The Study On The Effects Of Organizational Members' Job Burnout

Seon-Hwa Kwag, Pusan National University, Korea
Mi-Hee Kim, Pusan National University, Korea

ABSTRACT

The rapidity with which the concept of job burnout has been incorporated into everyone's life is astonishing. During the two decades, many organizational members had been experienced job stresses. Because of chromic job stresses, they have fallen into job burnout. Generally speaking, Job burnout is a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job, and is defined by the three dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. But there are not enough studies about a profession outside human service. In this point of view, this study examines the effect of organizational member's job burnout on job performance and what are the major antecedents of job burnout. Also the present study is designed to test the moderating effect of supervisor's support, job discretion, and self-esteem on relationship between role overload and role conflict and members' job burnout. The purposes of this study are as follows; First of all, this study purposed to examine the factors which affect the organizational members' job burnout. Secondly, this study was to examine the effect of the members' job burnout on job performance. Thirdly, this study aimed to test moderating effect of supervisor's support, job discretion, and self-esteem on relationship between role overload and role conflict and the members' job burnout. For the practical analysis, 100 structured questionnaires were distributed to Korean employees in Korean employees in Busan, and Gyeongnam, Korea. 100 questionnaires were distributed and 100 were returned. However, 3 questionnaires out of those returned were considered to be statistically valueless for analysis since some questions were left unanswered and some were clearly biased. Therefore, a total of 97 questionnaires were used for analysis. The collected data has been analyzed by using SPSS 12.0 for windows. The statistical techniques used in this study were descriptive analysis, reliability test, factor analysis, discriminate analysis, correlation analysis, multi regression analysis, and hierarchical regression analysis. The major findings of the study are as follows; First of all, role overload and role conflict are shown to be the major antecedents of job burnout, particularly of the exhaustion and disengagement components. Secondly, the disengagement of job burnout was related to lower levels of job performance. Thirdly, moderating effect of supervisor's support on the relationship between role overload and the members of exhaustion was statistically significant. But moderating effect of job performance and self-esteem was not significant.

Keywords: job burnout, role overload and role conflict, job performance, supervisor's support, job discretion, self-esteem

INTRODUCTION

Lately, companies get faced with complex and unclear management atmosphere due to rapid change of technique and severe competition. Hereupon, since retrenchment of management and teams were brought in office, tasks became more complex and its scales have been enlarged. In this atmosphere of office, it makes more tasks, responsibility, role conflict and interpersonal troubles, and increases job stress and job burnout.

Recently, a study on job burnout, which belongs to job stress, is being performed in a field of organizational behavior. Job burnout is a mental phenomenon, which is a form of chronic stress reactions occurred by accumulated and long-term negative effects of job stress (Jin-wook, Lee. 2003). This kind of job burnout is found from workers who engage in professional personal services such as mainly, teacher, doctor, nurse, lawyer, social worker, police and fire public official (Maslach C. 1982).

Lately, by rapid change in financial atmosphere, many companies have carried restructuring out to advance efficiency and existing vertical structure is being changed into horizontal structure in office with introduction of Korean own annual salary system.

As a result, structure members experience mental insecurity and job stress on their tasks continually. Structure members experiencing extreme job stress are in an emotional exhausted state because of overload of task, equivocalness of role and role conflict. In addition, a degree of job burnout in the structure is being increased by continual job stress in an environmental atmosphere all-around society, called ordinary restructuring. Hereupon, a concern on job burnout phenomenon, which is a particular form of job stress, has been increased.

The rapidity with which the concept of job burnout has been incorporated into everyone's life is astonishing. During the two decades, many organizational members had been experienced job stresses. Because of chromic job stresses, they have fallen into job burnout. Generally speaking, Job burnout is a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job, and is defined by the three dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. But there are not enough studies about a profession outside human service.

In this point of view, this study examines the effect of organizational member's job burnout on job performance and what are the major antecedents of job burnout. Also the present study is designed to test the moderating effect of supervisor's support, job discretion, and self-esteem on relationship between role overload and role conflict and members' job burnout.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

1. Job demands

Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli(2001) examined Job demands refer to those physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical or mental effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs. Caplan, R. D. & Jones, K, W. (1975) examined quantitative work load refers to the amount of work a person is asked to complete in a given amount of time. Role ambiguity exists when a person does not know what is expected of him or her for adequate performance of a role or task demand. Karasek, R. A. (1979) found that intellectual responsibility is treated as a measure of decision latitude and time pressure as a measure of job demands related to work load. Schaufeli & Bakker (2004) examined it can be concluded that particularly strong and consistent relationships exist between job demands and burnout. Role overload and role conflict are two potentially useful concepts that may promote better understanding of the relation between multiple roles and stress. Some of the inconsistent findings in the literature in this area may stem from researchers' failure to distinguish between the concepts. That is, role overload and conflict may affect stress differently, and the conceptual confusion surrounding these concepts may be masking important differences in their effect.

1) Role overload

Role overload refers to an imbalance between the role demands placed on the individual and the resources at the person's disposal to meet those demands (French & Caplan, 1973). Overloaded individuals must do more than they can do in the time available to them or require knowledge or skills that lie beyond their of role overload. Quantitative overload (a large number of tasks in given period of time) contrasts with quantitative overload (a demand to perform at a level exceeding the resources available to the individual). An objective load can be measured

objectively (for example, in terms of time), whereas a subjective load is experienced, perceived, and reported by the individual (French & Caplan, 1973).

Likewise, Lease (1999) found that role overload was a powerful predictor of many types of strain in academic faculty and concluded that the appraisal of being overwhelmed was more important than an objective measure of the number of roles and demands.

