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ABSTRACT

Teacher burnout has created many problems for the teaching profession. Teacher burnout is often cited as a large contributor to concerns with teacher retention rates (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). In addition, teacher burnout has been shown to have negative effects on teacher and student performance (Huberman & Vandenberghe, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 1999).

Previous research on teacher burnout has taken a reactive approach and identified several causes of burnout. This study took a proactive approach and identified specific teacher capacities that may prevent teachers from suffering from burnout.

A questionnaire was disseminated to 4945 teachers who began teaching in the state of Ohio during the 2006-2007 academic year. A total of 165 responses were matched with their respective scores from the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers and analyzed.

Utilizing structural equation modeling, this descriptive survey study identified a teacher’s sense of efficacy in classroom management and in student engagement as significant predictors of teacher burnout. Specifically, classroom management efficacy was a strong predictor of emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment, while student engagement efficacy had a strong impact on depersonalization and personal accomplishment.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In our society, teachers play a critical role in the development of the nation’s workforce. Every member of society is impacted in some manner by a teacher. The effectiveness of teachers drives the ongoing development of our society. Currently, the teaching profession is an area of concern because the quality and stability of the profession is being drawn into question. As the educational skills of our children are questioned and challenged through widespread standardized assessments, teachers are charged with “righting the ship” and ensuring that the next generation of youth meet and exceed a higher set of standards. As mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2002), teachers are expected to have all students at proficient levels by 2014.

This pressure adds to the stress and strain of a profession that is already among the most stressful (Borg & Riding, 1991a; Heus & Diekstra, 1999; Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996; Travers & Cooper, 1993). Increased testing standards are only one of the many challenges teachers are facing. Often the pressure of increasing student achievement falls squarely on the shoulders of teachers. Unfairly, teachers are charged with the challenge of getting all students to perform at proficient levels. Accountability
for students’ success is passed from the government to school districts to individual schools and ultimately to teachers.

Teaching is a challenging profession, and for beginning teachers it is even more challenging. As many as 50 percent of new teachers leave the profession after five years (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004). These novice teachers are often confronted with challenges that their more experienced peers do not face. “They are more likely to be assigned the most difficult classes, teach classes with a high concentration of special education students, and serve in schools that have the majority of minority, poor and/or non-English speaking learners” (Moore, 2007, p. 2). As previously stated, teaching is a stressful occupation and the stresses are compounded for teachers new to the profession. In most cases, new teachers are not given the chance to slowly transition into a high demand workload; rather, they are thrust into a challenging work environment on their first day. As teachers gain experience they often move to teach less challenging courses and their experience naturally equips them with knowledge to deal with the stresses of the profession. Novice teachers must enter the profession on the first day equipped with the skills to succeed in a challenging, demanding, and stressful work environment.

Teacher educators are responsible for preparing teacher candidates for the profession they are entering. Thus, they have the responsibility of preparing teacher candidates to contend with and manage the challenges they will face during their careers. Teacher educators and those responsible for beginning teacher induction programs and ongoing professional development would substantially benefit from the identification of specific teacher capacities that enable a teacher to successfully manage the daily stresses
of teaching. If teachers can be educated and better prepared to manage these challenges in their first years of service, they will be less likely to suffer from burnout.

Statement of the Problem

Teacher burnout has been cited as the impetus for several of the serious issues within the teaching profession. Some of the adverse affects of burnout on teachers are: frequent absences, less commitment, illness, physical ailments, inappropriate social behavior, and low quality teaching performance (Huberman & Vandenberghe, 1999; Rudow, 1999). Cordes and Dougherty (1993) more specifically noted that burnout can lead to: physical and mental health problems, deterioration of social and family relationships, development of negative attitudes, higher risk of smoking, and drug and alcohol abuse.

Burnout can harm practicing teachers both physically and mentally. But an even more significant concern is how teacher burnout impacts students (Maslach & Leiter, 1999).

[Students] not only provide the greatest source of difficulties and frustration but also the greatest potential source of gratification. For some teachers, the stress of classroom work is so great that they are unable to experience sufficient rewards from their teaching. Feeling deprived in this manner, some teachers will cut back on their efforts and psychological investment in order to balance the equation. They, of course, ultimately experience even fewer rewards and the downward spiral of burnout begins. (Farber, 1999, p. 160).

Farber is suggesting that student interactions are the greatest reward of teaching. However, students can also be one of the foremost causes of stress, and as student
conflicts wear on a teacher they are unable to appreciate the positive reinforcement of student interactions. Thus more stress and fewer rewards equate to higher burnout over time.

As teachers’ symptoms of burnout increase, their students may suffer. Teachers who experience burnout are more likely to criticize their students. This can eventually lead to students having lower self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, depth of learning, initiative, and creativity (Huberman & Vandenberghe, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 1999). At the extreme, a burnt-out teacher is more concerned with surviving the day, week, month, term, or year than with the quality of their students’ education (Woods, 1999). Put simply, teachers with higher levels of burnout may not only be less effective they may actually do their students harm.

In some cases, burnout will force a teacher to leave the profession altogether. Although this alleviates the concerns with student interactions, it affects the larger scale problem in teacher retention. Teacher retention has been an area of concern and the problem appears to be getting worse. After the 1988-89 school year, 5.6 percent of U.S. teachers left the profession. These rates have steadily increased and after the 2004-2005 school year 8.4 percent of working teachers left the profession (Marvel et al., 2007). Financially, some report that teacher turnover costs the U.S. $7 billion annually (National Education Association, 2007). Specifically, the retention of new teachers is an area of concern. School districts spend $4,400 to $17,800 on the hiring and support of first year teachers. Studies have shown that between 37 and 50 percent of new teachers leave the profession within five years (Hafner & Owings, 1991; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). This is of particular interest when compared with research that suggests
that most teachers entering the profession intend to work in the field for more than five years (Hite & Durr, 2007).

Some argue that a teacher retention rate of 100 percent is an unsound objective. The profession would prefer that less capable teachers exit while the more capable teachers remain (Johnson & Kardos, 2008). However, some research suggests that, in the case of teaching, the opposite is occurring. Studies have shown that the more qualified teachers leave difficult working environments, while less qualified teachers remain, possibly because they could not find work elsewhere due to their lesser qualifications (Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2002; Podgursky, Monroe, & Watson, 2004).

It is important to note that not all teachers leaving the profession are doing so because of burnout. Still, burnout is one of the noteworthy causes for teachers leaving the profession and the number of teachers who leave the profession during their first five years is disturbing. In a study conducted in Queensland, Australia, Goddard and Goddard (2006) sampled 112 first and second year teachers to study their levels of burnout and intentions about leaving teaching. Of the 112 teachers surveyed, 13 (11.6 percent) indicated they were “seriously considering” (p. 68) leaving the profession. Those 13 teachers had significantly higher levels of burnout across all three components (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment) than the rest of the sample. These results seem to indicate that a considerable number of teachers are leaving the profession, at least in part, because of burnout.

Whether burned-out teachers leave or remain in teaching, negative consequences have been documented. The majority of the research on teacher burnout has been
conducted from an observation perspective. Causes and outcomes have been identified, but little has been done to proactively study the phenomenon.

Purpose of Study

This study was meant to identify specific knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that would be helpful for beginning teachers to hold in an effort to later prevent them from becoming burned-out. The literature refers to a teacher’s set of knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs as a set of teacher capacities (Grant, 2008).

At the time this study was conducted the majority of research on teacher burnout had explored the causes of teacher burnout. The literature on causes of teacher burnout often utilize Bryne’s (1999) conceptual model. Bryne’s model was based on an extensive investigation of teacher burnout and concluded with the identification of three general factors that impact a teacher’s level of burnout: organizational, personal, and background. Each factor has been extensively studied with the findings generally supporting Bryne’s model; however, some researchers have proposed minor modifications or extensions to her model (Dorman, 2003).

This current study was not an attempt to expand the existing body of knowledge on predictors of teacher burnout; rather the aim was to identify specific capacities that empower teachers by making them less susceptible to burnout. Teacher educators have little influence over the organizational and background factors that lead to burnout; however, teacher preparation programs do have significant control over several specific capacities of their candidates. It is important to identify what, if any, specific knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs can help teachers to manage the stress of their job. Teacher education programs can instill in their candidates the skills that will provide a
buffer from burnout. Professional development programs would also benefit from information about capacities that may buffer against burnout because they could provide practicing teachers with further training on the specific capacities that buffer burnout.

This buffer would consist of specific knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that would make a teacher less susceptible to the symptoms of burnout. Coping strategies simply cover up an existing problem; what is needed is protection from burnout itself. Coping strategies are similar to a band-aid used to cover a scraped knee. Teachers are in need of knee pads to prevent their knees from getting scraped in the first place. Possible teacher capacities that may buffer against burnout that were explored in this study are a teacher’s sense of efficacy, organization of content knowledge, creation of a conducive learning environment, teaching practices, and professionalism. This study provided a unique analysis of burnout that gives teachers and teacher educators tools to better prepare candidates for the challenges of the teaching profession. Existing studies of teacher burnout take a reactive approach; what is needed is a proactive philosophy (Proctor & Alexander, 1992). This study has provided the first step in studying teacher burnout from a different perspective.

One specific teacher capacity that was explored for this study was teacher efficacy. Teacher’s sense of efficacy was defined along three distinct components: efficacy for student engagement, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for classroom management. These components were measured using the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), a self-reported measure of a teacher’s sense of efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). This study explored these three components and their relationship to burnout.
In addition to teacher efficacy this study also analyzed four other specific teacher capacities: organization of content knowledge, creation of a conducive learning environment, teaching practices, and professionalism. The Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers was used to measure each of these components. This study also analyzed how these capacities impact a teacher’s level of burnout. The TSES and Praxis III were used in this study to explore the impact that specific teacher capacities have on burnout. It is acknowledged that there are many capacities that are not included in the TSES and Praxis III data; however, they do provide a diverse set of information to begin the exploration of the impact of teacher capacities on burnout.

In addition to burnout and teacher capacities (as measured by Praxis III and TSES), this study assessed the participants on their level of role conflict, role overload, and perceptions of enabling school structure. Role conflict, role overload, and school climate are among the most significant organizational variables that relate to the various components of burnout. Bryne’s (1999) research noted that school climate is a major predictor of burnout. For this study the researcher chose to focus more specifically on how a school’s climate enables the teacher. In addition to school climate, role conflict and role overload were also used as control variables to aid in isolating the amount of variability in teacher burnout that may be accounted for by the teacher capacities being measured. More information on specifically how school climate, role conflict, and role overload relate to teacher burnout may be found in Chapter 2.

Research Questions

Based on the purpose of this study as previously described, the following research questions were investigated:
1. To what extent can the variability in practicing teachers’ level of burnout be explained by the teacher capacities measured in the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers?

2. To what extent can the variability in practicing teachers’ level of burnout be explained by their levels of teaching efficacy?

3. To what extent can the variability in practicing teachers’ level of burnout be explained by school classification (rural, urban, suburban), age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, number of children, years of teaching experience, and grade level?

4. To what extent can any specific teacher capacities measured in the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers and the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) be identified to buffer burnout symptoms caused by role conflict, role overload, or school climate?

Significance of the Study

This study adds to the current literature on teacher burnout by analyzing the impact of specific teacher capacities on burnout levels. As of the time of this investigation there was a lack of studies that uncovered the intersection of a teachers’ knowledge/skill base and their levels of burnout. This investigation used elements of existing frameworks, as well as new components for understanding the concept of teacher burnout. Previous research stopped with the identification of organizational factors that cause teacher burnout. This study extended those findings by identifying teacher capacities that prevent those organizational factors from impeding teachers’ performance. Teacher candidates, as well as practicing teachers, will benefit from the identification of
specific knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs by being more prepared to manage the day-to-day stress of teaching.

The most significant contribution this study made was in the findings it provides teacher educators and professional development coordinators. With specific capacities identified, teacher educators can assess their programs to address any areas of deficiency and, in turn, develop teachers that are capable of dealing with the stresses of their jobs and remain effective in their profession. Likewise, professional development programs can design specific learning opportunities that alleviate the symptoms of burnout in practicing teachers.

It is unacceptable for teacher education programs to continue to produce substitute teachers. Up to half of the current completers of teacher education programs leave after only five years (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003), and then they must be replaced by a new crop of teachers, of which, many will not remain. This creates a dangerous cycle that results in a highly inexperienced and unbalanced teaching force.

In addition, to the retention of teachers in the profession, teacher educators must be cognizant of the teachers experiencing burnout but remaining in the profession. This may be the more critical area of concern. Many of these teachers completed preparation programs as effective and motivated teachers, but became ineffective and unmotivated because of burnout. These teachers require skills that will enable them to flourish in their chosen profession. Teacher educators need to be concerned with developing teachers that endure and persist and do not succumb to the effects of burnout.
Assumptions of the Study

This study assumed that all teachers surveyed responded honestly to the questionnaire. This study also assumed that Praxis III scores of the participants were representative of their capacities in the specific domains measured, and that the Praxis III assessors rated the individuals accurately using the designated rubrics and the Praxis III procedures. The Praxis III assessment was administered during the 2006-2007 academic year, while the questionnaire was disseminated during the last month of the 2007-2008 school year. Although this creates a temporal precedence to aid in causality, it does not account for increased knowledge the subjects may have obtained (specifically in the four domains measured by Praxis III) over the course of a year.

An additional assumption made by this study was that teachers’ self-reported level of burnout during the last month of the school year was representative of their actual feelings throughout the school year.

