

Hardiness and Burnout among Elementary School Teachers

Libbie Annatagia^{*a}, Sri Kusrohmaniah^b

^aDepartment of Psychology, Universitas Islam Indonesia,

^bDepartment of Psychology, Universitas Gadjah Mada,
Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: libbie.annatagia@uii.ac.id

Abstract

Teacher burnout can lead to such condition: the decrease in the sensitivity to students, a sense of not being able to help the student's learning process, truant behavior, coming late to school, and the emergence of a desire to resign from the job. The aim of the study was to examine correlation between hardiness and burnout among elementary school teachers. 81 elementary school teachers in Cilacap, Central Java, Indonesia, completed two scales: Hardiness scale using the theory of Maddi & Kobasa (Astuti, 2005) and Burnout scale using the theory of Baron & Greenberg (Khairiyah, 1998). All respondents have been teaching for at least one year. The data was analyzed by product moment correlation. The result showed that there was a significant negative correlation between hardiness and burnout among elementary school teachers ($r=0.827$, $p=0.000$). The result of the study also found $R^2 = 0.684$, which meant that hardiness contributed 68.4% towards burnout.

Keywords: hardiness, burnout, elementary school teachers

Introduction

Teachers play an important role in education. There are many demands that teacher face in their works. Those demands come from the government and parents. In Indonesia, teacher at elementary school have a huge workload. They usually become a 'class teacher' who teach almost all the subjects except sport and religion subjects. Moreover, they have an obligation not only to transfer the knowledge but also to teach the character education (Anonim, 2016). From the initial interview conducted on two teachers, researcher found some responsibilities of the elementary school teachers: construct the basic concept of logic, teach the character education, and take care of students who are ill at school. The huge workload and extra tasks could be the stressor for teachers. Riggio (2003) said that the chronic stress could lead into burnout. Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter (2001) stated burnout as a prolonged response of emotional and interpersonal stressor in work place. Baron dan Greenberg (2008) also stated that burnout has four aspects: physical exhaustion (indicated by exhaustion, headaches and stomach disorders, sleep disorders, and eating disorders), emotional exhaustion (indicated by the feelings of failure, guilt, irritable and hate), mental exhaustion (indicated by the aversion to work, difficulty to focus on the pupil, avoid discussion about work, and cynicism to pupils). The last aspect is the low of personal accomplishment (indicated by the feeling of dissatisfaction with both work and personal life, the feelings of despair and neglected, loss of self, loss of the spirit to develop themselves).

Antoniou, Ploumpi, dan Ntalla (2013) found that teachers who work in primary schools experiencing emotional exhaustion at a higher level than the teachers who work in secondary schools. Genc (2016) found that of 163 teachers who become the subject of his

research, 50% of them experienced burnout at a moderate level. Dewi (2007) found that elementary school teachers have higher stress levels than the junior high school teachers.

Byrne (Riggio, 2003) said that there are some consequences of burnout happens to teachers, among others, is the reduced sensitivity of the student, lack of preparation to teach, and the feeling of not being able to help students in learning. In addition, people who are experiencing burnout develop a negative self-concept and negative working attitude. Therefore, we need to prevent burnout in teachers.

One of the things that influence the occurrence of burnout is the personality factor (Baron and Greenberg, 1998). Meanwhile, Rush (2003) states that burnout occurs in individuals who have a low hardiness. Kobasa and Maddi (Maddi, 2013) said that hardiness is a pattern that describes how a person face the pressure, by turning it into an opportunity.

Hardiness consist of three aspects: commitment, control and challenge. Those three aspects plays important role while a person has to deal with the stressors. Maddi and Kobasa (Judkins and Furlow, 2006) said that a person who has the control of his/herself believe that stressor is something that can be changed. A hardy person will tend to see stressor as a challenge. Maddi dan Kobasa (Judkins and Furlow, 2006) also found that employees with a high hardiness level will tend to interpret change and stressors as something that can be learned and useful for the self-development. By contrast, workers with low hardiness will interpret the stressor as a threat, so it's easy for them to experiencing stress. A stress that is not managed properly will be prolonged stress. Prolonged stress condition is called burnout. Based on the description above, a question arises, "Do hardiness has a correlation with burnout among elementary school teachers?"

Aim of the Study

The aim of this study was to examine correlation between hardiness and burnout among elementary school teachers.

Method

Respondents

Respondents in this study were 81 male and female public elementary school teacher in Cilacap, Central Java, Indonesia, and has been teaching for at least one year. According to Freudenberg (Schabracq, 1996) burnout occurred at least about a year after starting work.

Measurement

Burnout scale used in this study is a modification of the scale of burnout prepared by Khairiyah (1998) which are based on the aspects of burnout expressed by Baron and Greenberg (1998). Meanwhile, Hardiness scale is a modification of the scale of hardiness made by Astuti (2005), which are based on the aspects of hardiness expressed by Maddi & Kobasa (1984).

