Research Article

INFLUENCE OF PERSONALITY OF TEACHING FACULTY ON COPING STRATEGIES – A STUDY IN COIMBATORE DISTRICT

Prema Latha R*

Department of Commerce, Sri Jayendra Saraswathy Maha Vidyalaya College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore

A R T I C L E   I N F O

A B S T R A C T

With increasing number of roles that student, the job market and employers demand from lecturers, it is true that lecturers' stress and burnout are on a steady increase. Teachers generally use a wide range of coping strategies to deal with stress but very few find effective ways to counter the negative effects of stress. Coping is the behavior that occurs after the person has had a chance to analyze the situation, take reading of his or her emotions and to move to a closer or more distant position from the challenge. This research is aimed at identifying the perceived behavior under such situations and also to assess the coping strategies that teaching faculty adopts in accordance with their personality types. The study constitutes 486 sample respondents. ANOVA F Test, Mean and Standard Deviation are used as the statistical tool in this study. Keen observation acknowledges that teaching faculty working in self financing college and aided college has obtained highest mean coping score. In general, self financing colleges have given a special attention for attractions and quality of education in order to meet the competition. Similarly aided colleges have their own pattern to distinguish themselves. Hence, teaching faculty working in self financing colleges and aided colleges may have better coping skills compared to those working in government colleges.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades, the mushrooming growth of many private sector colleges and higher education institutions has led to an increased demand for teaching faculty; on the flip side, though, their roles have become more demanding as well. Just like corporate houses where individuals play multiple roles with demanding responsibilities, academicians are currently supposed to play many other roles besides the traditional roles of teaching and research. With increasing number of roles that student, the job market and employers demand from lecturers, it is true that lecturers' stress and burnout are on a steady increase. Teachers generally use a wide range of coping strategies to deal with stress but very few find effective ways to counter the negative effects of stress.

Personality stands for a person's values, preferences, needs, stable dispositions or emotional characteristics. The study of personality and attitudes gives insights into the behavior of people. Personality refers to the way in which a person views and understands himself, and the way in which he/she interacts with people and reacts to situations. An individual's personality is influenced by factors like heredity, external environment, and person-situation interaction.

Corresponding author: **Prema Latha R**
Department of Commerce, Sri Jayendra Saraswathy Maha Vidyalaya College of Arts And Science, Coimbatore

Some of the personality attributes that have an impact on an individual's behavior are the locus of control, Machiavellianism, self-esteem, self-monitoring, propensity to risk-taking and Type a personality. Stress refers to any environmental, organizational, and individual or internal demands, which require the individual to readjust the usual behavior pattern. Degree of stress results from events or situations that have potential to cause change. Stimuli or situations that can result in the experience of stress are called stressors. Stressors mainly originate at individual, group and organizational level; these relate to the persons personality and job responsibilities.

The goals of coping include the desire to maintain a sense of personal integrity and to achieve greater personal control over the environment. Then, he/she modify some aspects of the situation or the self in order to achieve a more adequate person-environment fit. Coping thus, is the behavior that occurs after the person has had a chance to analyze the situation, take reading of his or her emotions and to move to a closer or more distant position from the challenge.

Bharathiar University is a state university in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, South India. Named after Tamil poet Subramania Bharathiar, the university was established in February 1982 under the provision of Bharathiar University Act, 1981 (Act 1 of 1982) and was recognized by the University Grant's Commission the (UGC) in 1985. The university is in the foothills of Marudamalai road, Coimbatore and has jurisdiction

over the districts of Coimbatore, Tirupur, Erode and the Nilgiris. It has 104 affiliated institutions (80 arts and science colleges, 29 colleges of education, eight management institutions, one Air Force administration college and one college of physical education). Bharathiar University celebrated silver jubilee on 24 February 2007.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Major Debra *et al.* (2010) attempted to determine whether and how personality and coping affect commitment to complete a STEM major among a diverse sample of college students enrolled in a STEM major. Specifically, they evaluated whether coping strategies (i.e., active planning and behavioral disengagement) would mediate the relationship between proactive personality and commitment to completing a STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) major.