Limitations of the Study

The data used for this study consisted only of public school teachers in the state of Ohio. Thus, the results can only be generalized to public school teachers in the state of Ohio that began teaching during the 2006-2007 academic year and any such generalizations should be made with caution. This study identified teacher capacities that significantly impacted teacher burnout, however these findings may only apply to the sample that was surveyed. This is because the researcher was not able to definitely determine if the sample was representative of the population. Asking teachers to provide the last four digits of their social security number, date of birth, and institution from which they graduated may have deterred some individuals from completing the
questionnaire. In addition, the invitation to participate was emailed to the sample, the email addresses were provided by the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), and it was not possible to verify the accuracy of the email addresses.

An additional limitation was created by the domains of the Praxis III assessment and the components of the TSES. In searching for knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that may buffer against burnout this study was limited to the knowledge, skills, dispositions and beliefs that are assessed through the Praxis III assessment and the TSES. It is possible that there are teacher capacities beyond those assessed through these two instruments that may be more effective in buffering against burnout. Also, the results from the questionnaire are self-reported data and an individual’s actual level of burnout, efficacy, role conflict, role overload, and school climate may differ from what they reported on the instrument. Despite these limitations, the findings of this study should guide future research because the results may provide valuable insights into the construct of burnout.

Delimitations of the Study

This current study was not an attempt to expand the existing body of knowledge on predictors of teacher burnout; rather the aim was to identify specific capacities that serve teachers by making them less susceptible to burnout. These specific capacities are represented only through those measured by the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers.

The only participants of this study were teachers taking the Praxis III beginning teacher assessment in the state of Ohio during the 2006-2007 school year. In accordance with ODE teaching licensure procedures, all first year teachers in the state of Ohio are
required to take the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers. Therefore, all first year teachers in Ohio seeking professional licensure should have taken the Praxis III and thus be included in this study’s population. The researcher does acknowledge that their may be unique circumstances where a first year teacher did not take the Praxis III, but the researcher was unaware of any specific exception at the time of the study. Hence, data from new teachers during the 2006-2007 academic year that, for whatever reason, did not take the Praxis III were excluded from the analysis.

In searching for knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that may buffer against burnout, this study was limited to the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that are assessed in the Praxis III assessment and the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). It is possible that there are teacher capacities beyond those assessed in the Praxis III and TSES that may be more effective in buffering against burnout than those measured in this study.

Role conflict, role overload, and school climate were the only organization factors that were analyzed in this study. The literature has reported that role conflict, role overload, and school climate are among the strongest predictors; however, there are additional factors, organizational or otherwise, that may contribute to a teacher’s level of burnout that were not measured in this study. In addition, the researcher worked to include a diverse and complete set of demographic data; however there may be additional demographic characteristics that are significant that were excluded.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms were used in this study:
Candidate – an individual enrolled in a teacher preparation program; a “student” in a
teacher preparation program.

Depersonalization – a component of burnout that refers to a teacher’s feelings of
detachment and general negativity towards their students.

Efficacy in classroom management – a teacher’s belief in his or her ability to manage
their classroom environment.

Efficacy in instructional strategies – a teacher’s belief in his or her ability to implement a
variety of effective instructional and assessment strategies.

Efficacy in student engagement – a teacher’s belief in his or her ability to engage students
and motivate them to complete various tasks.

Emotional Exhaustion – a component of burnout that refers to a teacher’s feeling of being
emotionally depleted or overextended.

Personal Accomplishment – a component of burnout that refers to a teacher’s feeling of
competence and ability to successfully fulfill their teaching duties.

Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers – a three part assessment process: review
of documentation prepared by teacher and reviewed during a pre-observation interview,
direct observation of classroom practice, and a post-observation interview. The content
of the Praxis III is categorized into four domains: organization of content knowledge,
creation of a conducive learning environment, teaching practices, and professionalism.

Program completer – an individual who has completed all the requirements of a teacher
preparation program for initial licensure. Program completers are recommended for
teaching licensure by their respective institutions.
Teacher capacities – a teacher’s set of knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs about teaching.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter One of this dissertation has provided a justification for this study and the questions researched. It also provides a description of the assumptions and limitations of the study, as well as defines often used terms. Chapter Two provides the theoretical framework for the study and summarizes the literature related to teacher burnout and teacher capacity. Chapter Three details the methodological procedures of this research. Chapter Four presents the research results and the findings. Conclusion and recommendations are discussed and interpreted in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This literature review provides a broad view of the concept of teacher burnout. Although the focus of this study is to identify specific knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that will buffer against burnout, it is still vital to understand the known causes and outcomes of teacher burnout. Before research can determine what will buffer against burnout it is imperative to understand what specifically causes burnout. Just as an environmentalist must understand the causes (carbon emission) of global warming before educating the public to improve knowledge and skills (cleaner energy sources) so the effects of global warming can be alleviated, an educational researcher must also understand the causes of burnout before educating teachers so the effects of burnout can be alleviated.

Teacher Burnout

The first documented research on the concept of burnout was conducted by Fruedengerger in the 1970s. Initially, his work focused on health care workers that were physically and psychologically depleted from the stresses of their jobs. His definition of burnout focused on physical and behavioral symptoms that resulted from overworking
(Freudenberger, 1974). Since then the research on burnout has developed a more complete definition of the construct.

**What is Teacher Burnout and How is it Conceptualized?**

It is important to understand that burnout was not developed as a scholarly construct, but rather a social problem. This makes the conceptualization of burnout somewhat unique because it has a pragmatic foundation instead of scholarly one. Initially, burnout was loosely defined and studied clinically. This approach to studying burnout was implemented, in part, because burnout was being studied by practitioners rather than scholars. This is not surprising given that practitioners were dealing with the consequences of burnout on a daily basis. During the early 1980s researchers began to develop different measures of burnout. Of these various instruments, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) became the most widely accepted. By the mid 1980s the MBI was modified to create an instrument specific to teacher burnout. During the 1980s the MBI implementation expanded. The MBI has been translated into several different languages and is used to measure burnout and specifically teacher burnout around the globe (Maslach, 1999).

The literature on burnout during the last 20 years has been dominated by the three-component MBI. The acceptance of a single instrument to measure teacher burnout has been advantageous to researchers. It has provided a common conceptual vocabulary for scholars. In addition, the result of various research studies can be compared because the instruments provide a common standard measurement.

Maslach defined burnout as “an individual stress experience that is embedded in a context of social relationships, and thus involves the person’s conception of both self and
others.” (Maslach, 1999, p. 215). Maslach went on to state that burnout is comprised of experienced stress, evaluation of others, and evaluation of self. The MBI identified these three interrelated components as: *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment*. This differs from the largely one-dimension construct of stress and helps to differentiate the construct of burnout from stress (Huberman & Vandenberghe, 1999). Maslach and Leitter (1999) more descriptively described the three components as follows:

Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being emotionally overextended and depleted of one’s emotional resources; depersonalization refers to a negative, callous, or excessively detached response to other people (often the recipients of one’s service or care); and reduced personal accomplishment refers to a decline in one’s feelings of competence and successful achievement in one’s work (p. 295).

This three component model as been continually validated in international research (Maslach et al., 1996). It is also important to note that this model views the components of burnout as separate, but continuous variables (Maslach et al., 1996; Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982). Rather than classifying an individual as “burned out” or “not burned out,” the MBI looks at each component of burnout on a continuum.

Although emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment are viewed as distinct variables they are still interrelated. Emotional exhaustion is a critical component of burnout because it significantly impacts depersonalization, which in turn, has an influence on personal accomplishment (Byrne, 1999; Leiter, 1993). The literature often focuses on emotional exhaustion because it tends to be the most influenced by outside environmental variables (Leiter, 1993).
In this paper, as well as in most of the literature, the term *burnout* refers to a compilation of the three components; this is because of the interrelated nature of the components. When the term burnout is used it refers to the model in Figure 2.1 as a whole. However, Maslach et al. (1996) recommended that any research on the causes or effects of burnout analyze each of the components separately.

*How does Burnout Impact Teachers?*

When studying burnout in teachers, the first obvious question is, do teachers experience more burnout than other social professionals? Individuals in all professions experience job stress that can lead to varying levels of burnout. Is there something about teacher burnout that differentiates it from occupational burnout in general? In a study of Dutch teachers, Heus and Diekstra (1999) studied 13,555 professionals to determine if
teachers did have higher levels of burnout than other social professionals. They found that teachers had higher burnout levels on all three components with, the exception of female teachers’ level of depersonalization. Male teachers reported the highest levels of burnout across all three dimensions. The findings of Maslach et al. (1996) generally support the conclusions of Heus and Diekstra. In a study of 11,067 professionals, teachers MBI scores of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were higher than the means of all other professions. The personal accomplishment component, however, was slightly below the mean. The literature also contends that teaching is a stressful occupation (Borg & Riding, 1991a; Travers & Cooper, 1993). Burnout is manifested, in part, because of stress. It is important to differentiate between teacher stress and teacher burnout. Burnout develops and maintains over time and is more static, whereas stress is more volatile and can drastically change over time. A teacher may experience a stressful moment, day, or week, but burnout will not develop as quickly as a few days and will persist longer than just a few weeks. Exposure to various types of stress over time can lead to burnout (Rudow, 1999). This, along with, the three specific dimensions of burnout defined above provide a conceptualization of teacher burnout that can be differentiated from teacher stress.

*Conceptual Model of Teacher Burnout*

Because burnout presents an area of concern for the teaching profession, the next question addressed by the literature is: what causes teachers to burnout? Byrne (1994; 1999) analyzed the extensive body of research on burnout to address this question. Through her analysis of the literature she found burnout was caused by organization,
personality, and background factors. Based on her literature review, Bryne hypothesized the model shown in Figure 2.2.

Figure 2.2: Bryne’s hypothesized model of teacher burnout

Organizational factors of teacher burnout. There are six organizational factors, the first of which is role conflict occurs when a teacher is faced with two or more conflicting requirements. For example, teachers struggling to balance the mandated curriculum and preparing their students for statewide assessments with their own feelings on what content is important for the students, may experience role conflict. Several studies have documented the conflicting demands of teachers (Blase, 1986; Litt & Turk, 1985). Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) showed specifically that role conflict had a positive correlation with the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization components of burnout.
“Role ambiguity is associated with a lack of clarity regarding a worker’s obligations, rights, objectives, status, and/or accountability” (Byrne, 1994, p. 648). Role ambiguity is often cited by teachers as a leading cause of job stress. Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) also found that role ambiguity, like role conflict, had a positive correlation with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, although the strength of the relationship was smaller than role conflict.

Work overload (also referred to as role overload) refers to having too many tasks to complete in a given timeframe, as well as tasks that are too complex or difficult to complete successfully. Work overload has been shown to be a factor in causing higher levels of burnout (Lutz & Maddirala, 1990). Specifically, excessive paperwork, large class sizes, and students with differing ability levels in the same class are causes of work overload (Byrne, 1994). Teachers have cited too little planning time and too heavy a workload among the top reasons for leaving the teaching field (U.S. Department of Education, 2005).

Classroom climate includes student discipline, apathy, achievement, and interactions, and all have been shown to be sources of teacher stress. Some research suggests that classroom management and student misbehavior are the most stressful components of the teaching profession (Borg & Riding, 1991b). Specifically, student discipline concerns increase a teacher’s feeling of depersonalization (cited in Byrne, 1999).

Another organizational factor that can lead to teacher burnout is lack of involvement in decision making. Commonly teachers are not directly involved in decisions that directly impact their daily work. School, district, state, and federal
decisions generally are mandated and passed down with minimal consultation with teachers. Teachers who feel a lack of influence in the decision making process are susceptible to increased levels of the depersonalization component of burnout (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993).

A lack of social support from administrators and supervisors can create teacher stress and eventually lead to burnout. The literature on how peer support related to burnout, however, has been inconclusive (Bryne, 1999). More research is needed on teacher support systems and how they relate to burnout. One interesting area of new research is in the discrepancies between actual and received social support and how they relate to burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1999).

**Personality factors of teacher burnout.** In addition to research on organizational factors, Bryne’s (1994; 1999) literature review cites several personality factors that may lead to burnout. Individuals, who believe the outcomes of certain events are a result of their own actions, have an internal locus of control. External locus of control is a term used to describe individuals who feel outcomes are “out of their hands” or based on luck. Various studies have shown correlations between locus of control and all three components of burnout (Capel, 1992; Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992).

Additional research has shown how a relationship between classroom management and teachers’ attributions: “external student-related attributions were associated with lower depersonalization feelings, whereas internal, student-related attributions were related to higher emotional exhaustion” (Bibou-Nakou, Stogiannidou, & Kiosseoglou, 1999, p. 215). External student-related attributions place the cause of misbehavior on students’ mood or situation-specific behavior. Internal student-related
attributions place the cause of the misbehavior on the student’s personality or family upbringing. These findings indicate that a teacher who attributes a student’s misbehavior to the student’s mood may feel a closer attachment to the student. A teacher who attributes a student’s misbehavior to the student’s personality may experience more emotional exhaustion.

In her literature review, Bryne (1999) cited several studies that suggest self-esteem is strongly related to burnout. Friedman and Farber’s (1992) research, in particular, showed a strong correlation between self-esteem and burnout.

Background factors of teacher burnout. In addition to organizational and personality factors, Bryne’s (1994; 1999) review uncovered several differences among various demographic variables: gender, age, and grade level.

Research on gender differences in burnout has yielded conflicting results. For example, a Heus and Diekstra’s (1999) study found higher levels of burnout for male teachers across all three components, whereas, Anderson and Iwanicki (1984) found females to have a higher levels of reduced personal accomplishment. Bibou-Nakou et al.’s (1999) research found male teachers to have significantly higher levels only in the emotional exhaustion component. However, there does appear to be agreement in regard to higher levels of depersonalization among males (Byrne, 1999).

