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Summary

At present, the psychophysical health of educators is an issue that has taken on increased importance, especially the phenomenon of chronic work stress, as it directly affects the effectiveness of their work. Hence the importance of detecting what factors can prevent this chronic exhaustion in the educational field. This research aimed at answering this question from an empirical perspective.

To this end, a sample of 300 early education and primary school teachers from both public and private institutions of the Argentina was used. Maslach and Jackson’s Burnout Inventory (MBI) was implemented to determine the level of chronic stress. In order to assess two psychosocial resources of great relevance in the context of work, the Albert Bandura’s Teaching Self-efficacy Scale and the Job Satisfaction Scale for educators were used. Overall, the perceptions of teacher self-efficacy and of job satisfaction are considered psychological resources that would act as modulators of chronic stress in the workplace, noticing moderate and high values in the resources, but low levels of burnout symptoms in the teacher sample evaluated.
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Resumen

En la actualidad, la salud psicofísica de los educadores es un tema que ha cobrado mayor importancia, especialmente el fenómeno del estrés laboral crónico, ya que afecta directamente la efectividad de su trabajo.

De ahí la importancia de detectar qué factores pueden prevenir este agotamiento crónico en el campo educativo. Esta investigación tuvo como objetivo responder a esta pregunta desde una perspectiva empírica. Para ello, se utilizó una muestra de 300 docentes de educación inicial y primaria de instituciones tanto públicas como privadas de la Argentina.

Se implementó el Inventario de Burnout (MBI) de Maslach y Jackson para determinar el nivel de estrés crónico. Para evaluar dos recursos psicosociales de gran relevancia en el contexto del trabajo, se utilizó la Escala de Autoeficacia Docente de Albert Bandura y la Escala de Satisfacción Laboral para educadores.

En suma, las percepciones de la autoeficacia del docente y la satisfacción laboral se consideran recursos psicológicos que actuarían como moduladores del estrés crónico en el lugar de trabajo, identificándose en estos docentes valores moderados y elevados en los recursos, y niveles bajos en los síntomas de burnout.

Palabras clave: percepción de autoeficacia, satisfacción laboral, docencia, síndrome de burnout.

Introduction

Work Stress: A Road to Burnout. The manifestation of many psychosomatic ailments, as a result of the demands of today’s society and mainly in the workplace has favored the emergence of the term “work stress”.

Within the framework of its Occupational Health Program, the World Health Organization defines work stress as the individual’s response to demands and work obligations that do not match his / her competencies, testing his / her ability to cope with these circumstances (Leka, Griffiths & Cox, 2004). Peiró (1999) argues that the experience of work stress arises when there is a mismatch between the workplace and the individual.

This conceptualization emphasizes the subject’s assessment of his/her own resources, meaning it perceives that it lacks sufficient means to face this imbalance. There are two types of work stress, episodic and chronic. The first is related to something sporadic and not permanent, i.e. once the stressful situation is addressed or resolved, symptoms disappear (Slipack, 1996). On the contrary, chronic stress occurs when the person is under stressful situations, which duration, frequency and intensity are high and the stressor is constant (Slipack, 1996).

One response to chronic work stress is feeling emotionally exhausted, with oppositional feelings as regards the work role and coworkers. During 1974, Freudenberguer conceptualized this group of symptoms as burnout syndrome (Gil Monte & Peiró Silla, 1997). Afterwards, Cristina Maslach was the leading pioneer in the study of this phenomenon within the health care context (Zaldúa, Lodieu & Koloditzky, 2000).
The Maslach model is a three-factorial one, based on the different health care professions (doctors, nurses, policemen, teachers, among others) characterized by three main dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and lack of personal accomplishment (Blazer, 2010; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach, 2009; Omdahl & Fritz, 2006). Emotional exhaustion (EE) is related to a decrease in emotional resources and a sense of powerlessness when assuming that there is nothing else to offer to others, accompanied by somatic and psychological symptoms, such as exhaustion, anxiety and irritability (Blazer, 2010; Maslach, 2009).

Depersonalization (DP) refers to negative and insensitive attitudes towards the subjects to whom the benefits are directed to (the students), as well as to colleagues (educators). It is associated with an attitude of detachment from others, ignoring them and considering them guilty of frustrations in fulfilling their responsibilities (Blazer, 2010; Gil Monte & Peiró Silla, 1997; Maslach, 2009). The lack of personal accomplishment (PA) is related to the professional perception (teacher) that his/her work is useless, accompanied by some situations of failure and feelings of low self-esteem, unhappiness and discontent with his/her own person and with his/her job performance.

