Summer 1982

Burnout Among Elementary and Secondary Special Education Teachers in Self-Contained and Resource Classrooms

Pamela Knox Jones
Old Dominion University

BURNOUT AMONG ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS IN SELF-CONTAINED AND RESOURCE CLASSROOMS

by

Pamela Knox Jones
B.S. May 1976, Norfolk State College

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

PSYCHOLOGY

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
August 1982

Approved by:

Glynn D. Coates (Director)

Barry Gillen

Raymond H. Kirby

Louis H. Janda

ABSTRACT

BURNOUT AMONG ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS IN SELF-CONTAINED AND RESOURCE CLASSROOMS

Pamela Knox Jones
Old Dominion University
Director: Dr. Glynn D. Coates

The goals of the present study were threefold: (1) to determine if there is a difference in the degree of reported burnout between elementary and secondary special education teachers, (2) to determine if there is a difference in the degree of reported burnout between self-contained and resource special education teachers, and (3) to identify the characteristics inherent in the role of special education teachers that best predict the presence of burnout. Ninety-three subjects from three school systems responded to a 16-item Likert scale describing potential correlates of burnout, the Maslach Burnout Inventory, and a demographic data sheet. Type of class, level of class, and school system (independent variables), and reponses to the Maslach Burnout Inventory (dependent variables) were subjected to analyses of variance. There were no significant differences found in the amount of reported burnout between elementary and secondary teachers, and between self-contained and resource teachers. Step-wise multiple correlation and regression analyses were performed, using age, years in special education, years in the system, school system, and

the 16 items on the Likert scale as predictors and the responses to the Maslach Burnout Inventory as criteria. The results of the regression analyses yielded a number of predictors of burnout among special education teachers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express gratitude to those who contributed toward making this project possible. School systems A, B, & C who permitted me to use their employees as subjects. Ms. Kimberly Jones for the many hours spent on clerical duties, and Nancy Eberhardt for her ever-present support. The author wishes to thank the members of the thesis committee, Drs. Gillen, Janda, Kirby, and most especially, Dr. Glynn Coates (thesis committee director) without whose encouragement, patience, and assistance the project would never have reached completion.

This paper is dedicated to those teachers who graciously participated in the study, with the hope that one day teacher burnout will be recognized as a problem that affects not only the teachers who are suffering from it, but society in general.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

According to Pines, Aronson, and Kafry (1981) an individual suffering from burnout has been exposed to emotional pressure associated with an intense involvement with people over long periods of time and is particularly prevalent in the helping professions. "Burnout is the painful realization that one can no longer help people in need, that there is nothing left to give" (p. 15). Symptoms of burnout include chronic fatigue, detachment, boredom, cynicism, irritability, a sense of omnipotence, a suspicion of being unappreciated, paranoia, psychosomatic complaints, depression, and denial of feelings (Freudenberger, 1980). The people who are subject to burnout tend to be individuals who have worked exceptionally hard to achieve a goal. He suggests that they are usually leaders, who have never been able to admit limitations. Maslach (1976) reports that burnout can be a causal factor in low worker morale, absenteeism, high job turnover, and is positively correlated with other indices of stress, such as alcoholism, mental illness, marital conflict, and suicide.

The terms occupational "stress," "tedium," and "burnout" are often used interchangeably; they are, however, three separate (although not always easily distinguishable) phenomena. Occupational stress is job specific. For a

factory worker, causes of stress may be excessive noise, knowledge that he/she is being exposed to dangerous substances, or the difficulty of having to perform a task quickly and accurately. An emergency room nurse may experience occupational stress as a result of being on his/her feet for most of the day, or experiencing continuous tension awaiting the arrival of the next emergency. A teacher's occupational stress could be caused by spending much of the day using his/her voice, or the prevailing attitude among society that if students do not learn it is because the teacher is not teaching.

Tedium and burnout are similar in terms of symptomotology but are different in origin. Tedium can be the result of any prolonged chronic mental, physical, or emotional pressures. It may occur as the result of a traumatic event, but more often occurs as a result of the chronic stresses characteristic of everyday life and work (Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981). Their research revealed that most people develop some degree of tedium at some point in their lives and that occupational stress and tedium are frequently positively correlated with burnout.

Burnout In The Helping Professions

Maslach's (1976) findings indicated that a person who finds it difficult to cope with the continual stress provided by the emotional pressures inherent in the helping professions loses concern and empathy for the individuals he/she is trying to help. Burnout plays a major role in the

poor delivery of health and welfare services. Clients wait longer to receive less attention and care (Maslach, 1976). In the traditional client-centered orientation shared by most helping professionals, the focus is almost exclusively on the client, with virtually no attention given to the stress encountered by the professionals (Pines & Kafry, 1978).

Maslach and Pines (1977) studied staff members of eight child-care centers, where staff to children ratios ranged from one to four, to as high as one to twelve. They determined that burnout is likely to occur if the professional is placed in the position of having to care for too many people. In the high-ratio centers, the staff experienced greater pressure and emotional stress and reported to like their jobs less than did the staff in low-ratio centers. In an effort to achieve distance from their clients, a characteristic coping mechanism to stress identified by Maslach (1976), the staff from the high-ratio centers was more approving of supplementary techniques to make children quiet, i.e., compulsory naps and the use of tranquilizers for hyperactive children. Longer working hours were implicated as a contributor to burnout when the longer hours involved more interaction with the children. When the longer hours involved administration, burnout was less likely to occur.

Pines and Aronson conducted workshops involving several hundred dentists and discovered that the burnout rate among

dentists is extremely high. Dentists work with patients on a one-to-one basis; colleagues are not witness to their expertise and, therefore, are incapable of providing praise and encouragement. Most patients regard a visit to the dentist with anxiety. They would prefer not to be there, and this is communicated either directly or indirectly to the dentist (Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981).

Maslach (1981) describes three aspects of the burnout syndrome among the helping professions: (1) Emotional exhaustion; as emotional resources are depleted, workers are unable to give of themselves at a psychological level. (2) The development of negative attitudes and feelings about one's clients. (3) Negatively evaluating one's own performance. Thus, according to Maslach, burnout among helping professionals is manifested in three ways: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

Teacher Burnout

High turnover rates and reported burnout indicate that extreme job-related pressures are being experienced by teachers. Stevenson and Milt (1975) contend that large class size, low salaries, school violence, and the external demand for accountability have major impact on the mental health of educators. At present, no data exist regarding the number of teachers that burn out each year, or how many continue to work while burned out (Weiskopf, 1980). If unchecked, burnout can result in total emotional breakdown (Truch, 1980).

Grey (1979) reported that teaching exerts a tremendous emotional strain, and that often a teacher's psychological needs are not met and self-sacrifice manifests itself in the form of stress. She suggested that teachers are unwilling to ask for help; they have been programmed to be the ones to help others.

Within the framework of the helping professions, teachers are viewed as providers of a service whose role - to educate, help, understand, and support - is defined by the presence of the student and the student's needs. In the case of the special educator, these needs are augmented by intellectual, physical, social, and emotional problems. Weiskopf (1980) drew a comparison between special educators and the child care workers studied by Freudenberger in 1977. Freudenberger stated that "workers are required to be emotionally available to the deprived youngsters, to expend greater energy over long periods of time, to view themselves as motivated human beings, and to do this for a negligible salary" (p. 91).