Research on age, like gender, has produced varying results. Heus and Diekstra (1999) found higher levels of depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment for older teachers. In contrast, Byrne (1999) cited a study by Pierce and Molloy that found higher levels of depersonalization in younger teachers. Other research has shown higher
levels of emotional exhaustion in younger teachers (Friedman, 1999). Still others have found no significant differences by age (Anderson & Iwanicki, 1984).

*Grade level* has appeared to be a consistent predictor of teacher burnout. High school teachers have higher levels of burnout, particularly, in the depersonalization and personal accomplishment components (Byrne, 1999).

Byrne (1999) also mentioned the background variables of *marital status* and *years of teaching experience*, but she noted that research on either factor is sparse and inconsistent. Byrne (1999) used all of the organization, personality, and background variables listed above in a study of 3,138 teachers. She found that organizational factors were the largest determinants of teacher burnout; in particular, classroom climate, decision making, role conflict, and work overload were the largest contributors to burnout. Classroom climate impacted both emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Simply stated, as the environment of the classroom erodes, the teacher becomes more emotionally strained and feels a greater sense of detachment from the students. Decision making affects burnout in a more indirect manner. Teachers who are not involved in decision making processes that impact their daily work experience have low self-esteem and an external locus of control. Over time these effects will diminish a teacher’s sense of personal accomplishment. Byrne’s (1999) research found the impact of decision making to be stronger for intermediate teachers when compared to elementary and secondary teachers. Role conflict and work overload are also strong predictors of burnout, but there are differences in the teachers they affect. Role conflict leads to emotional exhaustion in elementary and intermediate teachers, but in secondary teachers
role conflict leads to depersonalization. Work overload impacted emotional exhaustion, but only for secondary teachers. Her results are represented in the model in Figure 2.3.

![Figure 2.3: Byrne’s common causal paths to burnout across K-12 teachers (solid arrows represent paths across all teacher groups, broken arrows represent elementary and intermediate only paths, and dotted lines represent paths across elementary and secondary teachers)](image)

*Alternative Model of Burnout*

Although Bryne’s model is often cited and is an important representation of burnout, it is not a complete or all encompassing representation of burnout. Some researchers have attempted to expand this model. A model incorporating teacher efficacy is presented later in this chapter.

*What are the Outcomes of Teacher Burnout?*

There are many negative outcomes of burnout. Some of the many adverse effects of burnout on teachers are: frequent absences, less commitment, illness, physical ailments, social behavior, and teaching performance (Huberman & Vandenberghe, 1999;
Rudow, 1999). Cordes and Dougherty (1993) more specifically noted that burnout could lead to: physical and mental health problems; deterioration of social and family relationships; development of negative attitudes; higher risk of smoking, drug, and alcohol abuse.

An area of even greater concern is how teacher burnout impacts students (Maslach & Leiter, 1999).

[Students] not only provide the greatest source of difficulties and frustration but also the greatest potential source of gratification. For some teachers, the stress of classroom work is so great that they are unable to experience sufficient rewards from their teaching. Feeling deprived in this manner, some teachers will cut back on their efforts and psychological investment in order to balance the equation. They, of course, ultimately experience even fewer rewards and the downward spiral of burnout begins (Farber, 1999, p. 160).

Farber is suggesting that student interactions are the greatest reward to teachers. However, students can also be one of the greatest causes of stress, and as student conflicts wear on teachers, they are unable to appreciate the positive reinforcement of the student interactions. Thus more stress and fewer rewards equate to higher burnout over time.

Teachers who are experiencing burnout are more likely to criticize their students. This can eventually lead to students having lower self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, depth of learning, initiative, and creativity (Huberman & Vandenberghe, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 1999). At the extreme, a teacher experiencing high levels of burnout is more
concerned with surviving the day, week, month, term, or year rather than their students’ quality of education (Woods, 1999).

In some cases burnout will force a teacher to leave the profession altogether. Although this alleviates the concerns about the negative impact of teacher burnout on teacher-student interactions, it affects a larger scale problem in teacher retention. After the 1988-1989 school year 5.6 percent of US teachers left the education profession. These rates have increased consistently and after the 2004-2005 school year 8.4 percent of working teachers left the profession (Marvel et al., 2007). Financially, some report that teacher turnover costs the U.S. $7 billion annually (National Education Association, 2007). Specifically, the retention of new teachers is an area of concern. School districts spend between $4,400 to $17,800 on the hiring and support of first year teachers. Studies have shown that between 37 and 50 percent of new teachers leave the profession within five years (Hafner & Owings, 1991; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). This is of particular interest when compared with research suggesting that most teachers entering the profession intend to work in the field for more than five years (Hite & Durr, 2007).

Some argue that 100 percent teacher retention is an unwise objective. The profession would prefer that less capable teachers exit while the more capable teachers remain (Johnson & Kardos, 2008). However, some research suggests that, in the case of teaching, the opposite is occurring. Studies have shown that the more qualified teachers leave difficult working environments, while less qualified teachers remain, possibly because they could not find work elsewhere due to their lesser qualifications (Lankford et al., 2002; Podgursky et al., 2004).
It is important to note that not all of the teachers leaving the profession are doing so because of burnout. Still, burnout is one cause for teachers leaving the profession and the number of teachers who leave the profession during their first five years is disturbing. In a study conducted in Queensland, Australia, Goddard and Goddard (2006) sampled 112 first and second year teachers to study their levels of burnout and intentions on leaving the teaching. Of the 112 teachers surveyed 13 (11.6 percent) indicated they were “seriously considering” (p. 68) leaving the profession. Those 13 teachers had significantly higher levels of burnout across all three components than the rest of the sample. These results seem to indicate that many teachers are leaving the profession, at least in part, because of burnout.

Role Conflict and Role Overload

Role conflict is an important variable in this study because it has been identified as a critical factor in job related stress, and persistent stress can lead to burnout. Role conflict occurs when a teacher is faced with conflicted demands. A descriptive example of role conflict could be when a teacher is faced with the decision to stay after school to work with a struggling student (teacher role) or leave to spend time with his/her own family (family member role). Role conflict is not exclusively a conflict between personal and professional roles. A teacher may also face role conflict as balance the roles within his or her job, such as, nurturer, disciplinarian, educator, role model, and many others. Role conflict has been shown to have a significant impact on teacher turnover and teacher absenteeism (Pettegrew & Wolf, 1982). The effects of conflict in teacher roles may be exaggerated by the new accountability standards. Some teachers struggle with the
decision to teach content they feel is important versus content that is emphasized on statewide assessments.

Role overload also refers to a teacher’s many responsibilities. Role overload occurs when a teacher is overwhelmed with responsibilities and unable to differentiate which role has priority. Although similar, role conflict and role overload are still distinct constructs.

The definition of role conflict implies that competing demands arise during particular or overlapping points in time. When this occurs, the individual often must choose which demand to satisfy, in effect privileging one role over the other, at least for the moment. In contrast, role overload refers to a process tied to a wider span of time – the volume of tasks is simply too heavy given the time available; however, the individual generally has wider latitude in deciding which are tended to and which are forgone (or resolved unsatisfactorily) (Hecht, 2001, p. 112).

A teacher can experience role conflict without role overload. A teacher may have conflicting role responsibilities, but he or she may not feel there are too many responsibilities to effectively manage. On the other hand, a teacher may feel overwhelmed by the job responsibilities (role overload), but not necessarily feel the various responsibilities are conflicting (role conflict).

As previously mentioned role conflict and role overload both have been shown to significantly impact a teacher’s sense of burnout. Byrne’s (1999) research found that, for secondary teachers, the role overload variable was a stronger predictor of emotional
exhaustion than any other variable measured. In addition, role conflict was the most influential variable for elementary and intermediate teachers,

School Climate

School climate is a general term that applies to many different components of a school’s structure. The climate of a school is largely influenced by the faculty, staff, and administration. The students also largely influence the makeup of a school, as well as the school in which the community is located. All these factors bring a multitude of influences. For this study, the researcher chose to focus on one specific aspect of the climate of a school - the bureaucratic structure - because it directly affects teachers and how they deal with the stress their jobs create. The researcher hypothesized that a school with a more supportive administration and staff will help teachers manage the stresses of their jobs and thus become less burned out. Previous research has show that bureaucracies can enhance workers’ satisfaction, increase innovation, lessen feelings of alienation, and reduce role conflict (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Hoy and Sweetland’s (2001) research on school bureaucracies identified how enabling or supportive a school’s environment was to teachers. Specifically, Hoy and Sweetland examined two aspects of bureaucratic structures: formalization and centralization.

Formalization refers to the formality of the schools rules and procedures. Adler and Borys (1996) viewed formalization in terms of enabling or coercive bureaucratic structures. Schools that are coercive will alienate teachers by forcing them to comply with regulations. “Enabling rules and procedures are flexible guidelines that reflect ‘best practices’ and help subordinates deal with surprises and crises” (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001, p. 298). Enabling structures support collaboration and focus on community building and
learning from mistakes that are made. Enabling school structures focus on problem solving while coercive structures require workers to blindly follow rules. Coercive environments maintain the current balance of power (status quo) while an enabling school structure will continually pressure for change and improvement (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

Centralization refers to the locus of control of the schools decision making and to the amount of input teachers have in the decision making processes of their schools. Schools that are highly centralized have a few individuals at the top of the structure who handle the decision making procedures. Highly centralized schools are often coercive as well. On the other hand, schools that have an enabling centralization distribute the decision making evenly across faculty and staff members. In schools with enabling centralizations “administrators use their power and authority to buffer teacher and design structures that facilitate teaching and learning” (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001, p. 300). The existence of hierarchical structures in schools is unavoidable, but in enabling schools administrators involve teachers in the tough decisions they must make, rather than make them in isolation.

Hoy and Sweetland (2001) used the formalization and centralization conceptualizations of school structure in their development of the Enabling School Structure (ESS) instrument. The ESS is a 12 item questionnaire measuring whether a school’s environment is enabling. The ESS is based largely on the trust between the teachers and administrators within a school. The ESS provides a quantitative measurement for a school’s structure. At one end of the continuum are highly enabling school environments that foster collaboration and share the decision making among
teachers and administrators. “In enabling school structures principals and teachers work cooperatively across recognized authority boundaries while retaining their distinctive roles” (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001, p. 318). At the other end of the continuum lie hindering school environments. In these schools there is a limited distribution of power and teachers feel controlled rather than supported by administration. The administration in a hindering school acts as though “teacher behavior must be closely managed and strictly controlled” (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001, p. 318).

For this research study the ESS was used as a measure of school climate because it specifically measures how supportive or hindering the administrations are to teachers. A supportive school is expected to be related to lower levels of teacher burnout. A supportive school is expected to lessen levels of role overload and role conflict (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Burnout literature has continually supported that role overload and role conflict lead to high levels of burnout (Bryne, 1999; Dorman, 2003). Therefore, a teacher who works in a supportive school structure should have substantially lower levels of burnout.

Teacher Capacity

The literature has referred to everything that a teacher needs to know or know how to do, as a teacher’s capacity. This includes all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that are needed to be a quality teacher (Grant, 2008).

As far back as 1889 there has been documentation of the importance of teacher capacity. “The most limited observer is aware that a very learned man may profoundly understand a subject himself, and yet fail egregiously in elucidating it to others” (State Office, 1889, p. 10). It is important to note, as the previous quote
emphasized, that teacher capacity is a set of knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that is distinct from other professions. The capacities of a teacher are what make a teacher different from other professionals or the layperson. In the 1920s the University of the State of New York required teaching graduates to be knowledgeable in general and educational psychology, history of education, principles of education, and subject matter and methods of teaching (McDiarmid & Clevenger-Bright, 2008). Again this indicates that teacher capacities are knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs beyond knowledge of one’s content area. These capacities are teaching specific.

The specifics of teacher capacities were debated, rather than researched, through the early part of the twentieth century. It was not until the 1960s that research began to systematically define various teacher capacities. The aim of early research was to identify the characteristics of effective teachers. Researchers aimed to identify general behaviors, attitudes, and emotional qualities of expert teachers. Ironically this early research did not include student learning. Current studies regarding teacher capacities are dominated by student learning and are generally termed teacher effectiveness. Currently, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), in contrast to existing literature, comments only on the importance of content knowledge in a quality teacher’s capacities (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Even though current federal policy has not added to the definition of teacher capacities, current research has shown the value of quality teaching. A quality teacher is proficient in all facets of teacher capacity. Research has shown the teachers who possess higher degrees, credentials, and more experience are the single most significant factor in
student achievement (McDiarmid & Clevenger-Bright, 2008). A teacher’s capacities are likely to increase as one furthers their education, certification, and experience.

This study explored specific teacher capacities to determine if they had a relationship to teacher burnout. This study focused on the specific capacities measured by the four domains of the Praxis III assessment: organization of content knowledge, creation of a conducive learning environment, teaching practices, and professionalism and the three components of teacher efficacy: efficacy for student engagement, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for classroom management.

*Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers*

The Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers was chosen for this study because it provides a unique analysis of a teacher’s practices. It is the only large scale assessment in which all beginning teachers are required to participate that is not a paper pencil type examination. The three components of the Praxis III: review of documentation prepared by the teacher and pre-observation interview, direct observation of classroom practice, and a post-observation reflective interview provide a unique and in-depth analysis of a teacher’s practice. The Praxis III provides a snapshot of a beginning teacher’s practices. While it does not measure a teacher’s quality of practice over time, it does require beginning teacher to demonstrate their capabilities across all four domains.

