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Mahmoud Manafi
Department of management and accounting
Marvdasht Branch
Islamic Azad university
Marvdasht, IRAN

Reza Gheshmi
Department of management and accounting
Marvdasht Branch
Islamic Azad university
Marvdasht, IRAN

Roozbeh Hojabri
DBA Student, MMU
Faculty of Management

Abstract
This research associates to the basic literature on the six factors on job satisfaction and tendency to quit job in several methods. First of all, chance that these job factors became a basic role to determine job satisfaction and tendency to leave from sales person in Iran in pharmaceutical department will be developed. Secondly, utilizing a model of sales person from industry in the field of pharmacy will increase and develop the literature.
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1. Introduction
Nowadays, we spend our time on work, wasting our time to come inside and outside work a lot. Besides, we involved on the stress of the work, technology, individual relationship and finance. Therefore, here, stress in considered as a pressure or worry which is stemming from the problems we met in our routine life (Oxford Advanced Learner’s dictionary). Indeed, work is one of the basic factor cover all the stress in our life all over the world. What is important here is to figure out how stress is determined as burnout. It is considered to some events referred to the problems in our modern work (Angerer, 2003). Following Maslach et al., 2001 mentioned as the job worried and stress which is referred to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover. Person – organization fit is referred to the burnout job experience variable that could be able to impact. (Siegall and McDonald, 2004) it is significantly related to the organizational commitment, tenure, intention to give up, job satisfaction and performance, and finally turnover.

In 21st century, environment of work changed their objectives related to those employees worked in corporations. A majority of the firms shift their job outside of their own country for the employees intend to work more without increasing the money and salary. Besides, technology plays as an important role in burnout jobs. Therefore, stress contributed to the performance of the employees. On the other hand, the question is person – organization fit make workers to have tendency to leave the job and also decrease their job satisfaction and also assist the companies to decrease turnover and develop motivation? Basic studies searched about many variables to figure about how it can impact on the outcome of works (Sin and Yau, 1995). Recently work on burnout tried to begin to extend new model which is associated with the situational and individual elements (Maslach et al., 2001). Complexity of business model in nature, individual and situational elements are associate with each other are very important. Therefore, Maslach et al., 2001 have postulated a job – person fit model for realizing what burnout is. The framework emphasized on compatibility among six factors of employee and job environment.

2. Literature Review
2.1. A history of burnout research
Freudenberger (1974) stated that burnout is the particular psychological situation that people got hurt due to the emotional problems, lack of accomplishment behaviour of individuals and tendency to depersonalize other peoples (Fogarthy et al, 2000). Cordes and Dougherty, (1993) divided burnout into three different types. The first one is job and role characteristics which focus on the basic issues of the relation happening among providers and clients. second one is organizational characteristics that include unclear outcome of organizational and third one is the personal characteristics focus on some factors like discrepancy among those achievement that each person expect and real situation in workplace (Chavlin and Marie, 2002).

2.2. Burnouts construct
All of the literatures mentioned burnout as three factors: Emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and diminished personal accomplishment. But recently another model of burnout suggests eight components of burnout including, depersonalization, exhaustion, inefficiency, split into low and high scores (Angerer, 2003). Following Leiter and Maslach (1998), postulated that, first factor (Exhaustion) contributed to the cynicism which is referred to inefficacy and a big cause of stressed in job and feeling of something which is inadequate.

2.3. Job satisfaction
Job satisfaction are generally contributed to different types such as, characteristic of environment (working conditions, tasks, benefits, pay, job security), characteristic of the person (interests, attitudes, valued skills, needs, values and others), and those behaviours which is the outcome of the relation of both person and environment with each other (tension, concord, competitive, co-operative, loose and rigid...). According to Fitsche, 1996, mentioned those job satisfaction which is evaluated income, work or promotional opportunity. Besides, job satisfaction contributed to the education, age, tenure and gender (Fritsche, 1996). Job descriptive index (JDI) is a tool which is standard, applied in many researches to measure job satisfaction developed by Smith, Hulin and Kendall (1969). Five components of job satisfaction (work itself, promotion, pay, supervision and co-workers) have figured out as the important evaluation. Following (Steers, 1988), job satisfaction engaged of how much each person eager to expect from what they received from their job. While expectation didn’t reveal so they meet a lower degree of satisfaction. Therefore, (Brauss, 1992) stated a job satisfaction as the potentiality of a job to satisfy their employees.

2.4. Situational factors
2.4.1. Job and its role characteristics
Researches of qualitative job demands emphasize on the role ambiguity and conflict, both of them have a high relationship with burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). (Low et al., 2001) Role conflict is a difference from the employees among job expectations exchanged by multiple sources. Furthermore, to study bout the demands of the job, scholars studies about the absence of job resources. Some of the resources lead to the job control. Job control considered as the skills to select someone’s action from many options (Gnaster and Fusilier, 1989). Autonomy of considered as the basic features of the job controls much so, they can figure out the order and job tasks, particular methods and paths for completing those tasks, coordinating with other workers, scheduling and other factors of work (Specto, 1986).