2) Role conflict

Morris, Steers, and Koch (1979) examined, before considering occupational differences, role conflict was found to be significantly related to participation in decision marking, organization structure's characteristics (e.g., supervisory span of control and formalization). When occupational grouping information was added to the overall regression for role conflict, a significant amount of added variance was explained, apparently reflecting the relatively wide differences in the levels of role conflict reported between groupings.

Often, role conflict is said to exist when persons (usually women) simultaneously fulfill multiple roles, such as spouse, parent, and paid worker. However, fulfilling several roles simultaneously actually is more indicative of role overload. The latter term is defined as having too many role demands and too little time to fulfill them (Baruch et al. 1985; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976). Role conflict, of the other hand, refers to "the extent to which a person experiences pressures within one role that is incompatible with the pressures that arise within another role" (Kopelman et al. 1983, pp.201).

2. Job burnout

The early investigations of job burnout focused on people working in human services and health care. Freudenberger (1975) labeled the emotional depletion and loss of motivation as job burnout. Maslach (1978) interviewed human services workers about the stresses and of each job.

During the 1980s, research focused on assessing job burnout. Many different measures were developed; however, the most widely used measure is the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981). Maslach, Jackson, and Leiter (1986) also developed the MBI-Human Services Survey, which was designed for use with employees in human service jobs; they developed the MBI-Educators Survey (Form ED) for use with teacher. In expanding the study of job burnout to occupations beyond human services and education, Maslach et al. (1996) developed the MBI-General Survey (MBI-GS).

Other studies of job burnout focused on the discriminate validity of the job burnout construct. Researchers wondered if job burnout was different than depression or job satisfaction. Recently, the distinction between job burnout and depression has been established by several studies using the MBI and other measures of depression (Bakker et al., 2000). Job burnout has been found to be specific to work content, whereas depression is multifaceted.

Job satisfaction and burnout have been found to have a negative correlation, ranging from 0.40 to 0.52. As Maslach and Leiter (1997) stated, "Although the correlation is not large enough to conclude that the constructs are actually identical, they are clearly linked". The causal relationship between job satisfaction and job burnout, if any exists, has yet to be satisfactorily determined.

The general public has viewed the concept of job burnout in many different ways. One idea was that idealistic workers experience job burnout. The concept behind the layman's theory was that dedicated workers work hardest toward their ideal, which leads to exhaustion and cynicism when their efforts do not bring their goals to fruition. A second theory is that job burnout is the result of being exposed to various job stressors.

More recently, the phase model and the sequential model of job burnout have taken center stage in the investigation of job burnout. The phase model of job burnout proposes that there are eight phases of burnout. The

three dimensions of burnout, namely inefficacy, depersonalization, and exhaustion, are split into high and low scores. This splitting of the phases into high and low scores results in eight different combinations or phases of job burnout (Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1988).

According to Leiter and Maslach (1988), there is a sequential progression to the three phases of job burnout. They argued that the first stage, exhaustion, leads to cynicism, which in turn leads to inefficacy.

Exhaustion, the feeling of being overextended emotionally and physically, is the first reaction to job stress. People who are exhausted feel drained and unable to unwind. Cynicism is the second reaction to job stress. People take on a cold attitude toward work and their coworkers in order to protect themselves from exhaustion and disappointment. Inefficacy is the feeling that one is inadequate. If one fells inadequate, accomplishments seem trivial and projects seem overwhelming (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

Although each developmental theory is compelling in its own right, the debate over the phase model versus the sequential model is beyond the scope of this article. However, more important for our purposes is the fact that the concept of job burnout and its physical and emotional effects are almost universally accepted. As Golembiewski, Boudreau, Munzenrider, and Luo (1996) noted, "And truth be told, the literature is all-but-unanimous in proposing such linkages of job burnout, however defined operationally, with various measures of emotional and physical functioning-again, whatever their operational definitions".

Schaufeli, Maslach, and Marek (1993) looked at the various models of burnout and discovered many elements of the syndrome common to most conceptualizations. First, job burnout is characterized by dysphoric symptoms. These symptoms are work-related and manifest themselves in "normal" persons who did not suffer from a previous psychopathology. In most cases, mental and behavioral symptoms were more prevalent than physical ones. Finally, negative attitudes and behaviors of individuals suffering from job burnout result in a decrease in effectiveness and work performance.

While the most commonly employed job burnout measure has been the Maslach Burnout Inventory (which is based on Maslach's definition and three-component conceptualization of burnout), researchers have been troubled by some of the psychometric limitations of that scale. The MBI focuses only on affective components of emotional exhaustion. A variety of researchers (Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981; Shinn, 1982) have suggested that the exhaustion component should include other aspects of exhaustion, including cognitive and physical exhaustion in order to more broadly capture the nature of exhaustion that is experienced as a result of chronic work stress.

To address the problems associated with the MBI, Demerouti, Bakker, Kantas, and Vardakou (2002) have developed and offered initial construct validity evidence for the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI). The OLBI is based on a model similar to that of the MBI; however, it features only two scales, exhaustion and disengagement. The most current version of the OLBI features questions that have balanced positive and negative wording (Bakker, Verbeke, & Demerouti, 2004). Furthermore, the OLBI features questions designed to assess cognitive and physical components of exhaustion, consistent with past suggestions in the job burnout literature (Pines et al., 1981; Shinn, 1982). This marks a significant advance of the OLBI above the MBI as it captures a broader conceptualization of burnout that is simply missing from the MBI. The OLBI is similar to the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS; Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach, & Jackson, 1996), in that both instruments are designed to reflect a conceptualization of burnout that is not restricted to human service professions, with questions that apply to any occupational group (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001).