This performance decreases, based on a negative self-evaluation, trying nevertheless to carry on, complicating its state in the long term (Blazer, 2010; Maslach, 2009). All these symptoms have consequences in different areas simultaneously. They negatively influence the life quality of the subject, increasing family problems, affecting the workers’ social network, as the interactions get tense and communication becomes poor and there is a trend towards isolation (Mansilla Izquierdo, 2011). Besides, it has implications on the work organization. Maslach and Leiter (1997) argue that as people become more stressed, they become less able to deal with their labor problems, for they are likely to physically and psychologically withdraw from work, invest less time and energy in it, do just what is necessary and be more frequently absent. High quality of work requires time and effort, as well as commitment and creativity, but the burned out person is no longer willing to provide it. A decrease in the quantity and quality of work accomplished is the final result.

It is worth noting that the burnout syndrome arises when that initial work stress has not been adequately handled, so it is prolonged over time and its symptoms get worse (Zavala Zavala, 2008).

Teachers’ self-efficacy: a protective resource?

Albert Bandura (1997) mentions that self-efficacy beliefs are “beliefs in one’s abilities to organize and implement the required courses of action that will produce certain achievements or outcomes” (p.3). Self-efficacy is considered a cognitive mediator of the effect the medium has on human behavior. Each person has their own belief system, made up of the joint perception of specific skills for the proper handle of various actions. Therefore, a person’s efficacy beliefs are diverse and vary according to the specific activity he/she carries out (Bandura, 1997, 1999). These beliefs play an essential role in teachers’ thinking. It is known that educators must enjoy different knowledge and skills, but it is also essential that they feel able to teach and achieve good results with their students (De Luis, 2007). Through extensive research, it has been proved that teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs influence professional
goals (Fernandez & Soto, 2012; Muijs & Reynolds, 2001), the dedication to organize and plan activities, the motivation to deliver the lessons (Bzuneck, 2017; Klassen & Tze, 2014), their performance measure by their students’ achievements, their ability to adapt to the unforeseen circumstances (Schwazer & Schwitz, 2004; Tschannen Moran & Hoy, 2002; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) and the predisposition to be at risk of the burnout syndrome (León Rubio, Cantero & León Pérez, 2011).

The teachers’ efficacy belief or perception would be an essential cognitive process to direct and regulate the behavior with a specific purpose, such as the student’s academic success, the resolution of tasks proper to the school environment and the handling and control of their actions in situations of chronic stress (Fernandez, Ramos, Silva, Nina, & Pontes, 2016; Gismero González, et al., 2012; Klassen & Tze, 2014).

**Teachers’ job satisfaction: promotor of mental welfare?**

Job satisfaction could be defined as an emotional state (Locke, 1976) and a positive attitude (Barraza & Ortega, 2009) towards work, a product of the individual subjective self-assessment of his/her work situation and of the values he/she attributes to it. The feeling of job satisfaction is considered a psychosocial resource that allows the educator to face situations of their work environment in everyday interaction. Thus, a high degree of job satisfaction would enable the teacher to evaluate certain situations in his/her work area on a more positive and less threatening basis (Pedro, 2011). Indeed, there are studies that have confirmed the important mediating role of job satisfaction for professional performance, motivation, professional training and, above all, the teachers’ physical and psychological well-being (Ololube, 2006; Sharma & Jyoti, 2006). In Argentina, mainly in the last fifteen years, education workers are one of the most disadvantaged social groups mainly in terms of remuneration and social recognition, with an eventual great sense of devaluation (Grasso, 2003; Kornblit, Mendes Diz & Di Leo, 2005).

These data are relevant as job satisfaction would be, to some extent, determined by the person’s assessment of the different factors that define his/her workplace, and not necessarily by the specific tasks of his/her job (Grasso, 2003).

Therefore, in their works Smith and Bourke (1992) consider the level of the person’s job satisfaction as a moderator of stress. In addition, García Renedo, Llorens, Salanova and Cifre (2004) argue that teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs are fundamental to face the obstacles, namely, these beliefs will determine whether that situations are perceived as threatening or challenging. According to Lazarus and Folkman’s (1986) theory of stress, it is considered that both self-efficacy and job satisfaction would be psychological resources that would act as stress modulators and thus they would decrease the probability of the onset of the burnout syndrome.

**Method**

**Participants:** For this study, in 2015, a non-random sample by availability, made up of 300 teachers of both sexes, mainly women (91%) was selected. They worked both in the early
education and primary (16.75% and 83.25% respectively) levels of public and private schools in the provinces of Entre Ríos and Buenos Aires, Argentina. The teachers’ mean age was 39 years (DS = 8.12) within a range of 21 to 63 years old. Work experience ranged from 1 to 37 years, with a mean of 12 years (DS = 8.56).