2.4.2. Organizational characteristics
According to Sin and Yau(1995) organizational factors are including, closeness of supervision, consideration, participation and training. Closeness of supervision refereed to the level that leaders covered enough supervision to the salespersons. Consideration is the level contributed to the leaders expands a work climate of psychological support like trust, helpfulness, friendliness and respect. The third one is referred to the ability of the salesperson to impact on the decisions about individual’s job. And finally training is helping the salesperson during selling period which is covered by the company. Also other researchers like Ken and Slocum (1987), Kopelman and colleagues (1990) stated the differences in retention of employees along companies might be referred to the organizational culture values (Sheridan, 1992).

2.5. Individual factors
2.5.1. Personal behaviours
Too many studies have been done to determine which group of people may be a higher risk for having burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). From all type of people, type-A character tics has been determined. Type-A is a behaviour influenced by competitiveness, great energy level. Achievement’s needs, wish to have challenge works, persistence, time pressures and urgency (Montgomery et al., 1996).
Researchers figured out that burnout are referred to the factors of neuroticism. Five characteristics like neuroticism, openness, agreeableness, extraversion and conscientiousness have been defined (Nasurdin et al., 1993). Neuroticism reflects the levels of someone’s emotional stability and adjustment which is lead to hostility, depression, trait anxiety, self-consciousness, and vulnerability (Maslach et al., 2001). But extraversion referred to the assertive of individuals, talkative, active. Conscientiousness evaluates self-control and purposefulness which is related to the academic results. Openness is those factors which are being ready in any time to any experience, innovation, Imaginative. Agreeableness refers to cooperative and altruistic of individuals (Nasurdin et al., 1993). Among all of these factors, extraversion and neuroticism figured out as the predictors factors for job burnout (Bakker et al, 2006). Besides, exhaustion can be referred to the TYPE –A characteristics (Maslach et al., 2001).

2.5.2. Demographic characteristics
Among all of the demographic factors, age is more linked to the burnout. Maslach et al., 2001 believed that younger works is more than those employees around age of 30 to 40 in the field of burnout. Larence and Ursula (2003) mentioned that there cannot be differences in showing job satisfaction among age groups related to the sales person in the industry of pharmacy. Although, developing differences of gender in job stress, outcomes are still challenging. too many studies reported gender differences but on the other hand, some other researchers mentioned no differences (Posig and Kickul, 2004).

2.6. Consequences
Following Kamberger and Stone (1983), burnout signs divided in to three groups; First of all, physiological reaction like chronic fatigue and sleep disturbances. Second, cognitive attitudinal response lime eager to put one’s mistake on to others, dysphonia, rigidity, developing emotional isolation. Last but not least, is behavioural signs such as productivity decreasing, leaving the job or substance abuse increasing.

According to job performance, occupational burnout in the environment of work, involved inefficiency growing, turnover, low morale in job satisfaction and absenteeism (Chalvin and Marie, 2002). Another researcher Low et al. (2001) mentioned that burnout can have a negative influence on performance and job satisfaction. In the field of mental health, personality factors linked to the burnout including psychiatric and neuroticism (Maslach et al., 2001). To sum up, burnout can effect on mental problems like depression, anxiety, self-esteem and etc.

2.7. Integration environment and person
Recently, burnout has started to mention a new model that is related to the individual and situational factors. Maslach and Leiter (1997) emphasize on the level of match and mismatch among person and six factors of job environment, including, conversely. And also if the match is higher, then the possibilities of involvement with work are greater (Maslach et al., 2001). Along all of these mismatches, three factors of burnout like cynicism, exhaustion and ineffectiveness came out (Hoops, 1999).

2.7.1. Workload
It is lead to the potentiality of the workers to monitor the work and resources to make the workload. If someone faces with an overload position with low time and more work and few sources, some employees are going to feel tired. Therefore, higher degree of burnout showed up in the exhaustion factors.

2.7.2. Control
Control contributed to the autonomy. Great positive involvement happened when people have a logical control over their work. Mismatch happened in control, determined the insufficient control over the resources while not enough capacity exists to deliver. so it is make employees distressing when they feel responsible for outcomes.

2.7.3. Rewards and recognition
In this field, workers got positive feedback while doing something or vice versa. It permits employees to feel good about their job. Moreover, mismatch cannot be enough for the financial rewards and positive effects to the works. But not to forget to mention that without social rewards employees work is ignored and not going to be worthy by others. so this lack of recognition reveals both with work and employees and also lack of reward is contributed to the feeling of being inefficient.

2.7.4. Community
Colleagues, staff, supervisors, and others are those people whom the employees are going to be related. so good community referred to the good job feeling and performance. For example, Chronic and conflict can destroy these communities because they make frustration, Hostility, decrease social support, stress and others.
2.7.5. Fairness
All the organization expects fairness and respect from their employees. So it can share also community. On the other hand, unfairness can happened when workload or non-payment and promotion monitored unjustly.