Bensky, Shaw, Gouse, Bates, Dixon, and Beane (1980) addressed the following questions in their research: (1) Does stress differ among teachers? (2) Is there a relationship between Public Law 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975) and teacher stress? (3) What stressful conditions are educators facing? Participants in their study were 114 regular and special education teachers enrolled in special education classes during the summer.

The subjects responded to a questionnaire which consisted of 31 items inquiring about compliance with Public Law 94-142 mandates, the degree and type of stress on educators, and the specific causes of stress. Special classroom teachers were found to be under less stress than regular classroom teachers and resource room teachers, who rated diagnosis and assessment as the most stressful components of their jobs. Writing individualized education programs (in compliance with P.L. 94-142) was rated low in terms of producing stress, as were managing student behavior and consulting with regular classroom teachers. Role clarity and discrepancy between the teacher's perception of his/her role and others' expectations of the teacher's role appeared as significant predictors of general stress.

Given the limited amount of empirical research regarding burnout among teachers of exceptional children, the present study focused on self-contained teachers and resource room teachers of handicapped children at the elementary and secondary levels.

Burnout Among Elementary and Secondary Teachers

Truch (1980) reports that most people do not fully appreciate the tremendous emotional pressure on teachers, particularly elementary teachers. Elementary level teachers are with their children from nine until three daily, with a short break for lunch. Secondary teachers are usually required to teach for five out of seven periods and are given a planning period. Therefore, secondary teachers have

less direct contact with their students than do elementary teachers.

School systems in cities usually contain a relatively large number of elementary schools, whose students later attend a smaller number of junior high schools, and then an even smaller number of senior high schools. In order to serve the handicapped population, special education classes are distributed fairly uniformly throughout the elementary schools, resulting in fewer classes in each elementary school, and a larger number of classes in each secondary school. Quite often, a special education teacher on the elementary level may be the only such personnel in her school. Since there is a greater concentration of classes in the junior and senior high schools, secondary level teachers have an opportunity to obtain self-support from other special educators, while many elementary special education teachers have less opportunity. Research indicates that support from co-workers results in lower burnout rates (Maslach, 1976).

Junior and senior high school students generally rotate classes during each period, and secondary level teachers teach the same subject to each of their classes. Secondary school teachers are responsible for providing goals for individualized education plans only for the subject area they teach. Elementary teachers must provide goals for each of the subject areas they teach. There is a substantial difference in the amount of planning involved, which may

result in feelings of greater work overload among elementary teachers. One would predict that elementary self-contained teachers experience greater burnout than secondary special education teachers.

Burnout Among Self-Contained and Resource Teachers

A student assigned to a self-contained class remains in the same classroom all day and is instructed by one teacher in all subject areas. Occasionally, one will encounter a student who is weak in all areas except one - math, for example. That student may leave the self-contained classroom at his or her teacher's discretion and attend math in a regular classroom. Students in need of assistance beyond the scope of a regular class are assigned to regular classrooms and go to a resource room to receive help in a specific area - for example, reading, speech, or hearing. The handicaps dealt with by a teacher of a self-contained class are more severe than those encountered by a resource teacher. It is understandable, therefore, that a teacher of students in a self-contained class, who display a multitude of deficits, might perceive less success than a resource teacher. Since the students in self-contained classes function below the norm in a variety of areas not solely restricted to academic areas, but often including social and emotional behaviors, the teacher of a self-contained class has a tremendous responsibility for the care of these students that is not required of a resource teacher. Teachers of self-contained classes have the additional responsibility

of approaching regular classroom teachers in an effort to integrate special students with regular classes in those subject areas in which they have the potential to function successfully. One would predict that self-contained teachers experience greater burnout than resource teachers

In summary, this study was designed to address the following:

1. The hypothesis that elementary special education teachers experience greater burnout than secondary special education teachers.
2. The hypothesis that teachers of self-contained classes experience greater burnout than resource teachers.
3. Identify other factors that contribute significantly to burnout among special education teachers.

Method

Subjects

Four populations of special education teachers were defined: elementary self-contained (ESC), elementary resource (ER), secondary self-contained (SSC), and secondary resource (SR). Teachers from three neighboring city school systems designated as Systems A, B, and C served as subjects. System A was represented by 48 teachers (12 from each population). Systems B and C were each represented by 60 teachers (15 from each population) for a total of 168 teachers.

Measures

Three instruments were used to gather the data required to test the hypotheses. First, the Special Educator Attitude Measure produced data regarding teachers' attitudes toward possible correlates of burnout. Second, the Maslach Burnout Inventory assessed the degree of burnout experienced by each of the teachers. Finally, a demographic data sheet was used to obtain information about class structure (self-contained vs. resource), level (elementary vs. secondary), teachers' ages, the number of years in special education, and the number of years in the system.

The Special Educator Attitude Measure (SEAM). Using information gathered from previous literature and interviews with special education teachers, a 48-item scale describing

possible correlates of special education teacher burnout was developed (Appendix A). Twenty-four items were positively worded and twenty-four were negatively worded. Responses were possible on a five-point dimension ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. In order to standardize the scale, it was mailed to five subjects randomly selected from a list of all possible candidates from each population from System A (N=20). These 20 subjects were then eliminated from the selection process and not eligible for selection as members of the sample of 48 to be drawn from System A.

Eighteen of the scales were returned. Data from one elementary self-contained teacher and data from one secondary self-contained teacher were randomly discarded to produce an equal N of 16 with four subjects in each group. The scales were scored five to one for the positively worded items and one to five for the negatively worded items. Unanswered items were assigned a score of three. An item analysis was conducted, and 16 items were identified as distinguishing between the first and fourth quartiles. Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of each of the 16 items for the first and fourth quartiles. Items were reworded, if necessary, to achieve an equal number of positively and negatively worded items. These 16 items form the SEAM sent to the 168 subjects. (Appendix B)

The Maslach Burnout Inventory. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (Appendix C) is designed to assess three aspects

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of the 16 Item SEAM for the First and Fourth Quartiles

Item No.	First Quartile	Fourth Quartile
1	2.00 (1.4142)	4.25 (.9574)
2	1.50 (.57735)	3.25 (1.5000)
3	2.25 (.9574)	3.75 (.5000)
4	1.75 (1.5000)	4.00 (.81650)
5	1.75 (1.5000)	3.25 (1.5000)
6	1.75 (.9574)	3.00 (1.1547)
7	1.75 (1.5000)	3.00 (1.8257)
8	2.00 (1.4142)	3.25 (.5000)
9	2.25 (.9574)	4.25 (.9574)
10	1.25 (.5000)	2.00 (.0000)
11	1.50 (1.0000)	2.50 (1.0000)
12	1.25 (.5000)	2.50 (1.2910)
13	1.00 (.0000)	2.50 (1.2910)

Table 1

(continued)

14	1.75 (1.5000)	2.50 (1.2910)
15	1.00 (.0000)	2.75 (1.7078)
16	1.25 (.5000)	3.25 (1.5000)

of burnout: Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment. Each aspect is measured by a separate subscale. Each subscale has two dimensions: frequency (how often) and intensity (how strong). For both the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales, higher scores correspond to higher degrees of experienced burnout. Lower scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscales correspond to higher degrees of experienced burnout. As reported by Maslach (1981) reliability coefficients for the subscales are: Emotional Exhaustion .90 (frequency), .87 (intensity); Depersonalization .79 (frequency), .73 (intensity); Personal Accomplishment .71 (frequency), .73 (intensity). Convergent validity was demonstrated in several ways, which are presented in Appendix C.

