



Effect of Stressors' Element on Job burn out of Male teachers of Abdanan city

Hamdollah Jayervand¹, Salman Khodamoradi^{2*}

1- Department Of Psychology, College Of Human Science, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz Branch, Ahvaz, Iran

2- Department Of Education, Islamic Azad University, Abdanan Center, Abdanan, Iran.

*(Corresponding Author)

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at assessing the effect of stressors on job burn out of male teachers in Abdanan city. Statistical community included all male teachers of junior high period (guidance period) in the town and research method was descriptive-correlation, the applied sampling method was simple which finally 250 people were chosen. Instruments included job stressors elements (30 items), and Maslesh and Jackson burn out questionnaire (22 items). The used statistics were regression coefficient, single variable t-test as well as MANOVA. Results showed that stressors include management, unfavourite situation of job effect on burn out. Also all of the elements intervene in the appearance of job stress.

Key words: Job stress, burn out, teachers.

Received 18.11.2015

Revised 22.11.2015

Accepted 09.12. 2015

INTRODUCTION

From a terminology view, job means working in a place so that the person is engaged in the job. The employee participates in the production process and receives money or goods in turn. In the job guidance, it refers to a group of similar situations in an organization, office or workshop that qualified people can reach them and do the responsibilities. The employee, in the process feels stress, so the capacity of each person should be assessed exactly [1].

Consequence of job stress in the organizations is burn out . The word "stress" is used when person's psychological and physical balance is disturbed and he/she suffers from a mental disorder. Hans Sellie defines stress as: " a set of unspecified reactions of organism against each type of adaption request from it". In other word, stress is a neurological reaction after an internal stimulation (cognitive) or external (environmental). When motivation reduces, people face burn out [3]. There are so many sources of stress which among them, job stress has a great position, because it makes life out of balance which in turn leads to psychological disorder. While job is an inevitable part of human life, it can threaten his/her health too. Hobefull [2] defines the concept as: "it's a situation in the job process which cannot be tolerated and stays against employee and leads to psychological and physical disorder". In fact stress drives people to resign from their job. When job beliefs are insufficient, the process of selection, decision and job finding is disturbed. The thoughts and beliefs are similar to them which are cited in the abnormal literature [4]. In fact, as logical thoughts can make sufficient schema, psychological problem can come from the insufficient ones [3]. Professional insufficient thoughts can appear in unconscious form and lead to self-defeating behaviors [5]. Insufficient thoughts can appear in 3 categories: 1- behavioral (incomplete task), 2- Emotional (depression, anxiety), 3- vocal expression (negative statements) [6]. Based on Bandora's theory of learning, Counseling and educational method can improve its constructs [7, 8]. Fields which are related to and affected by insufficient professional thoughts are: 1- mental health (mentioned perception of person about himself), 2- Poor job performance, 3- important people in life, 3- job mistakes, 4- job withdrawal, 5- depression and anxiety . So, some thoughts can affect job making decision [9]. According to the fact that occupational insufficient thoughts are considered one of the important problems related to occupation and employment, Cooper [10] defines job burnout as reduction of job ability and lack of job motivation which come after permanent stress and can threaten mental health. In the same way, Kopta

[11] and Fuller [12] showed that job stress elements have significant role in mental health of employers. In fact, with increase of stress and life pressures, burn out will increase too. Job stressors can include teachers, managers, colleagues, organizational roles, customers as well as physical situation of work. One of the concepts which attracts attention of industrial- organizational psychologists is inability looseness and feeling bored which is usually called burn- out [13]. A group of employers which are always exposed to job stress and inability are people who service others. Researchers showed in-door employees experience more stress than skillful or semi-skillful workers [10]. Today, stress is used to refer to the tension which is experienced by employees due to relations, responsibilities as well as thoughts [14]. From a physiological view, stress is defined as body's internal reactions against warmth, coldness, deprivation, pain, infection and poisonings [15]. Due to physiological and psychological consequences of job stress, it can reduce the process of organizational improvement [16]. There are so many definitions of stress; for example, Saatchi [17] defines it as feeling disturbance and conflict so that be under pressure. Morrill and Forest believe job counseling should make a balance among desires, abilities, personal and social needs, and information so that the person can do his job and enjoy it [18]. Of course, stress can be seen in all organizations in different degrees; in turn, the situation leads to burn out. The variable is a phenomenon which can affect people and reduce their productivity [19]. The components of job burnout are as: 1- emotional exhaustion which leads to reduction of emotional energy and appear of feelings of inability and make relationship with others. 2- depersonalization: a person who suffers from the problem behaves with others aggressively and cruelty, without paying attention to them [20]. 3- Personal performance: the component refers to a situation in which people feel that performance is not successful [21]. In the situation, person feels negative perceptions of himself. There are some elements precipitating burn out: A- person, B- job or organization, C- Role conflict, D- Role ambiguity, E-job expectations, F- job cumulating. Mazlak believes that traits and dimensions of personality can explain burn out [22]. The researchers have said that burn out among teachers can be ascribed to low salary compare to other jobs [23].