2.7.6. Values
Sometime employees didn’t do some works due to their beliefs about the unethical of the jobs or personal core values like not going the truth to the customers because of a higher sale rate. Theses moral behaviours are bigproblems for some kind of peoples. Besides, employees can be affected by conflicting values. As a matter of fact, when people working in an environment with a conflict value, it is enough to lead them to burnout work even if, other five factors are working good.

2.8. Interaction of six areas
This field of study are going to evaluate the relationship among these six areas with three factors of burnout. Recent studies report that values may play a central mediating factor for other fields (Maslach et al., 2001). Likelihood is that those six areas may effect on individual differences (Maslach et al., 2001). For instance, some people may put a greater value on rewards but not on control. Furthermore, it is not clarified how mismatch people can stand and this might be affected because of especial area of mismatch and other five areas (Maslach et al, 2001). For instance, employee can stand on workload mismatch in front of good payment, good environment of job and recognition. Furthermore, these factors mentioned above can focus on the importance of realizing employees in context instead of their fit with basic factors of work life.

2.9. The job-person interaction scale (JPIS)
JPIS could be able to develop Masalach’s studies by evaluating six area of job person interaction (mismatch o match).the job –person interaction scale was applied in this research to understand which of these six job factors related to the job satisfaction and tendency to leave the job the most.

3. Method
The method of this research is based on hypotheses testing, for this purpose the following framework (L.T. Leng, 2006) is considered:

Questionnaires are designed based on Gender, Age, various lengths of services, and material statuses, so hypotheses will be developed according them. The sample size of the respondents was 300 with the response of rate at 34% (Table1.). And the targeted population were all males and females of different age categories, marital status, and different length of services. All of them were sales persons in Iran in pharmaceutical department.
Hypotheses:
H1: There is a difference in job satisfaction between genders.
H2: There is a difference in job satisfaction between age groups.
H3: There is a difference in job satisfaction between material statuses of sale executive.
H4: There is a difference in job satisfaction among sales executive with various lengths of services.
H5: There is correlation between workload and job satisfaction.
H6: There is correlation between perceived control and job satisfaction.
H7: There is correlation between ‘reward system and recognition’ and job satisfaction.
H8: There is correlation between ‘Sense of community and social support’ and job satisfaction.
H9: There is correlation between ‘perceived fairness on the job’ and job satisfaction.
H10: There is correlation between ‘conflicting values’ and job satisfaction.
H11: There is significant and inverse relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave for pharmaceutical sale representatives.
It is important to say, C demographic questions, all questions are based on 5-point Likert scale.

4. Results & Discussion
After using SPSS 19 for ANOVA test, Cronbach’s Alpha and correlations, the results are as following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Employment</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Reliability Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Control</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intention to Leave</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Stay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Leave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above table is a good evidence for reliability, because based on Nunally (1998), if alpha is greater than 0.7 can be acceptable.

Table 3: ANOVA Test (Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>14.928</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.948</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since significance value is more than 0.05, it is concluded there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between males and females.

Table 3: ANOVA Test (Age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>12.899</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.948</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance value shows that there is significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between different ages.

Table 4: ANOVA Test (Marital status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>14.810</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.948</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between material statuses of sale executive.
According to Table 5, there is significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between years of employment of sales representatives.

Furthermore, based on Pearson correlation test following results can be concluded:

1) There is no significant relationship between workload and job satisfaction.
2) There is a significant relationship between perceived control and job satisfaction.
3) There is a significant relationship between ‘reward system and recognition’ and job satisfaction.
4) There is a significant relationship between ‘Sense of community and social support’ and job satisfaction.
5) There is a significant relationship between ‘perceived fairness on the job’ and job satisfaction.
6) There is no significant relationship between ‘conflicting values’ and job satisfaction.
7) There is a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave for pharmaceutical sale representatives.

5. Conclusion
5.1. Summary

This study highlighted six factors on job satisfaction and tendency to quit job in several methods, and these are Workload, perceived Control, Reward system and Recognition, Sense of Community and Social Support, Perceived Fairness on the job, and Conflicting Values.

Study of pharmaceutical companies in Iran showed that:

1) There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between males and females.
2) There is significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between different ages.
3) There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between material statuses of sale executive.
4) There is significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between years of employment of sales representatives.
5) There is no significant relationship between workload and job satisfaction.
6) There is a significant relationship between perceived control and job satisfaction.
7) There is a significant relationship between ‘reward system and recognition’ and job satisfaction.
8) There is a significant relationship between ‘Sense of community and social support’ and job satisfaction.
9) There is a significant relationship between ‘perceived fairness on the job’ and job satisfaction.
10) There is no significant relationship between ‘conflicting values’ and job satisfaction.
11) There is a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave for pharmaceutical sale representatives.

5.2. Future study

There are many research about the impact of Job Satisfaction on other variables, so Job Satisfaction can be used as a bridge between these six dimensions and other variables.
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