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INTRODUCTION

Burnout is a new, popular name for a relatively old phenomenon. It has been studied under a variety of names and is generally accepted to be the result of job-related stress. Burnout has appeared with increasing frequency in the human services literature since it was coined by Freudenberger in 1974. In part, its acceptance has been the result of its intuitive appeal to professionals operating in an environment of everincreasing turmoil, and unrest. In part, it has addressed the concerns of individuals who report feeling trapped in bureaucratic systems insensitive to clients and professionals alike.

It is evident that the question of what motivates a particular "type" of individual, the professional, to continue their performance of those tasks necessary for the organization which employs him is extremely complex. The motivation of the individual to identify with a "professional self-image" is one component, according to some researchers (Manlan, 1970; Clearfield, 1977). This image is defined by Clearfield (1977) as a set of attitudes, combined with their self-concept which influences their behavior.
The available literature on burnout does not provide much factual information regarding how endemic the problem is among human service professionals; nor have the instruments used by such researchers as Maslach and Jackson (1981) been compared with the standardized instruments developed through the research of industrial and experimental psychologists. Most studies have attempted to impute causality for the phenomenon. Most agree that the problem is a growing one, is serious, and is deserving of the implementation of changes, usually changes in the administrative structure of human services delivery systems. There has been very little effort made to study professional worker burnout with the view of questioning which professionals are more likely to experience the effects of this phenomenon than others. This study proposes to be an exploratory effort to examine professional worker burnout as a work-life manifestation of a specific coping device made necessary as the demands upon an individual within the work environment exceed the total resources of one's satisfaction with one's work, family, friends (intimate social network), and one's own individual coping style. This is in contrast to the major theoretical positions that some individuals are inherently vulnerable to burnout solely as the result of their work environments and/or work-related stress.
CHAPTER ONE
The Burnout Syndrome

Definition
Burnout as a term is ambiguous. While colorful, it lacks clarity either in the literature or from individual to individual. Originally defined by Fruedenberger (1974) it was taken strictly from Webster's Third International Dictionary. It was--burnout--to fail, to wear out, or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength, or resources. Maslach (1978) operationalized this definition and expanded it to include a loss of concern for the people with whom one is working in response to job related stress. Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) expanded the definition to emphasize the time-relatedness of the phenomenon. Cherniss (1980), focusing on changes in the individual's motivation, expanded the definition again to introduce the concepts of burnout as a psychological withdrawal from the environment of one's work (not just the work place) and as a particular coping device in response to excessive stress and/or strain.

It should be noted that this definition is not confined simply to human service professionals. Maslach (1976) and Veninga and Spradley (1981) have between them studied well
over one hundred and fifty different professions and/or occupations for the presence or absence of worker burnout. Both groups of researchers found it present to a greater or lesser extent in every occupational setting studied.

Effects of Burnout on the Individual

The effects of burnout are varied (Maslach, 1978). While most often seen as negative, not all think so. Daley (1979a) has suggested that one positive benefit of burnout might be that it affords to the worker's supervisor a major opportunity to counsel with one who has made an inappropriate career choice. To this researcher, this argument is questionable at best, and harsh at worst. These negative effects are generally reported in the literature as manifesting themselves as problematic behaviors. They may be divided into three broad classes: (1) those effects commonly associated with the effects of a psychiatric disturbance such as an Adjustment Disorder (A.P.A., 1980); (2) those effects commonly associated with effects of extreme stress in the other areas of one's life, such as deterioration or withdrawal from one's life roles (i.e., husband, wife, parent, etc.); and (3) those effects on one's organizational behaviors. Let us examine these in detail.

Psychiatric Symptoms Associated with Burnout

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders by the American Psychiatric Association (1980) defines an adjustment disorder (309.xx, DSM III) as a
"maladaptive reaction to an identifiable psychosocial stressor, that occurs within three months of the onset of the stressor.

