Job Burnout and Job Satisfaction among Industry, Mine and Trade Organization Employees: A Questionnaire Survey

Rahil Kazemi Talachi¹, ²*
¹ M.Sc., Department of Management, AliabadKatoul Branch, Islamic Azad University, AliabadKatoul, Iran
² Young Researchers Club, AliabadKatoul Branch, Islamic Azad University, AliabadKatoul, Iran
Email: r.kazemi.talachi@gmail.com

Mohammad Bagher Gorji³
³ Assistant Professor, Department of Management, AliabadKatoul Branch, Islamic Azad University, AliabadKatoul, Iran
E-mail address: gorjimb@gmail.com

DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v3-i7/7 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/3-i7/7

Abstract

One of the most important challenges facing organizations is the increasing levels of job burnout among their employees. In the meantime, it poses the question as what the relationship between this factor and job satisfaction is. The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between burnout and job satisfaction to provide an appropriate model. The population of this study consisted of all employees of Golestan Province industry, mine and trade organization, the number of whom is 154, out of which, 120 employees were selected as a sample by the simple random sampling method. For collecting the data, two questionnaires of job burnout and job satisfaction were applied, and the obtained data was analyzed using the statistical methods of Kolmogorov–Smirnov test, Spearman’s correlation, Pearson's correlation coefficient, Regression analysis, F-test and T-test. From the results, it was found that the variable of job burnout had a significant negative relationship with job satisfaction. The results demonstrated that among job burnout components, emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment can predict job satisfaction in a negative direction.
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1. Introduction

Psychological sensitivities in any jobs provide desirable context for job stress and injuries, so the prevention of burnout is considered as one of the main contexts in public health (Grau-Alberola et al., 2010). Fruedenberger was the first who used the concept of burnout to describe a state
of exhaustion (emotional and mental) observed among employees (Peterson, 2008). In the article entitled "staff burnout", he defined it as a specific psychological condition in which, people experience emotional exhaustion, a lack of personal accomplishment and tending to depersonalize others (Hogan & Mcknight, 2007). At first, burnout was mainly identified within human service: “Burnout is a syndrome including emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can happen among employees working with people. However, by the late 1980s, it was found that burnout occurs out of human services, for example, managers, white and blue collar workers and entrepreneurs. In the more general form, burnout is defined as “a state of exhaustion in which person is pessimistic about job value and his/her abilities for doing it (Schaufeli et al., 2009).

According to Maslach’s model, burnout starts with emotional exhaustion which is a response to long term job stress. As a consequence of this emotional exhaustion, people avoid others and depersonalization occurs and if this situation continues, person feels failure in doing job affairs. Therefore, according to Maslach’s model, emotional exhaustion happens prior to depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment is followed by situation (Chiu & Tsai, 2006).

Human resources are considered as the most important asset and strategic factors of any organization. In particular, in government agencies, policy makers exert their policies through human resources. Satisfied and motivated workforce play an important role in promoting policies and adjusted programs. Recognizing the employees’ job satisfaction can help managers to improve the productivity of human resources (Rajab Beigi et al., 2006).

Job satisfaction refers to the desires or positive feelings that people have toward their jobs. In fact, people have higher job satisfaction, are more loyal to their employer and like their job more. Therefore, they can satisfy their needs and have positive feelings towards it. Job satisfaction is also defined as the individual’s feelings of his/her own job and positive attitudes toward it (Rose et al., 2006).

In other word, job satisfaction is defined as the helpful and positive emotional feelings in person after doing the task. However, job satisfaction is not a single factor, but is an intermediate relation combining job duties, responsibilities, actions and reactions, motivations, encouragements and hopes (Tabatabaei et al., 2005).

According to Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory, the factors which play an important role in job satisfaction are categorized in two groups: The first group factors are called motivating factors (intrinsic factors). These factors - success taking responsibility, appreciation, recognition, advancement possibility - are related to job. The second group, are named hygienic factors (extrinsic or situational factors) are related to the job environment and its conditions. Policies of organization, Working conditions, supervision and interpersonal relations are included in this group (Bilge, 2006).

