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Abstract
Burnout is one of critical issues at work, which appears in the form of job pressures experienced by employees of the service sector. Occupational burnout actually is a mental burnout concomitant with mental pressures or work stressors. The problem appears among employees of social works such as consultant, teachers, social advisors, physicians, police, nurses and the like. The present study is aimed at surveying the relationship between job security and hardiness on one hand and burnout among teachers. Study population was comprised of teachers in Mashhad, Dist. 1. Sample group (n = 350) was selected through cluster sampling. To collect the data, job security, hardiness, and burnout questionnaire were used. The results showed that there was significant relationship between job security and burnout and between hardiness and burnout.
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Introduction
People generally spend most of their time at work, which makes work environment a key factor in mental health all around the world. Some of the elements that act as stressors are work condition, task volume, unspecific tasks, occupation conflict, responsibility, relationship with superior employees, and lack of job security. Lifetime employment is no longer available and only way to ensure having a job is to show capability and hardworking attitudes. However, many still believe that they are supposed to have a lifetime job and when their work contract is about to over and they feel threat of unemployment, they encounter burnout and depression. Improvement of mental health at work environment is one of the main aspects of development and improvement of human resources and many organizations have to come to realize the role of physically-mentally healthy work force in improvement of performance. (Mehrabi, 2005). It is clear now that mental health condition of education sector employees have considerable effect on students’ health (Talaie, 2008). Recent studies have revealed growing trend of occupational burnout and mental problems (anxiety and depression) among employees of education organizations. Occupation burnout is a mental syndrome constituted of emotional analysis (mental exhaustion), depersonalization (negative and emotionless response and feeling no responsibility toward the service taker) and decrease of sense of personal achievements, which results in negative self-image, negative perception about the job, and feeling no relationship with referrals. This situation has considerable effect on personal, professional, and organizational relationships. (Aziznejad, 2006). Karol categorized symptoms of the syndrome in four categories of physical, mental, social, and organizational symptoms. One of the factors effective on burnout among schoolteachers is job security, which includes mental and psychological elements and depends, partially, to one’s perception of work environment. To feel secure one should be able to preserve what they possess and ensure that the source of their livelihood is safe in the future (Sarmad, 2014). To put it another way, job security is ensured when one has no worries of losing their job until retirement. Based on the definitions, job security is a mental phenomenon; a feeling and perception that bring sense of job security. Some studies have shown that individuals who see their loss of job unavoidable feel more mental pressure comparing with the situation that there is no such threat. (Thomas et al., 2006). Job security can be explained by features such no possibility of job change (stability), no scheme for displacing the employee, and no threat to lose office, reputation, and prestige. Everyone prefers being secure from physical, mental, and financial harms of whatever nature. In short, keeping a steady trend of progress and promotion at work and feeling
security in this regard is defined as job security. (Sfandiari, 2005). Another factor effective on burnout among teachers is personal traits and the most important trait in this regard is hardness. The term “hardiness” is employed to refer to individuals’ ability to resist mental pressure and becoming seek consequently. People characterized with hardness have more control over their lives and feel more committed to what they do. They also are open to changes and different ideals (challenges). Psychologists highlight that hardness has to do with desire to perceive stressors in a less threatening way. Consistent findings in this regard indicate that; although, these individuals experience similar unpleasant event in their lives, they perceive such events as non-stressing and believe in their ability to cope the hardships. Thereby, hardness deals with one’s assessment of events and one’s capacity to cope hardships. Apparently, traits such as commitment, control, and accepting challenge have considerable effect on how people characterized with hardness evaluate stressors of their lives. Instead of giving up passively, an individual with high challenge trait finds life events as opportunities to grow and adapt and chances to progress. People with strong control trait feel being in control of their lives and find them capable to change the condition. On the other hand, an individual with strong control trait not only finds himself valuable but also believes in many valuable things that give meaning to their lives. Importance of human forces of education system in efficiency and performance of the organization demands more studies on the causes of burnout and findings ways to improve employees’ feel of effectiveness and helpfulness to the system to meet its goals. Anxiety and unpleasant work environment create high blood pressure, heart problems, asthma, depression, and headache. The society incurs billions of dollar each year to treat health problems caused by anxiety and occupation stresses. Given the above introduction, the present study is aimed at answering if job security and hardiness are reliable predictors of burnout among teachers.

**Methodology**

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for data analysis. Statistical tools to this end were Pearson’s correlation to calculate correlation between the variable (α=.05) and simple regression with two variables to survey variance of burnout (main variable) with predictor variables of job security and hardness. Study population was comprised of teachers working in 202 schools in Mashhad, Dist.1 – academic year 2014-2015. Sample group (n = 350) was selected from 40 schools through cluster sampling.

