

Job stressors, Burnout Levels and Coping Strategies among Faculty Members and Assistants: a comparative Study

¹Salwa Ahmed Mohamed, D.Sc., Ph.D ²Fatma Abed, D.Sc., Ph.D,

¹Lecturer of Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing, Beni Suf University, Egypt

²Assistant Professor of Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing, Cairo University, Egypt

Abstract:

Background: In this era of change the responsibilities of academicians have increased, and now faculty members are supposed to play many other roles besides their traditional roles of teaching and research. Role stress is a burning issue nowadays, particularly in this context. Stressful encounters over a long period of time lead to reduced physical and mental well-being and can end up in a chronic state of exhaustion or burnout (Rayan, Qurneh, Elayyan, and Baker, 2016). **Aim** the aim of this study was to Assess job stressors, burnout levels and coping strategies among faculty members and assistants at south Valley University and Cairo University. **Sample:** All available faculty members and assistants who agreed to participate in the study at time of data collection in Faculty of Nursing South Valley and Cairo Universities were included.

Setting: This study was conducted at Faculty of Nursing at south Valley University and Cairo University.

Research Design descriptive comparative design was used to achieve the objectives of the present study

Tool: The following tools were used **I:** Job Stressors Questionnaire: it was developed by (Abd El-Hady, 2008);

II: The Maslach Burnout Inventory Educator Survey (MBI-ES) was developed by Maslach, Jackson and Leiter, 1996; **III:** Closed-ended questions developed by Lazarus and Folkman, 1984 and modified by the researcher to assess different coping strategies of stress and burnout management.

Results and Conclusion, the study results indicate that, high job stressors were related to work overload, response of study group to stressors was physically, high Burnout was related to Achievement, moreover there was a statistical correlation between job stressors, strain and burnout of the study group In addition, findings of the present study revealed that, the most coping strategies used by respondents was effective/ cognitive emotional strategy. Therefore,

Recommendations: it is recommended for further research to Understand causality will allow for specific and appropriate strategies to address challenges of work related stress, burnout, and poor general health among nurses. In addition to, conducting stress management programs to enhance the abilities of nurse's educators to deal with stressors

Keywords: job stressors, burnout levels, coping strategies, faculty members and assistants

I. Introduction

Nowadays, Occupational burnout is a common problem in all the systems of the health care, in another words, based on the available census, one in seven person gets occupational burnout at the end of the day (Hedayat, et al, 2008). In last two decades, higher education institutions are commonly labeled as stressful environments (Ahmadi, Azizkhani, and Basravi, 2014).

Behavioral symptoms of teacher stress include poor time management, inability to concentrate, irritation and aggression, withdrawal from supportive relationships, abuse of alcohol, caffeine or tobacco and, if not managed properly, it leads to absenteeism, resignation, conflict with students and turnover intentions (Stevenson and Harper, 2006).

Work life takes up an important place in human life, and an employed person faces many stimuli from internal and external environments and is affected by them in a positive or negative way. The Positive stimuli in general make individuals happy whereas in the face of negative stimuli, stress can be generated (Rayan, Qurneh, Elayyan, and Baker, 2016). Work stressors is the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirement of the job do not match the capabilities, resources or needs of the employees. Moreover, (Izaquierdo, and Risquez, 2012) highlighted that work stressors might be defined as a perceived imbalance between work demands and the individual's ability to perform when the consequences of failure are important. It may produce both overt psychological and physiologic disabilities; however, it may also have more subtle manifestations that can affect personal wellbeing and affect outcomes of organizational importance such as productivity.

On the same line, Rafii, Shamsikhani, Zarei, Haghani and Shamsikhani, (2012) highlighted that work stressors can be result of a transactional process between job demands and a person's ability to meet or to modify them in any way. On the same line, the National Institutes for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH,

2009) defined work stressors as “the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. On the same line, **(BrownM, 2010)** defines work stressors as tension arising in person related to demands of the role or job.

During the last decade, many studies on stress point out that the role stressors may vary in different environments and lead to stress and burnout. The recent growth in higher education institutions in developing countries has led to higher competition and organizational change in most of the public and private sector universities, so faculty members increasingly suffer from pressures leading to stress and burnout **(Rajarajeswari, 2010)**.

In most developed countries, there was an improvement in economic competitiveness in international markets and the countries that embraced these changes. But eventually, strains began to show, and the concept of ‘burnout’ became well known within organizations **(Murphy, 2010)**. Stress, up to a certain point, will improve people’s performance and quality of life because it is healthy and essential that they should experience challenges within their lives, but if pressure becomes excessive, it loses its beneficial effect and becomes harmful. Stressful encounters over a long period of time lead to reduced physical and mental well-being and can end up in a chronic state of exhaustion or burnout **(Sadeghi, and Motamed, 2010)**

Burnout may develop in the individual in the case of a long duration of the state of stress, Burnout occurs when professionals use ineffective coping strategies to try to protect themselves from work-related stress. Burnout is defined as a psychological syndrome including the long-term response given to sources of chronic stress in the workplace **(Kalliath and Morris, 2002)**.

Burnout is a type of psychological stress. Occupational burnout or job burnout is characterized by exhaustion, lack of enthusiasm and motivation, feelings of ineffectiveness, and also may have the dimension of frustration or cynicism, and as a result reduced efficacy within the workplace. **(Andy, Caine, and Levon, 2013)**

Burnout pervades every occupation, but is thought to be especially prevalent among service professionals, or those who do “people work”, such as teachers, health practitioners, and caregivers. These types of jobs require attending to the emotional needs of others, and can lead to emotional and physical fatigue, as well as the feeling of no longer being able to give of oneself **(Neuman, 2008)**.

Burnout is defined as a response to chronic stress that has received a great deal of research attention because of its relevance in today’s workplace. Burnout is not simply excessive stress. Rather, it is a complex physical, mental, and emotional reaction to constant levels of high stress, and it relates to feeling that the inner resources are inadequate for managing the tasks and situations which presented **(Tehrani, 2011)**.

Burnout can occur in any work situation where a person feels overworked, underappreciated, confused about expectations and priorities, concerned about job security, overcommitted with responsibilities, and resentful about duties that are not commensurate with pay **(Anderfuren, 2011)**. Burnout produces feelings of hopelessness, powerlessness, cynicism, resentment, and failure – as well as stagnation and reduced productivity. These reactions can result in depression and unhappiness that can threaten the job, the relationships, and the health **(Jones, Tanigawa and Weisse, 2003)**.

Sometimes, individuals are unable to manage stress successfully through their own efforts and require assistance. Coping strategies may furnish temporary relief or none at all. With this level of distress; one can feel overwhelmed or helpless and may be at greater risk for mental or physical illness. This constellation of emotions is commonly called burnout **(Yoder-Wise, 2011)**.

Burnout as an individual negative experience occurring as a result of chronic work stress has become prominent in teaching professional literature since the mid-1970s’. There is a general view that teacher burnout may have a negative impact on the teachers themselves leading, for instance, to emotional and physical ill-health, and on the students as burned out teachers may be relatively impaired in the quality of teaching and commitment, may give less information and less praise as well as interact less with students. Job stress and burnout serve as impediments to the lecturers’ research functions in higher education **(Badri, Lotfinia and, Mohamadnadjad 2011)**.

The work of a typical university, polytechnic or college of education lecturer could be divided into four groups namely, teaching, conducting research, civil obligation and administration. The intensity and frequency of influence of involvement in any of the broad groups of job activities depend on the rank of the lecturer. With increasing number of roles that students, parents and employers demand from lecturers, it is no wonder that lecturers’ stress and burnout are on steady increase. This has invariably affected the research functions of the lecturers in tertiary institutions. **(Mozayan, Rezaee, Kalantari and, Tabatabaee A.2012)**.