3. Job performance

Katerberg and Blad (1983) stated that, at a more general level, successful job performance is important to both individuals and organizations. Due to the "fragmented" nature of construction projects, job performance evaluation is more vital to project management since employees play a crucial role in such project activities as communication, coordination, problem solving, and project team cooperation (Cheng et al. 2000). This is consistent

with Borman and Motowidlo (1997) who envisaged that more emphasis should be placed on understanding contextual aspects of job performance (e.g., cooperation, interest) due to the synthesis of team-based organizational structure. Although employee performance is expected to directly affect organizational performance, job performance evaluation, also known as performance appraisal (Woods et al. 1998), is surprisingly not a usual practice of many construction companies. As revealed in a study conducted by Hanna and Brusoe (1997), only 31% of the respondents in the United States admitted that their companies had job performance evaluations and companies with less income or smaller size are less willing to evaluate employee performance.

It has been found that exposure to a stressor, such as role conflict or role ambiguity, has deleterious effects on employee job performance (Fried, Ben-David, Tiegs, Avital, & Yeverechyahu, 1998; Jackson & Schuler, 1985). To put it simply, as Jex (1998) concluded, high stress reduces job performance.

4. Supervisor's support

The major dimensions have emerged from leadership research to describe leader behaviors (House 1971). The Dimension is supportive leader behavior (SLB), the degree to which the leader creates a facilitative environment of psychological support, warmth, friendliness, and helpfulness by doing such things as being approachable, looking out for the personal welfare of the group, doing small favors for subordinates, and giving advance notice of changes. A crucial function of a leader is to motivate subordinates and/or to increase their satisfaction with the job. The objective of both types of leader behavior is the same – to enhance the psychological state of subordinates so they know their work/task objectives and how to achieve them.

5. Job discretion

The amount of discretion or autonomy present in a job can reflect the potential for power within an organization (Kanter, 1979). The findings based on the objective ratings of job discretion are approximately the same as those based on the workers' own reports (Karasek, 1978a; see also Gardell, 1971). The amount of discretion present on the job is expected to increase the quality of one's job performance. Job discretion or autonomy motivates employees to expend high levels of effort (Hackman and Oldham, 1976) and provides opportunities to exercise decision-making skills that can enhance the effectiveness of one's job performance.

6. Self-esteem

Most people feel that self-esteem is important. It is difficult, if not impossible, for people to remain indifferent to information that bears on their own self-esteem, such as being told that they are incompetent, attractive, untrustworthy, or lovable. Increases and decreases in self-esteem generally bring strong emotional reactions. Moreover, these fluctuations are often coincident with major successes and failures in life. Subjective experience creates the impression that self-esteem rises when one wins a contest, garners an award, solves a problem, or gains acceptance to a social group, and that it falls with corresponding failures. This pervasive correlation may well strengthen the impression that one’s level of self-esteem is not just the outcome, but indeed the cause, of life’s major successes and failures.

Self-esteem is literally defined by how much value people place on themselves. It is the evaluative component of self knowledge. High self-esteem refers to a highly favorable global evaluation of the self. Low self-esteem, by definition, refers to an unfavorable definition of the self. (Whether this signifies an absolutely unfavorable or relatively unfavorable evaluation is a problematic distinction, which we discuss later in connection with the distribution of self-esteem scores.) Self-esteem does not carry any definitional requirement of accuracy whatsoever. Thus, high self-esteem may refer to an accurate, justified, balanced appreciation of one’s worth as a person and one’s successes and competencies.

HYPOTHESIS

Hypothesis 1 Job demands will be more positively associated with organizational member's job burnout.
Hypothesis 1a. Role overload will be more positively associated with organizational member's exhaustion.
Hypothesis 1b. Role conflict will be more positively associated with organizational member's exhaustion.
Hypothesis 1c. Role overload will be more positively associated with organizational member's disengagement.
Hypothesis 1d. Role conflict will be more positively associated with organizational member's disengagement.

Hypothesis 2 Organizational member's job burnout will be more negatively associated with Job performance.
Hypothesis 2a. Organizational member's exhaustion will be more negatively associated with Job performance.
Hypothesis 2b. Organizational member's disengagement will be more negatively associated with Job performance.

Hypothesis 3 Supervisor's support will be moderates the relation between job demands and organizational member's job burnout.
Hypothesis 3a. Supervisor's support will be moderates the relation between role overload and organizational member's exhaustion.
Hypothesis 3b. Supervisor's support will be moderates the relation between role conflict and organizational member's exhaustion.
Hypothesis 3c. Supervisor's support will be moderates the relation between role overload and organizational member's disengagement.
Hypothesis 3d. Supervisor's support will be moderates the relation between role conflict and organizational member's disengagement.

Hypothesis 4 Self-esteem will be moderates the relation between job demands and organizational member's job burnout.
Hypothesis 4a. Self-esteem will be moderates the relation between role overload and organizational member's exhaustion.
Hypothesis 4b. Self-esteem will be moderates the relation between role conflict and organizational member's exhaustion.
Hypothesis 4c. Self-esteem will be moderates the relation between role overload and organizational member's disengagement.
Hypothesis 4d. Self-esteem will be moderates the relation between role conflict and organizational member's disengagement.

