Journal of Social Studies. Vol., 2 (2), 47-50, 2016 Available online at http://www.jssjournal.com

ISSN: 2149-3316 @2016

The Relationship between Components of Organizational Structure and Burnout of Education Employees in Sib and Suran

Moahamad Eslam Dahani¹, Samad Karimzadeh^{2*}

¹Department of Management, Faculty of Educational Management, Zahedan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zahedan. Iran

²Department of Management, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Educational Management, Islamic Azad University, Zahedan, Iran

*Corresponding Author Email: skarimzad62@yahoo.com

Abstract: The aim of the present study was to study the relationship between components of organizational structure and burnout of education employees in Sib and Suran. The research method was descriptive based on correlational. The study consisted of all employees and teachers in the education of Sib and Suran on the number of 1203 subjects (506 women and 697 men) who according to Morgan Table and randomly, 291 subjects (169 male and 122 female) participated in this study. The tool used in this study was selected for variable of organizational structures (standard questionnaire of 14 questions for organizational structure), and for the variable of burnout (standard questionnaire of 25 questions for Maslach burnout, 1981). Pearson correlation coefficient was used to analyze the data. The results showed that there was no significant relationship between organizational structure and staff burnout, as well as between organizational structure dimension and staff burnout.

Keywords: Structure, Organizational Structure, Exhaustion, Burnout.

Introduction

Organizational structure can be defined as total procedures that determine tasks of individuals in separate sections and then provides coordination among them (Willem & Buelens, 2009). Organizations have different types of structure that are applied based on necessity and according to conditions of that organization. In a general classification, organizational structure is divided into two kinds of mechanical and organic structure. The mechanical structure can be used for stable and predictable environments and organic structure in turbulent and changeable environments. The mechanical structure of the organization is known by characteristics such as high formalization, centralization and planning behaviors in the form of regulations (Mihm, Loch, Wilkinson & Huberman, 2010). On the other hand, organic structure has been flexible and is known by characteristics such as decentralized authority, less laws and regulations of informal communication network (March & Simon, 2009). Regardless of financing, working can satisfy some of the basic human needs such as mental and physical activity, social interaction, feelings of self-worth, confidence, and ability. However, working can also be a major source of pressure. One of the concepts which in recent years have drawn the attention of industrial and organization psychologists, tiredness, falling from exhaustion, lethargy, weakness and lethargy for the job incumbent which it is known as burnout. Burnout is a person's response to interpersonal stressors in the work environment, in which the job incumbents back over capacity with colleagues, bosses, subordinates, clients, etc.,

causing changes in attitude and behavior towards them (Rashidi et al., 2012). Business activities of the labor force are constantly affected by changes resulting from scientific and technological advances in the workplace. Trying to keep pace with changes and challenges in this changing environment can be a contributing factor in the creation of occupational stress and burnout. Different practitioners in such circumstances in the sustainability of their social and occupational have to endure the constraints and pressures. The consequence of these pressures and constraints is a major factor in the development of burnout. Burnout is actually caused by some organizational conditions, but in some cases it is effective in both personal and professional factors (Hariri & Hassanzadeh, 2010). Of factors of burnout teachers can be some organizational structures such as working conditions; when the scope of activity of the teacher is inappropriate and problematic, it will mean that teachers from three directions are under different pressures; physical pressures, financial pressures and organizational pressures and physical strains contain poor conditions of schools where they are not created from scratch for the job and they have not features of a good school and educational activities are not worthy and desirable. Old small schools lacking educational facilities, classes lacking appropriate size, lighting, training aids and other standards; financial pressures; economic problems has particular importance and sensitivity. Due to the rapid increase in student population, school funding is reduced day by day and school budget cuts is the loss of school equipment and facilities that reduce the value of schools. Rising inflation for teachers with fixed salaries and benefits and imbalances between income and costs and pressures results in stress in teachers and provides the emergence of the field of physical or mental illness. Therefore, the presence of a suitable organizational structure can greatly reduce burnout and job satisfaction of employees (Moradmand & Karimi, 2010). However, the aim of the present study was to study the relationship between components of organizational structure and burnout of education employees in Sib and Suran.

Materials and Methods

The research method was descriptive based on correlational. The study consisted of all employees and teachers in the education city of Sib and Suran on the number of 1203 subjects (506 women and 697 men) who according to Morgan and randomly 291 subjects (169 male and 122 female) participated in this study. In the stage of the study, after the presentation of preliminary explanation about the purpose of the test and measurement instruments, how to answer test for participants were described in detail. On the ethical considerations, after obtaining the consent of the people and the necessary awareness, they were assured that information received in this research would be used and would be protected from any abuse. To measure the research variables, standard questionnaire of 25 questions of burnout of Maslach (1981) quoted by Abedi (2002) and standard questionnaire of organizational structure of (14 questions) of Robbins were used.

Questionnaire of burnout of Maslach

The questionnaire has 25 questions with a scale scores (1-5) from very low to very high. A minimum score is 25 and a maximum score is 125 and the average is 75. The higher score is more burnout and the lower score is less burnout. To content validity of questionnaire, researchers have put them under possession of several professors of management expertise and after final approval have been approved by teachers of validity. Maslach and Jackson (1981) considered the questionnaire in a study on 420 subjects (96% female and 31% male) using Cronbach's alpha of the internal consistency for the frequency 0.83 and severity 0.84 (quoted by Nazari et al., 2014). In the present study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the questionnaire was reported on 30 people of the sample for the frequency 0.86 and for severity 0.82.