The maladaptive nature of the reaction is indicated by either of the following:

1. impairment in social or occupational functioning,
2. symptoms that are in excess of a normal and expectable reaction to the stressor.

The disturbance is not merely one instance of overreaction to stress or an exacerbation of one of the mental disorders previously described."

Stressors sufficient to induce an adjustment disorder may be simple or complex, involving a single facet or many facets of an individual's life. They can be continuous as opposed to a specific catastrophic event, and the severity of the stressor may be inferred to be directly associated with the duration of the stressor, its timing, and the context of the individual's life. It is interesting to note that the authors of the DSM III consider this disorder common.

The following are symptoms of burnout which are consistent with characteristic symptoms of individuals who would warrant an adjustment disorder diagnosis.

1. The effects of burnout are almost immediately visible in the worker (Maslach & Jackson, 1978). This meets the requirement mentioned in the diagnostic requirements.
2. Sleep disorders manifest themselves—either marked inability to sleep, or a retreat to sleep with marked difficulty in awakening (Berkley Planning Associates, 1977; Maslach, 1978; Freudenberg, 1974; Pines & Kafry, 1978; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980).

3. Increasingly preoccupied with one's own self and one's own problems (Freudenberg, 1974; Maslach, 1976).

4. One suffers from frequent headaches and/or gastrointestinal disturbances which may be accompanied with weight loss (Freudenberg, 1974).

5. The individual complains of being bothered by feelings of failure, anger, resentment, guilt and/or blame (Pines & Kafry, 1978; Maslach, 1976; Freudenberg, 1974).

6. Freudenberg (1974 & 1980) suggests that there is also frequently an excessive use of sick leave or excused absence.

Burnout may be considered a synonym for those environmental stressors sufficiently strong to trigger episodes of the reactive depressive and/or the reactive anxiety symptoms previously described.

Life Management Disturbances as a Result of Burnout

Maslach (1976), Pines and Kafry (1978), Cherniss (1980) and Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) report a high degree of agreement that the effects of burnout on the individual are not confined to the individual's internal functioning or organizational behavior, but also manifest themselves in the
other major areas of an individual's life. These symptoms are the following:

1. Increased marital and/or family conflict, which might be seen to heighten the effects of social isolation or withdrawal.

2. Rigidity in one's thinking has been reported as contributing to conflict with one's friends.

3. Individuals report that their ability to manage the detail of their personal lives, business, etc., decreases. Present in this connection is a growing perception of becoming increasingly immobilized.

**Burnout Effects on the Individual's Work Behaviors**

The effects of burnout on the individual's behavior on the job is well documented by the majority of the basic studies in burnout. The following symptoms of burnout concern the problematic behaviors of the individual in the work environment (Freudenberger, 1974 & 1980; Maslach, 1976; Berkley Planning Associates, 1977; Daley, 1979; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; Cherniss, 1980; and Pines & Kafry, 1978).

1. There is a reported increase in absenteeism and tardiness.

2. There is a high resistance to going to work every day.

3. There is a clearly discernable attitude of indifference and/or discouragement when dealing with other staff members.
4. There is a marked increase in "clock watching", i.e., a preoccupation with breaks, quitting times, etc. with a view towards limiting their efforts on the job.

5. There is a noticeable increase in fatigue after work.

6. There is a loss of positive feelings towards clients.

7. There is frequent postponing of client contacts and resisting returning client phone calls.

8. There is an increase of derogatory stereotyping and depersonalization.

9. There is a cynical, blaming attitude towards clients, with a correspondingly rigid, "going by the book" behavior pattern.

10. Staff will avoid talking about their cases with colleagues.

11. Staff become increasingly approving of behavior control techniques for clients such as extensive use of major tranquilizers.

