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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between job satisfaction, resilience, optimism and emotional intelligence in the prediction of burnout in the workplace. This study was based on a quantitative, cross sectional design. Five self-administered questionnaires were distributed to ($n=130$) general staff at a private hospital, to test the hypothesis of which ($n=66$) males and ($n=64$) females completed the questionnaires, the study looked at gender difference, age differences and department differences in job satisfaction. No significant differences found.
1: Introduction

1.1 Burnout

The Concept of professional burnout was first used by Feudenberger in 1974 to describe a state of exhaustion both emotional and mental, Ulla Peterson (2008), also suggested that it seemed to be those who worked too much, for too long and worked too intensively were prone to burnout. Lot of different models of burnout have been published since 1974, but according to Schaufeli and Buunk (2003) a comprehensive hypothetical framework is still lacking. Human abilities in a working environment vary from person to person and how they cope with stress. Some people are extremely good at recognising the warning signs of stress, whereas others struggle to understand the seriousness of stress. Maslach and Goldberg (1998), described burnout from a multi-dimensional model and again in 2001 Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter defined burnout as a psychological syndrome in response to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job.

Prolonged exposure to work stress that could leads to withdrawal from an organisation, which is a great financial cost to the organisation. Bakker, Demerouti, Kantas & Vardakou (2003), developed the Oldenburg burnout inventory (OLBI) which looks at the positive and negative dimensions of burnout, as well as physical and cognitive sides of exhaustion. There are three phase of burnout, there is emotional exhaustion caused by extreme demands on a worker. First phase is Emotional
exhaustion, which is the feeling of tiredness and fatigue at work. Second phase is depersonalisation which can creative insensitive attitude toward other workers and the third phase is when a worker has feelings of low personal accomplishment, where they can become frustrated and have a sense of helplessness.

Golembiewski (1986) proposed that burnout might progress from depersonalisation through a person lack of personal accomplishment to emotional exhaustion. In the 1970s burnout was primarily in reference to work in areas such as health care, social work, psychotherapy, legal services and police, since then a lot of research has focused in many different occupations Leiter & Schaufeli (1996). Burnout is costly for an individuals as well as an organisation, research by Cox (2000) found that between 50%-60% of absence from work is related to stress in the workplace, and this is a global concern and can affect a workers psychological and physical health, which is a major challenge to the running of organisation.

According to Felton (1998), burnout syndrome may result from people giving too much of their time to their work, without adequate time to recover emotionally or physically. There are two different type of work overload; quantitative overload refers to a worker having too much to do and qualitative overload is when the worker finds the type of work too difficult to handle, (Cartwright, 1997). According to American psychologist Roger Harrison (1987, 1992) there are four main types of organisational culture, which are power, role, task/achievement and person/support. Burnout can be described as a distressed psychological state, which some employees may experience, more so when they are in the same job for a long time. When a person suffers from burnout they are emotionally exhausted which can lead to low work motivation. Other research carried out by Cordes and Dougherty (1993), found that heavy workload, low
control, role ambiguity and conflict would lead to burnout and this entail would lead to absence, dissatisfaction, health symptoms, poor performance and turnover, (Spector, 2012). According to Maslach and Leiter (1997) physical problems, such as headaches, gastro intestinal illness, high blood pressure, muscle tension and chronic fatigue are caused by burnout.

1.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is use to differentiate from a person morale, it refers to a single individual and their job circumstances. Many studies have shown that job characteristics can have a profound impact on employee well-being, theses being job strain, burnout and work engagement. According to research by Halbesleben & Buckley (2004), when a job demands high work pressure, emotional demands and role ambiguity may lead to sleeping problems, exhaustion and impaired health. Researcher Tai (1989), looked at the differences between men and woman, prior to 1974, the correlation between job satisfaction and life satisfaction for women was quite low (0.16) but a few years after it increased to a level found for men (0.31), they establish that this increase was due to better paid for women. Employees with more positive self-evaluation reported greater overall job satisfaction, over and above the impact of job characteristics as researched by Judge, Bono & Locke (2000).

Are some personality types more likely to be job-satisfied than others, regardless of the job, is it a consequence rather than productivity at work? According to Arnold (1998), the concept of job satisfaction has gained importance for two important reasons, which are a person general mental well-being. If a person is unhappy at work they probably are unhappy in general and the second is that, if
general supposition is that happiness at work improves work motivation and in effect, job performance. The stress among employees and the effect it can have on an organisation has received a substantial amount of research. Where stress is essential for employee activity, too much stress reduces an employee’s efficiency and undermines the foundation of the organization (Gudarzi 2002).

If an employee suffers from exhaustion in their jobs, they will have less input and will also show a decrease in productivity. According to Leiter and Maslach (2004), the less proportionality between the individual and they job, the more probability of job burnout, which can cause people to lose interest in their work, reduce efficiency, undermine inputs and performance of themselves and others. The causes of job satisfaction is the policies and procedures within a organisation, such as equity of pay and promotions, as well as specific aspects of the job they are doing, is the job workload been monitored, the amount of feedback they receive, the nature of the job and of course personal characteristics such as self-esteem, ability to tolerate stress and general life satisfaction probably will be a major factor in job satisfaction. Surveys indicate that 80-90 per cent of people are relatively happy at work, but not true of all work settings and jobs.

Herzberg (1957) reviewed the early satisfaction research literatures and found no relationships between job satisfaction and work performance Furnham (2000). They found that there were systematic relationships between workers attitudes and their behaviour, Herzberg also reported that job satisfaction depends upon a certain set of conditions, such as pay and benefits, promotions recognition, working conditions. If a worker is happy with the pay they receive for the job they do and they
receive recognition from their boss, they are more likely to have job satisfaction.