Atefe Karimzade and Mohammadalibesharat (2011) examined the relationship between personality dimensions and coping styles with stress. The method is correlation study in which 300 students (150 girls, 150 boys) are selected from Malaysian University. An extensive analysis is performed to assess the kind of association that exists among five personality factors personality (neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) and three coping strategies (problem-focused, positive emotional-focused, and negative emotional-focused). All participants are asked to complete the NEO-FFI personality inventory and the Tehran Coping Styles Scale (TCSS). Results indicated that Neuroticism is negatively correlated with positive emotional-focused coping style and is positively correlated with negative emotional-focused coping style in female students, while it is positively correlated with negative emotional-focused coping styles in male students. Extraversion is positively correlated with problem-focused and positive emotional-focused coping style in both male and female students. Openness is positively correlated with problem focused coping styles in female students. Agreeableness is positively correlated with problem-focused and positive emotional focused coping styles and negatively correlated with negative emotional-focused coping style in male, while it is positively correlated with problem-focused coping style and negatively correlated with negative emotional-focused coping style in female students. Conscientiousness is positively correlated with problem-focused coping style and negatively correlated with negative emotional-focused coping style in both male and female students. The study found that personality dimensions are associated with coping strategies.

Mahbobeh Chinaveh (2014) tried to determine if there are differences in the approach and avoidance of coping responses between Type-A and Type-B personality students when faced with a stressful situation on the campus. The study used a group of 150 Iranian undergraduate students who are divided into Type-A and Type-B groups of 75 students per group according to scores on the Type-A Behaviour Inventory (TABI). Using ANOVA he found that there is a significant main effect for coping responses, a significant interaction between types A/B behaviour and coping responses, but the main effect for type A/B behavior is not significant. A significant simple effect for Type A/B in avoidance of coping responses is found. Also, it is found that approach coping responses are a better predictor than avoidance coping responses when predicting the perceived stress of the students.

The study also indicated that Type-A students who use avoidance coping responses perceive higher level of stress than others; therefore, it is essential that university teachers should be sensitive to the needs of diversity learners.

Statement of the Problem: The education system is an instrument to develop the human capital as economic assets for wealth generation and also as social assets for improving the quality of the life of the people. However, there is little consensus between different professional groups regarding the etiology of stress or how to tackle it. The present study takes a holistic view of personality and considers role stress as one imposed upon and interacting with other stressors. There is a lacuna in the study related to personality, organizational stress and coping strategies. This research is aimed at identifying the perceived behavior under such situations and also to assess the coping strategies that teaching faculty adopts in accordance with their personality types.

Objective of the Study

The objective of the study is as follows:

To study the influence of personality of teaching faculty on coping strategies.

Hypotheses of the Study

- There is no significant difference between personality score and demographic factors.
- There is no significant difference between ORS score and demographic factors.
- There is no significant difference between coping score and demographic factors.

Area of the Study: Population of the study comprises of all the faculty members working in colleges situated in Coimbatore district which are affiliated to Bharathiar University, Coimbatore.

Sampling Design: The study is confined to arts and science colleges situated in Coimbatore district only. The colleges affiliated to Bharathiar University can be categorised as: Government Colleges, Aided Colleges and Self-Financing Colleges. The study considered all the above three categories of colleges affiliated to Bharathiar University in Coimbatore District. There are totally 9 aided colleges, 3 government colleges and 58 self-financing colleges affiliated to Bharathiar University in Coimbatore district. As per the sample formula of Yamane (1967), a sample of 9 aided, 3 government and 45 self-financing colleges affiliated to Bharathiar University are chosen as the sample. From the annual report data published by Bharathiar University, it has been learnt that there are 5101 (1815 are Male faculties and 3286 are Female faculties) teachers working in the colleges situated in Coimbatore district.10 percent of them is chosen as sample i.e., about 510 teachers. For the collection of primary data, the researcher adopted convenience sampling techniques. The sample population was approached through friends and references group introduction. Out of 510 questionnaires distributed and collected, nearly 24 questionnaires are found to be incomplete, it failed to pass the required information in detail, and these 24 questionnaires are deducted from the actual sample. Thus, the study constitutes 486 sample respondents.

Sources of Data: In the present study, both primary and secondary data are used. The present study is largely based on

the primary data. Required primary data have been collected through the survey method, well-structured and non-disguised questionnaire. The required secondary data for the present study have been collected from various research articles published in various journals, periodicals, and also through web sites.