**Teacher Efficacy**

As previously mentioned, a teacher’s locus of control has been identified as a predictor of burnout. The concept of efficacy provides a richer conceptualization of a teacher’s attributions so it was selected instead of locus of control for this study. Byrne’s
model is an important characterization of what leads to teacher burnout. However, her model is not a complete list of factors that lead to burnout. Recent research in the concept of teacher efficacy adds to her existing model. In addition, the use of teacher efficacy as a predictor of burnout has been supported in previous research (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Dorman, 2003).

Individuals with a higher sense of self-efficacy set higher goals and are more motivated to achieve those goals because they feel they are capable of doing so (Bandura, 1989, 1997). Self-efficacy can also have a double sided effect on job stress. “Employees who have a low sense of efficacy are stressed by heavy work demands and role responsibilities. Those with a high sense of efficacy are frustrated and stressed by limited opportunities to make full use of their talents” (Bandura, 1997, p. 465). A low sense of efficacy also lends to an escapist (diversion from the problem) type of coping with stress, and escapist coping is associated with higher levels of the emotional exhaustion component of burnout (Bandura, 1997).

There is a large body of literature on the concept of teacher efficacy, which applies Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy to teachers. Teacher efficacy is a teacher’s belief that they can affect their students’ performance (Ashton, 1984). “Teacher efficacy is the teacher’s belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context” (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p. 233). Tschannen-Moran et al. suggested that a teacher’s sense of efficacy is the result of an interaction between a self-assessment of one’s teaching competence and an assessment of task difficulty. Tschannen and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) further defined the concept of teacher efficacy with
the creation of *Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale* (TSES). The TSES measures three distinct components: efficacy for student engagement, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for classroom management. Like self-efficacy, teacher efficacy affects the goals one sets and their motivation to achieve those goals.

Teacher efficacy has been consistently shown to impact student achievement, commitment to teaching, and job satisfaction (Woolfolk Hoy, Davis, & Paper, 2006), as well as students’ motivation, students’ self-efficacy and attitudes, teachers’ goals and aspirations, teachers’ attitudes toward change and innovation, teachers’ use of teaching strategies, and teachers’ likelihood of staying in the profession (Skaldic & Skaldic, 2007). As previously noted, a teacher’s lack of involvement in the decision making process may increase their levels of burnout. A lack of involvement in decision making also lowers a teachers sense of efficacy (Ashton, 1984). In addition, the literature has demonstrated some direct relationships between efficacy and burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Dorman, 2003; Skaldic & Skaldic, 2007). Specifically, Dorman’s (2003) research showed that higher levels of teaching efficacy predicted strong feelings of personal accomplishment. Brouwers and Tomic (2000) found a similar impact of self-efficacy on personal accomplishment and a longitudinal effect on depersonalization, meaning over time a lower sense of efficacy can increase a teacher’s feelings of depersonalization. Brouwers and Tomic (2000) also found that the emotional exhaustion component of burnout had a negative impact on a teacher’s self-efficacy. Dorman (2003) modified Byrne’s model of teacher burnout. His findings can be seen in Figure 2.4.
What Research Needs to be Conducted on Teacher Burnout?

Maslach and Leiter (1999) suggested several different areas, in which, research should focus when studying burnout. The literature on burnout to this point in time has focused primarily on job factors as causes of burnout (Maslach, 1999).

One area for further study is the impact that teacher burnout has on student behaviors. As burnout increases, thoroughness of lesson preparation and involvement in classroom activities are expected to decline. In addition, more criticism of students is likely to occur. In response to these teacher behaviors it is suggested that students’ sense
of efficacy would suffer, as well as motivation and creativity. As previously mentioned students are often the greatest source of reward for a teacher. In studying the projected effects of teacher burnout on students, it is also important to note that positive interactions with students may actually alleviate the effects of burnout.

A second area of research Maslach and Leiter suggested was the personal qualities of teachers. They suggested personal qualities may be an interaction variable in the burnout model. For example, “teachers low in intrinsic motivation might experience greater increases in emotional exhaustion in response to only small increases in role conflict. In contrast, a teacher highly motivated toward their teaching would be less likely to respond emotionally to minor variations in role conflict” (Maslach & Leiter, 1999, p. 299).

A third area of suggested inquiry is the school environment; specifically, in the areas or role conflict, role ambiguity and work overload. These “generic concept[s] need to be translated more specifically into relevant terms for teachers” (Maslach & Leiter, 1999, p. 300). Along with these concepts, further study is needed into classroom management and specific instructional methods used. A secondary component of the school environment that requires additional research is support systems; specifically, the discrepancies between actual and received social support and how they relate to burnout. A final area of concern for future study regarding the school environment is teacher involvement in the decision making process.

An addition to Maslach and Leiter’s suggestions, another area in which there has been limited research has been how a teacher can be better prepared to deal with burnout. While there has been in-depth investigation into the sources of burnout, it has become
apparent that there is little teacher educators can do to alleviate the causes of such burnout in the teachers they prepare. Organization factors are the leading cause of burnout and teacher educators have minimal influence over these factors. What a teacher education program can do is to better prepare teachers to be ready for the stresses of the job and instill in them skills that will provide a buffer from burnout. This buffer would consist of specific knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that would make a teacher less susceptible to burnout. Research needs to be conducted to find out, specifically, what knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs make a teacher less susceptible to each of the three components of burnout. Coping strategies simply cover up the existing problem, what is needed is protection from burnout. Various coping strategies are like a band-aid used to cover a scraped knee. Teachers are in need of knee pads to prevent their knees from getting scraped in the first place. Specific skills could be critical in developing teachers that are prepared to handle the many stresses of teaching. Possible teaching knowledge, skills, dispositions, or beliefs that may buffer against burnout are a teacher’s reflective practice, sense of efficacy, development of professional relationships, communication with parents, and ability to create relationships with students.

It is unacceptable for teacher education programs to continue to produce substitute teachers. Up to half of the current completers of teacher education programs leave after only five years, and then they must be replaced by a new crop of teachers, of which, many will not remain. This is creating a dangerous cycle that will result in a highly inexperienced and unbalanced teaching force.

In addition, to the retention of teachers in the profession, teacher educators must be cognizant of the teachers experiencing burnout but remaining in the profession. This
may be the more critical area of concern. As previously mentioned, teachers that are experiencing burnout are more likely to criticize their students. This can eventually lead to students having lower self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, depth of learning, initiative, and creativity (Huberman & Vandenberghe, 1999; Maslach & Leiter, 1999). Many of these teachers left preparation programs as effective and motivated teachers, but became ineffective and unmotivated because of burnout. These teachers require skills that will enable them to flourish in their chosen profession. Teacher educators need to be concerned with developing teachers that endure and persist and do not succumb to the effects of burnout.

Having read the literature on teacher burnout and teacher capacities, it has become apparent to the researcher that further study is needed. This research study has identified specific capacities that an individual teacher can develop that will alleviate the symptoms of burnout. As fewer teachers suffer from burnout, retention rates should increase. In addition, if the level of burnout can be reduced, teachers’ students will perform better and build stronger, more rewarding relationships with their teachers. Teacher educators and professional development organizations can work with teachers to build the capacities identified in this study. This research study has begun to provide solutions to the problem of teacher burnout that can be utilized by individuals without the need of changes in schools or their structures. This individualized approach to solving the problem of widespread teacher burnout will empower teachers, as well as teacher educators.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a detailed description of the research methods that were used for this study. These methods were chosen to answer the research questions presented in Chapter 1.

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey research design. By collecting questionnaire responses from public school teachers who began teaching during the 2006-2007 school year in the state of Ohio and matching those responses with their scores on the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers, the researcher was able to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent can the variability in practicing teachers’ level of burnout be explained by the teacher capacities measured in the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers?

2. To what extent can the variability in practicing teachers’ level of burnout be explained by their levels of teaching efficacy?

3. To what extent can the variability in practicing teachers’ level of burnout be explained by school classification (rural, urban, suburban), age, gender,
ethnicity, marital status, number of children, years of teaching experience, and grade level?

4. To what extent can any specific teacher capacities in the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers or teacher efficacy be identified to buffer burnout symptoms caused by role conflict, role overload, or school climate?

Description of the Variables

The following provides the operational definitions of the variables that were measured in this study.

**Teacher capacities** – those capacities measured by the four domains of the Praxis III assessment: organization of content knowledge, creation of a conducive learning environment, teaching practices, and professionalism and the three components of teacher efficacy. See Appendix A for domain and criteria descriptors.

**Teachers’ sense of efficacy** – as measured by the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) which provides three components of teacher efficacy: efficacy for student engagement, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for classroom management. Sample item: *How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?*

**Teacher burnout** – as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) which provides three distinct components of teacher burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. *Reproduction of sample items is not permitted by the CPP Inc., the copyright holder of the MBI.*
School Climate – as measured by the Enabling School Structure (ESS) instrument developed by Hoy and Sweetland (2001). Sample item: *The administrative hierarchy of this school enables teachers to do their job.*

Role Conflict – as measured by the five-item role conflict instrument developed by Pettegrew and Wolfe (1982). Sample item: *I have a hard time satisfying the conflicting demands of students, parents, administration, and teachers.*

Role Overload – as measured utilizing the five item role overload instrument developed by Pettegrew and Wolfe (1982). Sample Item: *I find that I have extra work beyond what should normally be expected of me.*

Demographic characteristics – self-reported data on the subject’s school’s classification (rural, urban, or suburban), age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, number of children, years of full-time teaching experience, and grade level taught (elementary, middle, or secondary).

Population and Sampling

This study was conducted in partnership with the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP). The TQP project studied beginning teachers’ perceptions of their teacher education programs, their beliefs about teaching, and the types of support received. The TQP project, in partnership with the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), maintained several databases on all teachers seeking professional licensure who began teaching during the 2006-2007 school year in the state of Ohio. For this study, two TQP data files were utilized. The first file contained 7525 individuals and email addresses that had been updated by ODE within six months of beginning this study. Of these 7525 individuals, 2580 were selected for another study. The remaining 4945 were emailed a request to
complete a questionnaire. The second TQP data file that was utilized contained the Praxis III scores of all teachers participating in the assessment during the 2006-2007 academic school year. This file contained deidentified data. Each individual’s Praxis III scores were coded with a unique number that was constructed from the teacher’s date of birth, institution from which they graduated, and the last four digits of their social security number.

An invitation (Appendix B) was emailed that contained a web link to complete the anonymous questionnaire for the study. The participants were asked to provide the last four digits of their social security number, date of birth, and institution from which they graduated so that their responses could be matched with their Praxis III scores. This procedure allowed the researcher to match the responses of each teacher with their Praxis III scores while maintaining complete anonymity. Reminder emails were sent on two occasions to all subjects (Appendix B).

Instrumentation

This study used data from the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers, Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), Enabling School Structure (ESS), a role conflict instrument, a role overload instrument, and demographic information.

Praxis III is an Educational Testing Service (ETS) developed assessment that is used by the state of Ohio for professional licensure. The Praxis III assessment consists of a three part assessment process: review of documentation prepared by the teacher and reviewed during a pre-observation interview, direct observation of classroom practice, and a post-observation interview. The content of the Praxis III is categorized into four
domains: organizing for student learning (Domain A), creating an environment for student learning (Domain B), teaching practices (Domain C), and teacher professionalism (Domain D). Each domain is sub-categorized into multiple criteria with each criterion having a specific rubric by which the beginning teacher is assessed (Appendix A). Praxis III assessors are trained and certified by ETS using the ETS developed training protocol. Praxis III assessor training includes specific instruction on how to conduct all three components of the assessment process, as well as how to correctly utilize the scoring rubrics (Educational Testing Service, 2001). Previous studies have been unable to demonstrate reliability of the individual domains of Praxis III. For this study, the individual domains did not provide reliable results. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for Domains A, B, C, and D were .60, .52, .54, and .43, respectively. However, a summated total Praxis III score was reliable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .77, which is consistent with a reliability coefficient of .82 found in existing literature on Praxis III reliability (Moore, 2007). Because of these results, only the Praxis III total score was used in this study’s analysis.

The MBI was originally developed using a research approach in the early 1980s (Byrne, 1999). The MBI is considered the leading measure of burnout around the world (Maslach et al., 1996). This model is somewhat unique as it was derived empirically rather than theoretically. The model is divided into three interrelated components of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. The MBI was chosen for this study because of its reputation as the leading measure of burnout and its long standing history of use in research on teachers. The literature has supported that the MBI as a reliable and valid measure of burnout
Existing teacher burnout research has shown the MBI to be reliable, reporting Cronbach’s alphas of .88 for emotional exhaustion, .71 for depersonalization, and .77 for personal accomplishment (Dorman, 2003). The MBI was purchased for this study from CPP Inc. This study supported the existing reliability of the MBI across each component of burnout. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment were .91, .73, and .81, respectively.

The TSES measures three distinct components: efficacy for student engagement, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The TSES was chosen for this study because its three components can be compared individually with the three different components of burnout. This provided a descriptive procedure for analyzing the relationship between teacher efficacy and teacher burnout. The TSES has been demonstrated to be a reliable and valid measure of a three component model teacher efficacy (Capa, 2005; Moore, 2007). Capa’s (2005) research demonstrated Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients of .88 for student engagement efficacy, .80 for instructional strategies efficacy, and .79 for classroom management efficacy. This study supported the existing reliability of the TSES across each component of teacher efficacy. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management were .90, .79, and .88, respectively.

The ESS is an instrument designed to measure a teacher’s perception of the climate of their school. Specifically, the ESS measures how supportive or “enabling” the rules and regulations of a school are to a teacher’s ability to solve problems.
literature has supported the ESS as a valid measure of enabling school structure and the
validity of ESS as a measure of bureaucratic structure has been supported by a factor
analysis that resulted in a one factor model. In addition, the ESS was further validated by
comparisons to existing measurements of collegial trust and a teachers’ sense of
also found the ESS to be particularly reliable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .94. This study
supported the existing reliability of the ESS instrument with a Cronbach’s alpha
reliability coefficients of .91.