Salami (2006) defined teacher stress as an unpleasant feeling that teachers experience as a result of their work. Stress has effects on a person’s physical, emotional and psychological well-being. Past research on job stress among postsecondary lecturers has identified numerous sources and variables affecting stress levels as well as burnout, also identified heavy workload, working under pressure, large classes, students’ disruption of lectures and delayed and inadequate salaries as sources of stress among college of education lecturers in Nigeria.

In general, 'burnout' is a subject's response to chronic work-related stress and is an attempt to adapt to or protect oneself from it. Stress has been defined as the result of a relationship with the environment that the person appraises as significant for his or her well-being, and in which demands tax or exceed available coping resources. Coping is defined as cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific internal and/or external demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the person's resources (**Isaksson, et al, 2013**).

A person will be psychologically vulnerable to a particular situation if he or she does not possess sufficient coping resources to handle it adequately and places considerable importance on the threat implicit in the consequences of this inadequate handling. There are different general trends in coping with stress, such as cognitive or behavioral coping, cognitive or behavioral avoidance, emotion-focused coping or substance use. From this perspective, burnout may be observed as a progressively developed condition resulting from the use of the ineffective coping strategies with which professionals try to protect themselves from work-related stress situations (**Reissner, et al, 2010**).

There is an accumulation of evidence linking coping styles with stress and burnout. At first, coping style was studied as a relatively stable characteristic of the person, regardless of the nature of the task or situation, showing that certain inflexible coping styles could be associated with higher levels of stress (**Isaksson, et al, 2013**). Subsequently, the emphasis was placed on the relationship between the coping style and the situation.

Early research seemed to support the idea that problem-focused coping was a better strategy than emotion-focused coping for stress management. However, it was later found that there were sub-factors that did not allow the application of such a general conclusion. Problem-focused coping is not an appropriate strategy to address stress if the situation is uncontrollable or chronic, as it could lead, in this case, to a progressive process of behavioral disengagement (**Wallace, LeeandLee, 2010**).

Emotional coping has been noted to be detrimental if it involves distancing, avoidance or denial regarding the situation but is an effective strategy if it involves a positive reappraisal. In the long term, the key factor for developing the burnout syndrome seems to be the degree of passivity that the subject acquires (**Reissner, et al, 2010**). The effective management of stress is important to keep it at a level that enhances one's performance rather than deplete energy. To accomplish this, we require comprehensive approach to managing stress, which involves planning time and energy (**BadriGargari R, Lotfinia H, Mohamadnajar R.2011**)

Many strategies are explained by (**Kuipers, and Ball, 2011**) that includes Personal, Physical, Mental, Emotional \ Spiritual strategies and Supportive strategies can come from formal and informal directions. The formal aspects concern professional counseling, or value clarification. Workshops, seeking assistance from a spiritual support are valuable for the caregivers. Professional counseling and receiving emotional support through counseling can be useful when stress is building to burnout level. Support groups are used to handle stress in settings away from the universities. Support groups and networking can build confidence, mutual help, mutual support and friendships and can be enjoyable, where ideas can be exchanged. All these are useful in decreasing stress and increase work enjoyment.

The academic members, due to their educational and researching duties, consume a lot of mental energy and it is thought that they are among the groups exposed to harm of occupational burnout. So concerning the negative effects of occupational burnout and a pressure on personal accomplishment and physical and mental health of individuals, consequently, the reduction of quality, efficiency, and outcomes of their occupations, and also regarding the limited number of studies investigating the outbreak of occupational stress and its relationship with academic's occupational burnout, therefore the aim of this study was to assess the relationship between job stressors and burnout, how to manage them among faculty members and assistants in faculty of nursing at south Valley University and Cairo University. Identifying work place stressors, levels of burnout and relationship between them is required to provide strategies for effective management which helps in increasing performance, quality, job satisfaction, productivity and decreasing absenteeism and turnover.

Significance

Academics have been highly respected in most countries because they represent a "key profession" Studying stress and burnout among the college of education lecturers has implications for improving understanding of job-stress and burnout as well as for enhancing their working life. Understanding factors that lead to burnout can help authoritative personnel and career counselors to forecast burnout as well as factors related to early manifestation of burnout. From such information, appropriate intervention strategies that will combat burnout and enhance employee and organizational wellness can be developed. In Egypt, few researches were undertaken to study job stressors and burnout among faculty members and assistants. Researches handled only on coping strategies for each one such as burnout and coping strategies among nurse educators at faculty of nursing in Alexandria University (**Alo, 2008**), job stressors and coping strategies among nurse educators at secondary technical schools of nursing in Alexandria (**Abd El-Hady, 2008**). Therefore The aim of this study

was to Assess job stressors, burnout levels and coping strategies among faculty members and assistants at south Valley University and Cairo University.

II. Methodology

The present study was conducted in order to assess job stressors, burnout levels and coping strategies among faculty members and assistant at south Valley University and Cairo University.

Research questions:

1. What are job stressors and levels of burnout among faculty members and assistants in Faculty of Nursing at south Valley University and Cairo University?
2. What is the relationship between job stressors and levels of burnout among faculty members and assistants in Faculty of Nursing at south Valley University and Cairo University?
3. What are the coping strategies uses for stress and burnout among faculty members and assistants in Faculty of Nursing at south Valley University and Cairo University?

Subjects and Methods

Subjects and methods of the present study were discussed by the following four main designs: technical, operational, administrative, and statistical designs.

Technical design:

The technical design consists of research design, study setting, subjects, and the tool of data collection.

Research Design:

A descriptive comparative design was used to achieve the objectives of the present study.

Setting:

This study was conducted at Faculty of Nursing at south Valley University and Cairo University. South Valley University includes 8 scientific departments, which are: nursing administration, psychiatric and mental health nursing, medical and surgical care nursing, maternal and newborn health nursing, pediatric nursing, gerontology, critical and community health nursing. The faculty consists of three floors. Cairo University which consists of five floors and contains nine scientific departments (medical surgical nursing, Pediatric nursing, maternal and obstetric nursing, community health nursing, psychiatric health nursing, nursing administration, emergency, critical care nursing, nursing gerontology and nursing education department).It also contains academic guidance and student support office, and graduate follow up unit, education and student affairs department, education development center, and quality assurance unit. It also contains 13 classes for lectures and seminars, video conference room, Information technology department, central library, digital library, and many laboratories, these laboratories: OSCE, emergency and critical care nursing, maternity and obstetric nursing, medical surgical nursing, anatomy, audiovisual, computer and multi-purpose laboratory

Subjects:

All available faculty members and assistants who agreed to participate in the study at time of data collection in Faculty of Nursing South Valley and Cairo universities will be included. They divided as follows 33in faculty of nursing South Valley university(one assistant professors, 7 lecturers and 7 assistant lecturers, 14 demonstrators, and 4 clinical instructors) working in different departments, And 60 in Cairo university (2 professors, 6 assistant professors, 6 lecturers ,29 assistant lecturers, and 17 clinical instructors).

Tools for data collection:

Data for the present study was collected using the following three tools:

1. The job stressors questionnaire.
2. The Maslash Burnout Inventory Educator Survey (MBI-ES).
3. Closed- ended questions guided by **Lazarus and Folkman, 1984** and modified by the researcher to assess different strategies of stress and burnout management.

Tool I: Job Stressors Questionnaire: it was developed by **AbdEl-Hady, 2008**. It consisted of 63 statements. This tool divided into three parts:

Part one; Personal Data: such as (department, age, marital status, no. of children, monthly income, salary, educational level, job position, years of experiences, training, working hours per day, and working hours per week).

Part two: -. It contained 35 statements, and divided into two categories as follows:

- A. Personal stressors (9 statements), such as being pregnant.
- B. Job stressors (26 statements) divided into four categories as follows:
 - ✚ Organizational related stressors (7statements) such as low salary.
 - ✚ Work overload related stressors (7 statements) such as heavy work load affecting family needs.
 - ✚ Job related psychological stressors (5 statements) such as feeling insecure in job.