DATA AND METHODS

1. Sample and Data Collection

For the practical analysis, 100 questionnaires were distributed and 100 were returned. However, 3 questionnaires out of those returned were considered to be statistically valueless for analysis since some questions were left unanswered and some were clearly biased. Therefore, a total of 97 questionnaires were used for analysis. The collected data has been analyzed by using SPSS 12.0 for windows. The statistical techniques used in this study were descriptive analysis, reliability test, factor analysis, discriminate analysis, correlation analysis, multi regression analysis, and hierarchical regression analysis.

2. Measures

Fifty-five completed questionnaires were considered valid for the purpose

1) Role overload

We assessed role overload using 6 items from the scale described by Ivancevich & Matteson(1980). Five-

point Likert scales were used. Response options were 1("never") to 5("always").

2) Role conflict

Role conflict was measured with 3 items from Jong Mok Lee & Han Ki Park (1988). Response options were 1("never") to 5("always").

3) Job burnout

To measure employees' exhaustion we used 5 items developed by Demerouti et al.(2001). Response options were 1("never") to 5("always").

To measure employees' disengagement we used 5 items developed by Demerouti et al.(2001). Response options were 1("never") to 5("always").

4) Job performance

Job performance was measured with 3 items from Kirkman & Rosen(1999). Response options were 1("never") to 5("always").

5) Supervisor's support

Supervisor's support was measured with 3 items from Timmerman, Emanuels-Zuurveen, & Emmelkamp(2000). Response options were 1("never") to 5("always").

6) Job discretion

Job discretion was measured with 3 items from Fiedler(1993), Kyoung Ku Pakr(1999), and Young Hang Wang (1998). Response options were 1("never") to 5("always").

7) Self-esteem

Self-esteem was measured with 3 items from Rosenberg(1965). Response options were 1("never") to 5("always").

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, and correlations among study variables. The largest correlation among predictor variables was 0.78, and the median and mean correlations were 0.17 and 0.06, respectively. These magnitudes suggest that multicollinearity was not a serious problem in this study (Kennedy, 1980; Tsui, Ashford, St. Clair, & Xin,1995).

Tables 2 ~ 9 present the analytic results. Next, we used multiple-regression analysis to test each of our hypotheses.

1. Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that job demands would be positively related with job burnout. And, Hypothesis 1a predicted, role overload would be positively related with exhaustion (β=0.184, $p<0.05$). Hypothesis 1b predicted, role conflict would be positively related with exhaustion (β=0.613, $p<0.001$). However, contrary to hypothesis 1c was negatively associated with disengagement (β=-0.191, $p < 0.1$). Hypothesis 1d predicted, role conflict would be positively related with disengagement(β=0.546, $p<0.001$). Thus, Hypothesis 1a, 1b, 1d is supported, and Hypothesis 1b is not supported. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is partially supported.

2. Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted that job burnout would be negatively related with job performance. But, Hypothesis 2a not predicted (β=-0.065, p>0.1). Hypothesis 2b predicted disengagement would be negatively related with job performance (β=-0.335, p<0.001). Thus, Hypothesis 2a is not supported, and Hypothesis 2b is supported. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 is partially supported.

3. Hypothesis 3, 4, 5

To test hypothesis 3 which predicted that debate will moderate the effects of supervisor's support on job demands and the job burnout. And, Hypothesis 3a predicted, supervisor's support would moderate the effects related on role overload and the exhaustion (β=0.182, p<0.1). But, Hypothesis 3b not predicted (β=0.068, p>0.1).

And, Hypothesis 3c, 3d not predicted (β=0.128, -0.2007, p>0.1). Thus, Hypothesis 3a is supported, and Hypothesis 3b, 3c, 3d is not supported. Therefore, Hypothesis 3a is only partially supported.

To test hypothesis 4 which predicted that debate will moderate the effects of job discretion on job demands and the job burnout. And, Hypothesis 4a predicted, job discretion would moderate the effects related on role overload and the exhaustion (β=0.381, p<0.01). Also, Hypothesis 4b predicted, job discretion would moderate the effects related on role conflict and the exhaustion (β=-0.168, p<0.1).

Hypothesis 4c, 4d is not supported(β=-0.172, 124, p>0.1). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 is partially supported.

To test hypothesis 5 which predicted that debate will moderate the effects of self-esteem on job demands and the job burnout. Hypothesis 5a, 5b not predicted (β=-0.059, 0.006, p>0.1)

Hypothesis 5c, 5d not predicted (β=-0.059, 0.006, p>0.1). Therefore, Hypothesis 5 is not supported.

DISCUSSION

1. Conclusions

For the practical analysis, 100 questionnaires were distributed and 100 were returned. However, 3 questionnaires out of those returned were considered to be statistically valueless for analysis since some questions were left unanswered and some were clearly biased. Therefore, a total of 97 questionnaires were used for analysis. The collected data has been analyzed by using SPSS 12.0 for windows. The statistical techniques used in this study were descriptive analysis, reliability test, factor analysis, discriminate analysis, correlation analysis, multi regression analysis, and hierarchical regression analysis.

The major findings of the study are as follows;

First of all, role overload and role conflict are shown to be the major antecedents of job burnout, particularly of the exhaustion and disengagement components.

Secondly, the disengagement of job burnout was related to lower levels of job performance.

Thirdly, moderating effect of supervisor's support on the relationship between role overload and the members of exhaustion was statistically significant. But moderating effect of job performance and self-esteem was not significant.

Lately, by rapid change in financial atmosphere, many companies have carried restructuring out to advance efficiency and existing vertical structure is being changed into horizontal structure in office with introduction of

Korean own annual salary system.

As a result, structure members experience mental insecurity and job stress on their tasks continually.