Both role conflict and role overload were measured using instruments developed
by Pettigrew and Wolf (1982). Role conflict is an instrument designed to determine the
amount of conflict one experiences from all the different demands of a job. Role
overload measures one’s perceptions on the manageability of their workload. The role
conflict and role overload instruments were each deemed reliable and valid by Pettigrew
and Wolf (1982). Existing research on the relationship between role conflict and role
overloads to teacher burnout have shown the role conflict and role overload instruments
to be reliable, reporting Cronbach’s alphas of .81 for role conflict and .78 for role
overload (Dorman, 2003). This current study also found both the role conflict and role
overload instruments to be reliable with Cronbach’s reliability coefficients of .88 and .86,
respectively.

In addition to the subjects’ responses on these instruments, data were also
gathered from the questionnaire on their school’s classification (rural, urban, or
suburban), age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, number of children, years of full-time
teaching experience, and grade level taught (elementary, middle, or secondary).
Data Collection

An invitation (Appendix B) was emailed to all subjects in the sample. The invitation contained a web link to complete the anonymous questionnaire (Appendix D). Participants were asked to provide the last four digits of their social security number, date of birth, and institution from which they graduated so that their responses could be matched with their Praxis III scores. This procedure allowed the researcher to match each teacher’s responses with their Praxis III score while maintaining complete anonymity.

Below is the timetable for the critical events in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 23, 2008</td>
<td>IRB approval for the study was received (Appendix C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23, 2008</td>
<td>Initial email request for participation in the study was emailed to sample (Appendix B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28, 2008</td>
<td>First reminder email was sent to the entire sample (Appendix B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 2008</td>
<td>Second and final reminder email was sent to the entire sample (Appendix B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2008</td>
<td>Data were extracted from Surveymonkey.com.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July – October, 2008</td>
<td>Data were analyzed (see results section for findings).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis

Structural equation modeling was used to identify the variability in each of the three components of teacher burnout that could be explained by: the four domains of Praxis III, the three components of TSES, and subjects’ schools classification (rural, urban, or suburban), age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, number of children, years of full-time teaching experience, and grade level taught (elementary, middle, or secondary). All four research questions were analyzed with structural equation modeling using
AMOS 16.0. Figure 3.1 is a hypothesized model based on a review of the current literature. A refined model is presented in Chapter Four based on the results of the existing study.

Figure 3.1: Hypothesized model of burnout

 Threats to Validity

This research study was a descriptive survey research design. There were no implications that the findings indicated a cause and effect relationship, thus internal validity was not an area of concern.

In terms of external validity, there is a Hawthorn effect threat because the subjects knew their responses were being used for a research study. However, the subjects were not told that the study was researching teacher burnout, thus limiting the Hawthorn effect impact. The initial list of all teachers seeking professional licensure who began teaching during the 2006-2007 school year in the state of Ohio was provided by the Ohio Department of Education, minimizing the risk of frame error. The Ohio Department of
Education maintains the most accurate data available on teacher licensure in the state of Ohio.

Sampling error was a concern for this study because of a non-probability sample. A total of 4945 individuals were selected as participants, and 165 responses were collected and matched to their respective Praxis III scores. This resulted in a usable response rate of 3.3 percent. Therefore non-response is a major limiting factor in the generalizability of these results.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the statistical findings of this study. The statistical analysis results for each research question are contained in the following.

Respondents

A total of 238 teachers responded from the initial invitation that was emailed to 4945 teachers. This resulted in a 4.8 % response rate. Their responses were then matched with their corresponding Praxis III beginning teacher assessment scores. The TQP database did not contain Praxis III scores for all responding teachers; therefore, 165 teachers were matched and their responses and Praxis III scores were analyzed along with the other variables. This resulted in a total usable response rate of 3.3 percent.

Because the response rates were relatively small, the researcher conducted a statistical comparison between the sample and the population of 4945 teachers invited to participate to ensure that the participants were an accurate representation. Gender and race (defined as white and non-white) of the sample were compared to the sampling population. Using a chi-square comparison, the sample was not found to be significantly different from the population. Results of the analyses are shown in tables 1 through 4 below.
Table 4.1: *Expected values of gender sample to population chi-square comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: *Gender sample to population chi-square comparison test statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.185a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 36.7.

Table 4.3: *Expected values of race sample to population chi-square comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White/non-white</th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>155.4</td>
<td>-21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: *Expected values of race sample to population chi-square comparison*
Of the teachers who reported demographic information in the study, 28 percent, 26 percent, and 45 percent worked in rural, suburban, and urban schools, respectively. Data were also recorded on teachers’ grade level taught. Of those who responded, 40 percent taught elementary, 26 percent taught middle level, and 34 percent taught secondary. For those who responded to the gender item, male teachers made up 18 percent of the subjects, while females accounted for 82 percent. Of the respondents who reported ethnicity, 94 percent indicated they were white. A complete list of descriptive statistics for all of the variables in the study may be found in Table 4.5.

Table 4.4: Race sample to population chi-square comparison test statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White non-white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>50.315(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 9.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Descriptive Statistics</strong></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>9.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management Component of Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>30.2808</td>
<td>4.26977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization Component of Burnout</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>4.3716</td>
<td>4.62804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion Component of Burnout</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>17.4122</td>
<td>10.89775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling School Structure Combined</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>46.6713</td>
<td>8.19720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Taught</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies Component of Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>30.2603</td>
<td>4.20354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Status</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment Component of Burnout</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>39.3041</td>
<td>6.75284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis Total Score</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>52.2515</td>
<td>3.22510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict Combined</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>15.0210</td>
<td>5.52901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload Combined</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>15.8951</td>
<td>5.15631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Classification</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement Component of Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>27.0276</td>
<td>5.90544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Descriptive statistics
Findings of Research Questions

The research questions were answered using structural equation modeling. All structural equation analyses were conducted using AMOS 16.0 with Maximum Likelihood as the fitting function. To examine the impact the various variables had on teacher burnout, the researcher analyzed a model that included all variables recorded for the study. The resulting standardized model is presented in Figure 4.1.

![Figure 4.1: Initial standardized structural equation all variables in the study.](image-url)
Before analyzing the model, it is important to determine its goodness-of-fit. To determine the goodness-of-fit, chi-square statistics, Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA), and Normed Fit Index (NFI) were computed. The aim of the chi-square test of significance is to reject the hypothesis that the model is statistically different from the data. In structural equation modeling the null hypothesis is that the model fits; therefore, a statistically significant chi-square value is not desirable, whereas a non-significant chi-square results in an acceptance of the null hypothesis. The significant chi-square test \( \chi^2 = 255.96, df = 99, p \leq .001 \) indicated that this model did not fit the data. The NFI test of incremental fit of .72 for this study indicated a need to respecify the model. NFI values range from 0 to 1, with a value of 1 indicating a perfect model fit. It is recommended that model with values below .90 be restructured (Hair, 1998). The RMSEA value of .10 was at the recommended cutoff for acceptable value. According to Brown and Cudeck (1992), RMSEA values less than .05 indicate a close fit, between .05 and .08 indicate an acceptable fit, while values over .10 are deemed unacceptable. Because the chi-square test indicated that the model did not fit the data and the NFI and RMSEA indicated a restructure was needed, the researcher removed the non-significant paths of the model one by one to create a more parsimonious model and one still was supported the by literature. The final model that resulted can be seen in Figure 4.2.
Figure 4.2: Final standardized structural equation model of teachers’ classroom management efficacy, student engagement efficacy, role conflict, role overload, age, and years of teaching experience and the three components of burnout emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

Note: All regression coefficients are significant at p < .05.
Before analyzing the model, it is important to determine its goodness-of-fit. To determine the goodness-of-fit, chi-square statistics, Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA), and Normed Fit Index (NFI) were computed. The significant chi-square test ($\chi^2 = 41.86, df = 20, p \leq .001$) indicated that this model did not fit the data. The NFI test of incremental fit of .92 for this study indicated reasonable model fit. NFI values range from 0 to 1, with a value of 1 indicating a perfect model fit. It is recommended that model with values below .90 be restructured (Hair, 1998). The RMSEA value of .08 also indicated that model fit was acceptable. According to Brown & Cudeck (1992), RMSEA values less than .05 indicate a close fit, between .05 and .08 indicate an acceptable fit, while values over .10 are deemed unacceptable. Although the chi-square test resulted in rejection of the model, the final model presented in Figure 4.2 was the best fitting model the researcher could create that was still supported by the existing literature. A comparison of the goodness-of-fit for the initial and final model is presented in Table 4.6. Table 4.7 reports a correlation matrix of the variables used in the final model. The researcher used this model to answer the research questions for the study. However, the researcher cautions the reader against making generalization due to the model’s lack of fit. The findings of this study have provided some initial information about how teacher capacities may influence levels of burnout and can guide future research, but further study is needed to verify these results.
### Goodness-of-Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NPAR</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Model</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>255.96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Model</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Goodness-of-fit comparison of initial model (Figure 4.1) and final model (Figure 4.2)

### Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dep.</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>YE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.686”</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>-.488”</td>
<td>-.439”</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management Efficacy</td>
<td>-.455”</td>
<td>-.417”</td>
<td>.602”</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement Efficacy</td>
<td>-.352”</td>
<td>-.226”</td>
<td>.564”</td>
<td>.652”</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>.523”</td>
<td>.588”</td>
<td>-.320”</td>
<td>-.396”</td>
<td>-.349”</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>.296”</td>
<td>.530”</td>
<td>-.306”</td>
<td>-.287”</td>
<td>-.250”</td>
<td>.663”</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.228”</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 4.3617 17.2979 39.3404 30.2128 26.8794 15.0213 15.9433 31.89 2.72


**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
\(a\). Listwise N=141

Table 4.7: Correlation matrix for variables in final model presented in Figure 4.2
Research Question 1: To what extent can the variability in practicing teachers’ level of burnout be explained by the teacher capacities measured in the Praxis III Assessment of Beginning Teachers?

As previously mentioned, an analysis of the individual domains of the Praxis III beginning teacher assessments did not provide reliable results. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for Domains A, B, C, and D were .60, .52, .54, and .43, respectively. However, the total Praxis III score did have an acceptable reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .77. Based on these results, the total Praxis III score was used for analysis. This score provided a broad measurement of teacher capacity. Teachers with high scores demonstrated competency in: organization of content knowledge, creation of an environment conducive to learning, teaching practices, and professionalism. Teachers with lower Praxis III scores did not demonstrate these competencies. Even though the individual domains of Praxis III were not analyzed, it was still important for this study to determine whether the measured teacher capacities as a whole had an impact on a teacher’s level of burnout.

The Praxis III scores are not included in the final model (Figure 4.2) because they did not significantly add to the model. The results of this study indicated that Praxis III criteria have no significant impact on a teacher’s level of burnout. This did not in itself discount the researcher’s thoughts that there are specific teacher capacities that predict levels of burnout. Combining the various domains of the Praxis III into one score limited the specificity of the analysis, meaning the Praxis III measured a construct that was too general to be informative. The Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teacher was administered to the participants during the previous academic year. Although this
temporal difference supported a possible causal relationship between the Praxis III and teacher burnout, the time difference of over one year made it difficult to be certain that a teacher’s capacities had not significantly changed since taking the Praxis III. In addition, the Praxis III data did not contain a large amount of variance, which made identifying relationships more difficult. The impact of the Praxis III data is discussed further in Chapter 5.

Research Question 2: To what extent can the variability in practicing teachers’ level of burnout be explained by their levels of teaching efficacy?

All three efficacy components measured by the TSES (student engagement efficacy, instructional strategies efficacy, and classroom management efficacy) were analyzed in relationship to all three components of teacher burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment). As the model was trimmed, the instructional strategies component of teacher efficacy was removed because it did not significantly add to the model. This provided an interesting finding in regards to burnout and efficacy. According to this study, teachers’ efficacy in their instructional practices does not significantly impact their level of burnout. Whether teachers feel extremely confident or unconfident in their ability to successfully plan and implement a lesson has little bearing on their level of burnout. This is an interesting finding for teacher educators because the majority of typical teacher preparation programs focus on planning and implementing lessons. Of course, these skills are very valuable to teacher candidates; however, it is possible the curriculum should be expanded to include capacities that enable teachers to better manage the stresses of the job.
The final model in Figure 4.2 had several interesting findings in regard to teacher efficacy. Classroom management efficacy impacted the emotional exhaustion component of burnout. The standardized regression weight of the relationship was -.17; therefore as a teacher’s sense of efficacy in classroom management increased, his or her level of emotional exhaustion decreased. Classroom management efficacy also had a significant impact on the personal accomplishment component of burnout. The standardized regression weight of the relationship was .36; therefore as a teacher’s sense of efficacy in classroom management increased, his or her feelings of personal accomplishment also increased. It is also important to note that classroom management efficacy was the strongest predictor of personal accomplishment in the model.

Student engagement efficacy also significantly added to the final model. Student engagement efficacy impacted the depersonalization component of burnout. The standardized regression weight of the relationship was -.17; therefore as a teacher’s sense of efficacy in student engagement increased, his or her feelings of depersonalization went down. Student engagement efficacy also had a significant impact on the personal accomplishment component of burnout. The standardized regression weight of the relationship was .30; therefore as a teacher’s sense of efficacy in student engagement increased, his or her feelings of personal accomplishment also increased. Relative to the other variables in the model, the impact of student engagement efficacy on personal accomplishment was moderate, while its impact on depersonalization was small.
Research Question 3: To what extent can the variability in practicing teachers’ level of burnout be explained by school classification (rural, urban, suburban), age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, number of children, years teaching experience, and grade level?