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Statistical community and sampling method

Statistical community includes all male teachers of guidance high period in Abdanan town during 2013-2014. The sampling method was simple random which 250 teachers were selected through.

Instrumentation

There were two questionnaires in the current study: 1- the questionnaire of job stressors (QJS) having 30 items with a 5-option answering method on Likert spectrum (from very much too little). The QJS has 4 categories: management, organization, job's un-favourite situation and salary. To determine the validity of QJS, content validity method was used through which the primary items (37) had referred to 5 professions to be judged. Finally, 30 items were accepted to be included in the QJS. For reliability index, the alpha Cronbach coefficient was used which showed .84.

2- Job burn-out questionnaire (JBQ). It has 22 items with 7-option (from most to never) which assess the index in 3 categories of emotional tiredness, personal performance and depersonalization. Masslesh and Jackson (1981) reported concurrent validity .7, and its reliability as .88. Mahmoodi (2011) counted its reliability via alpha cronbach and reported it as.85.

RESULTS

Table 1- Descriptive results (management component), QJS.

items	Statistica l index	Very much	much	little	Too little	mean
1- lack of knowledgeable and professional manager	14	96	100	9	5.0	3.50
	6.7	3.43	44.6	4	1.3	
2- lack of friendly and intimated relationship with manager	34	88	70	32	0	3.55
	14.7	39.7	31.7	13.8	0	
3- over controlling and monitoring by manager	30	74	85	32	3	3.45
	14.3	32.1	38.8	3.4	1.3	
4- lawful and inflexible manager	35	104	64	18	3	3.67
	16.1	45.5	29.5	7.6	1.3	

5- over using of power by manager	65	115	34	9	1	4.06
	29.9	50.04	16.1	3.1	0	
6- paying no attention to morals by management	41	120	52	11	0	3.58
	18.3	53.6	23.3	4.9	0	
7- indifferent management	35	103	50	17	19	3.53
	15.6	46	22.3	7.6	8.5	

With regarding to table-1 about management component of QJS, maximum frequency in items 7,6,5,4,2 belongs to option "very much", and in items 1 and 3 to option "much". Also maximum and minimum means belong to items 5 and 3 respectively.

Table-2 descriptive results for organization (QJS)

items	Statistical index	Very much	much	little	Too little	mean
8- uncertain atmosphere	52	125	39	6	2	3.98
		52.9	17.4	3.6	1	
9- meaningless orders	49	95	46	31	3	3.71
		21.9	42.2	20.5	103	
10- over flooding of laws and orders	30	108	44	40	2	3.57
		14.3	48.2	18.8	0.4	
11- paying no attention to creativity of people	13	83	91	36	1	3.33
		4.8	38.9	38.7	43.1	
12- paying no attention to employee's education	43	109	52	18	2	3.29
		20.3	47.8	20.3	6.8	
13- lack of necessary faculty at work	15	99	50	54	6	4.07
		7.8	40.3	24.8	22.7	
14- bad physical situation	55	133	28	1	7	
		24.4	60.8	8.7	0.4	

According to content of table-2, maximum of frequency belongs to option "very much". Also maximum and minimum of means belong to items 14 and 13, respectively.