Structure members experiencing extreme job stress are in an emotional exhausted state because of overload of task, equivocalness of role and role conflict.

In addition, a degree of job burnout in the structure is being increased by continual job stress in an environmental atmosphere all-around society, called ordinary restructuring.

Hereupon, a concern on job burnout phenomenon, which is a particular form of job stress, has been increased.

In this study, the effects on which job demands such as role overload and role conflict gives job burnout and supervisor's support, job discretion and self-esteem give job burnout, were studied first.

Also, a study was progressed on how job burnout is involved in an important behavior and job performance of structure member.

In this study, multi-regression analysis was carried out to find out relations between job demands and job burnout, and between job burnout and job performance.

And in order to verify how supervisor's support, job discretion and self-esteem operate as effects for control them, hierarchical regression analysis was applied.

The following are results summarized through these positive analyses.

Based on above results, a meaning of this study is as follow.

First, existing studies on job burnout have been performed, working with workers that help people such as teacher, nurse, social worker and fire official. However, a study on workers, who attend to general job, is not being carried out a lot. Therefore, by examining how job burnout of those, who engage in general job influences job performance, this study presents implications as to a concern and improvement regarding job burnout for continual superiority in competition.

Secondly, results of this study that supervisor's support and job discretion strengthen the effects that role overload gives members of structure, and job discretion relieves the effects that role conflict gives members of structure, imply that institutional devices are needed not to make chronic job stress by controlling role overload or role conflict with supervisor's support and job discretion to advance efficiency in company. Proper supports of supervisor in time and proper sphere of discretion on task can strengthen job performance.

2. A limitation of the study and its aim in the future

This study has several limits and they will need to improve in the next study.

First, limitations of the study are in selection of sample and its scale. That means, the samples were not gotten enough for the study. Also, it suggests that a culture or element in a particular group could influence the results, because samples were not collected from many groups. In other words, the most samples in this study were come out of young people in 20-30 generation, general office workers that have fewer careers than 5 years and university graduates. Although, several variables of population statistics and group characteristics were regulated and divided, biased samples could be reflected. Therefore, in the next study, sufficient samples have to be collected and data of various groups need to be included.

Secondly, there is a foundational limitation that this kind of study only obtains results from contents of questionnaire and answerer attitude relying on a questionnaire. In order to complement this point, multilateral methods such as an interview and observation need to be applied to the study.

Thirdly, a study on buffing or control factor needs to be performed for the future to reduce job burnout of workers occurred by current job demands, in addition to supervisor's support, job discretional and self-esteem, which this study has tried.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Seon Hwa Kwag is a professor of school of business at Pusan National University. Her research interests include statical analysis of labor data, Strategic management and women's studies, Social Enterprise. She has publications in Daehan Journal of Business, Journal of Human Resource Management Research, Journal of Women's Studies.

Mi hee Kim is a graduate student of school of business at Pusan National University. Her research interests include organizations and Strategic management.

REFERENCES

1. Arvey, R. D., & Murphy, K. R. (1998). Performance evaluation in work settings. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49,* 141-169.
2. Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Demerouti, E., Janssen, P. M., Van der Hulst, R., & Brouwer, J. (2000). Using equity theory to examine the difference between burnout and depression. *Anxiety, Stress, and Copong*, Vol.13, pp.247~268
3. Caplan, R. D. & Jones, K. W.(1975), Effects of work load, role ambiguity, and type A personality on anxiety, depression, and heart rate, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 60, pp, 713~719
4. Cordes, S. L., Dougherty T. W., & Blum, M.(1997), Patterns of burnout among managers and professionals: a comparison of models, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 18, 685~701
5. Coverman, Shelley.(1989). Role Overload, Role Conflict, and Stress: Addressing Consequences of Multiple Role Demands, *Social Forces*, Vol. 67, No. 4, p965~983
6. Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli(2001), The job-demands resources model of burnout, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, No. 3, pp. 499~512
7. _____, & Halbesleben, Jonathon R. B.(2005), The construct validity of an alternative measure of burnout; Investigating the English translation of the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory, Work & Stress, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp.208~220
8. French, J.R.P., & Caplan, R.D.(1973), Organizational stress and individual strain. In A.J. Marrow (Ed.), *The failure of success*, pp.30-66
9. Freudenberger, H.(1974), Staff Burnout, *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 159~165
10. _____. (1975), The staff Burnout syndrome in alternative institutions. *Psychotherapy Theory*, Vol. 12, pp72~73
11. Golembiewski, R. T., Boudreau, R. A., Munzenrider, R. F., & Luo, H. (1996). Global burnout: A worldwide pandemic explored by the phase model. Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.
12. _____, & Munzenrider, R. (1988). Phases of burnout; Developments in concepts and applications. New York: Praeger.
13. Hecht, L. M.(2001), Role Conflict and Role Overload: Different Concepts, Different Consequences, *Sociological inquiry*, Vol. 71, No. 1, pp. 499~512
14. Janman, K. (1984), Gender dependency of occupational deviance and role overload as determinants of fear of success imagery, *European journal of social psychology*, vol.14, pp.421~429
15. Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R., Snoek, J. D. & Rosenthal, R. A.(1964), Organizational Stress, New York: Wiely