✚ Clinical area related stressors (7 statements) such as large numbers of nurses' students.

Part three: Nurse Educators Job Stressors Physical/Psychological Responses

It contained 28 statements, and divided into two responses:

❖ Job stressors Physical responses (17 statements), such as fatigue, headache.

❖ Job stressors Psychological responses (11 statements), such as lack of concentration.

Scoring system:

For job stressors questionnaire items the responses were on a four point Likert scale rating from (3) means always happen, to (0) which means not applicable. The scoring system for calculating the degree of personal stressors using likert scale ranged from 3 to 0. Since there were nine statements therefore a total score of 9 or less meant low personal stressors, from 10 to 18 moderate and 19 to 27 meant high personal stressors. The degree of job stressors questionnaire which had 26 statement using **likert scale** from 3 to 0 was scored as low for 26, from 27 to 52 as moderate and from 53 to 78 as high job stressors(**AbdEl-Hady, 2008**).

Tool II: The **Maslach Burnout Inventory Educator Survey (MBI-ES)** was developed by **Maslach. etal (1996)** which used to measure the frequency dimensions of burnout syndrome for faculty members and assistants in Faculty of Nursing at south valley University. It consisted of 22 statements, and classified under three dimensions subscales namely:

I. Emotional exhaustion (9statements) such as I feel burned out from my work.

II. Depersonalization (5 statements) such as I feel frustrated by my work.

III. Personal accomplishment (8 statements) such as I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students.

Scoring system:

For burnout inventory educator survey questionnaire items, the responses were on a seven point Liker scale rating from (0) means never, to (6) which means every day. The final score of each group of items related to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment was divided into 'low, moderate and high'. The scores were rated as follows: persons with high score for emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and low score on the personal accomplishment tend to have high level of burnout. Persons with a moderate score on three subscales tend to have moderate level of burnout. While low level of burnout is reflected in persons with low score in the emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and high score on the personal accomplishment.

Tool III: Closed- ended questions developed by **Lazarus and Folkman, 1984**and modified by the researcher to assess different coping strategies of stress and burnout management that used by the nurse educators in Faculty of Nursing at south valley and Cairo Universities. It consisted of 97 statements. This tool divided into two parts:

Part one: - The researcher used it to assess different coping strategies of stress management which used by the nurse educators. It comprised of 31 statements in relation to 4 main areas:

A. Effective cognitive/emotional coping strategies consisted of 7 statements as, seek help from god, accept problem and share stressful feeling with family members.

B. Effective behavioral coping strategies consisted of 13 statements as, do favorite hobbies, do double effort to make positive things and seeking advice from superiors to solve problem.

C. Ineffective cognitive/emotional coping strategies had 4 statements as, keep feeling to oneself, escaping from facing a stressful event and live in day dreaming.

D. Ineffective behavioral coping strategies comprised 7 statements as, postpone thinking about the problem, and get oversleeping.

Part two: - The researcher used it to assess different coping strategies of burnout management which used by the nurse educators. It comprised of 66 statements and classified into eight ways of coping namely: Confronting coping means that aggressive efforts to alter the situation n=7 and Distancing coping describes that cognitive efforts to isolate oneself from the situation n=9. Also Self controlling coping refers to the efforts to regulate one's feeling and actions n=11. Seeking social support coping which describes efforts to seek emotional support n=6. In addition, Accepting responsibility coping refers to acknowledge one's own role in the problem and try to put things right that refers to accept responsibility n=8. Escape/Avoidance coping, it describes wishful thinking and behavioral efforts to escape or avoid the problem n=9. Join the analytic approach to solving the problem and the efforts to create positive meaning focusing on personal growth, which refers to plan full problem solving n=7 and Positive Re-appraisal n=9respectively.

Scoring system:

The responses were on two point Likert scale consisted of giving (1) for the response "yes" and (zero) for "no".

III. Operational Design

The current study was carried out on the following phases, the pilot study and field work.

Validity and reliability of job stressors and burnout inventory educator survey questionnaire:

Validity: The validity of job stressors and burnout questionnaire performed by taking the opinions of five experts: four professors from Nursing Administration Department at the Faculty of Nursing, one Cairo, one Ain

Shams, one Zagazig, and , one Helwan University and a professor of Community Health Nursing Department at the Faculty of Nursing, Zagazig University. They were asked to examine the questionnaires for their content coverage, clarity, length, wording, format, and overall appearance. Based on experts, comment and recommendations some changes had been made at the data collection tools.

Reliability: Test-retest reliability was done using Spearman's rank correlation to compute correlation between the items of applied tools. Test-retest reliability for burnout $r= 0.840$ $p< 0.05$, for job stressors $r= 0.980$ $p< 0.05$, and for coping strategies $r=0.980$ $p< 0.05$.

Pilot study: A pilot study was carried out on 10 nurse educators to ensure the clarity and feasibility of the questions, and determine the time needed to fill-in the questions. They selected randomly, and they were later excluded from the main sample of research work to assure stability of the answers. The necessary modifications were done according to the answers and comments made by nursing educators.

Field work: Field work of this study was executed in four months started in March, 2014 and was completed by the end of September, 2014. The preparatory phase that was done by meeting with faculty members and assistants to clarify the objective of the study and the applied methodology and each individual was given the opportunity to fill-in the questionnaire under guidance and supervision of the researcher which ranged from 15 to 20 minutes.

IV. Administrative Design

An official permission was obtained from the Dean of the Faculty of Nursing after explaining the nature of the work. The researcher fully explained the aim and objectives of the research to the faculty members and assistants to get better cooperation during the implementation phase of the research; also an individual oral consent was obtained from each participant in the study after explaining the purpose of the study.

▪ Ethical considerations:

Prior to the initial interview, verbal explanation of the nature and the aim of the study had been explained to the faculty members and an assistant included in the study sample, clarification of the nature and purpose of the study was done in the interview with each subject. They were given an opportunity to refuse or to participate, and they were assured that the information would be utilized confidentially and used for the research purpose only.

V. Statistical Design

Data entry and statistical analysis were performed using computer software [the statistical package for social studies (SPSS), version 14]. Suitable descriptive statistics were used such as frequencies, and percentages for qualitative variables, means, and standards deviations for quantitative variables. T-test and Chi-square test was used to detect the relation between the variables. Whenever the expected values in one or more of the cells in a 2x2 tables were less than 5, Fisher exact test was used instead and correlation coefficient (r) test was used to estimate the closeness association between variables. For all the tests used, statistical significance was considered at p -value <0.05 .

The results:

The results of the study will be presented as follows:

Table 1: Frequency and percentage distribution of the studied sample's socio demographic variables (n=93)

| | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Age: | | |
| <40 | 69 | 74.2 |
| 40+ | 24 | 25.8 |
| Marital status: | | |
| Single | 28 | 30.1 |
| Married | 64 | 68.8 |
| Divorced | 1 | 1.1 |
| Current marital status: | | |
| Single/divorced | 28 | 30.1 |
| Married | 65 | 69.9 |
| Have children: | | |
| No | 12 | 18.5 |
| Yes | 53 | 81.5 |
| Monthly income (LE): | | |
| <3500 | 37 | 39.8 |
| 3500- | 21 | 22.6 |

| | | |
|------------------------|----|------|
| 4500+ | 35 | 37.6 |
| Salary: | | |
| Insufficient | 54 | 58.1 |
| Sufficient | 39 | 41.9 |
| Nursing qualification: | | |
| Bachelor | 20 | 21.5 |
| Master | 45 | 48.4 |
| Doctorate | 28 | 30.1 |