Table 3- descriptive results for un-favorite job (QJS)

items	Statistical index	Very much	much	medium	little	Too little	mean
15- anxiety of students' being uninterested in lessons	F	58	130	29	7	0	4.07
	P	24.9	58.9	12.1	3.1	0	
16- anxiety of parents' over expectations	F	30	91	78	24	1	4.58
	P	14.3	39.8	36.7	8.9	05	
17- anxiety of	F	30	110	62	22	0	

Jayervand and Khodamoradi

variability of students learning	P	13.9	47.8	28.7	8.6	0	3.85
18- anxiety of students' being uninterested to learn and regularity	F	50	87	68	10	9	3.78
	P	25.2	36.8	27.8	6.9	3.2	
19- un favorite atmosphere in school	F	40	95	69	18	2	3.85
	P	18.2	45.2	29	6.8	0.8	
20- long term education	F	62	115	32	5	10	3.95
	P	28	51.4	12.7	2.1	3.6	
21- Unfavorite and intimate relation with colleague	F	28	83	76	32	5	3.49
	P	11.7	35.6	32	15.7	0.8	
22- anxiety of colleagues intervention	F	45	116	40	22	1	3.89
	P	0	9.7	15.4	50.8	21.3	
23- Unfavourite atmosphere of school	F	2	4	18	140	60	4.21
	P	0	0	5.8	63.8	27.7	

According to table-3 about un-favorite job atmosphere of QJS, maximum frequency belongs to option "much". Also, maximum and minimum belong to items 23 and 21 respectively.

Table 4 – descriptive results for salary of QJS

items	Statistical index	Very much	much	medium	little	Too little	mean
24- low salary	F	50	142	26	4	2	4.11
	P	23.8	63.8	10.4	9	04	
25- imbalanced salary and life	F	43	81	82	15	3	3060
	P	19.2	36.3	36.3	6.7	103	
26- inability to justify life needs	F	40	88	71	15	2.9	3.59
	P	17.9	38.9	31.4	9	26	
27- unjust behavior of distributor for extra paying	F	28	85	70	15	11.6	3.36
	P	12.4	39.8	28.7	8	0	
28- unjust behavior in paying advantages	F	34	73	62	55	0	3.39
	P	16.1	32.8	26.8	23.7	2	
29- organizations ignorance of fiscal problem(s)	F	50	119	43	10	09	3.98
	P	24.1	50.7	17.8	4.5	0	
30- leading of low salary to fiscal problem(s)	F	40	140	38	6	0	3.94
	P	18.8	64.4	16.1	2.7		

According to table 4 about salary component of QJS, maximum frequency belongs to option "much". Also, maximum and minimum means belong to 24 and 27 items.

Table 5- Descriptive results of QJS

component	mean	SD	V	medium	min	max
Management	3.73	.58	.34	3.7	2.43	5
Organization	3.74	.51	.28	3.7	2.29	4.89
Unfavourite atmosphere	3.86	.48	.24	3.88	2.1	5
salary	3.78	.55	.31	3.7	2.59	4.87

With respect to table 5/ results showed that means of management, and un favourite atmosphere are the maximum and minimum respectively. Also, the variance of management and un-favorite atmosphere are the maximum and minimum in this regard.

Table6. Descriptive results of JBQ.

component	mean	SD	V	medium	min	max
Emotional tiredness	2045	4.6	17.29	19	13	29
Personal performance	18.3	3.3	11.2	18	11	27
depersonalization	11.8	2.15	5.2	12	5	17

According to table 6, descriptive results show that depersonalization and emotion tiredness have the minimum and maximum of variance in the component.

Table 7- Results of Kalmogaph-sminoph normalization of distribution

questionnaire	KSZ	P Valve
QJS	.84	.65
QB	.91	.53

According to table 7, normality assumption of the community can be accepted for both of the questionnaires. In fact, this is a basic assumption and without justifying the assumption, no analysis to the data will be valid.

Table 8- prediction coefficients of burn out

Source	Un-standard coefficients	SD	R coefficients	T Valve	Determination coefficient	P Valve
Management	2.36	1.15	.14	1.92	.21	.04
Organization	092	1.36	.08	.67	.05	.5
Un favorite job	4.65	1.31	.26	3.54	.21	.001
salary	059	1.28	.03	.46	.05	.65

According to table 8, management and un-favorite job affect on burn out of teachers in Abdanan teachers. If the elements were seen in a school, it can be said that burn out comes inevitably: determination coefficient shows a value of 21, but other variable are not effective in this regard.