This research question was answered by using the final model in Figure 4.2. For this study, data were gathered on teachers’ school classification (rural, urban, suburban), age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, number of children, years of teaching experience, and grade level. In constructing a model, the researcher found little information of use from these variables. In the interest of creating a parsimonious model, those variables were removed. Data from this sample supported that age and years of experience were the only demographic variables that predicted burnout. This does conflict with other research studies that have shown relationships between burnout and gender, grade level taught, and school classification (Byrne, 1999). Due to the risk of a non-representative sample from a low response rate, the researcher does not claim that gender, grade level taught, and school classification have no impact on burnout. However, due to a limitation in the data, the study only incorporated age and years of experience in its analysis.

It is also important to restate that the population for this study was all second year teachers in the state of Ohio. However, the researcher acknowledged that teachers may have gained years of teaching experience in other states before entering Ohio. Also, the number of years of teaching experience was self-reported data, and some respondents may have considered previous employment as teaching experience. For example, a teacher may have previously worked for several years as a teacher’s aide and when responding to this study’s questionnaire he or she considered that to be teaching
experience. Even though there may not be perfect consistency in how the respondents
defined teaching experience, this study still identified a relationship between the years of
teaching experience teachers felt they had and their level of emotional exhaustion.
Specifically, the standardized regression weight was -.14. This indicated that more
experienced teachers had lower levels of emotional exhaustion. Relative to the other
variables in the model, the strength of this relationship was small.

Age also impacted teachers’ level of emotional exhaustion. Specifically, the
standardized regression weight was -.16. Relative to the other variables in the model, the
strength of this relationship was small. There was a correlation between years of
experience and age. Older teachers were more likely to have more years of experience.

**Research Question 4: To what extent can any specific teacher capacities in the Praxis III
Assessment for Beginning Teachers or teacher efficacy be identified to buffer burnout
symptoms caused by role conflict, role overload, or school climate?**

This research question was answered using the final structural equation model
presented in Figure 4.2. The aim of this model was to determine the impact that teacher
capacities had on the various components of teacher burnout relative to the other
variables measured. School climate, role conflict, and role overload were also included
in the analysis. Extensive research has been conducted on how school climate, role
conflict, and role overload impact teacher burnout and has determined them to be among
the strongest predictors (Byrne, 1999; Dorman, 2003). These variables were used as a
basis for comparing the strength of new variables measuring teacher capacities. School
climate was measured using the Enabling School Structure (ESS) instrument, which
specifically measures how supportive a school’s environment is to a teacher. ESS is not
included in the final model presented in Figure 4.2 because it did not significantly add to model. This indicated that whether a school’s administration is supportive or hindering to teachers does not impact the teachers’ level of burnout. To further investigate this finding, the researcher analyzed the correlation between each component of burnout and the ESS data. As can be seen in Table 4.8, ESS significantly correlates with all three components of burnout. This indicated that there was a relationship between the level of support a school provided and the teachers’ level of burnout. However, when the following set of variables are considered as a group, namely role conflict, role overload, age, years of experience, classroom management efficacy, and student engagement efficacy, then the relationship between ESS and burnout disappears. This is an important finding for teachers and teacher educators because role conflict, role overload, classroom management efficacy, and student engagement efficacy are all individualized constructs. More specifically, these findings indicate that teachers who have high levels classroom management efficacy and student engagement efficacy will have lower levels of burnout regardless of how supportive the administrative environment in their school.

Like the ESS data, the data from the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers did not significantly add to the model so Praxis III variable was removed. These results indicated that the teacher capacities measured by the Praxis III did not impact a teacher’s level of burnout. This study had demonstrated issues with the reliability of the Praxis III; therefore, it is possible that a more refined instrument may be more effective at identifying teacher capacities that may impact level of burnout.
Table 4.8: Correlations between the components of burnout and Enabling School Structure

In summary, the research questions presented in the study were all answered using structural equation modeling. An initial model was created and analyzed. One-by-one the non-significant paths were eliminated, while considering previous research findings. The final model included endogenous variables of each component of burnout, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. The exogenous variables were classroom room management efficacy, student engagement efficacy, role conflict, role overload, age, and years of teaching experience. The final model can be seen in figure 4.2. This model accounted for 43 percent of the variance in emotional exhaustion, 53 percent of the variance in depersonalization, and 49 percent of the variance in personal accomplishment. These results are discussed in further detail in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

For the most part, research on teacher burnout has taken a reactive approach to teachers’ feelings of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. This research took a proactive approach to the study of burnout. It identified teacher capacities that may prevent teachers from reaching levels of burnout that impede their performance or cause them to leave the profession.

This study added to the current literature on teacher burnout by analyzing the impact of specific teacher capacities on burnout levels. At the time of this study there was limited research that uncovered the intersection of teachers’ knowledge/skill base and their levels of burnout. This investigation used existing frameworks, while adding new elements for understanding the concept of teacher burnout. Previous research stopped with the identification of organizational factors that cause teacher burnout. This study extended those findings by identifying teacher capacities that prevent those organizational factors from impeding teachers. Teacher candidates, as well as practicing teachers will benefit from the identification of specific knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that better prepare them to manage the day-to-day stresses of teaching.
Before the results of this study can be discussed in detail, it is important to address to whom these results can be generalized. The results can only be generalized to teachers seeking professional licensure in the state of Ohio who began teaching in the state during the 2006-2007 academic year, and even that generalization should be made with caution. The response rate was 3.3 percent, which is not at an adequate level. Comparisons were made between the responding sample and the population sampled on gender and race and no statistical differences were found. However, gender and race alone do not indicate a representative sample. It is recommended that similar studies draw on larger samples that can be more definitively determined to be representative of the population. Additionally, this research only studied teachers in the state of Ohio. Further inquiry is needed in other geographic locations to confirm these results outside of Ohio.

It is also important to note there are other variables that may predict burnout that were not included in this study. Specifically, in terms of teacher capacities, this study only identified teacher efficacy as a predictor of burnout. These results indicated that teacher efficacy was a strong predictor of burnout, but this study could not determine if teacher efficacy was stronger than other capacities that may directly impact emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

Even though there were limitations to this study, the findings still may provide valuable information regarding teacher burnout. These results have opened the door to research on teacher burnout that is proactive rather than reactive. This study only begins what will hopefully be a rigorous line of research that will empower teacher educators and professional development personnel with knowledge that will help teachers to remain
productive and effective in their careers despite the many stresses that come from teaching.

The Construct of Burnout

The findings of this study supported the existing literature on the conceptualization of the three component model of burnout. In addition, this study found the same relationships between the components as supported in the literature. Emotional exhaustion showed a direct impact to depersonalization which, in turn, directly impacted personal accomplishment. Consistent with the findings of other studies, teachers who become emotionally exhausted began to develop feelings of detachment from their students. Additionally, as teachers’ feelings of depersonalization increased, their feelings of personal accomplishment decreased (Byrne, 1999; Maslach et al., 1996).

Praxis III and Teacher Burnout

The analysis of scores from the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers did not produce meaningful findings. There may be many possible reasons for this. The first reason is in the Praxis III instrument itself. This study did not find the Praxis III to be a reliable measure when analyzed by domains, which supports previous findings (Moore, 2007). The total score for the Praxis III across all domains was reliable, but in summing all of the domains, the ability to differentiate between the various teacher capacities that were being measured was lost. Thus, the results were not able to identify specific knowledge, skills, dispositions, or beliefs that impacted burnout. It is recommended that the Praxis III be more aggressively researched in order to make it a more viable tool for future research studies.
A second problem was in the temporal difference between when the Praxis III was administered and when the questionnaire for this study was disseminated. Beginning teachers learn a great deal about the profession and the practice of teaching during their first two years. Typically, the Praxis III is taken by first year teachers (although there are exceptions, such as teachers moving to Ohio from another state). It is quite possible that the teachers in this study had learned a great deal in the year between the time they took the Praxis III and the time they completed the questionnaire for this study.

Lastly, the Praxis III does provide valuable information in regards to teachers’ practicing capacities; however, it is only a snapshot view of such practice. This snapshot does not communicate a teacher’s capacities or ability to utilize those capacities across a school year. The researcher choose to use data from the Praxis III because the instrument was administered to all first year teachers in the state; it provided data from a pre-observation interview, direct observation of classroom practice, and a post-observation interview; and it was administered by licensed assessors trained in using the rubrics. Despite the prospect of anticipated information about a large group of novice teachers, the Praxis III results did not add insight to the connection between teacher capacities and burnout.

Teacher Efficacy’s Impact on Burnout

The most significant contribution this study made to the literature was in the connection between specific aspects of teacher efficacy and burnout. This connection provides valuable information to teachers, teacher educators, and professional development personnel because efficacy is a belief that can be fostered. Research has shown there are many ways to increase an individual’s efficacy (Bandura, 1997).
Specifically, this study indicated that classroom management efficacy and student engagement efficacy significantly impacted teachers’ level of burnout. The strongest of these relationships was in classroom management’s impact on emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. Intuitively, both of these relationships make perfect sense. In Chapter 1, Farber (1999) was quoted as saying student interactions can be the greatest reward of teaching; however, they are also the greatest source of emotional stress. Therefore, teachers who are more capable in managing and engaging students will experience less stress and, in turn, more rewards. The combination of less stress and more rewards results in less burnout.

Classroom management efficacy was the strongest predictor of the two significant components of efficacy. Teachers reporting higher efficacy in classroom management possess a stronger feeling of accomplishment in their work. This finding supports previous research that indicated that classroom management efficacy had a stronger impact on personal accomplishment than emotional exhaustion or depersonalization (Ozdemir, 2007). This is particularly interesting when considering that classroom management efficacy was a stronger predictor of personal accomplishment than any other variable in the model, including role overload and role conflict. This implies that even if teachers are overloaded with many conflicting demands they can still feel a greater sense of personal accomplishment if they are efficacious about their classroom management skills.

Classroom management efficacy also had a strong impact on the emotional exhaustion component of burnout. Some research studies have identified the relationship between classroom management efficacy and emotional exhaustion is a reverse
relationship indicating that emotional exhaustion is a “cause” rather than a consequence of lower self-efficacy (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Brouwers and Tomic’s longitudinal study determined that higher levels of emotional exhaustion over time will deplete a teacher of confidence in his or her ability to effectively manage the classroom. The emotional exhaustion leading to lower classroom management efficacy causal relationship was supported by Brouwers and Tomic’s findings; however, the aim of this current study was to identify capacities that may relate to burnout so that teacher educators can better prepare new teachers for entry into the profession. Teacher educators can increase a teaching candidate’s level of classroom management efficacy whereas they cannot directly influence the emotional exhaustion teachers may feel during their initial years of teaching. Teacher educators should provide teaching candidates with specific proven classroom management strategies that teachers can implement, even if they are overwhelmed with emotional exhaustion. Increased emotional exhaustion may decrease teachers’ classroom management efficacy, but given effective management strategies, teachers’ loss of confidence could be minimized.

As previously mentioned, student interactions can be the greatest reward of teaching; however, they are also the greatest source of emotional stress (Farber, 1999). Teachers, who feel confident in their ability to design and implement procedures to manage the behaviors of their students, as well as manage time and the organization of their classrooms, may be less likely to succumb to feelings of emotional exhaustion. Teachers with high classroom management efficacy will be more capable of minimizing the stressful interactions with their students by managing their classroom effectively, which will increase the rewards of positive student interactions. Those positive
interactions will drastically impact the emotional exhaustion a teacher feels. The impact of classroom management on emotional exhaustion was not as strong as role conflict and role overload, but it did add significantly to the model of burnout presented in Figure 4.2.

In addition, Brouwers and Tomic’s (2000) research does support a directional relationship from classroom management efficacy to depersonalization and personal accomplishment. The findings of this current study did not support classroom management efficacy’s relationship with depersonalization, but did support its impact on personal accomplishment. While there are some inconsistent conclusions, Brouwers and Tomic’s findings are consistent with this study’s general conclusion that higher classroom management efficacy can significantly decrease teachers’ level of burnout.

Countless studies of novice teachers have identified classroom management as an area of weakness upon entering the profession. Teacher educators have failed to meet the needs of new teachers by supplying their candidates with effective classroom management skills. This study emphasized the importance of effective classroom management for novice teachers. The findings from this study indicated that teachers who feel they possess the strategies and skills to successfully manage their classrooms (high classroom management efficacy) may become less burned out over time.

Like classroom management, student engagement efficacy was a strong predictor of a teacher’s feelings of personal accomplishment. Teachers who feel they were capable of helping all students to learn, to overcome challenges, and to feel capable of succeeding in school were more likely to feel higher levels of personal accomplishment. This study supports the idea that teachers judge their success by the success of their students. As can be seen in Figure 4.2, the strength of student engagement efficacy’s impact on
personal accomplishment was stronger than any other variable except for classroom management efficacy.

Student engagement efficacy had a similar impact on the depersonalization component of burnout. Depersonalization is a sense of detachment a teacher feels from his or her students. A teacher with high levels of depersonalization may make comments like, “my students are out of control animals.” This example demonstrates a teacher’s feelings of depersonalization so extreme that the teacher does not even view his or her students as humans. The findings of this study indicated that teachers with high levels of student engagement efficacy are less likely to develop such depersonalized feelings, and that teachers with high levels of student engagement efficacy are more likely to care about their students. Interestingly, the connection between student engagement efficacy and depersonalization was not the strongest predictor of depersonalization. Both role conflict and role overload were stronger predictors. This means that even if teachers feel they are capable of helping all students to learn to overcome challenges and to feel capable of succeeding in school, feelings of role conflict and role overload may cause the teacher to experience feelings of depersonalization despite their high levels of student engagement efficacy.