Table 2: Frequency and percentage distribution of the studied sample's Work characteristics (n=93)

| | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Job position: | | |
| Clinical instructor | 21 | 22.6 |
| Demonstrator | 14 | 15.1 |
| Assistant lecturer | 36 | 38.7 |
| Lecturer | 13 | 14.0 |
| Assistant professor | 7 | 7.5 |
| Emiratus professor | 2 | 2.2 |
| Job position: | | |
| Assistant | 71 | 76.3 |
| Faculty member | 22 | 23.7 |
| Experience years: | | |
| <5 | 9 | 41.9 |
| 5- | 18 | 19.4 |
| 10+ | 36 | 38.7 |
| Responsible for clinical training: | | |
| No | 10 | 10.8 |
| Yes | 83 | 89.2 |
| Daily work hours: | | |
| <=8 | 62 | 66.7 |
| >8 | 31 | 33.3 |
| Weekly work hours: | | |
| <36 | 24 | 25.8 |
| 36- | 32 | 34.4 |
| 40+ | 37 | 39.8 |

Table 3: Frequency and percentage distribution of the studied samples in relation to Job stressors, strain and burnout (n=93)

| | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| High job stressor (60%+) related to: | | |
| Personal | 6 | 6.5 |
| Organization | 36 | 38.7 |
| Work overload | 54 | 58.1 |
| Psychological | 25 | 26.9 |
| Clinical area | 36 | 38.7 |
| Total stressors: | | |
| High | 22 | 23.7 |
| Low | 71 | 76.3 |
| High response (60%+) to stressors: | | |
| Physical | 27 | 29.0 |
| Psychological | 1 | 33.3 |
| Strain: | | |
| High (60%+) | 31 | 33.3 |
| Low | 62 | 66.7 |
| Burnout (high 60%+): | | |
| Achievement | 49 | 52.7 |
| Depersonalization | 25 | 26.9 |
| Exhaustion | 45 | 48.4 |
| Total burnout: | | |
| High (60%+) | 26 | 28.0 |
| Low | 67 | 72.0 |

Tables (1, 2, and 3) shows that, As regard the majority of studied sample was in age < 40 years. As regard "nursing education" the majority was in master degree 45%, As regard "job position" the majority was in assistant lecturer 36%, In relation to the "daily work hours" the majority "62%" of the sample < 8 hours, In relation to high job stressors (60 %+) was related to work overload, As regard high response (60 %+) their response to stressors was physically, As regard high Burnout (60 %+) was related to Achievement

Table 4: Frequency and percentage distribution of the Coping strategies used by study sample (n=93)

| Coping strategies used (60%+): | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Effective/cognitive emotional | 70 | 75.3 |
| Effective behavioral | 47 | 50.5 |
| Ineffective/cognitive emotional | 33 | 35.5 |
| Ineffective behavioral | 31 | 33.3 |
| Confronting | 37 | 39.8 |
| Distancing | 44 | 47.3 |
| Self-controlling | 57 | 61.3 |
| Seeking social support | 63 | 67.7 |
| Accepting responsibility | 64 | 68.8 |
| Escape/avoidance | 28 | 30.1 |
| Painful problem solving | 63 | 67.7 |
| Positive re-appraisal | 62 | 66.7 |

Table (4) reveals that, the most coping strategies used by respondents was effective/ cognitive emotional (75.3%) followed by Accepting responsibility (68.8%), Seeking social support (67.7%) and Painful problem solving (66.7%)

Table 5: Comparison of job stressors, strain, burnout, and coping strategies in the two universities

| | University | | | | X ² test | p-value |
|---------------------------------|--------------|------|---------------------|------|---------------------|---------|
| | Cairo (n=60) | | south valley (n=33) | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Stressors | 13 | 21.7 | 9 | 27.3 | 0.370 | 0.543 |
| Strain: | | | | | | |
| Physical | 14 | 23.3 | 13 | 39.4 | 2.665 | 0.103 |
| Psychological | 15 | 25.0 | 16 | 48.5 | 5.284 | 0.022* |
| Total | 14 | 23.3 | 17 | 51.5 | 7.609 | 0.006* |
| Burnout: | | | | | | |
| Achievement | 28 | 46.7 | 21 | 63.6 | 2.460 | 0.117 |
| Depersonalization | 12 | 20.0 | 13 | 39.4 | 4.074 | 0.044* |
| Exhaustion | 27 | 45.0 | 18 | 54.5 | 0.777 | 0.378 |
| Total | 14 | 23.3 | 12 | 36.4 | 1.795 | 0.180 |
| Coping: | | | | | | |
| Effective/cognitive emotional | 45 | 75.0 | 25 | 75.8 | 0.007 | 0.935 |
| Effective behavioral | 31 | 51.7 | 16 | 48.5 | 0.086 | 0.769 |
| Ineffective/cognitive emotional | 20 | 33.3 | 13 | 39.4 | 0.342 | 0.559 |
| Ineffective behavioral | 20 | 33.3 | 11 | 33.3 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Confronting | 23 | 38.3 | 14 | 42.4 | 0.149 | 0.700 |
| Distancing | 24 | 40.0 | 20 | 60.6 | 3.627 | 0.057 |
| Self-controlling | 35 | 58.3 | 22 | 66.7 | 0.623 | 0.430 |
| Seeking social support | 40 | 66.7 | 23 | 69.7 | 0.089 | 0.765 |
| Accepting responsibility | 37 | 61.7 | 27 | 81.8 | 4.029 | 0.045* |
| Escape/avoidance | 17 | 28.3 | 11 | 33.3 | 0.253 | 0.615 |
| Painful problem solving | 41 | 68.3 | 22 | 66.7 | 0.027 | 0.869 |
| Positive re-appraisal | 37 | 61.7 | 25 | 75.8 | 1.902 | 0.168 |

(*) Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

Table (5) clarifies that; the total scores of job stressors were higher in south Valley University (27.3%) than Cairo University (21.7%), moreover there is a significant statistical difference between two groups in Strain (Physical and Psychological response). Also this table reveals that there is no significant statistical difference between two groups in burnout but there was only significant statistical difference between two groups in depersonalization $p < 0.044$. regarding coping strategies there was a significant statistical difference between two groups in item of accepting responsibility $p < 0.045$

Table 6: Relationship between study sample's job stressors, their strain and burnout

| | Stressors | | | | X ² test | p-value |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|------|-----|------|---------------------|---------|
| | High | | Low | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Physical response stressors: | | | | | | |
| High | 16 | 59.3 | 11 | 40.7 | | |
| Low | 6 | 9.1 | 60 | 90.9 | 26.70 | <0.001* |
| Psychological response stressors: | | | | | | |
| High | 19 | 61.3 | 12 | 38.7 | | |
| Low | 3 | 4.8 | 59 | 95.2 | 36.47 | <0.001* |
| Strain: | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----|------|----|------|-------|---------|
| High | 19 | 61.3 | 12 | 38.7 | | |
| Low | 3 | 4.8 | 59 | 95.2 | 36.47 | <0.001* |
| Achievement: | | | | | | |
| High | 14 | 28.6 | 35 | 71.4 | | |
| Low | 8 | 18.2 | 36 | 81.8 | 1.39 | 0.24 |
| Depersonalization: | | | | | | |
| High | 12 | 48.0 | 13 | 52.0 | | |
| Low | 10 | 14.7 | 58 | 85.3 | 11.22 | 0.001* |
| Exhaustion: | | | | | | |
| High | 17 | 37.8 | 28 | 62.2 | | |
| Low | 5 | 10.4 | 43 | 89.6 | 9.63 | 0.002* |
| Total burnout: | | | | | | |
| High | 15 | 57.7 | 11 | 42.3 | | |
| Low | 7 | 10.4 | 60 | 89.6 | 23.15 | <0.001* |

(*) Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

Table (6) indicates that, there was a significant statistical difference between job stressors and total burnout ($p < 0.001$). Also there was a significant statistical difference between job stressors and Strain ($p < 0.001$)