Kalleberg (1977) proposed that job satisfaction has two components. Intrinsic job satisfaction indicates people’s feelings about the nature of the job tasks themselves whereas extrinsic job satisfaction refers to people’s feelings about aspects of work situations that are external to the job tasks or work itself (Voon et al, 2012; Shim et al., 2002). Thus, Job satisfaction is defined as a person’s evaluation of his/her job and work context (Carriere et al., 2008). Lack of job satisfaction results in staff’s morality reduction and this issue has negative effect on organization productivity. Therefore, agencies managers have to investigate the symptoms of
low morality and job dissatisfaction continuously and take actions in this regard (Foroughi et al., 2008).

The most used research definition among all ones of job satisfaction is presented by Locke (1969). According to him, job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional feeling resulting from one’s evaluation towards his job and his job experience through comparing between what he expects from his job and what he actually gains from it (Saari & Judge, 2004; Locke, 1969). Also job satisfaction is considered as a result of the interaction of the employee and his perceptions towards his job and work environment (Rehman et al., 2010; Locke, 1976). In general, successful organizations have more satisfied employees, while low job satisfaction may seriously affect the organization (Galup et al., 2008).

Due to the inevitability of the existence of factors causing burnout and their impacts on the job satisfaction, and also to gain a better understanding of the relations among mentioned variables, a comprehensive investigation of this issue is needed mainly to improve and promote the organization.

In 2006, a study entitled "Burnout, role conflict, job satisfaction and psychosocial health among Hungarian health care staff: A questionnaire survey" was conducted by Piko. Data was collected from 450 health care staff. The results indicated that Burnout, particularly emotional exhaustion was found to be strongly related to job dissatisfaction, while job satisfaction was a negative predictor of each type of burnout subscale. Role conflict was a factor contributing positively to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization scores (Piko, 2006).

In 2010, Lopez et al. conducted a study entitled "Exploring stress, burnout, and job dissatisfaction in secondary school teachers". The population of this study was 1386 participants from secondary school teachers. The results of statistical analysis strongly support the existence of determining factors (psychosocial, personal, and contextual) common to all three phenomena. Specifically, in secondary school teachers, daily hassles, optimism, support by colleagues, hardiness, and life events are valid predictors of job dissatisfaction, stress, and burnout (Lopez, 2010).

In 2010, a study was conducted by Ay and Avsaroglu entitled "Research on accountants’ professional burnout, job and life satisfaction: 2-Burnout and job satisfaction". The population of this study was 1494 accountants and the data collection was initiated by sending the questionnaires to the participants via mail and e-mail. It was perceived from this research that female accountants experienced more job satisfaction whereas male accountants experienced more emotional burnout. In addition, it was determined that there are significant differences in terms of gender, age group, income level, working style, workplace variables and burnout and job satisfaction. Furthermore, a negative correlation between burnout and job satisfaction was observed (Ay & Avsaroglu, 2010).

1.1. Theoretical Framework

The goal of this study is to survey the relationship between burnout and job satisfaction among industry, mine and trade organization (IMTO) employees of Golestan province-Iran. In general, theoretical principles indicate that there is a negative relationship between burnout and job satisfaction.
According to the conceptual model of research illustrated in Fig. 1, the relationship of burnout and its components (independent variables) will be studied with job satisfaction (dependent variable).

According to Maslach’s theory, burnout components consist of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment (Schaufeli, 2009).

1.2. Hypotheses

To reiterate, the following hypotheses were made:
Main Hypothesis 1: Burnout has a negative relationship with job satisfaction.
Sub-Hypothesis 1: Emotional exhaustion has a negative relationship with job satisfaction.
Sub-Hypothesis 2: Depersonalization has a negative relationship with job satisfaction.
Sub-Hypothesis 3: Reduced personal accomplishment has a negative relationship with job satisfaction.

2. Methodology

The present research is considered as an applied, correlation-survey study.