16. _____. & Byosiers, P.(1992), Stress in organizations, Im M. DsDunnette & L. M. Hough(Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Palo Alto, CA: Cousultiong Psychologists Press
17. Karasek, R. A.(1979), Job demands, Job latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 24, pp. 285~306
18. Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E.(1993), A longitudinal study of burnout among supervisors and manager: Comparisons between the Leiter and Maslach(1988) and Golembiewski et al.(1986) models, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 54, pp. 369~398
19. Maslach, C. (1978), The client role in staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol.34, No.4, pp111~124
20. _____. (1982), Burnout: The cost of caring, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
21. _____. & Jackson, S. E.(1981), The measurement of experience burnout. *Journal of Occupational and Behavioral Science*, Vol.2, pp99~113
22. _____. & Jackson, S. E.(1986), The measurement of experienced burnout, *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, Vol. 2, 99~115
23. _____. (1986), Maslach burnout inventory manual(2nd ed.), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press
24. _____, Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P.(1996), The Maslach Burnout Inventory(3rd ed), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press
25. _____. & Leiter(1997), The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it, Jossy-Bass/pfeiffer, San Francisco, CA
26. _____, Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P.(2001), Job Burnout, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp. 397~422
27. Michales, Roland E., Ralph L. Day, & Erich A. Joachimsthaler. (1987), Role Stress Among Industrial Buyers; An Integrative Model, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51, pp.28~45
28. Morris, J. H. Steers, R and Koch, J. C.(1979), Influence of Organization Structure and Role Conflict and Ambiguity for Three Occupational Groupings, *Academy of Management Journal*, pp.58~71
29. Oi-ling Siu. (2003), Job stress and job performance among employees in Hong Kong: The role of Chinese work values and organizational commitment, *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 38, No. 6, p337-347
30. Pearson, Q. M.(2008), Role overload, job satisfaction, leisure satisfaction, and psychological health among employed women, *Journal of counseling & development*, Vol.86, pp.57~63
31. Pfeffer, J.(1982), Organizations and Organization Theory, Marshfield Massachusetts: Pitman, pp.98~102
32. Rapoport, Robert, and Rhona N. Rapopory.(1976), Dual careers Reexamined: New Integrations of work and Family. Harper & Row.
33. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B.,(2004), Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 25, pp. 295~315
34. _____, Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. F.(1996), MBI-Gerneral Survey. In C. Maslach, S. F., Jaskson, & Leiter, M. P.(Eds), Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual (3rd ed.), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
35. _____, Maslach, C., & Marek, T. (1993). Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research. Washington, DC: Taypor & Francis.

<Table1> Means, Standard Deviations, and correlations for All Variables

Variables	means	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Role overload	2.83	0.628	1.000														
2. Role conflict	2.69	0.721	0.440***	1.000													
3.Exhaustion	3.06	0.897	0.481***	0.710***	1.000												
4.Disengage-ment	3.04	0.979	0.092	0.423***	0.455***	1.000											
5. Job performance	3.56	0.666	0.086	-0.037	-0.232**	-0.371***	1.000										
6.Supervisor's support	2.98	0.736	-0.144	-0.429***	-0.285***	-0.346***	0.127	1.000									
7. Job discretion	3.25	0.708	0.061	-0.206**	-0.114	-0.221**	0.225**	0.337***	1.000								
8.Self-steem	4.04	0.482	0.038	0.141	-0.030	-0.116	0.380***	-0.257**	0.323***	1.000							
9. Gender	0.71	0.455	-0.148	-0.056	-0.139	-0.103	0.010	0.018	0.210**	0.313**	1.000						
10. Age	1.81	0.795	0.025	0.061	0.189*	0.166	-0.174*	-0.211**	0.178*	0.033	0.397***	1.000					
11. Marital Status	0.63	0.486	-0.014	-0.087	-0.195*	-0.060	0.115	0.198*	-0.055	0.006	-0.207**	-0.666***	1.000				
12. Education	2.88	0.462	0.036	-0.148	-0.197*	-0.082	-0.211**	-0.057	0.285***	0.028	0.175*	0.107	-0.021	1.000			
13.Occupational categories	1.31	0.601	-0.060	-0.095	-0.252*	-0.040	0.275***	0.449***	0.119	-0.037	0.063	-0.227**	0.290***	-0.198*	1.000		
14.Job Position	1.85	0.950	-0.030	0.065	0.173*	0.089	-0.112	-0.299***	0.276***	0.264***	0.377***	0.775***	-0.622***	0.146	-0.316***	1.000	
15. Tenure	2.40	0.909	0.049	-0.066	0.237*	0.143	-0.215**	-0.183*	0.154	-0.101	0.032	0.580***	-0.579***	0.020	-0.420***	0.688***	1.000

<Table2>

Results of Multi Regression Analyses Predicting the relations between job demands and job burnout

Variables		Exhaustion				Disengagement			
		model1		model2		model1		model2	
		Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t
Control Variables									
	Gender	-0.178	-1.545	-0.059	-0.761	-0.175	-1.440	-0.130	-1.188
	Age	0.181	1.075	0.108	0.953	**0.339**	**1.901***	**0.333**	**2.090****
	Marital Status	-0.019	-0.138	0.039	0.425	0.129	0.883	0.185	1.424
	Education	**-0.238**	**-2.347****	**-0.129**	**-1.853***	-0.076	-0.705	0.043	0.435
	Occupational categories	**-0.224**	**-2.035****	-0.116	-1.563	0.007	0.062	0.094	0.893
	Job Position	0.048	0.263	-0.083	-0.670	-0.069	-0.357	-0.233	-1.335
	Tenure	0.005	0.031	**0.242**	**2.279****	0.078	0.488	**0.306**	**2.041****
Antecedents									
	Role overload			**0.184**	**2.474****			**-0.191**	**-1.816***
	Role conflict			**0.613**	**7.948*****			**0.546**	**5.009*****
R^2(adj. R^2)		0.175(0.111)		0.643(0.606)		0.078(0.005)		0.287(0.213)	
ΔR^2		0.175		0.467		0.078		0.209	
F		2.706**		17.375***		1.074		3.889***	