Instruments: To explore the burnout syndrome in the school area and the psychological resources, the following questionnaires were administered:

- Maslach and Jackson Burnout Inventory (MBI) (1981): it measures the feelings and attitudes that the professional has towards his work. This research used the educators’ version. It consists of 22 statements, grouped into three dimensions: (a) emotional exhaustion (EE) (b) depersonalization (DP) and (c) low personal accomplishment (PA).

  The frequency of affirmations is estimated in a Likert-type scale of seven options: “never”; “hardly ever”; “rarely”; “sometimes”; “quite”; “many times”; “everyday”. The scale in its Spanish version has an internal consistency and a reliability measured through the Cronbach alpha of .90 in EE; .79 in DP and .71 in PA (Seisdedos, 1997). The instrument has been used in studies carried out in Argentina (Hein, 2005; Marucco, Flamenco & Ragazzoli, 2009; Menghi & Oros, 2014; Popp, 2006) showing satisfactory psychometric properties. In the study sample, it was observed a reliability index measured through Cronbach’s alpha of .87 for the overall scale, of .86 for EE; of .65 for DP and of .82 for PA. While the internal consistency of the DP scale is moderately low, it similarly reflects the values obtained in most studies (Gil Monte & Peiró Silla, 1997).

- Job Satisfaction Scale for Teachers (JSS-Education) by Oros and Main (2004): it evaluates teachers’ job satisfaction and consists of 33 items grouped into two major factors and subdivided into two dimensions. On the one hand, there are the extrinsic factors, which are evaluated from the task and the socio-organizational dimensions; On the other hand, the intrinsic factors are constituted by the motivational and self-actualization dimensions. It uses a Likert-type scale with the following response options: “strong agreement”, “agreement”, “neutral”, “disagreement” and “strong disagreement”.

  When working with samples from Entre Ríos, Buenos Aires and La Pampa (Argentina), Oros and Main (2004) reported a Cronbach alpha reliability of .88, being for the extrinsic factor of .85 and for the intrinsic one of .77. In this research, the reliability measured across Cronbach’s alpha was .86 for the full scale, being for the extrinsic factor of .81 and for the intrinsic one of .75.

- Bandura’s Teacher Self-efficacy Scale, adapted by Menghi, Oros & Abreu Marinho in 2015: this scale measures the teachers’ perception of self-efficacy in six areas: a) efficacy in influencing decision making; b) educational self-efficacy; c) disciplinary self-efficacy; d) efficacy in achieving parental involvement; e) efficacy in achieving community participation; and f) efficacy in creating a positive school climate. The scale consists of 26 items and the response options are presented in a Likert scale: “nothing”; “very little”; “something”, “enough” and “a lot”. The reliability of the total scale through Cronbach’s alpha was .90, and in its dimensions was satisfactory ranging from .78 to .84.

Data collection and analysis procedure
A non-probabilistic sampling was used, for
convenience. Subjects were from public and private educational institutions in the provinces of Entre Ríos and Buenos Aires (Argentina). They were asked to collaborate voluntarily and were informed of the aims of the study and the mode of participation. Once the permission of the authorities and the signed consent of the teachers who wanted to participate were obtained, the questionnaires were given to be self-administered.

The statistical processing and analysis of the data was carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 22 (SPSS, version 22). Basic descriptive analyses, correlations and multiple regression analyses were carried out in successive steps in order to observe whether the perceived self-efficacy and the job satisfaction dimensions predict general burnout and specific burnout symptoms in the teachers assessed.

**Results**

1) Descriptive analyzes of the study variables were carried out in the sample of teachers assessed. Firstly, considering a scale of 1 to 5 points, in which value 1 corresponds to a very low satisfaction, and value 5 to a very high satisfaction, it was observed that teachers’ job satisfaction tended toward moderately high values (M = 3.65, DS = .41), being the intrinsic dimension slightly higher (M = 3.79, DS = .45) than the extrinsic satisfaction (M = 3.50, DS = .48). Regarding the general self-efficacy perceived by teachers, values were between moderate and moderately high (M = 3.45, DS = .49) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5 points. With respect to their dimensions, the perception of disciplinary efficacy and efficacy to create a positive school climate (M = 4, DS = .66, M = 3.71, DS = .60, respectively) stood out, followed by the belief in educational efficacy and efficacy in achieving parental involvement (M = 3.67, DS = .53, M = 3.59, DS = .77, respectively). At a lower level, it was noticed a belief in the efficacy in decision making (M = 3.22, DS = .80), being the lowest perceived efficacy that related to the achievement of community participation in school tasks (M = 2.28, DS = .88).

Finally, the dimensions of the burnout syndrome were evaluated with a scale of 0 to 6 points, finding that the teachers of this study show moderate values of personal accomplishment (M = 4.18, DS = .78), low values of emotional exhaustion (M = 1.79, DS = .99) and predominantly low values of depersonalization (M = .62, DS = .78). The overall value of job burnout was low (M = 1.54, DS = .67).