Table 7: Relationship between study sample's strain and their burnout

| | Strain | | | | X ² test | p-value |
|--------------------|--------|------|-----|------|---------------------|---------|
| | High | | Low | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Achievement: | | | | | | |
| High | 21 | 42.9 | 28 | 57.1 | | |
| Low | 10 | 22.7 | 34 | 77.3 | 4.23 | 0.04* |
| Depersonalization: | | | | | | |
| High | 20 | 80.0 | 5 | 20.0 | | |
| Low | 11 | 16.2 | 57 | 83.8 | 33.51 | <0.001* |
| Exhaustion: | | | | | | |
| High | 26 | 57.8 | 19 | 42.2 | | |
| Low | 5 | 10.4 | 43 | 89.6 | 23.44 | <0.001* |
| Total burnout: | | | | | | |
| High | 23 | 88.5 | 3 | 11.5 | | |
| Low | 8 | 11.9 | 59 | 88.1 | 49.36 | <0.001* |

(*) Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

Table (7) clarifies that, there was a significant statistical difference between strain and total score of burnout ($p < 0.001$)

Table 8: Relationship between study sample's job stressors and their use of coping strategies

| | Stressors | | | | X ² test | p-value |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|-----|------|---------------------|---------|
| | High | | Low | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Effective/cognitive emotional | | | | | | |
| High | 13 | 18.6 | 57 | 81.4 | | |
| Low | 9 | 39.1 | 14 | 60.9 | 4.05 | 0.04* |
| Effective behavioral | | | | | | |
| High | 7 | 14.9 | 40 | 85.1 | | |
| Low | 15 | 32.6 | 31 | 67.4 | 4.04 | 0.04* |
| Ineffective/cognitive emotional | | | | | | |
| High | 12 | 36.4 | 21 | 63.6 | | |
| Low | 10 | 16.7 | 50 | 83.3 | 4.57 | 0.03* |
| Ineffective behavioral | | | | | | |
| High | 9 | 29.0 | 22 | 71.0 | | |
| Low | 13 | 21.0 | 49 | 79.0 | 0.74 | 0.39 |
| Confronting | | | | | | |
| High | 8 | 21.6 | 29 | 78.4 | | |
| Low | 14 | 25.0 | 42 | 75.0 | 0.14 | 0.71 |
| Distancing | | | | | | |
| High | 12 | 27.3 | 32 | 72.7 | | |
| Low | 10 | 20.4 | 39 | 79.6 | 0.60 | 0.44 |
| Self-controlling | | | | | | |
| High | 9 | 15.8 | 48 | 84.2 | | |
| Low | 13 | 36.1 | 23 | 63.9 | 5.05 | 0.02* |
| Seeking social support | | | | | | |
| High | 11 | 17.5 | 52 | 82.5 | | |
| Low | 11 | 36.7 | 19 | 63.3 | 4.15 | 0.04* |
| Accepting responsibility | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----|------|----|------|------|------|
| High | 13 | 20.3 | 51 | 79.7 | | |
| Low | 9 | 31.0 | 20 | 69.0 | 1.27 | 0.26 |
| Escape/avoidance | | | | | | |
| High | 8 | 28.6 | 20 | 71.4 | | |
| Low | 14 | 21.5 | 51 | 78.5 | 0.54 | 0.46 |
| Painful problem solving | | | | | | |
| High | 12 | 19.0 | 51 | 81.0 | | |
| Low | 10 | 33.3 | 20 | 66.7 | 2.30 | 0.13 |
| Positive re-appraisal | | | | | | |
| High | 11 | 17.7 | 51 | 82.3 | | |
| Low | 11 | 35.5 | 20 | 64.5 | 3.60 | 0.06 |

(*) Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

Table (8) reveals that, there was a significant statistical difference between job stressors and coping strategies (effective/cognitive emotional, effective behavioral, ineffective/ cognitive emotional, self-controlling and seeking social support

Table 9: Relationship between study sample's job strain and their use of coping strategies

| | Strain | | | | X ² test | p-value |
|---------------------------------|--------|------|-----|------|---------------------|---------|
| | High | | Low | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Effective/cognitive emotional | | | | | | |
| High | 20 | 28.6 | 50 | 71.4 | | |
| Low | 11 | 47.8 | 12 | 52.2 | 2.89 | 0.09 |
| Effective behavioral | | | | | | |
| High | 14 | 29.8 | 33 | 70.2 | | |
| Low | 17 | 37.0 | 29 | 63.0 | 0.54 | 0.46 |
| Ineffective/cognitive emotional | | | | | | |
| High | 18 | 54.5 | 15 | 45.5 | | |
| Low | 13 | 21.7 | 47 | 78.3 | 10.36 | 0.001* |
| Ineffective behavioral | | | | | | |
| High | 15 | 48.4 | 16 | 51.6 | | |
| Low | 16 | 25.8 | 46 | 74.2 | 4.74 | 0.03* |
| Confronting | | | | | | |
| High | 13 | 35.1 | 24 | 64.9 | | |
| Low | 18 | 32.1 | 38 | 67.9 | 0.09 | 0.76 |
| Distancing | | | | | | |
| High | 15 | 34.1 | 29 | 65.9 | | |
| Low | 16 | 32.7 | 33 | 67.3 | 0.02 | 0.88 |
| Self-controlling | | | | | | |
| High | 17 | 29.8 | 40 | 70.2 | | |
| Low | 14 | 38.9 | 22 | 61.1 | 0.82 | 0.37 |
| Seeking social support | | | | | | |
| High | 18 | 28.6 | 45 | 71.4 | | |
| Low | 13 | 43.3 | 17 | 56.7 | 1.99 | 0.16 |
| Accepting responsibility | | | | | | |
| High | 23 | 35.9 | 41 | 64.1 | | |
| Low | 8 | 27.6 | 21 | 72.4 | 0.63 | 0.43 |
| Escape/avoidance | | | | | | |
| High | 12 | 42.9 | 16 | 57.1 | | |
| Low | 19 | 29.2 | 46 | 70.8 | 1.64 | 0.20 |
| Painful problem solving | | | | | | |
| High | 19 | 30.2 | 44 | 69.8 | | |
| Low | 12 | 40.0 | 18 | 60.0 | 0.89 | 0.35 |
| Positive re-appraisal | | | | | | |
| High | 17 | 27.4 | 45 | 72.6 | | |
| Low | 14 | 45.2 | 17 | 54.8 | 2.93 | 0.09 |

(*) Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

Table (9) shows that, there were a significant statistical difference between job strain and coping strategies (ineffective/cognitive emotional, ineffective behavior)

Table 10: Relationship between study sample's burnout and their use of coping strategies

| | Burnout | | | | X ² test | p-value |
|-------------------------------|---------|------|-----|------|---------------------|---------|
| | High | | Low | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| Effective/cognitive emotional | | | | | | |
| High | 17 | 24.3 | 53 | 75.7 | | |
| Low | 9 | 39.1 | 14 | 60.9 | 1.89 | 0.17 |
| Effective behavioral | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|------|----|------|------|-------|
| High | 11 | 23.4 | 36 | 76.6 | | |
| Low | 15 | 32.6 | 31 | 67.4 | 0.98 | 0.32 |
| Ineffective/cognitive emotional | | | | | | |
| High | 14 | 42.4 | 19 | 57.6 | | |
| Low | 12 | 20.0 | 48 | 80.0 | 5.32 | 0.02* |
| Ineffective behavioral | | | | | | |
| High | 11 | 35.5 | 20 | 64.5 | | |
| Low | 15 | 24.2 | 47 | 75.8 | 1.31 | 0.25 |
| Confronting | | | | | | |
| High | 11 | 29.7 | 26 | 70.3 | | |
| Low | 15 | 26.8 | 41 | 73.2 | 0.10 | 0.76 |
| Distancing | | | | | | |
| High | 12 | 27.3 | 32 | 72.7 | | |
| Low | 14 | 28.6 | 35 | 71.4 | 0.02 | 0.89 |
| Self-controlling | | | | | | |
| High | 11 | 19.3 | 46 | 80.7 | | |
| Low | 15 | 41.7 | 21 | 58.3 | 5.48 | 0.02* |
| Seeking social support | | | | | | |
| High | 14 | 22.2 | 49 | 77.8 | | |
| Low | 12 | 40.0 | 18 | 60.0 | 3.19 | 0.07 |
| Accepting responsibility | | | | | | |
| High | 17 | 26.6 | 47 | 73.4 | | |
| Low | 9 | 31.0 | 20 | 69.0 | 0.20 | 0.66 |
| Escape/avoidance | | | | | | |
| High | 9 | 32.1 | 19 | 67.9 | | |
| Low | 17 | 26.2 | 48 | 73.8 | 0.35 | 0.55 |
| Painful problem solving | | | | | | |
| High | 15 | 23.8 | 48 | 76.2 | | |
| Low | 11 | 36.7 | 19 | 63.3 | 1.67 | 0.20 |
| Positive re-appraisal | | | | | | |
| High | 13 | 21.0 | 49 | 79.0 | | |
| Low | 13 | 41.9 | 18 | 58.1 | 4.51 | 0.03* |