Beta coefficients are standardized. * : p<0.1, ** : p<0.05, *** : p<0.01, N=97

<Table3>

Results of Multi Regression Analyses Predicting the relations between job burnout and job performance

Variables		Job performance			
		model1		model2	
		Beta	t	Beta	t
Control Variables					
	Gender	0.023	0.199	-0.047	-0.420
	Age	-0.239	-1.391	-0.114	-0.693
	Marital Status	-0.057	-0.403	-0.015	-0.112
	Education	**-0.185**	**-1.792***	**-0.226**	**-2.267****
	Occupational categories	**0.196**	**1.743***	**0.184**	**1.697***
	Job Position	0.257	1.385	0.237	1.363
	Tenure	-0.200	-1.298	-0.174	-1.202
Independent Variables					
	Exhaustion			-0.065	-0.584
	Disengagement			**-0.335**	**-3.168*****
R^2(adj. R^2)		0.143(0.075)		0.266(0.190)	
ΔR^2		0.143		0.123	
F		2.117*		3.503***	

Beta coefficients are standardized. * : p<0.1, ** : p<0.05, *** : p<0.01, N=97

<Table4>

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting moderating effect of supervisor's support on the relationship between job demands and the members of exhaustion

Variables	Exhaustion							
	model1		model2		model3		model4	
	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t
Gender	−0.178	−1.545	−0.059	−0.761	−0.070	−0.913	−0.051	−0.690
Age	0.181	1.075	0.108	0.953	0.110	0.983	0.152	1.403
Marital Status	−0.019	−0.138	0.039	0.425	0.045	0.491	0.074	0.842
Education	−0.238	−2.347**	−0.129	−1.853*	−0.127	−1.840*	−0.218	−2.965***
Occupational categories	−0.224	−2.035**	−0.116	−1.563	−0.169	−2.119**	−0.187	−2.423**
Job Position	0.048	0.263	−0.083	−0.670	−0.044	−0.357	−0.052	−0.425
Tenure	0.005	0.031	0.242	2.279**	0.225	2.132**	0.126	1.157
Role overload			0.184	2.474**	0.177	2.409**	0.227	2.964***
Role conflict			0.613	7.948***	0.667	8.083***	0.694	8.638***
supervisor's support					0.139	1.713*	0.094	1.095
Role overload*supervisor's support							0.182	1.824*
Role conflict*supervisor's support							0.068	0.689
R^2(adj. R^2)	0.175(0.111)		0.643(0.606)		0.654(0.614)		0.686(0.641)	
$\triangle R^2$	0.175		0.467		0.012		0.032	
F	2.706**		17.375***		16.279***		15.303***	

Beta coefficients are standardized. * : p<0.1, ** : p<0.05, *** : p<0.01, N=97

<Table5>

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting moderating effect of supervisor's support on the relationship between job demands and the members of disengagement

Variables	Disengagement							
	model1		model2		model3		model4	
	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t
Gender	−0.175	−1.440***	−0.130	−1.188	−0.109	−1.018	−0.110	−1.020
Age	0.339	1.901	0.333	2.090**	0.329	2.113**	0.322	2.048**
Marital Status	0.129	0.883*	0.185	1.424	0.175	1.376	0.173	1.354
Education	−0.076	−0.705	0.043	0.435	0.039	0.401	0.047	0.439
Occupational categories	0.007	0.062	0.094	0.893	0.191	1.720*	0.201	1.801*
Job Position	−0.069	−0.357	−0.233	−1.335	−0.305	−1.755*	−0.347	−1.969*
Tenure	0.078	0.488	0.306	2.041**	0.337	2.295**	0.399	2.525**
Role overload			−0.191	−1.816*	−0.178	−1.738*	−0.234	−2.113**
Role conflict			0.546	5.009***	0.446	3.876***	0.430	3.698***
supervisor's support					−0.257	−2.274**	−0.315	−2.535**
Role overload *supervisor's support							0.128	0.885
Role conflict *supervisor's support							−0.207	−1.443
R^2(adj. R^2)	0.078(0.005)		0.287(0.213)		0.327(0.249)		0.344(0.250)	
$\triangle R^2$	0.078		0.209		0.040		0.016	
F	1.074		3.889***		4.185***		3.664***	

Beta coefficients are standardized. * : p<0.1, ** : p<0.05, *** : p<0.01, N=97

<Table6>

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting moderating effect of job discretion on the relationship between job demands and the members of exhaustion

Variables	Exhaustion							
	model1		model2		model3		model4	
	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t
Gender	−0.178	−1.545	−0.059	−0.761	−0.062	−0.796	−0.077	−1.071*
Age	0.181	1.075	0.108	0.953	0.112	0.985	0.120	1.143
Marital Status	−0.019	−0.138	0.039	0.425	0.035	0.373	0.069	0.795
Education	−0.238	−2.347**	−0.129	−1.853*	−0.140	−1.936*	−0.183	−2.562**
Occupational categories	−0.224	−2.035**	−0.116	−1.563	−0.128	−1.658	−0.133	−1.868*
Job Position	0.048	0.263	−0.083	−0.670	−0.102	−0.795	−0.058	−0.477
Tenure	0.005	0.031	0.242	2.279**	0.239	2.246**	0.218	2.076**
Role overload			0.184	2.474**	0.175	2.300**	0.174	2.317**
Role conflict			0.613	7.948***	0.624	7.847***	0.651	8.706***
job discretion					0.045	0.599	−0.100	−1.275
Role overload *job discretion							0.381	3.983***
Role conflict *job discretion							−0.168	−1.771*
R^2(adj. R^2)	0.175(0.111)		0.643(0.606)		0.644(0.603)		0.704(0.662)	
ΔR^2	0.175		0.467		0.001		0.060	
F	2.706**		17.375***		15.558***		16.682***	