2) Correlation analyses were performed in order to observe the existence of a relationship between the variables. In the variable Teacher’s job satisfaction; it was found highly significant negative relationships between the dimensions job satisfaction and total job satisfaction with the dimensions burnout, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and total burnout. Besides, it was found positive and highly significant relationships between the dimensions job satisfaction and total job satisfaction with the burnout dimension of personal accomplishment (see Table 1).
Table 1

*Correlation among job satisfaction, total job satisfaction dimensions, MBI and total MBI dimensions*

|       | EJS  | IJS  | GJS  | EE   | DP   | PA   | GMBI |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| EJS   |      | 0.559**|      | -0.359**| -0.170**| 0.208**| -0.350**|
| IJS   | 0.833**|      | -0.472**| -0.301**| 0.400**| 0.533**|      |
| GJS   | -0.457**|      | 0.252**| 0.323**| -0.479**|      |      |
| EE    | 0.396**| -0.388**|      | 0.868**|      |      |      |
| DP    | -0.326**|      |      |      |      | 0.635**|      |
| PA    |      |      |      |      |      |      | -0.741**|
| GMBI  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

Note: EJS = extrinsic job satisfaction; IJS = intrinsic job satisfaction; GJS = general job satisfaction; EE = emotional exhaustion; DP = depersonalization; PA = personal accomplishment; GMBI = General Maslach Burnout Inventory.

**p < 0.01

As regards self-efficacy, significant negative relationships were found between the dimensions of decision-making efficacy, disciplinary self-efficacy, efficacy for parental involvement and emotional exhaustion; besides, highly significant relationships with educational effectiveness, efficacy to achieve a positive climate, general self-efficacy and emotional exhaustion (see Table 2).

In addition, significant negative relationships between the dimensions of educational effectiveness and the dimension of depersonalization were found. Highly significant relationships were also found between disciplinary self-efficacy, efficacy for parental involvement, efficacy to create a positive school climate, general self-efficacy, and the dimension of depersonalization (See table 2).
Table 2
Correlations among self-efficacy, total self-efficacy dimensions, MBI and total MBI dimensions

|       | DM   | EE   | DS   | PI   | CP   | PC   | GS   | EE   | DP   | PA   | GMBI |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| DM    | 0.237* | 0.102 | 0.301* | 0.468* | 0.334* | 0.617** | -0.236* | -0.077 | 0.284** | -0.283** |
| EE    | 0.568* | 0.499* | 0.308* | 0.610* | 0.766** | -0.303** | -0.217* | 0.522** | -0.459** |
| DS    | 0.343* | 0.166* | 0.500* | 0.570** | -0.115* | -0.210** | 0.437** | -0.308** |
| PI    | 0.435* | 0.565* | 0.735** | -0.175** | -0.176** | 0.445** | -0.339** |
| CP    | 0.359* | 0.689** | -0.103 | 0.031 | 0.238** | -0.173** |
| PC    | 0.806** | -0.305** | -0.273** | 0.591** | -0.504** |
| GS    | -0.309** | -0.225** | 0.588** | -0.493** |
| EE    | 0.396** | -0.388** | 0.868** |
| DP    | -0.326** | 0.635** |
| PA    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | -0.741** |
| GMBI  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

Note: DM = decision making; EE = educational effectiveness; DS = disciplinary self-efficacy; PI = parental involvement; CP = community participation; PC = positive climate; GS = general self-efficacy; EE = emotional exhaustion; DP = depersonalization; PA = lack of personal accomplishment; GMBI = General Maslach Burnout Inventory.

** p< 0.01
*p< 0.05

3) Multiple regression analysis was performed to observe the predictive effect of job satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy on burnout. The first regression analysis calculated the predictor effect of the dimensions of teachers’ self-efficacy on the total burnout score. It was found that both the efficacy to create a positive school climate and the educational effectiveness significantly predicts the burnout syndrome; both dimensions accounted for 29% of the variance.

Note that the efficacy to create a positive school climate was the main predictor and explained 25% of the variance of burnout, and the efficacy to face learning difficulties implies an additional 4% (see Table 3). The results indicate a negative relationship between both variables and burnout (β = -.50 and β = -.24, respectively).
Tabla 3

*Multiple regression by successive steps between self-efficacy and burnout*

| Predictors                | Model 1 B | Model 2 B | IC 95%               |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|
| Positive climate          | -12.45**  | -8.81**   | [-14.88, -10.01]     |
| Educational effectiveness | -6.68**   |           | [-10.05, -3.32]      |
| R2                        | .25       | .29       |                      |
| F                         | 101.47**  | 60.81**   |                      |
| Change increase in R2     |           | .04       |                      |
| Change increase in F      |           | .00       |                      |

**P < 0.1

Subsequently, it was analyzed the predictive weight of the dimensions of self-efficacy on each burnout symptom. It was found that educational effectiveness and efficacy in creating a positive school climate predict emotional exhaustion, accounting for 11% of the variance.