“When you feel good about yourself you perform better, and when you perform well you feel good about yourself, neither can endure with each other” (Tracy 1939).

1.3 Resilience

Resilience at work is well-established in substantial research; one of these researches was Salvatore Maddi, who began developing the resilience and hardiness approach in 1975. Resilience is a set of flexible cognitive, behavioural and emotional responses to acute or chronic adversities which can be unusual or common place, (Neenan, 2009). Resilience is a capacity which helps people work well when faced with new challenges, setback and even crisis. Resilience is a complex and multi-faceted construct, looking at an employee’s capacity and how they handle difficulties that they come across, how they receive demands and high pressure, without feeling negative effects. Looking at resilience from a psychological point of view, it is defined as the general capacity for flexible and resourceful adaptation to external and internal stressors (Klohen 1996).

According Kobasa (2014) there are three elements that appear to be essential for an effective stress mindset to exist, these are a challenge, personal control and commitment. Resiliency invoices maintaining flexibility and balance in your life as you deal with stressful circumstances, such as changes in the organisation (Osborne and Wennberby 2012). The more resilient a workforce are, the more they can handle workloads, pressured and major change without becoming stressed out, it is the most important defence people have against burnout. Resilience is seen as the development
characteristic for dealing with negative and positive changes in life and in an organisational context it had been described as having the capacity to bounce back from adversity and changes (Luthans & Youssef 2004). No matter what kind of conditions an employee has to endure, it is their resilience that determines how they persevere, there is no way of predicting what will or will not cause burnout and stress, it is the way the people respond to the pressure Calnan & Wainwright (2002).

Resilient people cope well and recover better, they may actually benefit from stressful challenges, Farber (2014). Employee with low resilience become overwhelmed, they tend to dwell on problems and employ unhealthy coping mechanism, which can lead to setbacks & extra stress, which could turn out for the individual facing burnout, as some employees find challenges greater than other.

There has been a lot of research into resilience in the past 30 years, one such researcher is Barbara Fredrickson. She states that the key to resilience is access to positive emotions, she has pursued this idea and came up with the broaden and build theory, that there is a critical ratio of positive emotions to negative emotions, that leads to more effective brainpower.

The more outgoing and with a sociable behaviour an employee will lead to more positive emotions and an upward spiral of positivity (positive health hand out). Buckner (2003) found that environmental factors like the quality of family and friends/peers relationship and the attachment style in childhood, gave them more predictors of resilience to stress in later life. People cope well and recover better, they may actually benefit from stressful challenges, Farber (2014). Employee with low resilience become overwhelmed, they tend to dwell on problems and employ
unhealthy coping mechanism, which can lead to setbacks & extra stress, which could turn out for the individual facing burnout, as some employees find challenges greater than other. Not a lot of research found on resilience in the workplace.

1.4 Optimism

Carver (1985) suggests that optimism is defined as a generalised expectancy that the future will be good. According to Caver & Scheier (2002) expectancy value theories underlies optimism. Some people are more susceptible to the adverse consequences of job pressures than others, this is down to factor within their personality like behaviour, when someone is impatience and hostility and another person uses factor like optimism and hardiness, Weehuizen (2008). Optimism refers to a person’s expectations for what the future holds, Bossio and Peterson (1991). Optimism also influences a person decisions whether to success or give up, Scheier & Carver (1997). Optimists are hopeful in their outlook on life; they see a wide range of situations in a positive way. They have a sharp contrasting tactics for coping with stress; they concentrate on problem at hand and deal with it, they seek social support and the advice of other people.

Optimism is basic on positive thinking, that prevents people from becoming apathetic or giving up hope, not letting the stress of the job get the better of them, they belief that things can only get better, which can be infectious and influence those that are in the same environment. According to Given, Kurtz, Osuch and Stommel (1993) found that optimism of the caregivers of a group of cancer patients showed lower symptoms of depression and their physical health did not show much impact. Optimists do not blame themselves when bad things happen; they view bad events as
results of something outside of themselves. A person apply more active task focused strategies when they face a challenging situation, these strategies have been conceptualised in various ways, including optimism, active copying and a mastery oriented strategies Diener & Dweck (1978).

There are a lot of studied that involve optimism and stress together in relation to burnout, such as studies carried out by Maslack (1996) Chang, D’Zurilla & Maydeu-Olivares (1994) with revealed the same negative relationship between optimism and stress. A recent study of optimism and burnout was carried out on various spot athletes; the conclusion was that optimism was negatively associated with all three subscales of burnout, Ying-Me Tsai, Lung Hung Chen, & Ying Hwa Kee (2007). People with a lot of optimism expect the future to be positive, Peterson & Bosio (1991), so they may not always report if they do not success at certain thing in their life for they are aiming toward the possibility of success. According to Carver & Scheier (2002), expectancy value theories bring about optimism and pessimism, one of the elements of expectancy value theories is behaviour, which is set out in a way of achieving goals. Optimism can be defined as a generalised expectancy that the future will be good, while pessimism is the generalised expectancy that the future will be bad, Carver & Scheier (2002).

Tiger (1995) argues cogently that optimism is not an optional characteristic in humans, it is a biological phenomenon. Optimistic people are more likely to focus on the opportunities within an organisation; they can see the brighter side of things. Optimists believe that their own actions result in positive things happening, that they are responsible for their own happiness and that they can expect more good things to happen in the future. Alloy (2006) found that individual differences in optimism are
relevant to clinical psychology, both directly and indirectly and this would be at individual and social level. Seligman (1991), has research the concepts of optimism and pessimism in the workplace and he found that people with an optimistic attribution style are more likely to feature negative events differently than those with a pessimistic explanatory style.