2.1. Participants

The data is gathered through 154 employees working in industry, mine and trade organization of Golestan province-Iran. Sample volume was estimated 108 persons based on Krejcie and Morgan’s sample size determination table (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). The questionnaires were distributed among 120 persons and finally 110 questionnaires were returned. These persons were selected by simple random sampling.

2.2. Instruments

For collecting data, the burnout and job satisfaction questionnaires were used.
Job burnout questionnaire: To access the three burnout dimensions, Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was employed. MBI consists of 22 items and has three dimensions: emotional exhaustion (9 items), depersonalization (5 items) and reduced personal accomplishment (8 items). Each item referred to a 5-point Likert type scale.
Job satisfaction Questionnaire: To measure general job satisfaction, participants used a 5-point Likert type rating scale that consists of 22 items. Higher scores indicate more job satisfaction.
In order to determine validity of the questionnaires, the method of content validity was applied, and the reliability was calculated by Cronbach’s alpha (Maiyaki, 2012; Ahmad et al., 2012), by which the acceptable coefficients of 0.89 for Burnout questionnaire and 0.932 for job satisfaction were obtained.
2.3. Data analysis

Data analysis was performed in two descriptive and inferential statistics levels. In descriptive statistics level, different kinds of central and dispersion indexes were used whereas in inferential statistics level, Kolmogorov–Smirnov test (Moradi et al., 2012), Spearman’s correlation test (Beheshtifar et al., 2012; Naserieh et al., 2012), Pearson’s correlation test (Abbasi et al., 2012; Kazemi Talachi & Gorji, 2013), Regression analysis, F-test and T-test and also statistical software such as SPSS and Excel were implemented.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

According to the obtained results among population, 80 persons (72.7%) were male and 30 persons (27.3%) were female. Also, based on the education level, 30 persons (27.3%) had diploma and associate degree, 60 persons (54.5%) had bachelor’s degree and 20 persons (18.2%) had master’s degree and higher. According to work experience, 53 persons (48.2%) had lower than 10 years experience, 44 persons (40%) had between 10 to 20 years and 13 persons (11.8%) had 20 years and more.

Investigating the employees’ burnout and job satisfaction based on their gender revealed that the average score of burnout in men was 1.03 and in women was 1.10. In the case of job satisfaction, the average score was 3.08 for men and 2.93 for women. Accordingly, it was found that burnout in men and women was in a very low level. However, job satisfaction of both groups was in a higher than average level.

Exploring the Status of these two variables based on the education level showed that the average score of burnout in people with diploma and associate’s degree was 0.87, bachelor’s degree was 1.10, master’s degree and higher was 1.15, while the average scores of job satisfaction in people with diploma and associate’s degree was 3.09, bachelor’s was 3.09 and master degree and higher was 2.84. Accordingly, it was found that burnout of all employees was in a very low level. In the case of the other variable, job satisfaction of the employees with diploma and associate’s degree and also with bachelor’s degree was in a higher than average level meanwhile for the employees with master’s degree and higher it was in an average level.

Furthermore, surveying the status of research variables based on the work experience demonstrated that the average score of burnout in employees with the work experience of less than 10 years was 0.97, between 10 to 20 years was 1.09 and between 20 to 30 years was 1.21. Also, the average score of job satisfaction in employees with work experience of less than 10 years was 3.13, between 10 to 20 years was 2.90 and between 20 to 30 years was 3.16. Accordingly, it was found that burnout of all employees was in a very low level and their job satisfaction was in a higher than average level.

Inspecting the average percentage of amplitude in burnout components and job satisfaction demonstrated that the average percentage in all three dimensions of burnout (i.e. emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment) were in a low level while among for job satisfaction was in a higher than average level (see Tables 1 and 2).
3.2. Inferential statistics analysis

In order to ascertain whether the data was normally distributed or not we applied Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Peacock, 1983) where the null hypothesis was that the data is normally distributed. The results of the normality test are represented in Table 3.