Of these two dimensions, efficacy in creating a positive school climate was the main predictor and explained 9% of the variance of emotional exhaustion, and the educational effectiveness an additional 2% (see Table 4). The results indicate a negative relationship between the variables ($\beta = -.19, -.18$ respectively).

Tabla 4

*Multiple regression by successive steps between self-efficacy and emotional exhaustion*

| Predictors                | Model 1 B | Model 2 B | IC 95%               |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|
| Positive climate          | -.75**    | -.47**    | [-.81, -.14]         |
| Educational effectiveness | -.44**    |           | [-.77, -.12]         |
| R2                        | .09       | .11       |                      |
| F                         | 30.59**   | 19.29**   |                      |
| Change increase in R2     |           | .02       |                      |
| Change increase in F      |           | 7.34      |                      |

**P < 0.1

It was also found that the efficacy in creating a positive school climate predicts the feeling of depersonalization, accounting for 8% of the variance (see Table 5). Once more, the results indicate a negative relationship between the variables ($\beta = -.27$).
Finally, it was observed that self-efficacy to create a positive school climate and educational effectiveness predicts personal accomplishment, accounting for 39% of the variance. The self-efficacy to create a positive climate was the main predictor and accounted for 35% of the variance of self-accomplishment, and educational effectiveness implied an additional 4% (see Table 6). The results indicate a positive relationship between the variables ($\beta = .43; .26$ respectively).

Table 5
*Multiple regression by successive steps between sel-efficacy and depersonalization*

| Sole Predictor Model  | $B$     | $B$ error | IC 95%     |
|-----------------------|---------|-----------|------------|
| Positive climate      | -.29**  | .06       | [-.41, -.17]|
| R2                    | .08     |           |            |
| F                     | 24.02** |           |            |

**$P< 0.1$**

Furthermore, it was analysed the predictive effect of the job satisfaction dimensions on the burnout syndrome. It was found that only intrinsic job satisfaction predicts burnout, accounting for 28% of the variance (see Table 7). The results indicate a negative relationship between the variables ($\beta = -.53$).

Table 6
*Multiple Regression by successive steps between self-efficacy and personal accomplishment*

| Predictors               | Model 1 B | Model 2 B | IC 95%     |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Positive climate         | 1.03**    | .75**     | [.56, 1.19]|
| Educational effectiveness | .43**     | .39       | [.31, 1.04]|
| R2                       | .35       | .39       |            |
| F                        | 159.72**  | 95.12**   |            |
| Change increase in R2    | .04       |           |            |
| Change increase in F     | 20.22     |           |            |

**$P< 0.1$**
Table 7
*Multiple Regression by successive steps between self-efficacy and burnout*

| Sole Predictor Model | B     | B error | IC 95%      |
|----------------------|-------|---------|-------------|
| Intrinsic satisfaction| -.127** | .12    | [-1.50, -1.04] |
| R2                   | .28   |         |             |
| F                    | 118.15** |       |             |

**P< 0.1

Regarding the different symptoms of burnout, it was observed that intrinsic job satisfaction negatively predicts both emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.30$), accounting for 22% of the variance and the feeling of depersonalization ($\beta = -47$), accounting for 9% of the variance, while it positively predicts personal accomplishment ($\beta = .40$), accounting for 16% of the variance (see Table 8).

These results show that as teachers’ intrinsic job satisfaction increases, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization decrease, whereas their sense of personal accomplishment increases.

Table 8
*Multiple Regression by successive steps between job satisfaction and the three dimensions of burnout*

| Sole Predictor Model | B      | B Error | IC 95%     |
|----------------------|--------|---------|------------|
| Emotional exhaustion  |        |         |            |
| Intrinsic satisfaction| -.676** | .07    | [-.82, -.53] |
| R2                   | .22    |         |            |
| F                    | 85.22** |       |            |
| Depersonalization    |        |         |            |
| Intrinsic Satisfaction| -.19** | 1.84   | [-.25, -.12] |
| R2                   | .09    |         |            |
| F                    | 29.77** |       |            |
| Personal accomplishment|        |         |            |
| Intrinsic satisfaction| .40**  | .05    | [.30, .51]  |
| R2                   | .16    |         |            |
| F                    | 56.69** |       |            |

**P< 0.1
Discussion and Conclusion

As regards perceived self-efficacy, it was found that educational effectiveness and the efficacy in creating a positive school climate negatively predict emotional exhaustion, which means that higher levels of teacher self-efficacy (educational effectiveness and efficacy in creating a positive climate) correspond to lower levels of emotional exhaustion.