Procedure

The SEAM, the Maslach Burnout Inventory, the demographic data sheet, a stamped envelope addressed to the researcher, and a cover letter explaining the nature of the research and providing instructions were delivered to each subject at their place of employment.

For System A, a list of names of the teachers in each of the four groups studied was supplied to the researcher. Twelve subjects were randomly selected from each list. The SEAM, Maslach Burnout Inventory, demographic data sheet, stamped self-addressed envelope, and cover letter were mailed to each subject at his/her place of employment.

For System B, the materials were delivered to the Director of Special Educational Services. He distributed five sets of materials to each of three principals of special education centers. The principals distributed the materials to five elementary self-contained teachers and five secondary self-contained teachers in his/her school. Elementary and secondary resource teachers were given their materials at a regularly scheduled departmental meeting by the Director of Special Educational Services.

For System C, the materials were delivered to the Director of Special Educational Services. The materials and a cover letter from System C's research department approving the research were delivered to 60 teachers randomly selected from the population of special education teachers.

Results

Of the 48 potential respondents from system A, 33 responded, 42 of the 60 from System B, and 38 of the 60 from System C, yielding return rates of 69%, 70%, and 63%, respectively. Across systems, the return rate was 67%.

Of the 113 respondents, 20 were not included in the study, producing an N of 93. Nine of the subjects not selected for inclusion failed to complete the Maslach Burnout Inventory according to directions, eight supplied incomplete demographic data, two did not supply any demographic data, and one did not return the SEAM.

Of the 103 respondents on whom demographic data were collected, nine, or 8.7%, were over 51 years of age. Six of those nine, or 66.7%, had to be discarded because the Maslach Burnout Inventory was not completed according to instructions. It appeared that the 66.7% represent a disproportionately large percentage of the total of nine subjects whose questionnaires were discarded due to not following instructions on the Maslach Burnout Inventory. A chi square test of independence was performed to expand this finding. Teachers over the age of 51, completed the Maslach Burnout Inventory incorrectly significantly more frequently than the teachers in the younger age groups, (X^2, 3 df = 11.345, $p \leq .01$).

Analysis of Variance

Using the subscale scores of the Maslach Burnout Inventory as the dependent measures, a 2X2X3 analysis of variance was performed on each of the six subscales with level (elementary, secondary), type of class (self-contained, resource), and school system (A,B,C) as the independent measures. There were no significant main effects for level, type, or system on any of the six subscales, [$F(1,87)$, $p<.05$] nor were any of the interactions statistically significant. The results of the analyses are summarized in Appendix D. Table 2 presents the percentages of burnout reported by the teachers in the present study based on Maslach's norms.

Step-Wise Multiple Correlation and Regression Analysis

In an effort to identify correlates of burnout, stepwise multiple correlation and regression analyses were computed. Twenty-one predictor variables were used - age, number of years in special education, number of years in the system, type of class (ESC, ER, SSC, & SR, assigned the numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 to permit computation), and the 16 items of the SEAM. For each analysis one of the six subscales on the Maslach Burnout Inventory was used as the criterion. Means and standard deviations for the six subscales of the four types of classes are presented in Table 3. Table 4 provides a listing of the description, means, and standard deviations of the 21 variables used in the multiple correlation and regression analysis and the direction of the wording of 16 of the 21 variables that are SEAM items.

Table 2
Percentages of Burnout in School Systems A, B, and C

Maslach Burnout Inventory Subscales	% of Experienced Burnout		
	Low	Moderate	High
Emotional Exhaustion			
Frequency	49.23	29.52	21.25
Intensity	48.33	30.80	20.87
Depersonalization			
Frequency	70.37	17.15	12.48
Intensity	61.88	23.38	14.74
Personal Accomplishment			
Frequency	58.44	25.51	16.05
Intensity	49.68	31.77	18.55

Table 3

Means (and Standard Deviations) of the Six Subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory by Type and Level of Classroom

	ESC	ER	SSC	SR
EEF	19.77 (12.2586)	17.62 (11.1347)	18.96 (10.7639)	19.30 (10.9064)
DPF	4.56 (5.8282)	4.52 (4.5784)	5.91 (5.3506)	3.97 (4.5074)
PAF	40.50 (4.9709)	39.38 (5.2865)	41.08 (4.7474)	38.35 (6.8131)
EEI	24.46 (14.3526)	26.90 (14.2860)	25.56 (12.4420)	27.56 (13.6941)
DPI	4.19 (4.8423)	5.67 (6.07728)	6.74 (5.7621)	9.83 (10.7138)
PAI	43.12 (5.9609)	40.62 (8.9133)	45.30 (8.9133)	42.65 (6.9322)

Table 4

Description, Means, and Standard Deviations of the 21 Variables Used in the Step-Wise Multiple Correlation and Regression Analysis and the Direction of the Wording of the Sixteen SEAM Statements

	Variables	Direction of Wording	ESC	ER	SSC	SR
1.	Age of Subject		29.10 (5.4860)	30.32 (8.5508)	30.27 (9.8811)	34.82 (8.6830
2.	Yrs. in Special Education		4.86 (3.4093	7.37 (4.6927)	6.50 (3.9249)	6.48 (4.4809)
3.	Yrs. in the System		4.31 (3.6752)	6.68 (4.8654)	5.73 (5.1492)	6.22 (4.9905)
4.	Type of Class		1.00 (0.0000)	1.00 (0.0000)	1.00 (0.0000)	1.00 (0.0000)
5.	I have an opportunity to take a daily break at work.	+	3.21 (1.6120)	3.79 (1.3157)	3.77 (1.4452)	4.04 (1.1862)
6.	Interruptions caused by announcements, assemblies, fire drills, etc. do not interrupt my students' learning.	+	2.48 (1.2711)	2.58 (1.5024)	2.73 (1.5176)	2.52 (1.2384)
7.	My superiors are competent.	+	3.83 (.7592)	3.47 (1.3892)	3.86 (1.0372)	3.70 (.9261)

Table 4
(continued)

	Variables	Direction of Wording	ESC	ER	SSC	SR
8.	Planned conference days are unnecessary.	-	3.93 (.9612)	3.79 (1.2727)	4.18 (1.1396)	3.96 (1.1473)
9.	I am required to attend too many meetings.	-	3.03 (1.2387)	3.47 (1.3067)	3.32 (1.1705)	3.48 (1.2011)
10.	I have no problem with helping regular educators understand and accept my students in their classrooms.	+	2.93 (1.0997)	3.21 (1.6186)	3.36 (1.2927)	3.39 (1.1575)
11.	I am required to plan for and instruct too many students.	-	3.34 (1.4212)	3.21 (1.3157)	3.27 (1.3516)	2.74 (1.3217)
12.	Central Administration is knowledgeable and understanding regarding my students and my responsibilities	+	2.55 (1.1828)	2.79 (1.2283)	3.00 (1.3452)	3.00 (1.3484)
13.	My co-workers think that I am a babysitter, not a professional.	-	3.69 (1.3391)	3.89 (1.2425)	3.68 (1.2105)	3.91 (.5964)
14.	I lack the materials to properly instruct my students.	-	2.59 (1.3501)	3.37 (1.2115)	2.50 (1.4392)	3.04 (1.1473)

Table 4
(continued)