1.5 Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is a concept which is still debated, but there is evidence that indicates emotional intelligence is a distinct concept, this is shown by a lot of researcher such as Wong Law, Song (2004) Mayer & salovey (1995) and Lopes Salovey & Straus (2002). Emotional intelligence is seen as an individual’s ability to suitably regulate their emotions, as well as using information to guide their thinking and actions. Many tests have been developed to try and measure emotional intelligence as a distinct concepts, Ciarrochi, Chan & Caputi (2000) critically evaluated emotional intelligence as a concept and concluded that emotional intelligent is a distance from IQ and is involved in mood management, and is also related to relationship quality. Spector (2012), highlight that emotional intelligence is a characteristic that falls between personality trait and a cognitive ability.

It enables people to be more aware of their effect on others and the ability to control this effect, making it easier for them to get on well with colleagues and gives them the ability to wield leadership. Whereas, researchers Salovey & Mayer 1989 were credited with bringing the idea that emotional intelligence is import ability. While, others researchers have adopted different definitions and conceptions,
claiming both inside the field and in the popular media have cause confusion and controversy. Such as research carried out by Joseph and Newman 2010, they claims the emotional intelligence ability measures related to performance only in jobs that require employees to manage their own emotions Spector (2012).

Workers with higher emotional intelligence are significantly reported to have lower stress and burnout. The moderator effect of emotional intelligence in the stress-burnout relationship suggests that enhanced emotional intelligence may help diminish burnout development when chronic stress is experienced. Employees with a high level of emotional intelligence are assets to their organisation. According to Goleman (1995) it was claimed that people with high levels of emotional intelligence are more socially effective because they are able to achieve their goals through managing emotion in themselves and others Warr (2002). Emotional intelligence had become a popular term of reference with managers in organisations. The concepts of intelligence are often equated only with cognitive intelligence, where as numerous researchers suggest that general intelligence incorporate different intelligence, including social intelligence Mayer & Salovey (1993).

Emotional intelligence is a type of social intelligence that applies to emotion in the self and others can be externally relevant to the management of emotion at work concerning the relationship with emotional intelligence and job performance. Goleman (1998) analysed the competencies required for many job roles and concluded that emotional competencies, which would include influencing others and
understating, are essential for job effectiveness. He also reported that a group of financial advisors who attended an emotional competence training programme had significantly greater subsequent sales gains than people that did not take the programme. Studies by George, Abraham and Huy in (2000) found that team cohesion, innovation and other organisational processes have found emotional intelligence to be very important determinant of leadership. According to Ciarrochi, chan & caputi ((2000) emotional intelligence is very important in the workplace, to be able to understand perceived and express emotions in an appropriate way can determine whether an individual is successful or not as an employee. Therefore emotional intelligence is becoming one of the most important individual competencies for organisations and had been hypothetically related to organisation performance to the individual variables like job satisfaction.

Leadership has been defined as the competencies and processes required to enable employees to do more, it is also the ability to constantly deliver superior performance to the benefit of the organisation Bennis & Nanus (1985). Leadership has been described as the air of persuading people rather that domination them Charlton (1993). This suggests that the personal attributes which enable an individual to exercise transformational leadership both vision and to being that vision to others. Emotional intelligence addresses the personal, social, survival dimension and of intelligence, which sometimes would be more important that cognitive aspects of intelligent. A number of studies have highlighted emotional intelligence as a key predictor of adaptive coping and interpersonal success in the workplace and in a person life in general. Poor emotion management skills can have a very negative
impact on employees, effective job performance and making bad decision. A study carried out by Grant and Kinman (2010) on the role of emotional and social competencies through Stress and resilience on trainee social workers, they sampled 240 trainee social work students, the aim was to exam the respective roles played by emotional intelligence, reflective ability, social competence and empathy in predicting resilience to stress. The results found a correlation between the emotional and social competencies; significant positive relationships were found between resilience and emotional intelligence. The findings indicate that trainee social workers with emotional and social competencies are more resilient to stress.

1.6 Current study

The aim of this study was to see if the introduction of the Labour Relations Commission Proposals, known as ‘The Haddington Road Agreement,’ has changed employees attitudes towards their working life, with the additional two working hours added per week. This research was carried out by looking at job satisfaction, resilience, optimism and emotional intelligence and to see if they can predict burnout. This will be measured by administering five self-report questionnaires; first questionnaire to measure burnout was the Oldenburg burnout inventory, Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A.b (2008), to measure job satisfaction the MacDonald and Macintyre questionnaire (1997) was used, for resilience the Nicholson McBride questionnaire (NMRQ) (2010) administered, optimism was measured using a questionnaire by Scheier and Carver (1985) and emotional intelligence was measured using the TEIQue questionnaire by Petrides & Farnham (2003).
Hypothesis

The main hypotheses under consideration in this investigative study are as flows:

1. There will be a significant gender difference on job satisfaction.
2. There will be a significant age difference on job satisfaction.
3. There will be a significant department difference on job satisfaction.
4. There will be a correlation between independence variables and dependant variable.
5. Independence variables predicting dependant variables
2: Method

Participants

130 participants took part in this study of which (n = 66) were male (M = 33, SD = 7.59) and (n = 64) were females (M = 32, SD = 7.95). The age range of the participants was 18-55 and over. The sample of participants worked in the following areas within a private hospital, Finance, Administration, Reception, Portering, Support Services, Medical Records, Stores and the IT department, both full time and part time workers were included in this research. In total 150 participants were asked to participate in the research and 130 obliged.