The same trend was found for the efficacy in creating a positive climate and the feeling of depersonalization. Finally, there was a positive prediction of self-efficacy to create a positive school climate and educational effectiveness, about self-accomplishment, noting that increasing levels of teacher self-efficacy (positive school climate and educational effectiveness) increases the educators’ sense of personal accomplishment. Grau, Salanova and Peiró (2000) carried out a study with employees using new technologies, trying to test the hypothesis on the modulating role of the efficacy perception with respect to stress levels.

They found that stressors had a lower impact on subjects who had a higher perception of their job and general effectiveness. Bermejo Toro (2007) conducted a study in Madrid with secondary school teachers and observed that educators with low scores on self-efficacy had higher levels of burnout and had low personal accomplishment.

Findings in this line support this view (Extremera, Durán & Rey, 2010; Fernández, 2008; Friedman, 2003; Schwarzer & Schmitz, 2004). The high perception of self-efficacy is associated with the quality of lesson planning, the effort to overcome daily content, the continuous training, the students’ academic success and the handle and control of behavior in situations of chronic stress (Gismero González, et al., 2012; Klassen & Tze, 2014; Rodríguez, Núñez, Valle, Blas & Rosario, 2009).

It has been proved that educators with high levels of self-efficacy present low levels of burnout and high levels of enthusiasm in their work, which eventually improve their work with students (Fernández, 2008b). Apparently, in this study group, the perception of a high educational effectiveness with the students and the efficacy belief in creating a positive school climate would act as cognitive protectors against psychological job exhaustion (Bangs & Frost, 2012), and it would damp the process of daily stress experienced by teachers.

Thus, feeling effective as guides and trainers of students in full development, and being able to do so in a pleasant work environment would have a positive impact on the way they manage or control the stressors with which they coexist in teaching, and thus attenuating the probability that these stressors become chronic.

Regarding job satisfaction, it was found that the intrinsic dimension prevents emotional exhaustion and the feeling of depersonalization, acting as a promoter of teacher’s personal accomplishment. Hermosa Rodríguez (2006) studied the relationship between the level of satisfaction and burnout dimensions of primary and secondary teachers in Ibagué, Colombia.

The author found, consistently with this study, that there is a significant relationship with the three dimensions of the syndrome, being that relationship negative with exhaustion and depersonalization and positive in the case of personal accomplishment. Even the relationship seems to be more intense with the dimension
of emotional exhaustion. In this line, Jiménez Figueroa, Jara Gutiérrez and Miranda Celis (2012) analysed the relationship between the burnout symptoms and job satisfaction in Chilean teachers.

The authors found highly significant correlations between the dimensions of burnout (exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment) and general job satisfaction.

As in the present study, the relationships with job satisfaction and its dimensions were inverse for both exhaustion and depersonalization, and positive for personal accomplishment.

The findings of this research are consistent with the results found by Hermosa in Colombia (2006) and by Jiménez Figueroa, Jara Gutiérrez and Miranda Celis (2012) in Chile, who do not determine the predictive level of satisfaction on the symptoms of burnout, but they corroborate the relationship between the variables.

As found, teachers with greater intrinsic satisfaction show lower levels of burnout, which may be due to the fact that the intrinsic determinants of satisfaction such as work motivation, the challenge of schoolwork, the sense of vocation play a mediating role in light of the development of chronic labor stress (Ololube, 2006; Pearson & Mooman, 2005; Sharma & Jyoti, 2006).

In other words, being satisfied with their work, and especially intrinsically, would imply assuming more positive attitudes towards their work, which would help to elaborate and process daily difficulties in a healthier and more functional way; otherwise, those who are unsatisfied with their work will interpret any demand of the institution in a stressful way (Aldrete Rodríguez, Aranda Beltrán, Valencia Abundiz, Salazar Estrada, 2011; Ramery-Gelpi & Pérez Navío, 2016). Therefore, a high level of intrinsic satisfaction with their teaching would act as a protective factor in the development of the burnout syndrome.

Hence, the sense of job satisfaction and the perception of efficacy in teaching could be considered as promoters of psychophysical health in the teaching population.

In terms of the limitations of the present work, it should be emphasized that the sample could not be selected at random, for schools do not always allow access to their teaching staff since the individual evaluation of all subjects outside the school context demands time and resources.

Therefore, it is important to emphasize that the type of sampling used does not allow a representative generalization of the data to the population, but rather an approximation to the functioning of the processes evaluated in early education and primary level teachers of the areas and schools represented in the present work.

In addition, given its availability, it could be possible that the sample included in this study may have been biased as it was composed of the group of teachers that voluntarily agreed to take part and whose superiors were ready to collaborate with the study and know the results of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress of their teachers.