Table 9- results of single t. test QJS

Elements	mean	SD	t	P value
Management	3.47	.56	18.8	<.001
Organization	3.7	.54	20.43	<.001
un favorite job	3.85	.49	26.79	<.001
salary	3.82	.55	21.55	<.001

Whit respect to table 9, it can be said that all components showed significant effect on burn out and are important in terms of the conceit, and prediction as well as prevention of the problem.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Findings of this study about stressor elements for teachers in Abadan showed that they include management, organization, un-favourite job atmosphere and salary. In other word, elements like lack of knowledge and professional manger, lack of friendly and intimate relationship with manger, over controlling from manager, using too power by manager, lack of support from manager, uncertain atmosphere in organization, meaningless orders, over flooding of laws, paying no attention to employers' creativity, ignorance of organization to train employees, lack of facility at work, bad physical situation at work, anxiety of students' being uninterested in courses, anxiety of over expectations of parents, anxiety of violence of orders by students, injustice in terms of salary, extra paying, low paying and similar situation can lead to job stress among the group. Thus, it can be said that effect of inefficient thought on burn out and inability to solve the problem is clear. Accordingly, the group need help to control the thoughts and guide them to a good channel.

Thus, with respect to the current study as well as pervious results, it can be said that elements of management can act as stressors and reduce performance of employers.

REFERENCES

1. Taylor, K. M. & Betz, N.E. (1983). Applications of self-efficacy theory to the understanding and treatment of career indecision. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 22, 63-81
2. Hobfoll, S. (1988). *The ecology of stress*. A member of the Taylor and Francis Group. Pub. Sage.
3. Barlow, D. H., & Durand, V. M. (2009). *Abnormal psychology: An integrative approach*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, New York
4. Bennett, P. (2006). *Abnormal and clinical psychology*, 3rd, New York, McGraw-Hill Companies.
5. Krumboltz, J. D., & Worthington, R. L. (1999). The school-to-work transition from a learning theory perspective. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 47, 3, 12-325.
6. Korbishly, M. A., & Yost, E. B. (1989). Assessment and treatment of dysfunctional cognition in career counseling. *Career planning & adult development Journal*, 5 (3), 20-26.
7. Jalali, D., Nazari, A. (2009). Effect of learning pattern on self-esteem self-confidence, self-instrument. Academic achievement of grade 3 students of junior high period. Thesis.
8. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychiatry Review*. 84: 191-215.
9. Zunker, V. G. (2006). *Career counseling*. California: Brooks/Cole publishing company.
10. Cooper, C.L. (2003). *The Stress Check*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall: Spectrum.
11. Kopta, J. (2007). A psychological journal of psychological science. Vol. 98 (3) p.107-118.
12. Fuller, L. (2003). *Stress and comment*. New York: Wiley.
13. Hochin, M.A. (2009). The relationship between organizational support, work-family conflict, and the job satisfaction of university coaches. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport*, 78, 3, 236, 247.
14. Sholir, V. (1994). *Working under pressure*. Staples press, London. Mifflin company Boston. pp. 789
15. Berzonsky, D.M. (2006). Identity and coping strategies. *Journal of personality*, 60 (4) - 771-808.
16. Anderson, H. (2007). *My work and family challenge: Issues and options*. Conference board of Canada, Ottawa American.
17. Saatchi, A. (2009). *Mental health at work (with respect to job burn out)*, Tehran, Virayeh Publication.
18. Shafiabadi, A. (2011). *Job counseling and guidance*, Roshd Publication.
19. Dainir, J., Edwards, J., & Rothbard, N.P. (1999). Mechanism linking work and family: clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of management journal*. 25, 178-199.
20. Deguette, A. (2002). Factors related to nursing burnout: a review of empirical knowledge. *Issues Mental Health nursing*. Vol. 15(4) Jul-Agu, p. 337-35.
21. Maslach, C. (1998). A multidimensional Theory of burnout. In *Theories of organizational stress*, ed. C.I. Cooper, pp. 68-85. Oxford, UK: Oxford Uni.
22. Grosch, W.M. & Olsen, D.C. (2012). *When helping starts to hurt: A new look at burnout among psychotherapists*. New York: Norton.
23. Halbesleben, J.R.B. & Buckley, M.R. (2004). Burnout in Organizational Life. *Journal of Management*, 30(6) 859-87.

CITATION OF THIS ARTICLE

Hamdollah J, Salman K. Effect of Stressors' Element on Job burn out of Male teachers of Abadan city. *Bull. Env. Pharmacol. Life Sci.*, Vol 5 [2] January 2016: 83-88