	Variables	Direction of Wording	ESC	ER	SSC	SR
15.	I have to spend my own money for materials.	-	1.72 (.9598)	2.32 (1.2933)	2.18 (1.3675)	2.74 (1.0098)
16.	Materials are equally distributed among special education classes in the system.	+	2.17 (1.1671)	3.05 (1.2235)	3.18 (1.1396)	3.17 (1.3022
17.	Writing IEP's does not place an undue burden on me.	+	2.31 (1.5200)	2.68 (1.3355)	3.32 (3.9688)	2.52 (1.4731)
18.	Monitoring IEP's is not a problem.	+	3.14 (1.3289)	3.21 1.0317)	2.64 (1.3644)	2.91 (1.1644)
19.	I bring my students' problems home with me.	-	2.52 (1.2711)	3.16 (1.3442)	3.50 (1.3363)	2.96 (1.0651)
20.	I perceive my job to be stressful.	-	2.41 (1.2711)	2.79 (1.3442)	2.68 (1.3363)	2.78 (1.0651)
21.	School System (Dummy-Coded)		2.41 (1.4272)	2.79 (1.4368)	2.68 (1.4272)	2.78 (1.2777)

Table 5 presents the zero-order correlations of the independent variables with the six subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. The reader is reminded that as positively worded items on the SEAM increase, they move toward strongly agree; as negatively worded items increase, they move toward strongly disagree. Tables 6-11 summarize the stepwise multiple correlation and regression analyses.

Using a significant F-ratio and an increase in R2 of not less than 0.01 as selection criteria, ten of 21 variables emerge as significant multiple predictors of Emotional Exhaustion: Frequency (EEF). Seven variables are identified as significant multiple correlates of both Depersonalization: Frequency (DPF) and Personal Accomplishment: Frequency (PAF). There are six significant predictors of both Emotional Exhaustion Intensity (EEI) and Depersonalization: Intensity (DPI). Six variables emerge as predictors of Personal Accomplishment: Intensity (PAI).

Presented in the order in which they entered the equation, the frequency of emotional exhaustion (EEF) was best predicted by: (1) perceived occupational stress [item 20], (2) planning for and instructing too many students [item 11], (3) bringing the students' problems home [item 19], (4) superior incompetency [item 7], (5) unnecessary planned conference days [item 8], (6) lack of materials [item 14], (7) not having an opportunity to take a daily break [item [5], (8) writing IEP's [item 17], (9) school system [item

Table 5

Zero Order Correlations of the Independent Variables with the Six Subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory

Variables	Direction of Wording	EEF	DPF	PAF	EEI	DPI	PAI
1		-0.298**	-0.228*	0.198*	-0.313**	-0.224*	0.115
2		-0.276**	-0.169	0.077	-0.295**	-0.090	0.072
3		-0.170	-0.169	0.017	-0.202*	-0.152	-0.037
4		-0.046	-0.042	-0.089	0.065	-0.028	0.057
5	+	0.343**	-0.002	-0.024	-0.218*	-0.082	0.159
6	+	-0.123	-0.116	-0.074	-0.080	-0.053	-0.014
7	+	-0.355**	-0.311**	-0.192*	-0.391**	-0.269**	0.205*
8	-	0.203*	-0.088	0.029	0.262**	-0.073	-0.017
9	-	-0.133	-0.204*	0.101	-0.173*	-0.149	0.072
10	+	-0.253**	-0.159	-0.007	-0.201*	-0.201*	-0.095
11	-	-0.290**	-0.196*	0.003	-0.238	-0.156	0.087
12	+	-0.163	-0.089	0.047	-0.184*	-0.119	-0.011
13	-	-0.129	-0.344**	-0.009	-0.126	-0.240	0.004
14	-	-0.319**	-0.283**	0.132	-0.289**	-0.165	0.118
15	-	-0.318**	-0.193*	-0.046	-0.298**	-0.218*	-0.070
16	+	-0.092	-0.073	0.105	-0.162	-0.136	-0.117
17	+	-0.236*	-0.169	0.065	-0.132	-0.175*	-0.073
18	+	-0.204*	-0.104	0.238*	-0.189*	-0.081	0.076
19	-	-0.408**	-0.127	-0.034	-0.391**	-0.232*	0.045
20	-	-0.491**	-0.270**	0.072	-0.481**	-0.343**	0.024
21		0.076	-0.064	0.210*	0.028	-0.068	0.095

*05, $\underline{r}$ = .173
**.01, $\underline{r}$ = .242

Table 6

Step-wise Multiple Correlation and Regression Analysis Summary for EEF

Variable Entered	R^2	Increase in R^2	SEest	F for Regression	df
20	0.2409	0.2409	9.8804	28.8860	1,91
11	0.3091	0.0682	9.4785	20.135	2,90
19	0.3571	0.0480	9.1946	16.479	3,89
7	0.3972	0.0401	8.9536	14.4970	4,88
8	0.4343	0.0371	8.7232	13.3610	5,87
14	0.4508	0.0164	8.6453	11.7650	6,86
5	0.4651	0.0143	8.5822	10.5570	7,85
17	0.4787	0.0136	8.5227	9.6410	8,84
21	0.4891	0.0105	8.4874	8.8300	9,83
12	0.5000	0.0109	8.4473	8.202	10,82

Table 7

Step-wise Multiple Correlation and Regression Analysis Summary for DPF*

Variable Entered	R^2	Increase in R^2	SEest	F for Regression	df
13	0.1186	0.1186	4.9624	12.2430	1,91
7	0.1746	0.0560	4.8289	9.5170	2,90
20	0.1947	0.0201	4.7963	7.1730	3,89
14	0.2109	0.0162	4.7748	5.8790	4,88
5	0.2207	0.0098	4.7721	4.9280	5,87
1	0.2327	0.0120	4.7627	4.3470	6,86
16	0.2435	0.0107	4.7570	3.9080	7,85

*All F-values, $p<.05$

Table 8

Step-wise Multiple Correlation and Regression Analysis Summary for PAF

Variable Entered	R^2	Increase in R^2	SEest	F for Regression	df
18	0.0565	0.0565	5.5921	5.4490	1,91
21	0.0933	0.0368	5.5122	4.6330	2,90
1	0.1246	0.0313	5.4466	4.2240	3,89
15	0.1397	0.0150	5.4302	3.5710	4,88
7	0.1534	0.0137	5.4177	3.1520	5,87
13	0.1647	0.0113	5.4125	2.8260	6,86
14	0.1764	0.0117	5.4060	2.6000	7,85

Table 9

Step-wise Multiple Correlation and Regression Analysis Summary for EEI

Variable Entered	R^2	Increase in R^2	SEest	F for Regression	df
20	0.2318	0.2318	12.2432	27.4620	1,91
7	0.3043	0.0725	11.7159	19.6830	2,90
8	0.3581	0.0538	11.3168	16.5500	3,89
19	0.4052	0.0471	10.9557	14.9850	4,88
11	0.4399	0.0348	10.6915	13.6690	5,87
14	0.4499	0.0099	10.6579	11.7210	6,86

All F-values, $p<.05$

Table 10

Step-wise Multiple Correlation and Regression Analysis Summary for DPI

Variable Entered	R^2	Increase in R^2	SEest	F for Regression	df
20	0.1178	0.1178	6.4017	12.1490	1,91
7	0.1509	0.0031	6.3151	7.9980	2,90
13	0.1681	0.0172	6.2858	5.9960	3,89
19	0.1804	0.0123	6.2746	4.8420	4,88
1	0.1895	0.0091	6.2753	4.0690	5,87

Table 11

Step-wise Multiple Correlation and Regression Analysis Summary for PAI

Variable Entered	R^2	Increase in R^2	SEest	F for Regression	df
7	0.0422	0.0422	6.9728	4.0060	1,91
16	0.0703	0.0281	6.9077	3.4020	2,90
14	0.0820	0.0117	6.9025	2.6500	3,89
15	0.1037	0.0217	6.8591	2.5460	4,88
4	0.1251	0.0214	6.8155	2.4890	5,87
5	0.1372	0.0121	6.8075	2.2790	6,86

21], and (10) lack of understanding from central administration [item 12]. These ten items accounted for 50.00% of the variance.