Finally, the practical implications of this study are of particular relevance for organizations and public administrations (for instance Teacher Training Courses) which are responsible for implementing appropriate measures such as psychoeducational proposals to promote the psychophysical
health of educator by means of the training and continuous evaluation of the educator in current activity, and the implementation of psychoeducational workshops where their psychological, social and emotional resources could be strengthened and stimulated to carry out self-care activities so as to identify situations of risk with respect to work stress and try to prevent them; In the case where burnout indicators are detected they can be derived so that they receive timely psychological attention.

Likewise, the results of this study could lay the foundations for the implementation of programs of interventions designed to encourage the promotion of positive resources such as self-efficacy and job satisfaction towards the use of healthy coping strategies.

References

Aldrete Rodríguez, M., Aranda Beltrán, C., Valencia Abundiz, S., & Salazar Estrada, J. (2011). Satisfacción laboral y síndrome burnout en docentes de secundaria. Revista de Educación y Desarrollo, 17, 15-22.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York, NY: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (1999). Auto-eficacia: Cómo afrontamos los cambios de la sociedad actual (Jasone Aldekoa, trad). Editorial Desclée de Brouwer, S.A.

Bangs, J., & Frost, D. (2012). Teacher self-efficacy, voice and leadership: towards a policy framework for education international. University of Cambrigde Education International Research Institute. Recuperado de http://download.eiie.org/Docs/WebDepot/teacher_self-efficacy_voice_leadership.pdf

Barraza, A., & Ortega, F. (2009). Satisfacción laboral en instituciones formadoras de docentes. Un primer acercamiento. Revista Electrónica Diálogos Educativos, 9(17), 4-17.

Blazer, C. (2010). Teacher Burnout. Information Capsule. Research Services, Miami-Dade County Public Schools. Recuperado de http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED536515

Bzuneck, J. (2017). Crenças de autoeficácia de professores: um fator motivacional crítico na educação inclusiva. Revista Educação Especial, 30 (59), 697-707. Recuperado de <http://oai.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=313153445012> ISSN 1808-270X

De Luis, E. (2007). Autoeficacia del profesorado universitario. Eficacia percibida y Práctica docente. (Spanish). Estudios sobre Educación, (13), 207-209.

Extremera, N., Durán, A., & Rey, L. (2010). Recursos personales, síndrome de estar quemado por el trabajo y sintomatología asociada al estrés en docentes de enseñanza primaria y secundaria. Ansiedad y Estrés, 16 (1), 47-60.

Fernández, M. (2008). Burnout, autoeficacia y estrés en maestros peruanos: Tres estudios fácticos. Ciencia & Trabajo, 10(30), 120-125.

Fernández, M., & Soto, C. (2012). Resultados psicométricos preliminares de la escala de autoeficacia percibida en maestros de Lima. Psicogente, 15 (28), 314-322.
Grasso, L. (2003). Insatisfacción laboral entre docentes de EGB. Diálogos pedagógicos, 1(2), 44-47.

Grau, R., Salanova, M., & Peiró, J. M. (2000). Efectos moduladores de la autoeficacia en el estrés laboral. Apuntes de Psicología, 18(1), 57-75.

Hein, N. (2005). Estudio del síndrome de burnout en pastores adventistas y su relación con la satisfacción laboral y las características de personalidad (Tesis de licenciatura en psicología, inédita). Universidad Adventista del Plata. Libertador San Martín, Entre Ríos.

Hermosa Rodríguez, A. (2006). Satisfacción laboral y síndrome de Burnout en profesores de educación primaria y secundaria. Revista Colombiana de Psicología, 15, 81-89.

Jiménez Figueroa, A., Jara Gutiérrez, M.J., & Miranda Celis, E. (2012). Burnout, apoyo social y satisfacción laboral en docentes. Revista Semestral da Associação Brasileira de Psicologia Escolar e Educacional, 16(1), 125-134. Recuperado de http://www.scielo.br/pdf/pee/v16n1/13.pdf

Klassen, R., & Tze, V.M.C. (2014). Teachers’ self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 12, 59-76.

Kornblit, A.L., Mendes Diz, A. M., & Di Leo, P. (2005). El estrés laboral en docentes.
Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1986). *Estrés y procesos cognitivos*. Barcelona: Martínez Roca.

Leka, S., Griffiths A., & Cox, T. (2004). *La organización del trabajo y el estrés: estrategias sistemáticas de solución de problemas para empleadores, personal directivo y representantes sindicales*. Serie protección de la salud de los trabajadores. Organización Mundial de la Salud. ISBN 9243590472-ISSN 1729-3510

León Rubio, J.M., Cantero, F.J., & León Pérez, J.M. (2011). Diferencias del rol desempeñado por la autoeficacia en el burnout percibido por el personal universitario en función de las condiciones de trabajo. *Anales de Psicología*, 27(2), 518-526. Recuperado de http://revistas.um.es/analesps

Locke, E. (1976). *The nature and causes of job satisfaction*. En D.M.R., *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.