(*) Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

Table (10) it was observed from table 10 that, there was a significant statistical difference between burnout and coping strategies (ineffective/ cognition emotional, self-controlling and positive re- appraisal)

Table 11: Correlation matrix of job stressors, strain, and burnout scores

| | Spearman's rank correlation coefficient | | |
|---------------|---|--------|---------|
| | Job stressors | Strain | Burnout |
| Job stressors | | | |
| Strain | .578** | .936** | |
| Burnout | .423** | .611** | |

(**) Statistically significant at $p < 0.01$

Table (11) show that, there was a statistical correlation between **job stressors**, strain and burnout of the study group

Table 12: Correlation between job stressors, strain, and burnout scores and coping strategies

| Coping strategies | Spearman's rank correlation coefficient | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--------|---------|
| | Job stressors | Strain | Burnout |
| Effective/cognitive emotional | -.021 | .142 | .173 |
| Effective behavioral | -.080 | -.028 | -.023 |
| Ineffective/cognitive emotional | .061 | .303** | .219* |
| Ineffective behavioral | .069 | .181 | .206* |
| Confronting | .007 | .049 | .022 |
| Distancing | .056 | .136 | .158 |
| Self-controlling | -.198 | .065 | -.069 |
| Seeking social support | -.184 | -.093 | -.107 |
| Accepting responsibility | -.133 | .146 | .110 |
| Escape/avoidance | -.024 | .201 | .103 |
| Painful problem solving | -.142 | -.075 | -.154 |
| Positive re-appraisal | -.150 | -.139 | -.149 |

(**) statistically significant at $p < 0.01$

(*) Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

Table (12) reveals that, there was a significant correlation between strain and ineffective/ cognitive emotional coping strategies Also, there was a statistical correlation between burnout and ineffective/cognitive

emotional, ineffective behavior. While, there was no statistical correlation with the other predictors of coping strategies.

Table 13: Correlation between job stressors, strain, and burnout scores and respondents' characteristics

| | Spearman's rank correlation coefficient | | |
|-----------------|---|--------|---------|
| | Job stressors | Strain | Burnout |
| Age | -.069 | .031 | .087 |
| Income | .028 | .154 | .226* |
| Qualification | .071 | .200 | .323** |
| Experience | -.005 | .033 | .086 |
| Work hours/day | .236* | .138 | -.034 |
| Work hours/week | .266** | .199 | .092 |

(**) statistically significant at $p < 0.01$

(*) Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

Table (13) indicates that, there was a significant correlation between job stressors and work hours/day, work hours/week. Also, there was a significant correlation between burnout and income and qualification

VI. Discussion

Stressors affecting nurse educators had a negative impact to the quality of their working life. This could lead to deterioration in the teaching process, nurse educators' turnover and increase of their shortages that are a threat to worsen the nursing education. Such shortages increase the workload for others; increase the likelihood of stress and burnout (**Heppner, Wampold and Kivlighan, 2008**). So, this study was conducted to Assess job stressors, burnout levels and coping strategies among faculty members and assistants at south Valley and Cairo University Results of the present study revealed that the most job stressors that the nurse educators complain about were related to work overload, clinical area and organizational. The first dimension of job stressors for nurse educators was work overload related stressors. This finding was congruent with **Mohammed, Elsayed, and Gaber, (2014)** who reported that, the highest percentage of work related stressors as reported by the nurse educators were heavy work load, in the same line, **Huber, (2012)**.found that a high level of occupational stress is related to workload and responsibility.

In addition to **Taris, Schaufeli and Verhoeven, (2005)** who mentioned that increase in student enrollment, mandatory use of new technologies, additional administrative tasks, time pressures and unrealistic deadlines, which have increased the workload for many academicians, are a source of stress. The second dimension of job stressors was clinical area related stressors this result is supported by the findings of **Hurrell, and McLaney, (2011)**.who mentioned that lack of resources, crowded class rooms, and students with emotional problems are sources for job stressors. In addition, **Abd El-Hady (2008)** stated that clinical area related stressors were the main source of job stressors which related to the contradictions of school objectives and hospital objectives, inadequate supplies and equipments, and inappropriate physical environment in clinical areas. Moreover, **Converse, Wolfe, Huang and Oxford (2008)** reported that the combination of work place environment, lack of resources, and personality create stressful situations among teachers.

The third dimension of job stressors that the nurse educators complain about was organizational related stressors. This result congruent with the **Mohammed, Elsayed, and Gaber , (2014)**who reported that, highest percentage of organizational stressors was related to low salary and no criteria for nurse students' selection. That could be due to low incentives in relation to assigned responsibilities and insufficient salary that did not cover basic needs in addition to increased expenses of life. Furthermore, **Kelly, 2008** mentioned that low salary and low money incentive resulting in low job satisfaction and increase level of nurses stressors. Regarding physical responses, the result of the present study revealed that the nurse educators had physical health problems perceived as a response to job stressors the most frequently reported health problems were related to physical responses, as fatigue followed by backache and headache. In the same context. **Ongori, 2007; Grigoryan, 2008** reported that if nurse educators do not quit stress, it will affect their physical and psychological health

From the Researcher point of this could be attributed to high workload as counsel students, work on committees, as well as engage in clinical practice with students. These findings were in the same line with; **Azeem and Nazeer, (2008)** in London who mentioned that occupational stress has been found to be one of the major work-related health problems for the workers. In accordance, with **Mozayan, Rezaee, Kalantari and, Tabatabaee, (2012)** who reported that Stress-related physical illnesses include migraines, hypertension, and muscle, back and joint pain. On the same context, The American Psychological Association (APA) (2007) stated that 43% of all adults suffer from adverse health effects from stress. Regarding burnout levels, the study findings proved that the nurse educators suffered from high levels of burnout. This could be related to unrelieved stress. In addition, nurse educators are responsible for many tasks in their organization. This result was inconsistent with, **Bourcier ,(2006)** who mentioned that nurse educators reported average levels of burnout

and congruent with, **Abo-bakker,(2012)** who conducted a study at Algeria to identify levels of burnout among teachers in secondary technical schools, and founded that the teachers suffered from high level of burnout.

In this respect, findings of the study revealed that, there was a significant statistical difference between job stressors and total burnout. On the other hand other results showed that there is a significant relationship between job stress and burnout dimensions. The higher rate of job stress in personnel leads to the higher rate of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Moreover, these job stress enhancements cause a personal accomplishment reduction in hospital personnel. **Wu, et al, 2007**, indicated that there is a significant relationship between job stress and emotional exhaustion, as well as depersonalization and personal accomplishment .in agreement with, **(Arefi, Ghahramani and Taheri, 2010)**. Who found that there was a positive correlation between job stress and burnout dimensions in terms of frequency and intensity of emotional exhaustion, intensity and frequency of depersonalization and frequency of decrement of personal accomplishment.