Six variables contributed 44.99% of the variance of the intensity of emotional exhaustion (EEI). They are: (1) perceived occupational stress [item 20], (2) superior incompetency [item 7], (3) unnecessary planned conference days [item 8], (4) bringing the students' problems home [item 19], (5) planning for and instructing too many students [item 11], and (6) lack of materials.

24.35% of the variance of the frequency of depersonalization (DPF) was supplied by: (1) co-workers regarding special education teachers as babysitters, not professionals [item 13], (2) superior incompetency [item 7], (3) perceived occupational stress [item 20], (4) lack of materials [item 14], (5) having the opportunity to take a daily break [item 5], (6) subject's age [item 1], and (7) equal distribution of materials [item 16].

The best predictors of the intensity of depersonalization (DPI), accounting for 21.16% of the variance, were: (1) perceived occupational stress [item 20], (2) superior incompetency [item 7], (3) co-workers regarding special education teachers as babysitters, not professionals [item 13], (4) bringing the students' problems home [item 19], (5) subject's age [item 1], and (6) number of years in special education.

Contributing 17.64% of the variance of the frequency of personal accomplishment (PAF) were (1) monitoring IEP's [item 18], (2) school system [item 22], (3) subject's age [item 1], (4) teachers spending their own money for materials [item 15], (5) superior competency [item 7], (6) being regarded as a professional by co-workers [item 13], and (7) having sufficient materials [item 14].

The intensity of personal accomplishment (PAI) produced six significant predictors, supplying 13.72% of the variance. The predictors are: (1) superior competency [item 7], (2) equal distribution of materials [item 16], (3) having sufficient materials [item 14], (4) teachers spending their own money for materials [item 15], type of class [item 4], (6) having a daily break [item 5].

Discussion

All work with people involves some degree of stress (Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981). Certain occupations such as medical, educational, and social services share particular kinds of emotional stress. Specific categories within each occupation have unique stresses that contribute to burnout. The first purpose of the present study was to ascertain whether, as predicted, a difference exists in the amount of burnout between elementary and secondary special education teachers. The lack of significant differences between the two groups may indicate that the stresses unique to each group balanced each other out. This supposition is supported by a study by the Tacoma Association of Classroom Teachers and the Tacoma Public Schools (1979) which found that certain events seemed worse to certain groups of staff. Elementary teachers viewed districtwide testing as more stressful than did secondary teachers, and secondary staff felt that seeking a principal's intervention in a discipline matter was more stressful than did elementary teachers.

Teachers of self-contained classes were not found, as predicted, to experience more burnout than resource teachers. The same theoretical implications regarding stresses unique to specific groups apply to these two groups as well.

The results of the present study, indicating that there are no significant difference between the four groups of special education teachers are based upon the assumption that the Maslach Burnout Inventory measures the construct that it purports to measure. The convergent validity coefficients (refer to Appendix C) are relatively low; an indication that the Maslach Burnout Inventory may not accurately distinguish between those individuals who are actually experiencing burnout and those who are experiencing some other phenomenon.

The Maslach Burnout inventory measures two dimensions of burnout: frequency and intensity. Maslach (1981) stated that future research might reveal that one dimension is more important than the other or that the two dimensions are so highly correlated as to be redundant. In the present study, an examination of the multiple predictors for each subscale on the frequency dimension reveals that over half of the predictors also appeared on the corresponding intensity subscales. There are two possible explanations for this repetition: (1) the two dimensions are indeed redundant, and/or (2) the format of the Maslach Burnout Inventory encourages perseveration of responses on the two dimensions (refer to Appendix C).

Although most of the multiple predictors can be logically explained, a few idiosyncracies do appear. As reported, the analyses of variance revealed a lack of significance between the three school systems, yet school

system appears as a significant predictor of EEF and PAF. There is apparently some characteristic inherent in one or more of the systems that is in some way related to the frequency of emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. The same theoretical implications apply to the type of class which appeared as a correlate of PAI.

Item number 5 (I have the opportunity to take a daily break at work) and item number 16 (Materials are equally distributed among special education classes in the system) are positively worded items that are positively correlated with the frequency of depersonalization (DPF). One would predict that these two variables would be negatively correlated with depersonalization. Equally perplexing is the fact that item number 16 is negatively correlated with the intensity of personal accomplishment.

There are several predictor variables which, when considered in isolation in terms of their appearances on some of the subscales, suggest a pattern. The results of the present study indicate that age is negatively correlated with the burnout measures of frequency and intensity of depersonalization (DPF & DPI), a relationship which adheres to the pattern established by the sample used in arriving at the demographic norms for the Maslach Burnout Inventory. It has been noted that most beginning special education teachers encounter difficulties (Morsink, Blackhurst, & Williams, 1979). It is possible that the initial difficulty can be attributed in part to inadequate training, but there

are some competencies that cannot be developed sufficiently in pre-service training. The anticipation of teaching the handicapped after four arduous years of training, followed by the realities of the position, may contribute to the negative relationship between age and depersonalization.

According to the statistics of the National Education Association, the number of teachers with twenty years or more experience dropped by half in the fifteen year period between 1964 and 1979 (1979). Truch (1980) reported that younger teachers are leaving within the first five years of teaching. The fact that only 49.46% of the subjects sampled in the present study were over the age of 30 lends credence to Truch's statement.

The present results also indicate that age is positively correlated with the frequency of personal accomplishment (PAF). Studies of overall job satisfaction tends to be higher for older teachers (Di Caprio, 1974; Price, 1970; Start & Laundy, 1973). It may be hypothesized, that as one examines teachers' responses with increasing age, the attitudes of a survival group are under study, rather than the attitudes of a particular age group.

Pines, Aronson, & Kafry (1981) determined that occupational stress is invariably postively correlated with burnout. The present study supports their findings; perceiving teaching as stressful (item number 20) is negatively correlated with the frequency and intensity of both emotional exhaustion (both EEF and EEI) and depersonalization (both

DPF and DPI). It was the only variable that appeared as the first correlate in the equation on more than one subscale (EEF, EEI, & DPF). Of the 93 subjects, 25.81% strongly agreed that their jobs are stressful and 24.73% agreed that their jobs are stressful.

Planning for and having to instruct too many students (item number 19) is negatively correlated with the frequency and intensity of emotional exhaustion (EEF & EEI). Pines and Kafry (1978) found that as the number of clients increases, staff members experience emotional overload and like their work less. In their study of child-care center staff, Maslach and Pines (1977) determined that burnout is likely to occur if the professional is required to care for too many people. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1978) discovered a correlation between class size and teacher stress. In the same study, a correlation was revealed between lack of sufficient teaching materials and teacher stress - a relationship which is supported by the present study. "I lack the materials to properly instruct my students" (item number 14) appears as a correlate of burnout on all subscales except the intensity of depersonalization (DPI). It is the variable with the second highest number of correlations.