Tools Applied In the Study: ANOVA F Test, Mean and Standard Deviation are used as the statistical tool in this study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Analysis of Variance (Anova)

Table 1 describes the analysis of variance between demographic factors of the respondents and personality score.
Hypothesis: Does personality score have any significant difference on demographic factors?

Table 1 ANOVA-Demographic Factors vs. Personality Score

Demographic Factors	N	Mean	SD	F-Value	P-Value
Gender					
Male	152	141.94	12.49		
Female	334	144.30	15.14	2.808	0.094
Total	486	143.56	14.39		
Age group					
Below 26 years	40	146.88	20.23		
26-35 years	250	144.23	13.94		
36-45 years	123	143.65	14.07	3.073	0.027
46-55 years	73	139.29	11.87		
Total	486	143.56	14.39		
Educational Qualification					
Ph.D	132	140.27	13.35		
M.Phil	300	144.24	14.39		
Professional Degree	20	144.80	15.71	4.690	0.003
Post Graduate	34	149.62	15.30		
Total	486	143.56	14.39		
Marital Status					
Married	396	142.78	13.63		
Unmarried	90	146.98	17.04	6.297	0.012
Total	486	143.56	14.39		
Type of Family					
Joint	224	144.09	14.32		
Nuclear	262	143.10	14.47	0.572	0.450
Total	486	143.56	14.39		

Table 1.1 ANOVA-Demographic Factors vs. Personality Score

Demographic Factors	N	Mean	SD	F-Value	P-Value
Status of Institution					
Affiliated	216	146.54	15.23		
Autonomous	263	141.22	13.36	8.671	0.000
University	7	139.29	8.30		
Total	486	143.56	14.39		
Nature of Institution					
Government	44	138.32	9.20		
Aided	120	137.58	11.10	21.750	0.000
Self-financing	322	146.51	15.17		
Total	486	143.56	14.39		
Designation					
Head of Department	61	142.44	11.87		
Professor	6	139.00	10.60		
Associate Professor	283	139.99	10.54	23.406	0.000
Assistant Professor	136	151.68	18.73		
Total	486	143.56	14.39		
Experience					
Below 6 years	155	145.83	17.40		
6 - 10 years	180	143.79	12.68		
11- 15 years	83	143.52	13.87	3.776	0.005
16 - 20 years	56	137.79	9.63		
Above 20 years	12	137.92	10.19		
Total	486	143.56	14.39		
Monthly Income					
Less than Rs.15001	122	143.21	14.78	6.784	0.000

Rs.15001 - Rs.30000	210	147.24	15.52		
Rs.30001 - Rs.45000	70	139.81	10.03		
Rs.45001 - Rs.60000	39	139.59	11.03		
Rs.60001 - Rs.80000	27	136.59	12.13		
More than Rs.80000	18	136.61	10.00		
Total	486	143.56	14.39		

Table 1.1 depicts the analysis of variance performed between demographic factors and personality score obtained from the respondents' feedback. It is observed from the table that gender has F-value 2.808 and its p-value 0.094, age group has F-value 3.073 and its p-value 0.027, educational qualification has F-value 4.690 and its p-value 0.003, marital status has F-value 6.297 and its p-value 0.012, family type has F-value 0.572 and its p-value 0.450, status of institution has F-value 8.671 and its p-value 0.000, nature of institution has F-value 21.750 and its p-value 0.000, designation has F-value 23.406 and its p-value 0.000, working experience has F-value 3.776 and its p-value 0.005 and monthly income has F-value 6.784 and its p-value 0.000. ANOVA is tested at 5% level of significance. It is noticed from the result that age group of the respondents, educational qualification, marital status, status of institution, nature of institution, designation, experience, monthly income factors' p-values are less than the level of significance, hence, the hypothesis confirms the significant difference on those factors.

Table 2 describes the analysis of variance between demographic factors of the respondents and ORS score.

Hypothesis: Does ORS score have any significant difference on demographic factors?