Mansilla Izquierdo, F. (2011). Adicción al trabajo en la administración pública. Psicología.com, 15. Recuperado de: http://www.psiquiatría.com.

Marucco, M.A., Flamenco, E., & Ragazzoli, P.N. (2009). Estudio para evaluar el Síndrome de Quemarse por el Trabajo y la Calidad de Vida Laboral en docentes de Educación Primaria Básica. Superintendencia de Riesgos del Trabajo. Recuperado de http://www.infoleg.gov.ar/basehome/actos_gobierno/actosdegobierno19-10-2009-4.htm

Maslach, C. (2009). Comprendiendo el Burnout. *Ciencia & Trabajo*, 11(32), 31-43. Recuperado de www.cienciaytrabajo.org.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). *The measurement of experienced burnout*. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 99-113.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Menghi, M.S., & Oros, L. B. (2014). Satisfacción laboral y Síndrome de Burnout en docentes de nivel primario. *Revista de Psicología*, 10(20).

Menghi, M.S., Oros, L. B., & Abreu Marinho, R. (2015). Estudio psicométrico de la Escala de Autoeficacia Docente de Albert Bandura, en una muestra argentina. *Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina*, 61(1), 22-32.

Omdahl, B.L., & Fritz, J.M.H. (2006). *Coping with Problematic Relationships in the Workplace: Strategies that Reduce Burnout*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Dresden Germany. Recuperado de http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p93215_index.html.
Olorubé, N. P. (2006). Teachers job satisfaction and motivation for school effectiveness: An assessment. Recuperado de http://www.usea.edu/essays/v0182006/olorubé.pdf.

Oros, L. B., & Main, M. V. (2004). ESLA-educación: una escala para evaluar la satisfacción laboral de los docentes. Revista Internacional en Estudios en Educación, 20-34.

Pedro, N. (2011). Auto-eficácia e satisfação profissional dos professores: colocado oss construto sem relação um grupo de professores do ensino básico e secundário. Revista de Educação, 18(1), 23-47.

Peiró, J. M. (1999). Desencadenantes del estrés laboral. Madrid: Pirámide.

Popp, M. S. (2008). Estudio preliminar sobre el síndrome de burnout y estrategias de afrontamiento en enfermeras de unidades de terapia intensiva (UTI). Interdisciplinaria, 25(1), 5-27. Recuperado de http://www.scielo.org.ar/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1668-70272008000100001&lng=es&tlng=es.

Ramery-Gelpi, E., & Pérez Navío, E. (2016). Comparación de la satisfacción laboral del Director Escolar y los Docentes. Revista Electrónica de Investigación y Docencia (REID), 85-100. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.17561/reid.v0i15.2797

Rodríguez, S., Núñez, J., Valle, A., Blas, R., & Rosario, P. (2009). Auto-eficacia docente, motivación del profesor y estrategias de enseñanza. Escritos de Psicología, 3(1), 1-7.

Schwarzer, R., & Schmitz, G. S. (2004). Perceived self-efficacy as a resource factor in teachers. En M. Salanova, R. Grau, I. M. Martínez, E. Cifre, S. Llorens, & M. García Renedo (Eds.), Nuevos horizontes en la investigación sobre la autoeficacia (pp. 229-236). Castelló de la Plana: Publicaciones de la Universitat Jaume I.

Sharma, R. D., & Jyoti, J. (2006). Job satisfaction among school teachers. IIMB Management Review, 349-363.

Slipack, O.E. (1996). Estrés Laboral. Alcmeon: Revista Argentina de Clínica Neuropsiquiátrica, 5(3), Buenos Aires. Recuperado de www.alcmeon.com.ar

Smith, M., & Bourke, S. (1992). Teacher stress examining a model based on context, workload, and satisfaction. Teaching & Teacher Education, 8, 31-46.

Smylie, M. A. (1998). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. American Educational Research Journal, 25(1), 1-30.
Tschannen Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2002). The influence of resources and support on teacher’s efficacy beliefs. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans.

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 81-91.

Zaldúa, G., Lodieu, M. T., & Koloditzky, D. (2000). La salud de los trabajadores de la salud. Estudio del síndrome de burnout en hospitales públicos de la ciudad autónoma de Buenos Aires. *Revista del Hospital Materno Infantil Ramón Sardá*, 19(4), 167-172. Recuperado de http://www.redalyc.org

Zavala Zavala, J. (2008). Estrés y burnout docente: conceptos, causas y efectos. *Educación 17*(32), 67-86.