As can be perceived from the data in Table 3, P-value is much more than 0.05. Therefore it can be concluded that the null hypothesis is supported and the distribution is normal. Next, the details of the hypotheses along with the results of our statistical tests will be presented.

3.2.1 Main hypothesis

The main hypothesis of this research indicates that there is a significant relationship between burnout and job satisfaction. Therefore, in order to evaluate this hypothesis, Spearman and Pearson’s correlation tests were performed. The results are represented in Table 4.

It is seen from the above table that Spearman and Pearson’s correlation coefficients are -0.639 and -0.630, respectively. As the level of significance for rejecting the null hypothesis was taken to be p-value <0.05, therefore we can conclude that above hypothesis is supported. It means that there is a negative relationship between burnout and job satisfaction. In fact, the increase in burnout of employees leads to reduction in their job satisfaction and vice versa. In following, the regression model is calculated between burnout and job satisfaction.

The significance level represented in Table 5 demonstrated that, this test is significant and there is a linear regression model between above factors (p-value <0.05 indicates the test is significant). In other words, there is a linear relationship between the employees’ burnout and job satisfaction.

According to the adjusted $R^2$ value represented in the above table, 43% variation in job satisfaction with the burnout components could be predicted by this model. Now it is possible to determine the model parameters by means of coefficients represented in Table 6.
Based on the data presented in the above table, the final model can be expressed as follow:

\[ Y = -0.49X - 0.251Z \]

where \( Y \) is the job satisfaction (dependent variable), \( X \) is the reduced personal accomplishment and \( Z \) is the emotional exhaustion.

The negative sign in front of the \( X \) term in Eq. (1) indicates that there is a negative-linear relationship between the burnout components and job satisfaction. In addition, the depersonalization coefficient was insignificant to the response (job satisfaction) which could be manually removed from the model. It means that the increase in burnout leads to a reduction in job satisfaction and vice versa. In other words, one unit increment in job satisfaction arises from 0.49 unit decrease in reduced personal accomplishment and 0.251 unit decrease in emotional exhaustion.

### 3.2.2 First sub-hypothesis

The first subsidiary hypothesis indicates that there is a significant relationship between emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction in IMTO employees. In order to evaluate this hypothesis, we hired Spearman and Pearson’s correlation tests. The results are presented in Table 7.

| Table 7 |

It is seen from the above table that Spearman and Pearson’s correlation coefficients are -0.568 and -0.609, respectively. As the level of significance for rejecting the null hypothesis was taken to be \( p \)-value <0.05, therefore we can conclude that above hypothesis is supported. It means that there is a negative relationship between emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction. In fact, the increase in emotional exhaustion of employees leads to reduction in their job satisfaction and vice versa.

### 3.2.3 Second sub-hypothesis

The second subsidiary hypothesis indicates that there is a significant relationship between depersonalization and job satisfaction in IMTO employees. In order to evaluate this hypothesis, we hired Spearman and Pearson’s correlation tests. The results are presented in Table 8.

| Table 8 |

It is seen from the above table that Spearman and Pearson’s correlation coefficients are -0.392 and -0.389, respectively. As the level of significance for rejecting the null hypothesis was taken to be \( p \)-value <0.05, therefore we can conclude that above hypothesis is supported. It means that there is a negative relationship between depersonalization and job satisfaction. In fact, the
increase in depersonalization of employees leads to reduction in their job satisfaction and vice versa.

### 3.2.4 Third sub–hypothesis

The third subsidiary hypothesis indicates that there is a significant relationship between reduced personal accomplishment and job satisfaction in IMTO employees. In order to evaluate this hypothesis, we hired Spearman and Pearson’s correlation tests. The results are presented in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is seen from the above table that Spearman and Pearson’s correlation coefficients are -0.548 and -0.510, respectively. As the level of significance for rejecting the null hypothesis was taken to be p-value &lt;0.05, therefore we can conclude that above hypothesis is supported. It means that there is a negative relationship between reduced personal accomplishment and job satisfaction. In fact, the increase in reduced personal accomplishment of employees leads to reduction in their job satisfaction and vice versa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Conclusion

As mentioned earlier, this study aimed at investigating the relationship between burnout and job satisfaction.