Beta coefficients are standardized. * : p<0.1, ** : p<0.05, *** : p<0.01, N=97

<Table7>

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting moderating effect of job discretion on the relationship between job demands and the members of disengagement

Variables	Disengagement							
	model1		model2		model3		model4	
	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t
Gender	−0.175	−1.440	−0.130	−1.188	−0.119	−1.089	−0.113	−1.029
Age	0.339	1.901*	0.333	2.090**	0.317	2.002**	0.316	1.986*
Marital Status	0.129	0.883	0.185	1.424	0.202	1.565	0.197	1.494
Education	−0.076	−0.705	0.043	0.435	0.082	0.819	0.084	0.780
Occupational categories	0.007	0.062	0.094	0.893	0.137	1.277	0.137	1.269
Job Position	−0.069	−0.357	−0.233	−1.335	−0.162	−0.906	−0.160	−0.858
Tenure	0.078	0.488	0.306	2.041**	0.315	2.120**	0.300	1.882
Role overload			−0.191	−1.816*	−0.157	−1.480	−0.139	−1.215
Role conflict			0.546	5.009***	0.505	4.553***	0.485	4.278***
job discretion					−0.171	−1.624	−0.106	−0.892
Role overload *job discretion							−0.172	−1.187
Role conflict *job discretion							0.124	0.866
R^2(adj. R^2)	0.078(0.005)		0.287(0.213)		0.308(0.228)		0.320(0.222)	
ΔR^2	0.078		0.209		0.021		0.012	
F	1.074		3.889***		3.830***		3.289***	

Beta coefficients are standardized. * : p<0.1, ** : p<0.05, *** : p<0.01, N=97

<Table8>

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting moderating effect of job discretion on the relationship between self-esteem and the members of exhaustion

Variables	Exhaustion							
	model1		model2		model3		model4	
	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t
Gender	−0.178	−1.545	−0.059	−0.761	−0.037	−0.459	−0.040	−0.494
Age	0.181	1.075	0.108	0.953	0.068	0.576	0.085	0.705
Marital Status	−0.019	−0.138	0.039	0.425	0.045	0.495	0.049	0.527
Education	**−0.238**	**−2.347****	**−0.129**	**−1.853***	**−0.139**	**−1.981***	**−0.145**	**−2.036****
Occupational categories	**−0.224**	**−2.035****	−0.116	−1.563	−0.126	−1.686*	−1.33	−1.752*
Job Position	0.048	0.263	−0.083	−0.670	−0.004	−0.031	−0.004	−0.028
Tenure	0.005	0.031	**0.242**	**2.279****	**0.200**	**1.798***	0.181	1.579
Role overload			**0.184**	**2.474****	**0.195**	**2.610****	**0.208**	**2.698*****
Role conflict			**0.613**	**7.948*****	**0.616**	**8.000*****	**0.619**	**7.546*****
self-esteem					−0.095	−1.209	−0.098	−1.240
Role overload *self-esteem							−0.059	−0.745
Role conflict *self-esteem							0.006	0.066
R^2(adj. R^2)	0.175(0.111)		0.643(0.606)		0.648(0.608)		0.651(0.601)	
ΔR^2	0.175		0.467		0.006		0.003	
F	2.706**		17.375***		15.866***		13.067***	

Beta coefficients are standardized. * : p<0.1, ** : p<0.05, *** : p<0.01, N=97

<Table9>

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting moderating effect of job discretion on the relationship between self-esteem and the members of disengagement

Variables	Disengagement							
	model1		model2		model3		model4	
	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t	Beta	t
Gender	−0.175	−1.440	−0.130	−1.188	−0.108	−0.956	−0.086	−0.768
Age	**0.339**	**1.901***	**0.333**	**2.090****	**0.294**	**1.763***	0.254	1.521
Marital Status	0.129	0.883	0.185	1.424	0.191	1.468	0.194	1.500
Education	−0.076	−705	0.043	0.435	0.033	0.338	0.066	0.661
Occupational categories	0.007	0.062	0.094	0.893	0.084	0.798	0.118	1.118
Job Position	−0.069	−0.357	−0.233	−1.335	−0.155	−0.785	−0.135	−0.688
Tenure	0.078	0.488	**0.306**	**2.041****	**0.264**	**1.675***	**0.308**	**1.930***
Role overload			**−0.191**	**−1.816***	**−0.180**	**−1.697***	**−0.212**	**−1.981***
Role conflict			**0.546**	**5.009*****	**0.548**	**5.022*****	**0.484**	**4.242*****
self-esteem					−0.094	−0.846	−0.077	−0.704
Role overload *self-esteem							0.072	0.658
Role conflict *self-esteem							0.165	1.422
R^2(adj. R^2)	0.078(0.005)		0.287(0.213)		0.293(0.211)		0.326(0.229)	
ΔR^2	0.078		0.209		0.006		0.033	
F	1.074		3.889***		3.560***		3.382***	

Beta coefficients are standardized. * : p<0.1, ** : p<0.05, *** : p<0.01, N=97