"My superiors are competent" is the only variable that appeared as a correlate of all six subscales in the present study. The statement was negatively correlated with the frequency and intensity of both emotional exhaustion (EEF and EEI) and depersonalization (DPF and DPI) and positively

correlated with the frequency and intensity of personal accomplishment (PAF and PAI). The correlations indicate that as superior competency decreases, burnout increases or that as burnout increases, superior incompetency has been expressed as being a contributing factor.

Consistent with these results is a survey of stressful conditions conducted by the Tacoma Association of Classroom Teachers and the Tacoma Public Schools (1979) that revealed disagreements with superiors as a major contributor to stress. Lack of effective consultation with superiors was correlated with teacher stress in a study by Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1978). Truch (1980) reported that inadequate administrative support has greatly increased teacher stress. Dixon, Shaw, and Bensky (1980) cited problems between special educators and administrators as an indicator of special educator burnout.

Insufficient materials with which to teach too many students are two administrative decisions (albeit, usually due to funding) that might lead many teachers to question their superiors' competence. Whether we are plagued by a host of superiors that are not competent, or by teachers experiencing burnout and making causal attributions, it would appear that a problem may exist between special education teachers and their superiors that may be affecting the quality of services provided to students.

Conclusion

It should be noted that the present results were based on responses by teachers to statements on the SEAM and the Maslach Burnout Inventory. It should be noted that this questionnaire method assessed self-reported attitudes and is not a direct measure of the subjects feelings. Consequently, the usual problems associated with correlational data apply to this research. Which variable is the cause of burnout and which is the effect is unknown or if both are the effects of a third variable; do the stressful experiences produce burnout, does burnout make one more susceptible to stress, or do certain occupations attract people who are likely to burn out and experience more than their share of stress?

There is an additional problem with self-report data. Did the subjects respond honestly or do the responses reflect other motives? One might, and understandably so, become somewhat defensive about some of the statements, especially on the Maslach Burnout Inventory, which deals with the individual's emotions, attitudes, and sense of accomplishment, rather than with job characteristics as does the SEAM. These are questions that are unanswerable based on the type of data collected.

Implications for Future Research

Some of the items on the SEAM apply only to special education teachers (item numbers 6, 9, 12, 13, 14); some apply to all teachers (item numbers 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 15,

16); and some probably are a greater source of stress to special educators than to regular educators (item numbers 1, 2, 11). The items that apply specifically to characteristics of the job of special educator did not appear as strong correlates of burnout. Little research has been conducted with both special and regular educators. Bensky, Shaw, Gouse, Bates, Dixon, and Beane (1980) concluded that regular classroom teachers reported more job-related stress than special education classroom teachers. Further research is needed, using a sample comprised of special and regular educators, to determine if there is a difference between these two groups in terms of the correlates of burnout and in the amount of expressed burnout.

High turnover rates have been cited as an indication that teachers are experiencing extreme job-related pressures (Stevenson & Milt, 1975). Little evidence has been collected on the relationship between burnout and actual turnover, however. Research has been conducted showing a positive correlation between self-reported teacher stress and the intention to leave teaching (Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1979). The following hypotheses are in need of exploration: (1) Do teachers who leave the profession report greater burnout than those who remain? (2) If not, what are the differences between the two groups that motivate one to leave and one to stay?

It has been hypothesized that certain occupations attract certain types of people who are likely to burn out

and who are extremely susceptible to stress (Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1980; Freudenberger, 1980; Smith, 1980). Freudenberger (1980) expresses the following viewpoint:

> "Not every personality is susceptible to Burn-Out. It would be virtually impossible for the under-achiever to get into that state. Or the happy-go-lucky individual with fairly modest aspirations. Burn-Out is pretty much limited to dynamic, charismatic, goal-oriented men and women or to determined idealists..." (p. 20).

Freudenberger described what has commonly been referred to as the Type A personality. Some characteristics of Type A personalities are: (1) Trying to accomplish more and more in less time. (2) Hard driving and competitive. (3) Tend to challenge people in a variety of situations. (4) So highly involved with their work that often it becomes the most important element of their lives. (5) Always in motion. (6) They do not know how to relax without feeling guilty (Smith, 1980). Smith explains that teachers with Type A personalities experience more stress because, by their behavior, they create more potential stressors and respond less effectively to the stressors they are exposed to.

Freudenberger emphasized that the overcommitment typical of burnouts is an indication that the person's goals have been externally imposed. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) investigated the relationship between occupational stress in teachers and a personality dimension measured by Rotter's Internal-External locus of control. Individuals who adhere

to the belief that achievement and reinforcement is contingent on their own behavior are said to believe in internal control; those who adhere to the belief that achievement and reinforcement are the result of the influence of chance or authority figures believe in external control. As predicted, there was a significant positive correlation between self-reported teacher stress and a belief in external control. A variety of personality factors, in addition to those cited above, as they relate directly to burnout, are in need of empirical investigation.

The delegates to the 1979 National Education Association Convention adopted a resolution urging its local affiliates, in cooperation with local school authorities, to develop stress management programs. Maslach (1976) reported that burnout rates appear to be lower for those professionals who have access to such a program. Dixon, Shaw, and Bensky (1980) commented on the importance of special services administrators recognizing the consequences of ignoring the mental health of their staffs. Bensky, Shaw, Gouse, Bates, Dixon, and Beane (1980) stated that administrators should be equipped with methods to identify and assist staff members who are experiencing job-related stress. Considering the percentages of burnout reported by the teachers in the present study, the expressed need for a stress management program by special educators and the effects of implementing such a program on burnout rates are in need of exploration.

References

Bensky, J., Shaw, S. F., Gouse, A. S., Bates, H., Dixon, B., & Beane, W. E. Public law 94-142 and stress: A problem for educators. Exceptional Children, 1980, 47, 24-29.

DiCaprio, P. R. A study of the relationship of organizational climate to job satisfaction of teachers in selected rural and suburban secondary schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 3334, as cited in Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. Teacher stress and satisfaction, Educational Research, 1979, 21, 89-96.

Dixon, B., Shaw, S. F., & Bensky, J. M. Administrator's role in fostering the mental health of special services personnel. Exceptional Children, 1980, 47, 30-36.

Freudenberger, H. J. Burnout: Occupational hazard of the child care worker. Child Care Quarterly, 1977, 6, 90-98.

Freudenberger, H. J. Burnout. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1980.

Grey, N. Tucson Teachers Initiate Stress Counseling Program. NEA Reporter, 1979, 18, 6-7.

Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. A note on teacher stress and locus of control. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 1979, 52, 227-228.

Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. Teacher stress and satisfaction. Educational Research, 1979, 21, 89-96.

Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. Teacher stress, prevalence, sources, and symptoms. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 48, 159-167.

Maslach, C. Burned-Out. Human Behavior, 1976, 5, 16-22.

Maslach, C., & Pines, A. The Burn-out syndrome in the day care setting. Child Care Quarterly, 1977, 6, 110-113.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. Maslach Burnout Inventory. Palo Alto, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1981.

Morsink, C. U., Blackhurst, A. E., & Williams, S. SOS: Follow-up support to beginning learning disabilities teachers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1979, 12, 17-21.