Table 2 ANOVA – Demographic Factors vs. ORS Score

Demographic Factors	N	Mean	SD	F-Value	P-Value
Gender					
Male	152	129.45	33.96		
Female	334	134.86	35.43	2.498	0.115
Total	486	133.16	35.03		
Age Group					
Below 26 years	40	140.50	39.82		
26-35 years	250	133.98	34.05		
36-45 years	123	130.98	37.48	0.986	0.399
46-55 years	73	130.01	31.09		
Total	486	133.16	35.03		
Educational Qualification					
Ph.D	132	130.09	34.79		
M.Phil	300	133.67	34.72		
Professional Degree	20	131.35	24.74	1.052	0.369
Post Graduate	34	141.71	42.88		
Total	486	133.16	35.03		
Marital Status					
Married	396	131.36	34.70		
Unmarried	90	141.11	35.57	5.740	0.017
Total	486	133.16	35.03		
Family Type					
Joint	224	132.83	35.11		
Nuclear	262	133.45	35.02	0.038	0.846
Total	486	133.16	35.03		

Table 2.1 ANOVA – Demographic Factors vs. ORS Score

Demographic Factors	N	Mean	SD	F-Value	P-Value
Status of Institution					
Affiliated	216	138.18	35.97		
Autonomous	263	129.04	34.00	4.088	0.017
University	7	133.29	26.02		
Total	486	133.16	35.03		
Nature of Institution					
Government	44	117.07	32.52		
Aided	120	125.43	31.33	11.427	0.000
Self-financing	322	138.25	35.56		
Total	486	133.16	35.03		
Designation					

	N				
Head of Department	61	130.36	35.37		
Professor	6	132.83	28.82		
Associate Professor	283	124.86	29.86	20.308	0.000
Assistant Professor	136	151.71	38.27		
Total	486	133.16	35.03		
Experience					
Below 6 years	155	141.62	35.23		
6 - 10 years	180	133.39	32.76		
11- 15 years	83	128.76	31.66	5.726	0.000
16 - 20 years	56	119.16	38.73		
Above 20 years	12	116.42	42.76		
Total	486	133.16	35.03		
Monthly Income					
Less than Rs.15001	122	131.43	34.80		
Rs.15001 - Rs.30000	210	138.89	36.44		
Rs.30001 - Rs.45000	70	127.39	31.74		
Rs.45001 - Rs.60000	39	129.90	31.11	2.481	0.031
Rs.60001 - Rs.80000	27	120.78	27.21		
More than Rs.80000	18	126.28	42.32		
Total	486	133.16	35.03		

Table 2.1 depicts the analysis of variance performed between demographic factors and ORS score obtained from the respondents' feedback. It is observed from the table that gender has F-value 2.498 and its p-value 0.115, age group has F-value 0.986 and its p-value 0.399, educational qualification has F-value 1.052 and its p-value 0.369, marital status has F-value 5.740 and its p-value 0.017, family type has F-value 0.038 and its p-value 0.846, status of institution has F-value 4.088 and its p-value 0.017, nature of institution has F-value 11.427 and its p-value 0.000, designation has F-value 20.308 and its p-value 0.000, working experience has F-value 5.726 and its p-value 0.000 and monthly income has F-value 2.481 and its p-value 0.031. ANOVA is tested at 5% level of significance. It is noticed from the result that marital status, status of institution, nature of institution, designation, working experience and monthly income factors' p-value are less than level of significance; hence, the hypothesis confirms that ORS score has found significant difference on those factors.

Table 3 describes the analysis of variance between demographic factors of the respondents and coping score.

Hypothesis: Does coping score has any significant difference on demographic factors?

Table 3 ANOVA – Demographic Factors vs. Coping Score

Demographic Factors	N	Mean	SD	F-Value	P-Value
Gender					
Male	152	40.91	8.10		
Female	334	39.55	7.85	3.076	0.080
Total	486	39.98	7.95		
Age Group					
Below 26 years	40	39.55	8.49		
26-35 years	250	40.14	8.34		
36-45 years	123	40.21	7.01	0.289	0.833
46-55 years	73	39.29	7.84		
Total	486	39.98	7.95		
Educational Qualification					
PhD	132	40.10	7.52		
M. Phil	300	40.19	8.18		
Professional Degree	20	38.50	7.13	0.687	0.560
Post Graduate	34	38.53	7.99		
Total	486	39.98	7.95		
Marital Status					
Married	396	39.95	7.83		
Unmarried	90	40.10	8.47	0.025	0.873
Total	486	39.98	7.95		
Family Type					
Joint	224	39.59	7.92		
Nuclear	262	40.31	7.97	0.979	0.323
Total	486	39.98	7.95		