Permission was granted by the CEO of the private hospital, to carry out the research.
2.1 Design

This research was structured in a quantitative cross-sectional design, descriptive in nature and based on an opportunistic sample. A questionnaire method was used. With the purpose of exploring the relationship between measured predictor variables such as job satisfaction, resilience, optimism, and emotional intelligence and criterion variables such as emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and negative/low personal accomplishment, (Burnout).

1) Independent samples t-test was also used to test whether there was any significant difference in the gender difference on job satisfaction,

2) One way between groups ANOVAs was used to predict age difference on job satisfaction.

3) One way between groups ANOVAs was used to predict department difference on job satisfaction.

4) Person's Correlation was used to see if independent variables and dependent variables correlated.

5) Multiple Regression Analysis was used to see if there is a relationship between independent and dependent variables.
2.2 Material

Materials consisted of five self-administered questionnaires.

The first questionnaire: is a 16 item measure of burnout; called the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory created by Demerouti et al (2008) (see appendix A). It is measured on a five point, Likert disengagement and exhaustion scale, to measure how much the participant agrees with the statement, ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. Examples of test items include “I always find new and interesting aspects in my work”. Positively worded items were reverse scored, items 1,2,5,7,10,11 &15, odd number items 1,3,5,7,9,11,13 & 15 comprise the Disengagement scale and the even numbers 2,4,6,8,10,12,14 & 16 are the exhaustion scale. Reliability for this measure in the current study was Cronbach’s Alpha = .62. Disengagement and Exhaustion = .78.

The second questionnaire: is a 10 item measure on job satisfaction, created Macdonal and MacIntyre (1997) (see appendix B). It is measured on a five point Likert scale, ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ’strongly agree’. Examples of test items include “I receive recognition for a job well done”. This scale works equally well for male and females from all occupations. Reliability for this measure is the current study was Cronbach’s Alpha = .87.

The third questionnaire: is a 12 items measure on resilience, created by McBride (2010) (see appendix C). It is measured on a five point Likert scale, ranging
from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. Examples of test items include “I do not take criticism personally”. Scores 0-37 a developing level of resilience, scores 38-43 an established level of resilience, scores 44-48 a strong level of resilience and scores 49-60 an exceptional level of resilience. Reliability for this measure is the current study was Cronbach’s Alpha = .76.

The forth questionnaire: is a 10 items measure on optimism, created by Scheier and Caver (1985) (see appendix D). It is measured on a five point Likert scale, ranging from ‘I aggress a lot’ to ‘I disagree a lot’. Examples of test items include “In uncertain times, I usually expect the best”. Reverse code items (3,7, & 9) take the original scores for items 3,7 & 9, meaning that the original answer 4,3,2,1,0 would be reversed score as 0,1,2,3,4. Items 1, 3R, 4, 7R, 9R & 10(R indicated that score has been reversed for that items, items 2,5,6 & 8 are filler items, they are not included in the final score. Reliability for this measure is the current study was Cronbach’s Alpha = .81.

The fifth questionnaire: is 30 items measure on emotional intelligence, using the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue-SF). Two items form each of the fifteen subscales of the TEIQue were selected for inclusion, on their correlations with the corresponding total subscale scores, this procedure was followed in order to ensure adequate internal consistencies and broad coverage of the sampling area of the construct. Created by Petrides and Farnham (2006) (see appendix E). It is measure on a seven point Likert scale, ranging from ‘Complete disagree’ to ‘completely agree’. Examples of test items include “Expressing my emotions with word is not a problem for me”. Reliability for this measure is the current study was Cronbach’s Alpha = .87.
2.3 Procedure

The participants were approached at random and handed the questionnaires, with the knowledge that all information was anonymous, they were no obligation to complete the questionnaires. The time frame was two week, with some participants retuning the questionnaires in a shorter period of time. When the participations had completed the questionnaire they were thanked and informed that results/findings will be made available to them if they wish to know, once all research is completed. Each participant was informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time.
3: Results

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Statistical analyse using SPSS computer software package, a number of statistical analyses were carried out on the data, these test included a t-test, looking at differences between variables, person correlation to investigate the relationship between variables, Multiple Regression Analysis to look at predictions and one way ANOVAs analysis of variance to test of significant groups differences, all of these tests were two tailed.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics including mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) for job satisfaction, resilience, optimism and emotional intelligence are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male participants</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>M = 33</td>
<td>SD = 7.59</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female participants</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>M = 32</td>
<td>SD = 7.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66 males and 64 females’
Hypothesis 1- Gender Differences on Job Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that there would be significant differences in job satisfaction between males (n=66) and females (n=64). Analysis of variances was conducted in order to compare job satisfaction and the predictor variables against gender, results showed that there was no significant difference in the scores for males and females. The mean score for males in relation to job satisfaction was (M=33, SD= 7.59) and for females the mean score was (M=33, SD= 7.59). An independent samples t-test also supposed this finding $t (128) = -.756, p > 0.05$, 2(tailed). An independent samples t-test is a parametric test, it was used for it is more powerful than non-parametric tests, as shown on table 2. A parametric test was also used for the data was normal. A boxplot to explains the overlap, the hence of no significant difference and the homogeneity of variance, this is explained by the extended whiskers as shown on table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>-756</td>
<td>127.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

Hypothesis 1- Gender Differences on Job Satisfaction.
Error bars: 95% CI
3.2: ANOVA

Table 4: One way between groups ANOVAs for differences between ages and Job Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that there would be significant differences in job satisfaction and the difference age groups. A one-way between groups ANOVA was used to measure if there would be a statistically significant difference between ages and job satisfaction (F =1.60 p=.178) across five difference age groups. Post Hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score of the first group, age band between (18-24) (M=33, SD=7.59) this score did not differ significantly from the next groups, age band between (25-34) (M=34), SD=7.1) this results did not differ significantly from the others group, age band between (35-44) (M=30, SD=7.79) did not differ significant from the other groups, forth group, age band between (45-54) (M=34, SD=7.51) no significant difference, fifth group, age band between (55-over) (M=31.9, SD=9.08) did not differ significantly from the others groups. As shown on table 3. Again a boxplot was used for it is a very visual way to see no difference by age, there are also no skewness, as show on table 5.