In order to evaluate the main hypothesis and its sub–hypotheses, the Spearman and Pearson’s correlation tests were employed. Since, for all hypotheses the significance level was less than the error level, H0 hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relation between burnout and its components with job satisfaction at the 95% confidence level with Spearman and Pearson’s correlation coefficients of -0.639 and -0.630, respectively. The negative coefficients would indicate that there is a negative relation between these two variables which means increasing in burnout results in decreasing job satisfaction and vice versa.

Comparisons were made between the results presented here and the findings from the other researches:

The findings from this research indicated there is not a significant relationship between burnout level and job satisfaction in terms of gender, education level and work experience. It was against the Kalisch’s observation in a research entitled "Nursing staff teamwork and job satisfaction" where they mentioned that education, gender and job title lead to increase job satisfaction (Kalisch et al., 2010). Also in another study conducted by Ay and Avsaroglu entitled "Research on accountants’ professional burnout, job and life satisfaction: 2-Burnout and job satisfaction" a significant difference between job satisfaction and burnout in terms of gender was determined. Furthermore it was perceived that while female accountants experienced more job satisfaction, male accountants experienced more emotional burnout. Besides, these results showed that there is a negative correlation between job satisfaction and burnout which are compatible with current research. (Ay & Avsaroglu, 2010).
In 2006, a study entitled "Burnout, role conflict, job satisfaction and psychosocial health among Hungarian health care staff: A questionnaire survey" was performed by Piko. The findings showed that Burnout, particularly emotional exhaustion was strongly related to job dissatisfaction whereas job satisfaction was a negative predictor of burnout components (Piko, 2006).

Based on the results obtained in this survey and the validation of the hypotheses which indicates a negative relationship between the burnout and its components with job satisfaction among IMTO employees, the following suggestions are offered:

It is recommended to administrators of this organization to reduce burnout via creating attractive work using new technology, job rotation in routine and repetitive works, attention to employees' opinions about work improvement and modification, work delegation to persons based on their favorites, making attractive work environment according to human issues in workplace, attention to employees' emotional problems and trying to eliminate them, attention to welfare issues of employees and their families, providing sport facilities, library etc, eliminating conflicts and establishing a friendly environment.
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Figure and table legends:

Fig. 1 Conceptual model of research

Table 1 The average percentage of amplitude in burnout components
Table 2 The average percentage of amplitude in job satisfaction scales
Table 3 The summary of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test
Table 4 Result of Spearman and Pearson’s correlation tests between burnout and job satisfaction
Table 5 Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for burnout-job satisfaction
Table 6 Regression model of burnout components-job satisfaction relationship
Table 7 Results of the Spearman and Pearson’s correlation tests between emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction
Table 8 Results of tests of Spearman and Pearson’s correlation tests between depersonalization and job satisfaction
Table 9 Results of tests of Spearman and Pearson’s correlation tests between reduced personal accomplishment and job satisfaction
Fig. 1

Job satisfaction

Burnout
Components:
- Emotional exhaustion;
- Depersonalization;
- Reduced personal accomplishment
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire scale</th>
<th>Emotional exhaustion</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Reduced personal accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some times</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire scale</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov – Smirnov</td>
<td>P-value Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Spearman’s correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>-0.639*</td>
<td>-0.630*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum squares</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>18.529</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.265</td>
<td>40.153</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>24.227</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.756</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response variable</th>
<th>Influential variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>-0.434</td>
<td>-0.490</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced personal accomplishment</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td>2.908</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Spearman's correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Pearson's correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>-0.568*</td>
<td>-0.609*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Spearman’s correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>-0.392*</td>
<td>-0.389*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Spearman’s correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced personal accomplishment</td>
<td>-0.548*</td>
<td>-0.510*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).