Regarding the relation between burnout and job stressors, the present study reported that there was a statistically significant relation between burnout and nursing educators' job stressors. This might be due to continuity of high job stressors level lead to increase level of burnout among the studied nurse educators, On the same way, **Kokkinos (2012)** studied the association between burnout, personality characteristics, and job stressors in primary school teachers and found that emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were more related to environmental stressors. In contrast, with **Hedayat,et al, (2007)** who found that there was no difference between occupational burnout and job stress in the studied subjects The present study clarifies that, there was a significant statistical difference between strain and total score of burnout. In the same context, **Greenglass and Fiksenbaum, (2009)** show that, the relationship between job strain and burnout was little affected by adjustment for other factors, including indicators of physical and mental health, according to the researchers.

The current study results delineated that, job stressors were higher in south Valley University than Cairo University, from the Researcher point of view this is may be due to that, for faculty members of south Valley University, the distance between faculty and faculty member residents, family problems for married and frequent problems for their children, for management personnel, may be manager need to develop their leadership skills .Moreover, there is a significant statistical difference between two groups in Strain (Physical and Psychological stressors responses) south valley university had higher Physical and Psychological stressors responses than Cairo university these may be due to that members of faculty of nursing south valley university were in need to be trained on stress and burnout management. Regarding coping strategies of job stress management, the study findings proved that effective cognitive/emotional coping strategy was the most used by the nurse educators, followed by Accepting responsibility, Seeking social support and Painful problem solving coping strategy, On the same context, in Iran **Farahbakhsh, (2009)** who conducted a study on top managers of governmental organizations to identify job burnout, sources and coping strategies, stated that effective socializing as a coping strategy seemed to be important not only to decrease stress but also to maintain a good work environment.

Regarding coping strategies of job burnout management, the study findings revealed that there was significant statistical difference between burnout and coping strategies of (ineffective/ cognition emotional, self-controlling and positive re- appraisal) this result in disagreement with, **Abd El-Hady, (2008)** who reported that the nurse educators having highest mean percentage in coping strategies of planful problem solving, while distancing was the lowest mean percentage of coping strategies. And inconsistent with, **Huey, (2007)** who stated that problem solving ability plays a central role as a multifaceted coping strategy that can significantly affect person's ability to increase adaptive performance and reduce, manage, and control stress and its negative effects across a wide range of situations. Concerning the relation between job stressors, strain, and burnout scores and respondents' characteristics the results of the present study indicates that, there was a significant correlation between job stressors and work hours/day, work hours/week. In disagreement with the previous findings, **Torres,Lambert and Lawver,(2009)**; reported that items were not found to be predictive of stress include teaching experience, marital status, personality type, days of exercise a week, number of teaching years, and number of children. Moreover In disagreement with the previous findings, **Lee and Wang (2010)** found that a high level of occupational stress is related to working experience and education. On the other hand, in Oman, **Break ,(2011)** conducted a study entitled "job stressors and its relation with personal and job characteristics among teachers of the private schools in Oman" and asserted that there was a statistically significant relation between job stressors and salary. In agreement with the previous result, in Saudi Arabia, **Abdalla (2012)** examined job stressors among 472 randomly selected teachers and found that there was a statistically significant relation between job stressors and age and salary.

Also, the results of the present study revealed that there was a significant correlation between burnout and income and qualification In contradicted with, **Alo, (2008)** who stated that, there was a statistically significant relation between burnout dimensions and nurse educator's age group and years of experience and

consistence with, (Jones, 2013).who stated that there was a statistically significant relation between burnout level and nurse educator's salaries.

VII. Conclusion

Based on the results of the following study, it was concluded that , high job stressors was related to work overload, response of study group to stressors was physically, high Burnout was related to Achievement, moreover there was a statistical correlation between job stressors, strain and burnout of the study group Also, findings of the present study revealed that, there was a significant correlation between job stressors and work hours/day, work hours/week .furthermore, there was a significant correlation between burnout and income and qualification moreover findings of the present study revealed that, the most coping strategies used by respondents was effective/ cognitive emotional followed by Accepting responsibility, Seeking social support and Painful problem solving .

VIII. Recommendations

Based on the study result the following recommendations were suggested:

1. Further research to Understand causality will allow for specific and appropriate strategies to address challenges of work related stress, burnout, and poor general health among nurses. In addition to, conducting stress management programs to enhance the abilities of nurse's educators to deal with stressors
2. The stress counseling should be provided to faculty members for helping them to deal with work related and personal problems in order to understand and solve stress related problems to control mostly behavioral and emotional outcomes of employees.
3. The faculty members can be given weekly sessions of Yoga and other such relaxing exercises so that they are able to deal with stress in a more constructive manner.
4. Arranging educational tours and visits would help in creating personal bonds between the various individuals belonging to the organization and this will definitely contribute towards better relations at the work place.
5. There is a need of periodical assessment programs to reduce stress among the teachers.
6. Conducting stress-audit at organizational level to understand what causes stress and its impact on themselves. This leads to design the best suitable strategies for managing the stress.

References

- [1]. Abd El-Hady,W. (2008). Job Stressors and Coping Strategies among Nurse Educators at Secondary Technical Schools of Nursing in Alexandria. Unpublished Master Thesis, Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University. Egypt.
- [2]. Abdalla, O. (2012). Examine Job Stressors among Teachers.Published Master Thesis, Saudi Arabia. Retrieved in 5/2012 at9 am from <http://www.acofps.com/vb/showthread.php.html>.
- [3]. Abo-bakker, D. (2012).Levels of Burnout among Teachers of Primary, Intermediate, and Secondary Technical Schools at Algeria. .Published Master Thesis, Algeria. Retrieved in 5/2012 at 9am from <http://www.ouargla-univ.dz/roages/press>.
- [4]. Ahmadi O, Azizkhani R, and Basravi M.(2014).Correlation between workplace and occupational burnout syndrome in nurses.Adv Biomed Research Journal.
- [5]. Anderfuren, A. (2011).Burnout in local Television news producers.The thesis in Texas Christian University, MAI 44/04, pp: 1553.
- [6]. Arefi M, Ghahramani M, Taheri M.(2010).Assessment of prevalence burnout syndrome in academic staff and relationship with demographic characteristics.Research and Consultancy. News and Research Consultancy:9(36),93–110.
- [7]. AZEEM, S. M. ; NAZEER, N. A. (2008), "A study of job burnout among university teachers", Psychology Developing Societies, vol. 20, n°1, p. 51-64.
- [8]. BadriGargari R, Lotfinia H, Mohamadnajad R.(2011). Staff burnout in Tabriz hospital: the role of behavior types and coping strategies.Journal of Urmia Nursing and Midwifery Faculty. ; 9(4):221–9.
- [9]. Bourcier,F. (2006).Burnout in baccalaureate nurse educators.Unpublished Dissertation Research Project. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
- [10]. Break, W, (2011). Job Stressors and its relation with personal and job characteristics among teachers of the private schools in Oman. Published Master Thesis, Oman. Retrieved in 5/2012 at2 am from <http://www.acofps.com/vb/showthread.php.html>.
- [11]. Brown M.K. (2010).Role strain: nurse, researcher, educator, counselor. The Canadian Nurse 1, 31–37. Retrieved in5/2012 at1pm from <http://www.acofps.com/vb/showthread.php.html> Converse, P., Wolfe, E., Huang, X., and Oswald, F. (2008). Response rates for mixed mode surveys using mail and E-mail/web.American Journal of Evaluation, 29(1), 99- 107.
- [12]. Farahbakhsh,S.(2009). A Study of Job Burnout, Sources and Coping Strategies in Top Managers of Governmental Organizations in Province of Lorestan, Iran, Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 3(4): 4032-4039.
- [13]. GRIGORYAN, A. (2008). A new paradigm shift in managing occupational stress in Organizations, n°3, p. 206-235.
- [14]. Hedayet,N.,Mojgan,J.,Shorangiz,B.,Mandana,S.,Nasrin,A.,andFarzad,E.(2007).Stress Management: How to reduce ,prevent and cope with stress. Available from: [http:// www.helpguide.or/mental/stress_managemnt_relief-coping](http://www.helpguide.or/mental/stress_managemnt_relief-coping).
- [15]. Heppner, P., Wampold, B., and Kivlighan, D. (2008). Research design in counseling (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole. In Lent,J,(2010). The impact of work setting, demographic factors, and personality factors on burnout of professional counselors. Akron University.
- [16]. Huber, D. (2012). What are the sources of stress for nurses? In J., McCloskey & H. Grace, (eds.), Current issues in nursing? (4thed. pp.623-631). St. Louis: Mosby.
- [17]. Huey,W. (2007). The Effects of Training in Behaviour Modification Strategies on Stress, Burnout, and Therapeutic Attitudes in Frontline 48. Inpatient Mental Health Nurses. Australian Journal of Rehabilitation Counselling, 12(1), 1–10.

