | **15.00** | **3.60** |
| | **S.D** | **9.56** | **5.70** | **7.26** | **1.60** | **2.40** | **3.42** | **5.85** | **4.23** | **3.56** | **4.50** | **-** | **-** | **5.80** | **2.40** |

**Note**: N=340, S.D. = Standard Deviation, a=nominal data, so no mean score, (male=0, female=1), b= nominal data, so no mean score,

(Married=1, single, divorced, widow/widower=0), EEX= Emotional exhaustion, Dep= Depersonalization, Pac= personal accomplishment, * p< 0.05 (2- tailed test).

Table 2. Summary of hierarchical regression analyses for variables predicting emotional exhaustion

| **Variable** | **R** | **R²** | **R²change** | **F** | **F change** | **DF** | **Beta** | **t** | **P** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step1 Demographics | .16 | .02 | - | 1.30 | 1.20 | 5,335 | | | |
| Age | | | | | | | .09 | 1.20 | .95 |
| Gender | | | | | | | .07 | .08 | .82 |
| Rank | | | | | | | .05 | .07 | .73 |
| Experience | | | | | | | .08 | .05 | .78 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | .09 | .03 | .90 |
| Step 2 Stress | .48 | .23 | .21 | 11.56 | 9.67* | 1,334 | .24 | 14.20* | .03 |
| Step 3 personality | .56 | .31 | .08 | 9.42 | 5.60* | 5,329 | | | |
| Neuroticism | | | | | | | .20 | 7.78* | .05 |
| Extraversion | | | | | | | .25 | 8.65* | .05 |
| Openness | | | | | | | .18 | 4.20* | .05 |
| Agreeableness | | | | | | | .08 | 1.45 | .76 |
| conscientiousness | | | | | | | .23 | 6.73* | .05 |
| Step 4 social support | .67 | .44 | .13 | 10.32 | 8.54* | 1,328 | .22 | 8.90* | .05 |
| Step 5 Interaction terms | .69 | .47 | .03 | 1.60 | 1.20 | 6,322 | | | |
| Stress X Neu | | | | | | | .06 | .09 | .73 |
| Stress x Exit | | | | | | | .09 | 1.30 | .52 |
| Stress x Op | | | | | | | .02 | .07 | .67 |
| Stress x Agr | | | | | | | .01 | .05 | .73 |
| Stress xCon. | | | | | | | .03 | .07 | .65 |
| Stress xSS | | | | | | | .04 | .09 | .55 |

**NOTE:** N= 340, Neu=Neuroticism, OP= openness, Exit= Extraversion, Agr= Agreeableness, Con = conscientiousness, SS= social support, * P<0.05.

Table 3. Summary of Hierarchical Regression analyses for variables predicting depersonalization

| Variable | R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ change | F | F change | DF | Beta | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 1: Demographics** | .12 | .01 | - | 1.10 | .09 | 5,335 | | | |
| Age | | | | | | | .05 | .08 | .70 |
| Gender | | | | | | | .03 | .05 | .53 |
| Rank | | | | | | | .06 | .07 | .80 |
| Experience | | | | | | | .09 | 1.30 | .45 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | .04 | .06 | .50 |
| **Step 2 Stress** | .35 | .12 | .11 | 8.50 | 6.75* | 1,334 | .21 | 7.60* | .05 |
| **Step 3 Personality** | .42 | .17 | .05 | 7.85 | 5.34* | 5,329 | | | |
| Neuroticism | | | | | | | .23 | 8.57* | .05 |
| Extraversion | | | | | | | .09 | 1.54 | .54 |
| Openness | | | | | | | .18 | 7.66* | .05 |
| Agreeableness | | | | | | | .08 | 1.20 | .67 |
| Conscientiousness | | | | | | | .25 | 9.63* | .05 |
| **Step 4 Social Support** | .52 | .27 | .10 | 8.97 | 7.43* | 1,328 | .27 | 9.45* | .05 |
| **Step 5 Interaction terms** | .56 | .31 | .04 | 1.89 | 1.41 | 6,322 | | | |
| Stress x Neu | | | | | | | .08 | 1.34 | .84 |
| Stress x Ext | | | | | | | .04 | .93 | .87 |
| Stress x Op | | | | | | | .07 | .87 | .88 |
| Stress x Agr | | | | | | | .02 | .67 | .76 |
| Stress x Con | | | | | | | .05 | .58 | .93 |
| Stress x SS | | | | | | | .06 | .36 | .65 |

**Note**: N=340, Neu=Neuroticism, OP=Openess, Ext=Extraversion, Agr=Agreeableness, Con=Conscientiousness SS=Social Support, Social Support, * P<0.05.

Table 4. Summary of Hierarchical Regression analysis for variables predicting personal accomplishment

| Variable | R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ change | F | F change | DF | Beta | t | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 1: Demographics** | .10 | .01 | - | 1.30 | 1.13 | 5,335 | | | |
| Age | | | | | | | .03 | .06 | .75 |
| Gender | | | | | | | .07 | 1.10 | .56 |
| Rank | | | | | | | .09 | 1.23 | .43 |
| Experience | | | | | | | .05 | .09 | .86 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | .04 | .05 | .73 |
| **Step 2, Stress** | .32 | .10 | .09 | 4.32 | 3.56* | 1,334 | .19 | 4.43* | .05 |
| **Step 3 Personality** | .42 | .17 | .07 | 4.53 | 3.84* | 5,329 | | | |
| Neuroticism | | | | | | | .20 | 7.64* | .05 |
| Extraversion | | | | | | | .18 | 6.23 | .05 |
| Openness | | | | | | | .09 | 1.50 | .42 |
| Agreeableness | | | | | | | .07 | 1.23 | .33 |
| Conscientiousness | | | | | | | .22 | 8.72* | .05 |
| **Step 4 Social Support** | .48 | .23 | .06 | 5.73 | 4.38* | 1,328 | .19 | 4.20* | .05 |
| **Step 5 Interaction terms** | .64 | .40 | .17 | 7.89 | 5.23* | 6,322 | | | |
| Stress x Neu | | | | | | | .06 | .09 | .85 |
| Stress x Ext | | | | | | | .23 | 9.06* | .05 |
| Stress x Op | | | | | | | .09 | 1.10 | .42 |
| Stress x Agr | | | | | | | .07 | 1.00 | .40 |
| Stress x Con | | | | | | | .25 | 11.09* | .04 |
| Stress x SS | | | | | | | .02 | .05 | .68 |

**Note**: N=340, Neu=Neuroticism, OP=Openess, Ext=Extraversion, Agr=Agreeableness, Con=Conscientiousness SS=Social Support, Social Support, * P<0.05.