The results of this study indicate that teacher efficacy is a strong predictor of teacher burnout. Of particular importance was how teacher efficacy may buffer against the impact of a non-supportive school structure. The Enabling Structure of Schools (ESS) data showed no significant impact on any of the three components of burnout when analyzed with the other variables in the model. These results indicated that, in terms of burnout, it does not matter how supportive a school’s administration is to a teacher.
What matters is how conflicted and overload teachers feel, as well as how confident they are in their ability to successfully engage their students and manage their individual classrooms. The results of this study support the conclusion that a high sense of efficacy may protect a teacher from suffering from burnout. Efficacy may provide a buffer between unsupportive school environments and emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

Implications for Teacher Education

The results of this study are good news to teacher educators. This study has identified teacher capacities that may prevent teachers from suffering from symptoms of burnout and predictors of burnout that are within teachers’ control. Previous research has mostly identified predictors of burnout that are outside of teachers’ control. Teacher educators can use information from this study to develop experiences for teacher candidates that increase their sense of efficacy in student engagement and classroom management. If novice teachers can develop a strong sense of efficacy in these areas, they may be better equipped to deal with the stresses of the profession.

The identification of classroom management efficacy as a predictor of burnout is an important finding for teacher educators and professional development personnel because teacher efficacy can be fostered in teacher education and professional development programs. Specifically, teacher educators should design experiences for their candidates that give them the opportunity to have real successes with students in classroom management situations. Candidates should have the opportunity to design and implement classroom management systems and through guidance (rather than modeling alone) from their cooperating teacher, they can experience the success of managing their
own classrooms. According to these findings, teachers who are more efficacious about their classroom management abilities will not become as emotionally exhausted and will feel a greater sense of personal accomplishment in their work.

As with classroom management efficacy, the identification of student engagement efficacy as a predictor of burnout will provide teacher educators with knowledge that will allow them to better prepare their candidates for the stresses of the profession. Teachers who feel they are capable of helping all students to learn, to overcome challenges, and to feel capable of succeeding in school will experience lower levels of depersonalization and feel more personal accomplishment in their work. Having higher levels of student engagement efficacy allows teachers to more easily connect with their students and build meaningful relationships.

When teachers are more confident in their ability to engage students, they tend to actually do a better job of engaging students. When teachers are able to develop strong relationships with their students it is much easier for them to see the successes of the students regardless of how large or small those successes. Teachers who can identify their students’ successes will feel a greater sense of accomplishment in their work. Teacher educators can develop activities and experiences that give teachers the opportunity to engage students and successfully build relationships. By providing candidates with strategies to engage students and build relationships, teacher educators can increase the student engagement efficacy of pre-service teachers.

The findings of this study have indicated that the problem of teacher burnout may need to be addressed from an individual level. School structure, student make up, and even social support may not be as important to teacher burnout as an individual teacher’s
capacities. Rather than addressing the problem of burnout from an administrative or bureaucratic perspective, it may be in educators’ best interest to approach solutions by finding ways develop teacher capacities, specifically, classroom management and student engagement skills. Attempting to redesign the school structures and mentoring systems may help reduce levels of teacher burnout, but developing individual teacher’s capacities may be more effective.

Implication for Future Research

This study has generated new knowledge on the construct of burnout and how it is impacted by specific teacher capacities. Further research is needed to confirm this study’s findings and to continue the exploration of how teacher educators and professional development personnel can combat burnout through the development of individual teachers.

As previously mentioned, it is recommended that similar studies draw on larger samples that can be more definitely determined to be representative of their respective population. Additionally, this study only sampled teachers in the state of Ohio. Further investigation is needed in other geographic locations to confirm these results.

It is also important to note that there are other variables that may predict burnout that were not included in this study. Specifically, in terms of teacher capacities, this study only identified teacher efficacy as a predictor of burnout. These results indicated that teacher efficacy was a strong predictor of burnout, but this study could not determine if teacher efficacy was stronger than other capacities that may directly impact emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Two such variables are peer support and mentoring systems. Although the ESS instrument did measure teachers’
perception of the level of support received from their school, it did not adequately measure how supportive teachers were of each other or the effectiveness of mentoring programs. Further research is needed to identify the relationship between teacher capacities, burnout, and other known causes of burnout. In the case of peer support and mentoring systems, it may be that such support systems help develop capacities that, in-turn, prevent teachers from experiencing higher levels of burnout. Additionally, research needs to be conducted on various combinations. It is possible that a mentoring program for new teachers that focuses on specific teacher capacities, such as classroom management and student engagement, may provide an even greater impact on novice teachers’ level of burnout.

Along with teacher capacities, additional research needs to be conducted on predictors of burnout that are controllable by individual teachers. This study focused on teacher capacities, but there may be other variables that can alleviate burnout that are not specific knowledge, skills, dispositions, or beliefs. For example, exercise or physical activities have been shown to lessen an individual’s stress level; therefore exercise may impact a teacher’s level of burnout. This study found age and years of experience were predictors of burnout. As teachers gain years of experience they will invariably add additional capacities. Further study needs to be conducted to identify what capacities teachers gain from years of experience. Initial teachers could greatly benefit by the identification of how experienced teachers are better able to manage the stresses of the profession.

It has previously been stated that new research needs to be conducted on the relationship between teacher burnout and student achievement (Maslach & Leiter, 1999).
The findings of this study further support this conclusion. This study began to look more closely at the impact of student-teacher relationships on teacher burnout. By identifying efficacy in student engagement as a predictor of depersonalization and personal accomplishment, this study has demonstrated that student-teacher interactions are important to consider when studying burnout. What is still needed is research on how emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment impact a students’ classroom performance.

Conclusion

This study has opened the door on research into the interaction between teacher capacities and teacher burnout. Research needs to continue to identify other capacities that may better prepare teacher candidates for the stresses of the teaching profession. The data from the Praxis III Assessment for Beginning Teachers did not aid in the identification of teacher capacities that may buffer against burnout. Therefore, further research is needed to continue to identify what knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs will enable a teacher to better deal with the stresses of the teaching profession. The identification of teacher efficacy as a predictor of burnout implies that teacher capacities in general are an important area to study in regards to teacher burnout.

In closing, this study had limitations, but it added to the existing literature on understanding the construct of burnout. This study took a proactive approach to empower teacher educators with knowledge that will help teachers to be more prepared to deal with the stresses of their initial years of teaching. This study succeeded in identifying classroom management efficacy and student engagement efficacy as predictors of burnout.
Teacher educators are charged with the task of using these findings to build the classroom management efficacy and student engagement efficacy of their candidates. It is also suggested that research continue in the area of teacher capacities as predictors of burnout to further empower teachers and teacher educators. Teacher burnout has been a roadblock in many students’ learning experiences and has caused teachers to leave the profession. This has created a crisis that must be actively addressed rather than passively studied. It is the researcher’s hope that this investigation will begin to stimulate change in how teachers are prepared to succeed in a challenging but critically important workplace.
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APPENDIX A

DOMAINS OF THE PRAXIS III

ASSESSMENT OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments

Introduction

Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments of THE PRAXIS SERIES: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers® comprise a system for assessing the skills of beginning teachers in their own classroom settings. Educational Testing Service developed Praxis III for use in teacher licensing decisions made by states or local agencies empowered to license teachers. Under the guidelines that govern its use, Praxis III may not be used for the purpose of making employment decisions about teachers who are already licensed. Praxis III is intended to be an open, public system. Its framework of knowledge and skills for beginning teachers, including the assessment criteria, scoring rules, and the assessment process, should be made available to all those who are involved in the use of Praxis III, particularly the beginning teachers themselves. It is hoped that the criteria can become part of the growing professional dialogue among teachers and can contribute to support programs for beginning teachers.

The Praxis III system uses three assessment methods — direct observation of classroom practice, review of documentation prepared by the teacher, and semi-structured interviews. The assessment is centered around a trained assessor's direct observation of a lesson or instructional event taught by the beginning teacher. Prior to the observation, the beginning teacher provides the assessor with written documentation that conveys a sense of the general classroom context and the students in the class as well as specific information about the lesson to be observed. Semi-structured interviews before and after the observation allow for exploration of the teacher's rationales for his or her decisions and practices. The interviews are also intended to assess the teacher's ability to relate instructional decisions to such contextual factors as student characteristics.

As used here, the term “system” refers to three components:

- the framework of knowledge and skills for beginning teachers used in Praxis III to assess teaching performance, including a set of assessment criteria and accompanying scoring rules that apply to all grade levels and content areas
- the various instruments and forms used by trained assessors to collect data (Class Profile, Instruction Profile, Preobservation Interview, Classroom Observation Record, and Postobservation Interview) and the form used to analyze data and score the teaching performance (Record of Evidence)
- the training of assessors to document the teacher's performance, and to accurately and reliably interpret and score the performance assessment data
Praxis III uses the term “assessment cycle” to describe the set of assessment activities centered around a single instructional event or lesson. The use of multiple assessment cycles makes it possible to assess the beginning teacher’s performance in a variety of instructional circumstances. This allows the teacher to demonstrate his or her competence in using different classroom structures (e.g., whole-class instruction, small-group instruction, individualized instruction, group projects) and in teaching different content areas or different groups of students.

The Framework of Knowledge and Skills

The framework of knowledge and skills for beginning teachers used in Praxis III is derived from a national research base. Its structure and the details of its content were shaped and refined through fieldwork and collaboration with educators in Delaware and Minnesota during 1991-92. Its philosophical basis is outlined in Guiding Conceptions and Assessment Principles for THE PRAXIS SERIES: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers® (Dwyer and Villegas, 1992). The framework of knowledge and skills consists of four interrelated domains:

- Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning
- Creating an Environment for Student Learning
- Teaching for Student Learning
- Teacher Professionalism

Each domain consists of criteria used to assess the teacher’s performance. There are a total of 19 criteria among the domains. Each criterion represents a critical aspect of teaching. The criteria are designed to allow maximum flexibility in how they may be demonstrated. Unlike assessment systems that limit attention to issues of equity and diversity to a single criterion or a small subset of these, Praxis III has infused a multicultural perspective throughout the system. This cultural infusion is based on the premise that effective teaching requires familiarity with students’ background knowledge and experiences (including their cultural resources) and how they use this familiarity to devise appropriate instruction. General descriptions of the four domains follow.

Domain A: Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning. Knowledge of the content to be taught underlies all aspects of good instruction. Domain A focuses on how teachers use their understanding of students and subject matter to:

- decide on learning goals
- design or select appropriate activities and instructional materials
- sequence instruction in ways that will help students to meet short- and long-term curricular goals
- design or select informative evaluation strategies
All of these processes, beginning with the learning goals, must be aligned with each other, and because of the diverse needs represented in any class, each of the processes mentioned must be carried out in ways that take into account the variety of knowledge and experiences that students bring to class. Therefore, knowledge of relevant information about the students themselves is an integral part of this domain.

Domain A is concerned with how the teacher thinks about the content to be taught. This thinking is evident in how the teacher organizes instruction for the benefit of her or his students. The primary sources of evidence for this domain are the Class Profile, Instruction Profile, and Preobservation Interview. The Classroom Observation may also contribute to assessing performance in this area.

**Domain B: Creating an Environment for Student Learning.** Domain B relates to the social and emotional components of learning as prerequisites to and context for academic achievement. Thus, most of the criteria in this domain focus on the human interactions in the classroom, on the connections between teachers and students, and among students. Domain B addresses issues of fairness and rapport, of helping students believe they can learn, meet challenges, and of establishing and maintaining constructive standards for behavior in the classroom. It also includes the learning “environment” in the most literal sense—the physical setting in which teaching and learning take place.

A learning environment that provides both emotional and physical safety for students is one in which a broad range of teaching and learning experiences can occur. Teachers must be able to use their knowledge of their students in order to interpret their students’ behavior accurately and respond in ways that are appropriate and supportive. When teachers do so, their interactions with students consistently foster the students’ sense of self-esteem. In addition, teachers’ efforts to establish a sense of the classroom as a community with clear standards should never be arbitrary. All behavioral standards and teacher-student interactions should be grounded in a sense of respect for all members of the classroom community.

Evidence for the criteria in Domain B is drawn primarily from the Classroom Observation. Supporting evidence may be drawn from both the Pre- and Postobservation Interviews. The Class Profile provides contextual information relevant to the criteria comprising this domain.

**Domain C: Teaching for Student Learning.** This domain focuses on the act of teaching and its overall goal: helping students to connect with the content. As used here, “content” refers to the subject matter of a discipline and may include knowledge, skills, perceptions, and values in any domain: cognitive, social, artistic, physical and so on. Teachers direct students in the process of establishing individual connections with the content, thereby devising a good “fit” for the content within the framework of the students’ knowledge, interests, abilities, cultural backgrounds and personal backgrounds. At the same time, teachers should help students to move beyond the limits of their current knowledge or understanding. Teachers monitor learning, making certain that students assimilate information accurately and that they understand and can apply what they have learned. Teachers must also be sure that students understand what procedures are expected of them during the lesson and that class time is used to good purpose.
Most of the evidence for a teacher's performance with respect to these criteria will come from the Classroom Observation. It may be augmented or illuminated by evidence from the Pre- and Postobservation Interviews, the Instruction Profile, and the Class Profile.

**Domain D: Teacher Professionalism.** Teachers must be able to evaluate their own instructional effectiveness in order to plan specific future lessons for particular classes and to improve their teaching over time. They should be able to discuss the degree to which different aspects of a lesson were successful in terms of instructional approaches, student responses, and learning outcomes. Teachers should be able to explain how they will proceed to work toward learning for all students. The professional responsibilities of all teachers, including beginning teachers, also include sharing appropriate information with other professionals and with families in ways that support the learning of diverse student populations.