NEA Reporter, The Pressure Cooker World of the Teacher, 1979, 18, p. 5.

Pines, A. M., Aronson, E., with Kafry, D. Burnout: From Tedium to Personal Growth. New York: The Free Press, 1981.

Pines, A., & Kafry, D. Occupational tedium in the social services. Social Work, 1978, 23, 499-507.

Price, L. W. Organizational stress and job satisfaction in public high school teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 727-8, as cited in Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. Teacher stress and satisfaction. Educational Research, 1979, 21, 89-96.

Smith, R. Teacher stress. Virginia Journal of Education, March 1980, 10-15.

Start, K. B., & Laundy, S. Successful teachers in the secondary school. Research in Education, 1973, 9, 1-15, as cited in Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. Teacher stress and satisfaction. Educational Research, 1979, 21, 89-96.

Stevenson, G. S., & Milt, H. Ten tips to reduce teacher tension. Today's Education, 1975, March-April, 52-54.

Truch, S. Teacher Burnout and What to Do About It. Novato, CA, 1980.

Weiskopf, P. E. Burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 1980, 47, 18-23.

Appendix A

48 Item Questionnaire

48 Item Questionnaire

Indicate your choices under the appropriate headings:

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
? - undecided
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

	Responses				
	SA	A	?	D	SD
1. The administration caters to parents and ignores the needs of teachers.					
2. I spend time on job-related work after hours regularly.					
3. I do not have an opportunity to take a daily break at work.					
4. My job carries little status and respect.					
5. I receive praise from my superiors for my efforts.					
6. I feel that there is room for advancement within the system.					
7. Interruptions caused by announcements, assemblies, fire drills, etc. do not interrupt my students' learning.					
8. My superiors are competent.					
9. I am required to perform bus and cafeteria duties.					
10. Disciplinary action by the office is inadequate.					
11. School rules are not uniformly enforced.					

Indicate your choices under the appropriate headings:

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
? - undecided
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

	Responses				
	SA	A	?	D	SD
12. My salary, compared to others who spent as much time in training as I did, is adequate.					
13. Planned conference days are unnecessary.					
14. I am required to attend too many meetings.					
15. Lack of success with my students is a problem.					
16. Student violence is not a problem for me.					
17. I spend too much time conferring with my students' social workers, psychiatrists, etc.					
18. The instruction of students is a difficult aspect of my job.					
19. Counseling parents is part of my job.					
20. I have no problem with helping regular educators understand and accept my students in their class-rooms.					
21. Special education teachers should receive additional pay for writing IEPs.					
22. I do not have an aide, but need one.					

Indicate your choices under the appropriate headings:

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
? - undecided
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

	Responses				
	SA	A	?	D	SD
23. If I had to do it over again, I would not become a special education teacher.					
24. Most aides I have worked with have not been competent.					
25. I am required to plan for and instruct too many students.					
26. My principal is knowledgeable and understanding regarding my students and my responsibilities.					
27. Central administration is knowledgeable and understanding regarding my students and my responsibilities.					
28. I feel that I am working more and contributing less to my students' welfare.					
29. My co-workers think that I am a babysitter, not a professional.					
30. Demand for accountability is reasonable.					
31. I feel that I should only be evaluated by special education personnel.					
32. I lack the materials needed to properly instruct my students.					
33. Current evaluation methods do not accurately assess student development and progress.					

Indicate your choices under the appropriate headings:

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
? - undecided
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

	Responses SA	A	?	D	SD
34. I experience pressure from having to meet constantly recurring deadlines.					
35. I have to spend my own money for materials.					
36. Children in special education classes are often improperly placed.					
37. Materials are equally distributed among special education classes in the system.					
38. The structure of special education programs is good.					
39. Writing IEPs does not place an undue burden on me.					
40. Implementing IEPs does not place an undue burden on me.					
41. Monitoring IEPs is not a problem.					
42. Diagnosis and assessment is not a problem.					
43. Student transportation does not interfere with the school schedule.					
44. I perceive my job to be stressful.					
45. I bring my students' problems home with me.					
46. My students appreciate me.					

Indicate your choices under the appropriate headings:

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
? - undecided
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

	Responses				
	SA	A	?	D	SD
47. My efforts have minimal impact on my students.					
48. Providing emotional support to my students is stressful.					

Appendix B

Special Educator Attitude Measure

Special Educator Attitude Measure

Indicate your choices under the appropriate headings:

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
? - undecided
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

	Responses				
	SA	A	?	D	SD
1. I have an opportunity to take a daily break at work.					
2. Interruptions caused by announcements, assemblies, fire drills, etc. do not interrupt my students' learning.					
3. My superiors are competent.					
4. Planned conference days are unnecessary.					
5. I am required to attend too many meetings.					
6. I have no problem with helping regular educators understand and accept my students in their classrooms.					
7. I am required to plan for and instruct too many students.					
8. Central administration is knowledgeable and understanding regarding my students and my responsibilities.					
9. My co-workers think that I am a babysitter, not a professional.					
10. I lack the materials needed to properly instruct my students.					

Indicate your choices under the appropriate headings:

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
? - undecided
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

	Responses				
	SA	A	?	D	SD
11. I have to spend my own money for materials.					
12. Materials are equally distributed among special education classes in the system.					
13. Writing IEPs does not place an undue burden on me.					
14. Monitoring IEPs is not a problem.					
15. I bring my students' problems home with me.					
16. I perceive my job to be stressful.					

Appendix C

Maslach Burnout Inventory

Convergent Validity for Maslach Burnout Inventory

Human Services Survey

Christina Maslach and Susan E. Jackson

The purpose of this survey is to discover how various persons in the human services or helping professions view their jobs and the people with whom they work closely. Because persons in a wide variety of occupations will answer this survey, it uses the term *recipients* to refer to the people for whom you provide your service, care, treatment, or instruction. When answering this survey please think of these people as recipients of the service you provide, even though you may use another term in your work.

On the following page there are 22 statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way *about your job*. If you have *never* had this feeling, write a "0" (zero) in both the "HOW OFTEN" and "HOW STRONG" columns before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate *how often* you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. Then decide *how strong* the feeling is when you experience it by writing the number (from 1 to 7) that best describes how strongly you feel it. An example is shown below.

Example:

HOW OFTEN:	0 Never	1 A few times a year or less	2 Once a month or less	3 A few times a month	4 Once a week	5 A few times a week	6 Every day	
HOW STRONG:	0 Never	1 Very mild, barely noticeable	2	3	4 Moderate	5	6	7 Major, very strong

HOW OFTEN	HOW STRONG	
0–6	0–7	
_____	_____	Statement: I feel depressed at work.

If you *never* feel depressed at work, you would write the number "0" (zero) on both lines. If you *rarely* feel depressed at work (a few times a year or less), you would write the number "1" on the line under the heading "HOW OFTEN." If your feelings of depression are *fairly* strong, but not as strong as you can imagine, you would write a "6" under the heading "HOW STRONG." If your feelings of depression are very mild, you would write a "1."

Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
577 College Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306

Sample

Human Services Survey

HOW OFTEN:	0 Never	1 A few times a year or less	2 Once a month or less	3 A few times a month	4 Once a week	5 A few times a week	6 Every day	
HOW STRONG:	0 Never	1 Very mild, barely noticeable	2	3	4 Moderate	5	6	7 Major, very strong

HOW OFTEN 0–6	HOW STRONG 0–7	Statements:
1. _____	_____	I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. _____	_____	I feel used up at the end of the workday.
3. _____	_____	I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
4. _____	_____	I can easily understand how my recipients feel about things.
5. _____	_____	I feel I treat some recipients as if they were impersonal objects.
6. _____	_____	Working with people all day is really a strain for me.
7. _____	_____	I deal very effectively with the problems of my recipients.
8. _____	_____	I feel burned out from my work.
9. _____	_____	I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.
10. _____	_____	I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.
11. _____	_____	I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.
12. _____	_____	I feel very energetic.
13. _____	_____	I feel frustrated by my job.
14. _____	_____	I feel I'm working too hard on my job.
15. _____	_____	I don't really care what happens to some recipients.
16. _____	_____	Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.
17. _____	_____	I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my recipients.
18. _____	_____	I feel exhilarated after working closely with my recipients.
19. _____	_____	I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
20. _____	_____	I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.
21. _____	_____	In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.
22. _____	_____	I feel recipients blame me for some of their problems.

(Administrative use only)

	cat.	cat.
EE:F	_____	_____
DP:F	_____	_____
PA:F	_____	_____
EE:I	_____	_____
DP:I	_____	_____
PA:I	_____	_____

	Dimensions	
	Frequency	Intensity
External validation of personal experience (peer ratings)		
Mental health workers (n = 40)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
emotionally drained by job	.28*	.41**
physically fatigued	.42**	.26†
higher Depersonalization		
emotionally drained by job	.56***	.57***
physically fatigued	.55***	.50**
complaints about clients	.32*	.33*
Police and spouses (n = 142)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
upset and angry	.34***	.34***
tense or anxious	.27***	.25**
physically exhausted	.20**	.15*
complaining about problems	.26***	.29***
higher Personal Accomplishment		
cheerful or happy	.25**	.14†
work brings pride and prestige	.24**	ns
Dimensions of the job experience		
Physicians (n = 43)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
more direct patient contact	.31*	.30*
less teaching	−.26*	−.33*
less administration	−.21†	−.36*
higher Depersonalization		
less administration	ns	−.26*
Social service and mental health workers (n = 91)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
less feedback from job	−.24*	−.38***
more dealing with others	.15†	ns
higher Depersonalization		
less feedback from job	−.44***	−.38***
higher Personal Accomplishment		
more feedback from job	.38***	.29**
more task significance	.19*	.18*
Personal outcomes		
Nurses, social service, mental health workers (n = 180)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
less growth satisfaction	−.24***	−.26***
higher Depersonalization		
less growth satisfaction	−.47***	−.39***
higher Personal Accomplishment		
more growth satisfaction	.41***	.29***
Social service and mental health workers (n = 91)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
less meaningfulness of work	ns	−.16†
less knowledge of results	−.31**	−.21*
higher Depersonalization		
less meaningfulness of work	−.32***	−.21*
less knowledge of results	−.31**	−.28**
higher Personal Accomplishment		
more meaningfulness of work	.27**	.19*
more knowledge of results	.20*	.15†

	Dimension	
	Frequency	Intensity
Mental health workers (n = 40)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
more work breaks	ns	.29*
evaluate clients negatively	ns	.33*
higher Depersonalization		
more absenteeism	.25†	.30*
Physicians (n = 43)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
want to get away from people	.27*	.25*
Nurses, social service, mental health workers (n = 180)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
less coworker satisfaction	−.16*	−.19**
higher Depersonalization		
less coworker satisfaction	−.41***	−.36***
higher Personal Accomplishment		
more coworker satisfaction	.40***	.32***
Police officers and spouses (n = 142)		
higher Emotional Exhaustion		
gets angry at family	.16*	.26***
wants to be alone, not with family	.16*	.19*
more insomnia	.24**	.24**
takes a drink	.24**	.19*
uses medications	.17*	.21**
higher Depersonalization		
gets angry at family	.16*	.28***
sees children as emotionally distant	.32***	.24**
does not share feelings with wife	ns	.19*
does not care about wife	ns	.17*
absent from family celebrations	.21**	.15*
fewer friends	.22**	.20*
officer and wife have different friends	.17*	.24**
higher Personal Accomplishment		
sees children as emotionally close	.38***	.33***
fewer tranquilizers	−.18*	−.21**
fewer medications	−.28**	−.33***

Note: All p values are two-tailed.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001, †p < .10

Appendix D

Summary of the Analyses of Variance

Analysis of Variance for Level, Type, and System

Source	SS	df	MS	F
	Emotional Exhaustion:		Frequency (EE:F)	
A(Level)	45.4609	1	45.4609	0.351
B(Type)	17.4280	1	17.4280	0.134
C(System)	145.3064	2	72.6532	0.560
AxB	9.6702	1	9.6702	0.075
AxC	102.6946	2	51.3473	0.396
BxC	36.1004	2	18.0502	0.139
AxBxC	269.9728	2	134.9864	1.041
Error	11280.3146	87	129.6588	
	Depersonalization:		Frequency (DP:F)	
A(Level)	1.3407	1	1.3407	0.051
B(Type)	38.7785	1	38.7705	1.485
C(System)	28.9099	2	14.4550	0.554
AxB	12.4871	1	12.4871	0.478
AxC	159.7844	2	79.8922	3.059
BxC	69.2146	2	34.6073	1.325
AxBxC	8.2170	2	4.1085	0.157
Error	2272.0320	87	26.1153	
	Personal Accomplishment:		Frequency (PA:F)	
A(Level)	0.8352	1	0.8352	0.028
B(Type)	68.9906	1	68.9906	2.289
C(System)	164.3390	2	82.1695	2.726
AxB	25.0460	1	25.0460	0.831
AxC	59.5208	2	29.7604	0.987
BxC	58.5249	2	29.2624	0.971
AxBxC	24.5920	2	12.2960	0.408
Error	2622.1287	87	30.1394	
	Emotional Exhaustion:		Intensity (EE:I)	
A(Level)	23.5634	1	23.5634	0.123
B(Type)	106.2243	1	106.2243	0.553
C(System)	264.4952	2	132.2476	0.689
AxB	5.7449	1	5.7449	0.030
AxC	299.8930	2	149.9465	0.781
BxC	93.7956	2	46.8978	0.244
AxBxC	633.5367	2	316.7683	1.650
Error	16700.3521	87	191.9581	

Analysis of Variance for Level, Type, and System (continued)

Source	SS	df	MS	F
	Depersonalization: Intensity (DP:I)			
A(Level	0.1867	1	0.1867	0.004
B(Type)	17.8495	1	17.8495	0.381
C(System)	32.0279	2	16.0140	0.342
AxB	0.2932	1	0.2932	0.006
AxC	164.0950	2	82.0475	1.753
BxC	56.4244	2	28.2122	0.603
AxBxC	0.4155	2	0.2077	0.004
Error	4071.7874			
	Personal Accomplishment: Intensity (PA:I)			
A(Level)	82.0480	1	82.0480	1.715
B(Type)	138.8296	1	138.0296	2.903
C(System)	71.7449	2	35.8724	0.750
AxB	0.9941	1	0.9941	0.021
AxC	52.9921	2	26.4960	0.554
BxC	110.5584	2	55.2792	1.156
AxBxC	42.6216	2	21.3108	0.446
Error	4161.1991	87	47.8299	