Table 4 Different ages and Job Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Deviation</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. One way between groups Anova for differences between ages and Job Satisfaction.
3.3: ANOVA

Table 6: One way between groups ANOVAs for differences between departments and Job Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that there would be significant differences in job satisfaction and the department worked in. Again a one-way between groups ANOVA was used to assess if there would be a statistically significant difference between job satisfaction (F = .328 p = 0.94) and the eight difference departments in the sample. Post Hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score of department one which is Finance (M=32, SD=7.21) this score did not differ significantly from the next department, which is department two was Administration (M=33, SD=9.90) this results did not differ significantly from the others departments, third department was Reception (M=34, SD=6.16) did not differ significant from the other departments, forth department was Porters (M=30, SD=8.69) no significant difference from the other departments, the fifth department was Support Services (M=32, SD=5.42) did not differ significantly from the others departments the sixth department in the sample was Medical Records (M=33, SD=5.78) did not differ significantly from the others departments, seventh department was Stores (M=31, SD=4.60) and the eighth and final department in the sample was IT (M=31, SD=1.88) this also did not differ significantly from the others department. As shown on table 6.

A boxplot was based around the median and therefore confirming normality assumptions, finding resulting in no significant difference between departments, as shown on table 7.
Table 6: One way between groups Anova for differences between departments

Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Deviation</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=130</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: One way between groups Anova for differences between departments-

**Boxplot**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>77931.725</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77931.725</td>
<td>1247.255</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>143.616</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.517</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7622.876</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>62.483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145014.000</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>7766.492</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .018 (Adjusted R Squared = -.038)
3.4: Correlation

Table 8: Pearson Correlation results:

Using a Pearson’s correlation for it provide a description of the strength and direction of a relationship as well as been parametric, making it more powerful than other non-parametric alternatives. Hypothesis 4 predicted that there would be correlation between the independent variables Resilience, Optimism, Emotional Intelligence, Disengagement and Exhaustion and dependant variables Job Satisfaction. The relationship between the variables was investigated using Pearson Product-moment correlation coefficient preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a weak negative correlation between the two variables Resilience and Job satisfaction, \( r = .335, n = 130, p < 0.01 \) Optimism and Job satisfaction \( r = .362, n = 130, p < 0.01 \) Emotional intelligence and Job satisfaction \( r = .326, n = 130, P < 0.01 \) Disengagement and Job satisfaction \( r = -.762, n = 130, p < 0.01 \) Exhaustion and Job Satisfaction \( r = -.571, n = 130, p < 0.01 \) all results were (2 tailed).
Table 8: Pearson Correlation results: To find a correlation between Independent variables Resilience, Optimism, Emotional Intelligence, Disengagement and Exhaustion and dependant variables Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job-Sat</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Optimism</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>Diseng</th>
<th>Exh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.3 35**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimism</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.326*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.578**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.326*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.578**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EI</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-.762**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.390**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.762**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.390**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disengage</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-.571**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.321**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.571**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.321**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed), statistical significance
*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Table 9: Pearson Correlation results: To find a correlation between Independent variables Resilience, Optimism, Emotional Intelligence, Disengagement and Exhaustion and dependant variables Job Satisfaction.

Scatter plot

Table 9: Is one example of a scatter box, showing Resilience on the X axis and Job stratification (dependent) on the Y axis.
Table 10: Multiple Regression Analysis.

Hypothesis 5 Independent variables will predict the dependant variables. Multiple regressions were performed to investigate the ability of resilience, optimism, emotional intelligence, Disengagement and exhaustion. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. Additionally the correlations between the predicate variables included in the study were examined, all correlations were weak to moderate, with Resilence $r=-.028$ $p<.005$, Optimism $r=.015$, $p<.005$, Emotional Intelligence, $r=.105$, $p<.005$, Disengagement, $r=-.671$, $p<.005$, Exhaustion, $r=-.104$, $p<.005$.

Model $p<.0005$

Model explains 60% variance in job satisfaction

Disengagement is the only significant predictor of Job satisfaction, Beta = -.67.

Table 11: Ran multiple regression analysis on Disengagement against job satisfaction as a single linear regression, WOWSERS the model is perfect, No variation due to chance and no shape to the residuals, confirming the perfect model and the scatter plot as shown on table 11, looks predictable and it is negatively.
### Table 10: Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (constant)</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>44.28</td>
<td>65.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseng</td>
<td>-1.083</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.671</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.329</td>
<td>-8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.355</td>
<td>-355</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11: Multiple Regression Analysis

*Scatter plot*

![Scatter plot](image)
Discussion

The primary aim of this study was to examine if the role of job satisfaction, resilience, optimism and emotional intelligence could predict burnout, using the two phases of burnout which are disengagement and exhaustion. The dependent variable was job satisfaction, with the independent variables as resilience, optimism, emotional intelligence, disengagement and exhaustion. The study compared gender, age and department of work in the prediction of job satisfaction.