Results

A. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistic

Variable	Hypothetical Score				Empirical Score			
	min	max	Mean	SD	min	max	mean	SD
<i>Hardiness</i>	42	168	105	21	101	168	124,8148	10,97168
<i>Burnout</i>	59	236	147,5	29,5	63	151	116,4815	14,93077

B. Normality Testing

Normality testing is done on each of the variables using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic techniques. Normality testing results demonstrate the significant value of 0.258 (> 0.05) for the hardiness variable and 0.166 (> 0.05) for burnout variables. This means the two variables of the study had a normal distribution of data. Meanwhile, the linearity testing results indicate that the research data is linear with a significance of 0.000 (< 0.05).

C. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is done by product moment correlation. Hypothesis testing results showed a significant negative correlation between hardiness and burnout with correlation coefficients (r) of -0.827 and significance value of 0.000 ($p < 0.01$).

Meanwhile, the coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.684 indicates that the hardiness contribute 68.4% towards burnout, and it also means that there are 31.6% other variables that had contribution to burnout.

D. Correlation between Hardiness Aspects and Burnout

Table 2.

Correlation between Hardiness Aspects and Burnout

		Correlations				
		burnout	h_commitment	h_control	h_challenge	
Pearson Correlation	Burnout	1.000	-.787	-.682	-.718	
	h_commitment	-.787	1.000	.634	.664	
	h_control	-.682	.634	1.000	.708	
	h_challenge	-.718	.664	.708	1.000	
Sig. (1-tailed)	Burnout	.	.000	.000	.000	
	h_commitment	.000	.	.000	.000	
	h_control	.000	.000	.	.000	
	h_challenge	.000	.000	.000	.	
N	Burnout	81	81	81	81	
	h_commitment	81	81	81	81	
	h_control	81	81	81	81	
	h_challenge	81	81	81	81	

The table above showed that each of hardiness aspects, commitment, control and challenge has a significant correlation with burnout ($p < 0.01$) ..

E. Hardiness as a Predictor of Burnout

Table 3.

Hardiness as a Predictor of Burnout

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.787 ^a	.620	.615	9.25985	.620	128.922	1	79	.000
2	.829 ^b	.688	.680	8.44514	.068	16.978	1	78	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), h_komitmen

b. Predictors: (Constant), h_komitmen, h_tantangan

From the table above it is known that commitment (one of the aspects of hardiness) has the highest predictor values to burnout.

Discussion

This study showed a significant correlation ($p < 0.01$) between hardiness and burnout with a correlation value of -0.884 . This suggests a significant negative correlation between hardiness with burnout. The higher the hardiness of the teacher, the lower the burnout being experienced. The results obtained in this study in accordance with the theory and the results of previous studies which stated that there was a correlation between hardiness with burnout experienced by the individual.

Zadegan, Kohan & Zarahi (2016), examined the correlation between hardiness and burnout in nurses. The study involved 96 respondents. The study found that hardiness had a correlation with burnout ($r = -0.52$, $p < 0.01$). The research conducted by Asih and Trisni (2015) involving 38 nurses in Semarang, Indonesia, also found a correlation between hardiness and burnout ($r = -0.89$, $p < 0.01$). Meanwhile, research conducted by Da Silva Goulart, Lopes, Serrano, Costa and Guido (2014), involving 570 nursing students in Brazil, found that 68% of respondents who had the hardiness characteristic did not experienced burnout.

The results of this study support the argument of Maddi (2004) who stated that people who have the characteristics of hardiness is not just experience stressor as something that is pressing, but also something that is interesting and important (commitment), can be influenced (control), and have a benefit for self-development (challenge). By interpreted stressor through that way, people will be protected from burnout.

The coefficient of determination (R^2) values of this study was 0.684 , so it can be concluded that the hardiness contribute 68.4% towards burnout. This indicated that there were 31.6% other variables that also had contribution to burnout.

The study found that each aspect of the hardiness (commitment, control and challenge) had a significant correlation with hardiness ($p < 0.01$). The results of the study also showed that commitment has the highest predictor value towards burnout. Several studies have found about the effect of commitment to burnout. Yasmin and Marzuki (2015) found that normative commitment has an influence on burnout. Meanwhile, Maryama, Zawawi, Black, and Jody (2011) found that affective commitment had an effect on burnout.

In this study, researchers conducted interviews with some teachers who have been teaching more than 15 years. From the interview it is known that one of the things that makes the teacher taught for many years is a commitment to the work. In this case, the commitment is not only meant as a form of responsibility to oneself, but also to family, country and religion. A job as a teacher is considered as a form of responsibility for family subsistence. The teachers also stated that being a teacher increasing their meaning of life. In addition, they believe that educating students is also interpreted as a spiritual commitment between them and their God.