**Data gathering**

Close-ended questionnaires were used for data gathering so that after a brief introduction, the questionnaires were handed over.

a. **Job security questionnaire**: the tool determines and measures threats to job security at work as perceived by the respondents. The questionnaire includes 30 five-alternative questionnaires and introduced by Nisi. It was later modified by Nisi and Seyed Mahmoudian in 2002. Reliability and validity of the questionnaire were obtained by Rajabi equal with 67% and 56% respectively.

b. **Hardiness scale**: The scale was introduced by Kobasa with 50 items including subscales of challenge (17 items), commitment (16 items), and control (17 items) designed based on Likert’s scale. Studies have shown reliability of all the subscales equal with 70.

c. **Burnout questionnaire**: Goldard questionnaire including 40 statements was used to measure burnout. Reliability of the questionnaire was obtained by Khakpour and Pirshak and Erfani equal with 0.86 and 0.76 respectively.

**Data analysis**

In light of the fact that only one dependent variable is under study, linear regression analysis and Pearson correlation coefficient were used. Regression test clarifies if the predictor variables (job security and hardiness) are reliable predictor of the dependent variable (burnout). In addition, Pearson’s correlation test is recommended for quantitative variables.

**Findings**

**Hypothesis one**: job security predicts burnout.

Table 1 lists results of Pearson correlation test on job security and burnout among teachers.
Table 1 – Pearson correlation test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>BURNOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As listed in Table 1, with Pearson correlation equal with -0.185 and P<0.05, there is a significant relationship between the variables at confidence level of 99%. Given that value of correlation coefficient is negative, the relationship between the two variables is not positive so that increase of job security results in decrease of burnout.

Table 2 - Regression test to predict burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>-2.041</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
<td>2291.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As listed in the table above with B = -0.266 and β = -0.185, change equal with one standard deviation in job security results in -0.185 of standard deviation change in burnout. Value of R (0.185) indicates strength of relationship between job security and burnout and taking into account value of R², 2.6% of changes in variance of burnout can be explained by job security.

**Hypothesis two**: hardness predicts burnout.

Table 3 lists results of Pearson correlation test on hardness and burnout among teachers.

Table 3 – Pearson correlation test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>BURNOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardiness</td>
<td>-0.235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As listed in Table 3, with Pearson correlation equal with -0.235 and P<0.01, there is a significant relationship between the variables at confidence level of 99%. Given that value of correlation coefficient is negative, the relationship between the two variables is not positive so that increase of hardness results in decrease of burnout.

Table 4 - Regression test to predict burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardiness</td>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>-0.235</td>
<td>12.775</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>5664.964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As listed in the table above with B = 0.287 and β = -0.235, change equal with one standard deviation in hardness results in -0.235 of standard deviation change in burnout. Value of R (0.235) indicates strength of relationship between hardness and burnout and taking into account value of R², 4.9% of changes in variance of burnout can be explained by hardness.

**Discussion and conclusion**

Hardiness and job security as two predictors of burnout among teachers working in Mashhad, Dist 1 were studied. Pearson’s correlation coefficient between job security and burnout was obtained -0.185 (P = 0.042 < 0.05), which was significant. The fact that value of the coefficient is negative means that the relationship between the two variables is negative and increase of job security leads to decrease of burnout. Therefore hypothesis one is supported given value of “t”. In addition, with R² = 0.026, job security only explains 2.6%
changes of burnout, and thereby, increase of job security results in decrease of burnout in the population under study. Results in this regard are consistent with Talaie (2008). Pearson’s correlation coefficient between hardiness and burnout was \(-.235\) (\(P = 0.003 < 0.01\)), which was significant. The fact that value of the coefficient is negative means that the relationship between the two variables is negative and increase of hardiness leads to decrease of burnout. With \(B = 0.287\) and \(\beta = -0.235\) one standard deviation change in hardiness results in \(-0.235\) change in burnout. In addition, with \(R^2 = 0.049\), and \(R = 0.235\), 4.9 % changes of burnout is contributed to hardiness at work. Having hypothesis two supported, hardiness can be considered as a factor in decrease of burnout of the participants. People with high hardiness, thanks to their control, commitment, challenge traits, are more adaptable and flexible and better in coping hardships. These people are able to replace negative thoughts with positive ones and perceive stress as a normal part of life so that instead of avoiding or reacting aggressively, they cope with the situation. Consistent with Abdi (2007), our results clearly showed that people with higher hardiness tend to experience lower burnout rates. In addition, the results are consistent with Ghamari (2007) who showed there was positive and significant relationship between hardiness and job satisfaction (among high school teachers and members of board of faculty). However, our results are inconsistent with Jomheri. The results also showed that individuals who believe they have a good job and see high probability of keeping their job until retirement and feel no pressure of overtime works and irrational workload, feel higher job security. In other words, job security is the outcome of one’s assessment of the personal situation and work environment. Job security precedes satisfaction and peace and lack of it leads to occupational depression and disorders. There are specific issues in educational environment that the teachers have to deal with directly; such as size of class, disciplinary problems with children, lack of motivation among the student, low social class, low salary, ineffective performance assessment, lack of facilities, no organizational support, small role in decision making, and lack of support of colleagues that all lead to dissatisfaction. There are several factors effective in job security and job satisfaction is one of the most important on them, which is closely related to organizational commitment. Fear of losing job results in poor job security, which in turn results in maladaptation and failure to accept assigned tasks and responsibilities. In conclusion, it can be said that all employees, regardless of their position, need organizational support and job security.
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