Five questionnaires are distributed among general staff at a private hospital eight difference department, with a (N=130) participants in total. The results obtained from the independent samples t-test did not indicate significant difference between genders in relationship to job satisfaction. No significant differences between the different ages of the participant’s results obtained from a one way between groups ANOVAs and no significant difference within the eight different departments this was obtained by running a one way between group ANOVAs. Therefore all data could be pooled and analysed as from the same population with homogenous variances. A Pearson Correlation was run and the findings were that all independent variables correlated with job satisfaction, so multicollinearity was not an issue. Multiple regression analysis was run and only a significant (Beta = -.67) predictor was disengagement a phase in burnout.

Resilience and Job satisfaction, (r=.335, n=130, p<0.01) Optimism and Job satisfaction (r=.362, n=130, p<0.01) Emotional intelligence and Job satisfaction (r=.326, n=130, p<0.01) Disengagement and Job satisfaction (r=-.762, n=130, p<0.01) Exhaustion and Job Satisfaction (r=-.571, n=130, p<0.01) all results were (2 tailed).
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is not an easy concept to define, it is the attitude that employees adopt, there are lots of difference way to improve employee engagement, and pay is a very important factor in job satisfaction. Another important issue affecting job satisfaction is life satisfaction, life satisfaction i.e., how an employee is with his or her life in general. Studies by Bowling and Hammond (2008) found that life satisfaction correlated with job satisfaction. Three hypotheses have been proposed about how job and life satisfaction might affect one another, Rain, Lane and Steiner (1991). Most of the job burnout research has focused on stressors in the job environment and discounted the impacts of an individual’s personality, even with there been no significant differences found on the current study, the individual remains an important factor in burnout process and should not be overlooked, Rhoades et al (2001).

The first being The Spillover hypothesis, this suggests that if a person is happy in one part of their life then it might spillover to another part. The second one is The Compensation hypothesis, if a person is dissatisfaction in one area of their life they might compensated for this in a different part of their life and the third one is The Segmentation Hypothesis state that when a person compartmentalises their life and that satisfaction in one area of life has no relation to satisfaction in another.

According to Robbins et al (2012), Job satisfaction is defined as a positive feeling about one’s job, depends on a person’s characteristics. If a person has a high level of job satisfaction then they will have positive feelings about this or their job. After the boom in Ireland and the loss of so many jobs, people are just happy to have
employment, it’s not that easy to change jobs in this current economic climate. The
behaviour of the organisation reflexes the behaviour of the employee or their
behavioural tendencies toward his or her job. According to Pierce and Gardner (2004)
individuals who believe themselves to be worthy and valuable in general are likely to
believe that they are worthy and valuable in specific settings such as the workplace.
According to Looke (1976) job satisfaction can be described as a pleasurable to
positive emotional state, this can result in the evaluation of a person’s job or
experiences. High job satisfaction is linked with higher productivity and lower turnout
(Mckenna 2006), where positively influence their job satisfaction.

One of the reason for this study was to see that if the introduction on the Labour
Relations Commission Proposal, known as The Haddington Road Agreement a few
months ago, might have changed employee’s attitudes concerning work,
hypothesising that it would be a big factor in job stress and burnout with employees
having to work two extra hours per week unpaid. Perhaps if this study was to be
carried out again in six years’ time the results might be a significantly different, for
this current study found that job satisfaction correlated with resilience, optimism,
emotional intelligent and exhaustion. Resilience and Job satisfaction, \( r = .335, \ n = 130, \ p < 0.01 \) Optimism and Job satisfaction \( r = .362, \ n = 130, \ p < 0.01 \) Emotional
intelligence and Job satisfaction \( r = .326, \ n = 130, \ P < 0.01 \) Disengagement and Job
satisfaction \( r = .762, \ n = 130, \ p < 0.01 \) Exhaustion and Job Satisfaction \( r = .571, \ n = 130, \ p < 0.01 \) all results were (2 tailed)
Resilience

Resilience is a term of increasing frequency in many aspect of the workplace, the finding of this study is that there was a correlation between job satisfaction and resilience \((r=.335, n=130, p<0.01)\). Been resilience is a great assets to withstand traumatic and stressful experiences. The objective of the present study was to study the relationship between stress resilience and job satisfaction among the general staff at a private hospital. Resilience in the face of despair will show effective problem solving and self-control, employee with resilience tend to be happy individuals, they are mainly successful in both working and business life, Diener (2005). According to Watson (2000) affect is a sense of a phenomenological state, of which feeling usually is described in terms of emotions like sad, enthusiastic and happy.

Optimism

Optimism refers to a person’s expectations for what the future holds Peterson and Bosio (1991), current study found that there was a correlation between job satisfaction and optimism \((r=.362, n=130, p<0.01)\). Dispositional optimism is beneficial for psychical and psychological well-being. As pervious research has shown Optimism has an influence on a person’s emotions and the decision they make to motivate for success or giving up, Schheier & Carver (1987). Employees with optimism are needed in today’s workplace; they represent qualities that include self-awareness, flexibility, self-confidence, initiative, resiliency and adaptability. They
aim to be successful by thinking, feeling and behaving creates conditions for success. Employees are higher in extraversion, perceived more personal accomplishment in their jobs, there are more opportunities within their organisations, most if not all organisations carry out employees appraisals, where the employee received feedback and support, enabling the employees to see a more positive or a rewarding aspect to their jobs. Dispositional optimism is usually defined as an outlook or descriptive style which leads an individual to usually expect good things to happen, even when faced with major challenges, Scheier & Carver (1985). Optimism in contrast to emphasis takes a broader view of the potential fundamental forces assumed to be at work. Are Optimistic people immensely talented, luckily, blessed or know the right people? Murphy et al (2000). Lots of study on optimism has been carried out over the past two decades, mainly in the behavioural context, often referred to as resource or resilience variables, mainly for they thrive under adversity.

**Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional intelligence is very important within an organisation for it provides an excellent structure for looking at how people manage and understand their emotions. This study found that emotional intelligence correlated with job satisfaction (r=326, n=130, P<0.01). Petrides and Furnham (2001), suggest that the problem with emotional intelligence lies in the fact that it is measured in two different ways, therefore producing two different results. Subsequently they proposed that there should be two kinds of emotional intelligence to account for this, trait emotional intelligence and ability emotional intelligence, allowing for a better measure of emotional intelligence overall. Perhaps measuring emotional intelligence in this way would produce a more reliable and valid measure. The concepts of emotional intelligence are still debated, maybe it is not a distinct concept or possibly that it
needs to be redefined (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura, people with high confidence in their capabilities handle stress related factors effectively and approach difficult task as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Chan et al (2000), suggest interesting areas of research in emotional intelligence such as the cognitive resources used in emotional intelligence. For example do people high in Emotional intelligence use more or less resources than those lower in emotional intelligence, when managing their moods in the workplace.

**Disengagement & exhaustion**

A multiple regression analysis was run with disengagement been the only significant predictor of job satisfaction, beta (=-.67), (r=-.762, n=130, p<0.01). This result shows that some of the sample used in this study showed disengagement toward job satisfaction. This might be down to the recent introduction of the Haddington Road agreement, which all employees have to work an extra two hours a week unpaid, or take proportional pay cut. Employees were given an option, of remaining on their current hours or take a proportional pay adjustment, to reflect the extra working time.

This study was conducted on employees in a private hospital, after the labour relations debate, the new agreement states that all hospital staff, whether private or public will have to adhere to the new law. Exhaustion correlated with job satisfaction (r=-.571, n=130, p<0.01). Cooper et al (2001) found that work overloads contributes to burnout, in addition causing exhaustion and eventually could lead to ill health. Previous research by Maslach (2000) found that perceived stressor lead to emotional reactions which in turn lead to physical and psychological ill health. A report
published in America in 2010 noted that job satisfaction has steadily declined over the years despite big improvements in the work environment, such as a reduction of hazards in the workplace and an increase in holidays. This was visible across the board, workers in every age group and invoice levels showed the drop, but mainly workers under 25 years of age, Pepitone (2010)

**Gender and job satisfaction**

These results contradicted previous theoretical and empirical studies on the role of gender in the workplace, back in the 1980 a study carried out by Miller, found women are less favourably disposed than men toward complex work with family responsibilities and personal expectation. The workplace has changed since then. This study found that no significant difference within the sample used, between males and females with regards job satisfaction, males M=33, SD=7.95) and females (M=32, SD=7.95). Crosby (1983) reported that there were fewer differences in the appraisal of job by men and women. The relationship between gender and job satisfaction has been examined frequently. Some studies show that women are more satisfied than men, Bartol (1975) and others research show that men are more satisfied, Forgionne (1982). But it important to note that studies carried out more recent have showed no significant difference between genders, Tait (1989).

Women are treated the same as men in most organisations now and women are seen as equal. Research carried out by Witt & Nye (1992), had finding that supports this current study. A study carried out in 1990 by Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley found there to be no significant gender difference either. While no significant gender difference was established between group’s results showed participants reported moderate stress levels and high level of job satisfaction. There is no divided between males and females on how they deal with stress.
Age and job satisfaction

There have been many studies into the relationship between age and different forms of job satisfaction. The results found that significant variations across age were commonly found, mainly with older employees tending to report best job satisfaction than employees of a younger age, (Doering et al 1983). In 1993 Clark found that overall job satisfaction was must greater when observing age differences than when observing gender, education or ethnicity. A question that is of interest to industrial organisational psychologists concerns possible changes in job satisfaction over a person’s working life. There are lots of different studies that have shown older workers are more satisfied with their jobs than the younger workers, Cooper (1999).

Discrimination based on age, applied to some organisations, mainly in the 1960’s. Organisations can no longer require mandatory retirement at a specific age; older employees are often victims of potent though subtle forms of discrimination, Brandt (2000). Although it would be logical for employers to make a commitment to skill, upgrading and retaining designed to facilitate acceptance of new techniques and procedure by older workers. This study has shown that employees value their work while also proving that there are no significant differences between the ages of employees and to how satisfied they are at work (F=1.60, p=.178). Clarke (1996) has suggested that overall job satisfaction will increase with age.
Department of work and job satisfaction

This was the most surprising of all the results, that there was no significant difference with respect to job satisfaction between the eight different departments (F=0.328, p=0.094). A reason for this might be that all staff are content within their jobs, their pay and the conditions they work in, all these would be a vital factors in defining job satisfaction. The Theory of Planning Behaviour, Ajzen (1991) suggests that attitudes with regards to one’s behaviour lead to intentions to perform, this then leads to genuine performance of the behaviour. Having a considerate manager also improves a person attitude to work, where an employee feels that they are equal within the organisation, despite the department they work in. Motivation can be vital keys to a workforce.