- [18]. Hurrell, T.&McLaney, M. (2011). Exposure to job stress - a new psychometric instrument. *Scandinavian Journal of Environment Health*, 14(supple 1), pp.27-28 Isaksson, K., Tyssen, R., Hoffart ,A., Sexton ,H., and Aasland ,O. (2013) A three-year Cohort study of the relationship between coping, job stress and burnout after a
- [19]. Counseling intervention for help-seeking physicians. *BMC Public Health* 10: 213. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-10-213.
- [20]. Izaquierdo, M., Risquez, M. (2012). The relationship between psychosocial job stress and burnout in emergency departments: An exploratory study. *Nursing Outlook*, 60(3), 322-329.
- [21]. Jones D, Tanigawa T, Weisse S. (2003) .Stress management and workplace disability in the U.S., Europe, and Japan. *Journal of Occupational Health*. 45:1-7. in Moustaka, an and Theodors, c (2010). Sources and effects work-related stress in nursing, Thrace University, *Health Science Journal*.4 (4) 212-214
- [22]. Jones, H. (2013). *I'm too busy to be stressed? How to recognize and relieve the symptoms of stress*. London: Hodder and Stoughton Co.
- [23]. Kalliath, T., and Morris, R.(2002). Job satisfaction among nurses: A predictor of Burnout levels. *J. Nurse. Adm.*, 32, 648–651.
- [24]. Kuipers, A. & Ball, S. (2011). Strategies for reducing stress in nursing. *U.S.A Journal of Nursing*, 6, 88-98.
- [25]. Kelly, C. (2008). Organizational climate and occupational stressors as predictors of withdrawal behaviors and injuries in nurses. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(3), 285-299. Retrieved in 5/2012 at 5pm from [http://www.apa.org/journals/ releases/apl882207.pdf](http://www.apa.org/journals/releases/apl882207.pdf)
- [26]. Kokkinos, C. (2012). Job stressors, personality, and burnout in primary school teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 229-243.
- [27]. Lazarus, R. (1993) from psychological stress to the emotions: a history of changing Outlooks. *Annu Rev Psychol* 44: 1–21. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.44.020193.000245.
- [28]. Lee, I and Wang H. (2010) .Perceived occupational stress and related factors in community nurses. *Journal of Nursing Research*. 10(4):253-260.
- [29]. Maslach, C., and Jackson, S. (1993).*Manual of the maslach burnout inventory*. 2 nd Ed. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press Ind;.
- [30]. Mohammed,M., Elsayed , M, Gaber , A. (2014)Job Stressors and Burnout and Coping Strategies among Faculty Members and Assistants in Faculty of Nursing at Zagazig University. *Zagazig Nursing Journal* 2014 Vol.10 Issue 1, pp. 156 - 171
- [31]. Mozayan, M., Rezaee, M., Kalantari, M., and Tabatabaee, A. (2012) Survey on Burnout and related factors among occupational therapists in Iran. *The Scientific Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*;1(1):44–53.
- [32]. Murphy, L. (2010). Occupational Stress Management: Current Status and Future Direction in Trends in Organizational Behavior (pp. 114), Vol. 2.
- [33]. Neuman, J. (2008). Injustice, stress, and aggression in organizations. Chapter 3, In R. W. Griffen and A. M. O’LearyKelly (Eds.), *The dark side of organizational behavior*. (pp. 62102). San Francisco, CA: JosseyBass.
- [34]. ONGORI, H. (2007), “A review of the literature on employee turnover”, *African Journal of Business Management*, vol.1, n°3, p. 49-54.
- [35]. Rajarajeswari, S. (2010). Role stress among the aided and self-financing college Teachers: A discriminate analysis, *Global Management Review*. 2010, 4 (4):73-86
- [36]. Randy, N. & Caine ,S. &Levon,B. (2013). Critical care nurse early identification and management of critical incident of stress .*Safe Work @Ilo.org*.
- [37]. Rayan, A., Qurneh, A., Elayyan, R., & Baker, O. (2016). Developing a policy for workplace violence against nurses and health care professionals in Jordan: A plan of action. *American Journal of Public Health Research*, 4(2), 47-55.
- [38]. Rafii F, Shamsikhani S, Zarei M, Haghani M, Shamsikhani M. Burnout and its relationship with the nurses’ characteristics. *Iran Journal of Nursing*. 2012; 25(78):23–33.
- [39]. Reissner, V., Baune, B., Kokkevi, A., Shifano, F., and Room R. (2010) Burnout, Coping and job satisfaction in service staff treating opioid addicts-from Athens To Zurich. *Stress Health* 26: 149–159. doi: 10.1002/smi.1276
- [40]. Sadeghi A, Motamed M. Survey the stress resources on academic staff in Guilan university of Medical Science and Islamic Azad University. *Journal of Gilan University of Medical Sciences*. 2010; 19(76):38–47.
- [41]. Salami, S. (2006). Management of stress among trainee-teachers through cognitive Behavior therapy. *Personality Study and Group Behaviour*, 26, 1-25.
- [42]. Stevenson, A.,and Harper, S. (2006). Work Stress and Student Learning Experience, *Journal of Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(2): 167-178
- [43]. Taris, T., Schaufeli, W., and Verhoeven, L. (2005). Internal and external validation of the Dutch Work Addiction Risk Test: Implications for jobs and non-work conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54, Tehrani, N, (2011). Work-related stress. CIPD Stress at work. retrieved in 2011 at 3 am , from <http://www.cipd.co.uk/subjects/health/ stress/stress.htm>.
- [44]. The American Psychological Association (APA), (2007). Stress, satisfaction and burnout among Dutch medical specialists. Retrieved in 5/2012at 10pm, from <http://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/ causdis/stress.htm>.
- [45]. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), (2009). Work Organization Stress. Retrieved in 2012at 3 a.m, from <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/home page.html>.
- [46]. Torres,R.,Lambert,M., and Lawver,R. (2009). Job Stress among Secondary Ag Teachers: An Explanatory Study, in *American Association for Agricultural Education Research Conference Proceedings*, Louisville, KY Page 587
- [47]. Wallace, S., Lee, J., Lee, S. (2010) Job stress, coping strategies, and burnout among Abuse-specific counselors. *J Employ Couns* 47: 111–122. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1920.2010.tb00096.x
- [48]. Wu, S., Zhu, W., Wang, Z., Wang, M., and Lan, Y.(2007).Relationship between Burnout and occupational stress among nurses in China. *J AdvNurs*. 59(3):233–9. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04301.x.
- [49]. Yoder-wise, P. (2011). *Leading and Managing in Nursing*. (5thed.). Ch.20. Texas: Mosby, Inc., P.p.9.