The primary source of evidence for the criteria in Domain D is the Postobservation Interview and the physical evidence the teacher brings to the interview.

**The Assessment Process**

Administration of Praxis III assessments is necessarily individualized. Initially, the procedure requires matching beginning teachers and assessors. Once an assignment is made, a mutually agreeable time for the assessment is set. The beginning teacher receives the necessary forms to fill out (Class Profile and Instruction Profile) which are part of each assessment cycle. The beginning teacher fills out the forms, which are available to the assessor on the day of the assessment. The assessor is expected to arrive early enough to have time to review the forms before meeting with the beginning teacher.

The first assessment activity that brings beginning teacher and assessor together is the Preobservation Interview. This should ideally be conducted in a quiet place that is free of distractions. It provides a chance for the two participants to review the two profiles and for the assessor to gain more of a sense of the context of the class. If the Instruction Profile has become outdated, the beginning teacher can explain any changes in his or her plans for the lesson. The interview focuses primarily on issues that relate to the criteria in Domain A — how the beginning teacher has planned and organized the lesson, how he or she becomes familiar with students' background knowledge and experiences, and how that familiarity influences planning decisions. The assessor notes in writing the beginning teacher's responses to the interview questions.
Following the Preobservation Interview is the Classroom Observation, either a class period or a lesson in length. The assessor takes careful notes of what the teacher and students say and do. The notes should be objective and descriptive. No judgments are made at this point. After the observation, the assessor looks over the notes and identifies any areas that need clarification during the Postobservation Interview. The Postobservation Interview should follow shortly thereafter. In the interview, the beginning teacher is asked to reflect on how the lesson went for the class in general and for specific students. The teacher is also asked to reflect on how he or she might adjust later instruction. The beginning teacher also has an opportunity to talk about whether he or she departed from the activities outlined on the Instruction Profile, and if so, why. The Postobservation Interview also includes questions that focus on how the beginning teacher builds professional relationships with colleagues and communicates with students’ parents or guardians. The teacher should be prepared to document with physical evidence examples of specific communication with parents or guardians and of collaboration with colleagues. The assessor again takes notes during the interview.

The Postobservation Interview completes the interactive stage of the assessment cycle. At this point, the assessor looks over all the notes taken — during the Preobservation Interview, Classroom Observation, and Postobservation Interview — as well as the information on the written documents. Although there are general expectations about which phase of the assessment cycle will provide evidence for each criterion, there is always the possibility that good evidence will come from an unexpected source within the assessment cycle. The assessor sorts out what evidence there is (positive and/or negative) for each criterion, selects the most salient evidence of performance for each, and transfers it to the Record of Evidence form. After weighing the evidence for each criterion, the assessor writes a summary statement linking the evidence to the criterion’s scoring rules and assigns a score for each criterion. The Record of Evidence must be clear and cogent, presenting information to support the assigned score. This is particularly critical because of the nature of Praxis III decision-making. The assessor is asked to use his or her honed professional judgment to weigh potentially conflicting evidence of the beginning teacher’s skill. The Record of Evidence, therefore, is a key document of the Praxis III system, representing the exercise of the assessor’s skill in the service of providing accurate information about the beginning teacher’s performance.
APPENDIX B

INITIAL EMAIL REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

AND

REMINDER EMAIL MESSAGES
Initial Email Request for Participation

Subject line of email: Help Improve Teacher Education

How can you help improve teacher education and professional development programs? By being a participant in this research study. You were selected as participant for this study from the Ohio Department Education’s public domain list of initial 2006-2007 teachers who completed the Praxis III beginning teachers assessment.

The purpose of this study is to identify specific knowledge and skills obtained through your teacher preparation program that have helped you manage the day-to-day demands of teaching. This questionnaire contains 64 questions and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete; your responses will then be matched with your Praxis III scores. The Praxis III provides us with a unique look at your teacher preparation in action and we want to identify how those skills have translated to your specific work environment.

We have gone to great lengths to ensure that your responses are anonymous and still able to be matched to specific Praxis III scores without identifying you personally. In partnership with the Ohio Department of Education we have been provided a list of Praxis III scores that contains a unique identification number that does not identify anyone personally (we do not know whose score is whose). The unique identification numbers are created based on the last four digits of your social security number, date of birth, and graduating institution. By providing us with this information we can match your anonymous responses (we do not know who filled out each survey) with specific Praxis III scores using the four digits, birth date, and graduating institution provided. This process is to insure that you can answer this questionnaire honestly without fear of being identified by your responses. This research study and its procedures have been approved by The Ohio State University’s Internal Review Board (protocol number 2004B0150).

Using the questionnaire responses and their respective Praxis III scores, we will be able to identify if there are any specific knowledge or skills that better prepare teachers for the daily demands of teaching. We are aware that you have been requested to complete online questionnaires in the past and we understand that your time is valuable. However, the data collected in this study will directly impact how teacher education and professional development programs are designed and your responses will influence future program development decisions.

Your participation is optional and by completing this questionnaire it is understood that you are agreeing to be a participant in this study. Your thoughts will be beneficial to teacher preparation programs and school districts and we would greatly appreciate your time and opinions. To complete the questionnaire click on the link below.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=zH5vhwAoDKeK89wz1opszw_3d_3d
If you have any additional question or would like to receive information on the results of this study please contact me by email at durr.18@osu.edu

Anthony Durr
Doctorial Candidate in Teacher Education
The Ohio State University
First Thank You/Reminder Email Message

Subject line of email: Help Improve Teacher Education (Thank you/Reminder)

We would like to thank those of you that taken the time to participate in the Teacher Education Improvement project your opinions are greatly appreciated and may disregard the rest of this email.

If you have not had the opportunity to complete this questionnaire, we would like to extend the invitation. Your responses are vital to making this project a success and each one counts.

How can you help improve teacher education and professional development programs? By being a participant in this research study. You were selected as participant for this study from the Ohio Department of Education’s public domain list of initial 2006-2007 teachers who completed the Praxis III beginning teachers assessment.

The purpose of this study is to identify specific knowledge and skills obtained through your teacher preparation program that have helped you manage the day-to-day demands of teaching. This questionnaire contains 64 questions and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete; your responses will then be matched with your Praxis III scores. The Praxis III provides us with a unique look at your teacher preparation in action and we want to identify how those skills have translated to your specific work environment.

We have gone to great lengths to ensure that your responses are anonymous and still able to be matched to specific Praxis III scores without identifying you personally. In partnership with the Ohio Department of Education we have been provided a list of Praxis III scores that contains a unique identification number that does not identify anyone personally (we do not know whose score is whose). The unique identification numbers are created based on the last four digits of your social security number, date of birth, and graduating institution. By providing us with this information we can match your anonymous responses (we do not know who filled out each survey) with specific Praxis III scores using the four digits, birth date, and graduating institution provided. This process is to insure that you can answer this questionnaire honestly without fear of being identified by your responses. This research study and its procedures have been approved by The Ohio State University’s Internal Review Board (protocol number 2004B0150).

Using the questionnaire responses and their respective Praxis III scores, we will be able to identify if there are any specific knowledge or skills that better prepare teachers for the daily demands of teaching. We are aware that you have been requested to complete online questionnaires in the past and we understand that your time is valuable. However, the data collected in this study will directly impact how teacher education and professional development programs are designed and your responses will influence future program development decisions.
Your participation is optional and by completing this questionnaire it is understood that you are agreeing to be a participant in this study. Your thoughts will be beneficial to teacher preparation programs and school districts and we would greatly appreciate your time and opinions. To complete the questionnaire click on the link below.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=zH5vhwAoDKeK89wz1opszw_3d_3d

If you have any additional question or would like to receive information on the results of this study please contact me by email at durr.18@osu.edu

Anthony Durr
Doctorial Candidate in Teacher Education
The Ohio State University
Second and Final Thank You/Reminder Email Message

Subject line of email: Help Improve Teacher Education (Thank you/Reminder)

Many of you have participated in this research project and we would like to thank you all. Your feedback has helped make this survey a success. If you have already filled out this questionnaire you may disregard the rest of this email. If you have not had a chance to participate we would still appreciate your opinions. This is the final reminder email and the last chance to have your thoughts included in our research. It is important that our data reflect the feelings of everyone in our study; your responses will ensure the results of this project are an accurate representation of Ohio teachers.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=zH5vhwAoDKeK89wz1opszw_3d_3d

How can you help improve teacher education and professional development programs? By being a participant in this research study. You were selected as participant for this study from the Ohio Department of Education’s public domain list of initial 2006-2007 teachers who completed the Praxis III beginning teachers assessment.

The purpose of this study is to identify specific knowledge and skills obtained through your teacher preparation program that have helped you manage the day-to-day demands of teaching. This questionnaire contains 64 questions and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete; your responses will then be matched with your Praxis III scores. The Praxis III provides us with a unique look at your teacher preparation in action and we want to identify how those skills have translated to your specific work environment.

We have gone to great lengths to ensure that your responses are anonymous and still able to be matched to specific Praxis III scores without identifying you personally. In partnership with the Ohio Department of Education we have been provided a list of Praxis III scores that contains a unique identification number that does not identify anyone personally (we do not know whose score is whose). The unique identification numbers are created based on the last four digits of your social security number, date of birth, and graduating institution. By providing us with this information we can match your anonymous responses (we do not know who filled out each survey) with specific Praxis III scores using the four digits, birth date, and graduating institution provided. This process is to insure that you can answer this questionnaire honestly without fear of being identified by your responses. This research study and its procedures have been approved by The Ohio State University’s Internal Review Board (protocol number 2004B0150).

Using the questionnaire responses and their respective Praxis III scores, we will be able to identify if there are any specific knowledge or skills that better prepare teachers for the daily demands of teaching. We are aware that you have been requested to complete online questionnaires in the past and we understand that your time is valuable. However, the data collected in this study will directly impact how teacher education and
professional development programs are designed and your responses will influence future program development decisions.

Your participation is optional and by completing this questionnaire it is understood that you are agreeing to be a participant in this study. Your thoughts will be beneficial to teacher preparation programs and school districts and we would greatly appreciate your time and opinions. To complete the questionnaire click on the link below.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=zH5vhwAoDKeK89wz1opszw_3d_3d

If you have any additional question or would like to receive information on the results of this study please contact me by email at durr.18@osu.edu

Anthony Durr
Doctorial Candidate in Teacher Education
The Ohio State University
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Note that if applicable, informed consent (and HIPAA research authorization) must be obtained from subjects or their legally authorized representatives and documented prior to research involvement. The IRB-approved consent form and process must be used. Changes in the research (e.g., recruitment procedures, advertisements, enrollment numbers, etc.) or informed consent process must be approved by the IRB before they are implemented (except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to subjects).

It is the responsibility of the investigator to promptly report to the IRB any serious, unexpected and related adverse events or potential unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

This approval is issued under The Ohio State University’s OHRP Federally Assured #00006378.

All forms and procedures can be found on the OERP website—www.orr.osu.edu. Please feel free to contact the IRB staff contact listed above with any questions or concerns.

Shari R. Speer, PhD, Chair
Behavioral and Social Sciences Institutional Review Board
The first 22 items on this questionnaire were the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). The copyright of the MBI is held by CPP Inc. and permission to use the instrument was purchased for this study. However, CPP Inc.'s does not permit reproduction of any of the MBI items in a dissertation. To view these items, contact CPP Inc. at www.cpp.com.

This next set of 12 questions is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?
2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?
3. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?
4. How much can you do to help your students value learning?
5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?
6. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?
7. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?
8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?
9. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?
10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?
11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?
12. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?

The next 12 statements are descriptions of the way your school is structured. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes behavior in your school by making the appropriate selection.

1. Administrative rules in this school enable authentic communication between teachers and administrators.
2. In this school red tape is problem.
3. The administrative hierarchy of this school enables teachers to do their job.
4. The administrative hierarchy obstructs student achievement.
5. Administrative rules help rather than hinder.
6. The administrative hierarchy of this school facilitates the mission of this school.
7. Administrative rules in this school are used to punish teachers.
8. The administrative hierarchy of this school obstructs innovation.
9. Administrative rules in this school are substitutes for professional judgment.
10. Administrative rules in this school are guides to solutions rather than rigid procedures.
11. In this school the authority of the principal is used to undermine teachers.
12. The administrators in this school use their authority to enable teachers to do their job.

This is the second to last section and there are 21 total questions left. Please respond to the next 10 statements according to the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel that my job interferes with my family life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel constant pressure from others to improve the quality of my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I find that I have extra work beyond what should normally be expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The criteria of performance for my job are too high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am given too much responsibility without adequate authority to carry it out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I receive conflicting demands from two or more people or groups in the school setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have a hard time satisfying the conflicting demands of students, parents, administration and teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am given school related duties without adequate resources and materials to carry them out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>There is a difference between the way my administrative head thinks things should be done and the way I think they should be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would just like to ask 11 more questions to get some specific information about you.

1. How would you classify the school where you currently work? Rural Urban Suburban
2. What is your current age?
3. What is your gender? Male Female
4. How would you classify your ethnicity?
   White  African America  Hispanic  Asian  Native American
   Other

5. How would you identify your marriage/domestic partnership status?
   Married/Domestic Partnership  Not Married/Not in Domestic Partnership

6. How many children do you have?

7. Including the current school year, how many years have you been a full-time teacher?

8. What grade level are you currently teaching?  Elementary  Middle School  High School

   In order to enable us to match these responses with specific Praxis III scores we need the following
   information. These specific items allow us to match these responses to a Praxis III score WITHOUT
   personally identifying you. We have gone to great lengths to ensure your anonymity.

9. Last four digits of your social security number.

10. Date of birth

11. The college/university where you completed your teacher preparation program.