In general, this study has some limitations in its implementation, among others:

1. Limitations of respondents. There were only 81 teachers involved in this study.
2. The amount of each item on the scale is considered too much by some respondents.

Conclusion

From the results of the study, we can conclude that:

1. There was a negative correlation between hardiness and burnout among elementary school teachers. The higher the hardiness of a teacher, the lower the burnout experienced, and vice versa.
2. Hardiness contributed 68.4% to the burnout in elementary school teacher. This means that there were 31.6% other variables that also had contribution to burnout.

Suggestion

- a. This study found that there were 31.6% other factors that had contribution for burnout. Further researchers suggested to examine the correlation of these factors with burnout.
- b. Further researchers are suggested to decrease the number of the item on the scale
- c. Further researchers are suggested to take more respondents in the study.

References

- Anonim. 2016. *Membangun Manusia Indonesia Unggul, Berdaya Saing, dan Berkarakter Melalui Ekosistem Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Kemendikbud Terus Tingkatkan Pencapaian Program Prioritas Pemerintah*. Dikases dari <http://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2016/10/kemdikbud-terus-tingkatkan-pencapaian-program-prioritas-pemerintah>
- Antoniou, A., Ploumpi, A., & Ntalla M. 2013. Occupational stress and professional burnout in teachers of primary and secondary education: the role of coping strategies. *SciRes*, 4, (3), 349-355
- Asih, F & Trisni, L. 2015. Hubungan antara kepribadian hardiness dengan burnout pada perawat gawat darurat di rumah sakit pantiwilasa citarum. *Psikodimensia*, 14, (1), 11 - 23
- Astuti, H. P. 2005. Kesiapan Menghadapi Menopause Pada Wanita Bekerja Dan Tidak Bekerja Ditinjau Dari Tipe Kepribadian Tangguh (Hardiness) dan Persepsi Dukungan Sosial Suami. *Postgraduate Thesis*. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Psikologi UGM.
- Baron, R. A & Greenberg, J. 1998. *Behaviour in Organization: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work*, 9th ed. USA: Prentice Hall
- Da Silva, R.M., Goulart, C.T., Lopes, L.F.D., Serrano, P.M., Costa, A.L. S., & Guido, L.A. 2014. Hardy personality and burnout syndrome among nursing students in three brazil universities- an analytic study. *BMC Nursing*, 13, 9, 1-6.
- Dewi, D.R. (2007). Perbedaan Stres Kerja antara Guru SD dan Guru SMP di kecamatan Pakis Magelang. *Thesis*. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Psikologi USD
- Genc, G. 2016. Learned resourcefulness and burnout levels of english teachers. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 3, (1), 1-13
- Judkins, S. dan Furlow, L. 2006. Hardiness training among nurse managers: building a healthy workplace. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 37, 5. Cited from <http://w3.iac.net/~mercy/Library/EARL/562/JudkinsS.pdf>.
- Khairiyah, R. (1998). Dukungan Sosial, Konsep Diri Dan Burnout Pada Guru SD Negeri di Kotamadya Yogyakarta. *Thesis*. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Psikologi UGM.
- Lee, R. & Ashforth, B. E. 1996. A meta analytic examination of the correlated of the tree dimation of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 123-133.
- Maddi. 2004. Hardiness : an operationalization of existential courage. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 44,(3), 279-298
- Maddi, S.R. 2013. *Hardiness : turning stressfull circumstances into resilient growth*. Springer

HARDINESS AND BURNOUT AMONG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

- Maddi, S. R., & Kobasa, S. C. 1984. *The Hardy Executive: Health Under Stress*. Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Maryama, N. H., Zawawi, N., Hitam, M., & Jody, J.M. (2011). Organizational commitment and job burnout among employees in malaysia. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business and Economics Research*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 2011.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. 2001. Job burnout. *Annual. Rev. Psychol*, 52, 97–422
- Riggio, R. E. 2003. *Introduction to Industrial/ Organizational Psychology*. 4th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Rush, R. R. 2003. The Influence of Selected Factors on Burnout Among Faculty in Higher Education. *A Dissertation*. Cited from: http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-0612103092453/unrestricted/Rush_dis.pdf.
- Schabracq, M. J, Winnubst, Jacques.A.M, Cooper, & Cary,L. 1996. *Handbook of Work and Health Psychology*. Chicester: John Willey&Sons, Ltd.
- Yasmin, K. & Marzuki, N. A. 2015. Organizational commitment and job burnout among psychaitric nurses in punjab pakistan. *Journal of Sociological Research*, 6, (2), 138-149. Doi: 10.5296/ jsr.v6i2.8693 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jsr.v6i2.8693>
- Zadegan, Z. R., Kohan, A. , & Jarahi, L. 2016. Hardiness and occupational burnout amongnursing managers inmashhad university of medical sciences. *Alta Health Medica*, 1, (2), 23- 28. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.19082/ah23>