Table 3 1 ANOVA – Demographic Factors vs. Coping Score

Demographic Factors	N	Mean	SD	F-Value	P-Value
Status of Institution					
Affiliated	216	39.95	8.17		
Autonomous	263	40.05	7.82	0.169	0.845
University	7	38.29	6.37		
Total	486	39.98	7.95		
Nature of Institution					
Government	44	37.02	9.35		
Aided	120	40.42	7.31	3.409	0.034
Self-financing	322	40.22	7.91		
Total	486	39.98	7.95		
Designation					
Head of Department	61	40.33	6.76		
Professor	6	42.33	8.45		
Associate Professor	283	40.57	8.47	2.340	0.073
Assistant Professor	136	38.49	7.13		
Total	486	39.98	7.95		
Experience					
Below 6 years	155	40.14	7.49		
6 - 10 years	180	40.44	7.98		
11- 15 years	83	39.57	8.90	0.628	0.643
16 - 20 years	56	39.20	7.58		
Above 20 years	12	37.58	8.39		
Total	486	39.98	7.95		
Monthly Income					
Less than Rs.15001	122	39.89	8.09		
Rs.15001 - Rs.30000	210	39.30	7.79		
Rs.30001 - Rs.45000	70	41.46	8.54		
Rs.45001 - Rs.60000	39	41.54	8.24	1.195	0.310
Rs.60001 - Rs.80000	27	40.41	6.48		
More than Rs.80000	18	38.78	7.47		
Total	486	39.98	7.95		

Table 3.1 depicts the analysis of variance performed between demographic factors and coping score obtained from the respondents' feedback. It is observed from the table that gender has F-value 3.076 and its p-value 0.080, age group has F-value 0.289 and its p-value 0.833, educational qualification has F-value 0.687 and its p-value 0.560, marital status has F-value 0.025 and its p-value 0.873, family type has F-value 0.979 and its p-value 0.323, status of institution has F-value 0.169 and its p-value 0.845, nature of institution has F-value 3.409 and its p-value 0.034, designation has F-value 2.340 and its p-value 0.073, working experience has F-value 0.628 and its p-value 0.643 and monthly income has F-value 1.195 and its p-value 0.310. ANOVA is tested at 5% level of significance. It is noticed from the result the nature of institution factors' p-values is less than the level of significance; hence the hypothesis confirms the significant difference on the coping score in the nature of institution factor.

CONCLUSION

Results reveal that age group of the respondents, educational qualification, marital status, status of institution, nature of institution, designation, working experience, and monthly income have found significant difference on the personality score. Thus, personality can be affected by the factors mentioned earlier. Results reveal that marital status, status of institution, nature of institution, designation, working experience and monthly income have found significant difference on the ORS score. Thus, it is concluded that earlier mentioned factors are influential to regulate and ignite the organizational role stress. It is suggested to provide proper mentoring and training to reduce the level of role stress. Results reveal that the nature of institution had found significant difference on the coping score. Keen observation acknowledges that teaching faculty working in self financing

college and aided college has obtained highest mean coping score. In general, self financing colleges have given a special attention for attractions and quality of education in order to meet the competition. Similarly aided colleges have their own pattern to distinguish themselves. Hence, teaching faculty working in self financing colleges and aided colleges may have better coping skills compared to those working in government colleges.

References

Atefekarimzade and Mohammadalibesharat, (2011) "An investigation of the relationship between personality dimensions and Stress coping styles", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,* No.30, pp. 797 – 802.

Mahbobeh Chinaveh, (2014) "A comparison of Type-A and Type-B Learners in the perception of stress level and use of coping responses in the Campus", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, No.143, pp. 384 – 388.

Major Debra A, Holland, Jonathan M. and Oborn Kurt L., (2010) "The Influence of Proactive Personality and Coping on Commitment to STEM Majors", *Career Development Quarterly*, Vol. 60, No. 1, pp.34-45.

****