Both organisational commitment and job satisfaction are more likely to affected by e.g., the type and variety of work, the autonomy involved, the level of responsibility associated with the job, the quality of the social relationship at work, compensation and the change for promotion and advancement in the organisation. Finegan (2000) found that perceived equity of rewards influences job satisfaction. If an employee sees that they are valid member of the department, they will be more content within the organisation and perform better. Motivation is central to any discussion of work behaviour for it is a direct link to good work performance, if an employee feels that their management are concerned about their well-being, they will take more pleasure out of their work and will perform more efficiently, which will benefit and employer and the employee in the long term.
Conclusion

The study did look at all general departments within a hospital, equal amount of males and females contributed their thoughts and views to the study. If ethical approval was granted to conduct this study on clinical staff, the finding might be significantly different. The resent strike by junior doctors would quite possibly make for interesting results on burnout and job satisfaction. Patients demand, long hours and the enormous responsible that comes with looking after people may increase burnout and decrease job satisfaction.

Not a lot research was found on resilience in relation to job satisfaction more research needed. Participants in this study have shown that overall they are satisfied with the working lives. Another interesting study would be survey general staff on home stressors and their working life, for instant do they have children, are they married etc. Has the present economic downturn, made people more appreciative of their jobs, how would the results differ if this study was carried out in the financial boom.

Expansion of this research could be to conduct a study on public and private hospitals, with clinical and non-clinical staff, another way to expand on this research would be to use burnout with others predictors. Length of services, would there be a differences between employees with years of services and new employees in relation to work stress. Therefore this research may contribute significantly in helping to understand the factors associated with job satisfaction, among general staff at a private hospital and concluded that the implication of this study are frequent and varied
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Appendix:

Job Satisfaction
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**Study Title:** The role of job satisfaction, resilience, optimism and emotional intelligence in the prediction of burnout.

**Researcher:** Yvonne Murphy

**Project Supervisor:** Dr. Garry Prentice

**Contract details:**

I am in my 4th year of a BA honours Psychology degree and for my thesis I am conducting a study on burnout of staff. My study is looking at the role of job satisfaction, resilience, optimism and emotional intelligence in the prediction of burnout amongst general staff at St-Vincent’s Private Hospital.

**Please note all information is anonymous, no names are required.**

To take part in this study you will be asked to fill in 5 short questionnaires.

This information is for my thesis only; none of this information will be available to St Vincent’s Private hospital.

If people want feedback on my final results, please feel free to contact me.

Many thanks
Yvonne Murphy
Male □
Female □

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Department you work in: ____________________________

Full time: □
Part time: □
**Emotional intelligence**: There are seven possible responses to each statement ranging from
1……………2……………3……………4…………….5……………6……………7
Completely
Disagree
Completely
Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expressing my emotions with words is not a problem for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I often find it difficult to see things from another person’s viewpoint.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On the whole, I’m a highly motivated person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I usually find it difficult to regulate my emotions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I generally don’t find life enjoyable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can deal effectively with people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I tend to change my mind frequently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Most times, I can’t figure out what emotion I’m feeling.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I often find it difficult to stand up for my rights.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I’m usually able to influence the way other people feel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>On the whole, I have a gloomy perspective on most things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Those close to me often complain that I don’t treat them right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I often find it difficult to adjust my life according to circumstances.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>On the whole, I’m able to deal with stress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I often find it difficult to show my affection to those close to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I’m normally able to “get into someone’s shoes” and experience their emotions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Emotional intelligence (Continued):** There are seven possible responses to each statement ranging from 1………….2…………3………….4………….5………….6………….7

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I normally find it difficult to keep myself motivated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I’m usually able to find ways to control my emotions when I want to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>On the whole, I’m please with my life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I would describe myself as a good negotiator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I tend to get involve in things that I later wish I could get out of.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I often pause and think about my feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I believe I’m full of personal strengths.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I tend to “back down” even if I know I’m right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I don’t seem to have any power at all over other people’s feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I generally believe that things will work out fine in my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I find it difficult to bond well even with those close to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Generally, I’m able to adapt to new environments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Others admire me for being relaxed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I normally find it difficult to keep myself motivated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Job Satisfaction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I receive recognition for a job well done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel close to the people at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel good about working at this company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel secure about my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I believe management is concerned about me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>On the whole I believe work is good for my physical health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am happy with my wages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>All my talents and skills are used at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I get along with my supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel good about my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resilience

For each question, score yourself between 1 and 5, where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In a difficult spot, I turn at once to what can be done to put things right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I influence where I can, rather than worrying about what I can’t influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I don’t take criticism personally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I generally manage to kept things in perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am calm in a crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I’m good at finding solutions to problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I wouldn’t describe myself as an anxious person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I don’t tend to avoid conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I try to control events rather than being a victim of circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I trust my intuition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I manage my stress levels well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I feel confident and secure in my position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Optimism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A agree a lot</th>
<th>I agree a little</th>
<th>I neither Agree Or disagree</th>
<th>I disagree a little</th>
<th>I disagree a lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In uncertain times, I usually expect the best.
2. It’s easy for me to relax.
3. If something can go wrong for me, it will.
4. I’m always optimistic about my future.
5. I enjoy spending time with my friends a lot.
6. It’s important for me to keep busy.
7. I hardly ever expect things to go my way.
8. I don’t get upset too easily.
9. I rarely count on good things happening to me.
10. Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad.
### Burnout: SD=strongly disagree, D=disagree, N=don’t agree or disagree, A=agree, SA=strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I always find new and interesting aspects in my work.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in negative way.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I can tolerate that pressure of my work very well.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I find my work to be a positive challenge</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>During my work, I often feel emotionally drained.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>When I work, I usually feel energised</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel sickened by my work task</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I feel more and more engaged in my work.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work,</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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