Questionnaire of Robbins organizational structure

The questionnaire contains 14 questions and scale scores (1-5) is from completely disagree to completely agree. A minimum score is 14 and a maximum score is 70 and the average is 52. The questionnaire measures three dimensions of questions 1 to 5, focusing 6 to 9 and 10 to 14 to complexity. To content validity of questionnaire, researchers have put them under possession of several professors of management expertise and after final approval have been approved by teachers of validity. Azizi et al (2013) considered the questionnaire 0.81 in a study on 42 subjects of Managers of the Ministry of Sport and Youth using internal consistency Cronbach's alpha (quoted by Nazari et al., 2014). In the present study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the questionnaire was reported on 30 people of the sample equaling 0.83 and this indicated desirable reliability of the research questionnaire. Pearson correlation was used to analyze the data. In all analyzes, the significance level of P <0.05 was considered.

Results

To study the relationship between organizational structure and staff burnout, Pearson correlation coefficient was used. The results are presented in Table 1. As it can be seen in the table, the correlation coefficient is 0.08 which this value has become significant at the level 0.17. Since the significantly acceptable level is lower than 0.05, therefore, we can conclude that there is no significant relationship between organizational structure and staff burnout.

Table 1. The relationship between organizational structure and burnout.

Variables	Frequency	Correlation coefficient	Sig.
Organizational structure	291	0.08	0.17
Burnout	291		

Other findings showed that there was no significant relationship between complexity dimension of organization and burnout of staff (Table 2).

Table 2. The relationship between complexity and burnout.

Variables	Frequency	Correlation coefficient	Sig.
Organizational complexity	291	0.10	0.08
Burnout	291		

There is no significant relationship between formality dimension of organization and staff burnout (Table 3).

Table 3. The relationship between formality dimension of organization and staff burnout.

Variables	Frequency	Correlation coefficient	Sig.
Organizational formality	291	0.03	0.57
Burnout	291		

Other findings showed that there was no relationship between centralization of organization and staff burnout (Table 4).

Table 4. The relationship between centralization of organization and staff burnout.

Variables	Frequency	Correlation coefficient	Sig.
Centralization of organization	291	0.03	0.50
Burnout	291		

Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of the present study was to study the relationship between components of organizational structure and burnout of education employees in Sib and Suran. The results showed that there was no significant relationship between two variables of organizational structure and job burnout. This finding is not consistent with the findings of Golparvar, Aqaei and Hosseinzadeh (2013) and Kessler (2007). This non-alignment may be due to the samples studied or different cultures and ethnicities. Other findings showed that there was no significant relationship between organizational complexity and job burnout. This finding is the consistent and approved in some ways with the results of theoretical studies of Nazari and Siadat and Abedi (2014). There is no significant relationship between organizational formalization and burnout. This finding is consistent with the theoretical findings of Nazari and Siadat and Abedi (2014) and is not consistent with the results of Nasurdin et al (2006). This non alignment may be due to culture, ethnicity and community differences of samples studied. There is no significant relationship between organizational focus and staff burnout. This finding is consistent with the theoretical findings of Nazari and Siadat and Abedi (2014) and is not consistent with the results of Nasurdin et al (2006). This non alignment may be due to culture, ethnicity and community differences of samples studied. Since the sample is limited to employees of Sib and Suran, there is a possibility that factors such as work experience, work environment etc., also affect the amount of burnout of staff. Therefore,

consideration of these factors is recommended in similar future studies. Also, it is suggested that more attention on the organizational structure and its dimensions be applied in education.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Golparvar M, Aqaei A, Hosseinzadeh KH, 2013. The structural pattern of person-job correlations and emotional exhaustion and job attitudes. Knowledge and Research in Applied Psychology. 1.
- Hariri N, Hassanzadeh P, 2010. To measure burnout among librarians in public libraries in Mazandaran province. Journal of New Thoughts on Education. 6th year. 1.
- Kessler SR, 2007. The effects of organizational structure on faculty job performance, job satisfaction and counterproductive work behavior. Availabale from: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent. cgi?article=3242&context=etd
- March J, Simon H, 2009. Organizations. Blackwell. Cambridge. MA: 195-324.
- Mihm J, Loch CH, Wilkinson D, Huberman BA, 2010. Hierarchical structure and search in complex organizations. Management science. 56(5): 831-848.
- Moradmand R, Karimi F, 2010. The relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational structure and job stress levels in secondary schools of Isfahan. Journal of Leadership and Educational Administration. Islamic Azad University of Garmsar. 4th year. 2: 125-145.

 Nasurdin AM, Ramayah T, Beng YC, 2006. Organizational structure and organizational climate as potential
- predictors of job stress. International Journal of Commerce & Management.
- Nazari S, Siadat Seyved A, Abedi MR, 2014. To investigate the relationship between organizational structure and burnout of high school teachers in Shahrkord. Research-scientific journal of general management: 175-188.
- Rashidi MM, et al, 2012. To evaluate burnout of human resources and organizational factors affecting it (Case Study: Iranian National Drilling Company). Journal of human resource management in the oil industry. third year. 11.
- Willem A, Buelens M, 2009. Knowledge sharing in inter-unit cooperative episodes: The impact of organizational structure dimensions. International Journal of Information Management. 29: 151-160.