It should be pointed out that it is the total context of symptoms across the dimension of time which is diagnostic of worker burnout. Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) and Cherniss (1980) have clearly indicated that this phenomenon may "wax or wane" according to time. Many of these reported symptoms are in fact symptoms of many different problems. However, the mixture of any and/or all of the above symptoms are
significant of burnout if they are present with the key
diagnostic symptoms of feelings of estrangement and
time-relatedness (Daley, 1979b).

**Effects of Burnout on the Professional Work Environment**

As with the symptoms reported for the individual, the
organization may have a problem with burnout which is charac-
terized by a number of symptoms. Again, as above, these
effects and symptoms are generally viewed to be negative
ones. Those most often reported are the following:

1. Turnover rates in some social service agencies are
rising significantly. One report on child welfare workers
reports a turnover rate of 55% per year (Denton, 1976).
The Berkley Planning Associates (1977), in a study of 11
demonstration projects concerned with child abuse and neglect
service delivery systems, found what they termed an "alarming
degree of burnout" in two thirds of the personnel of these
model programs. It is hypothesized that this contributed
significantly to the job turnover rates.

2. Recruitment of trained workers is not a common
occurrence in these agencies (Freudenberger, 1977a).
Typically, the new professional requires a serious commitment
by the agency in terms of supervisory time, training
resources, etc. (Daley, 1979a; Freudenberger, 1977b; Kahn,
1978; and Mattingly, 1977). Since human services are almost
uniformly labor intensive organizations, to reduce these
personnel costs through reducing the turnover rates constitutes a significant target area for improvement.

3. Potentially more costly to the agency, is that of workers who have become unable to function (Mattingly, 1977). Unlike industry, such a situation may exist undetected in human services organizations for quite some time. Since the output, or product, of such an organization can generally be viewed as a result of a relationship between the direct service provider and the client (and traditionally many of our clients have severe limitations on their functions--Hanna, 1975), an accurate evaluation of the cause of a case being unsuccessfully resolved is often difficult to fix.

4. A fourth aspect, and to this author the most significant with respect to its long-term expense, is the effect of burnout sparking the movement of the worker towards a supervisory position (Emener, 1979). It is unlikely one who is himself burned out will be able to guide his or her section towards holding the organizational costs of burnout down.

Theories Of Burnout

While the literature on burnout is increasing at a significant rate, few attempts have been made to explain burnout from a conceptual point of view. Those attempts which have been made present the phenomenon from two major perspectives.
The Occupational Hazard Theory of Burnout

The proponents of this theoretical approach (Freudenberger, 1975, 1977b, 1980; Maslach, 1976, 1978a; Pines & Kafry, 1978; Pines & Maslach, 1978, 1980; Daley, 1979a; Larson, Gilbertson, & Powell, 1978; Thacker, 1978; Armstrong, 1978; Boy & Pines, 1980; Godard, 1979; Harrison, 1979; Jennings, 1980; and Lamb, 1979) view the phenomenon of worker burnout as a condition of "battle fatigue" experienced by all personnel in the helping professions to a greater or lesser extent. Freudenberger (1974) gave the original definition of burnout. The major operational construct of burnout according to this definition is the failure of the individual's personal resources of energy and interest. Crucial to this point is Maslach's concept of estrangement from the clients and even from other staff.

The individuals identified as "personality types" (Freudenberger, 1974) at risk to burnout are:

1. The committed dedicated workers.
2. The staff member who is over-committed and whose outside life is subsatisfactory, defined as the individual who uses the workplace as a substitute for a social life is marked as a prime candidate for burnout.
3. The authoritarian personality who is reported to the individual with a strong need to control. This individual is depicted to be a somewhat compulsive and/or driven to undertake all the jobs which affects his or her own position.
4. Administrator burnout is identified by Freudenberger, (1975) and by Vash (1980) as a unique form of burnout which occurs in "the case of the individual who, aside from any particular problems of his or her own, is genuinely overworked." (Freudenberger, 1975, p. 77).

Maslach (1976) extends the identification of individuals at risk to include all those who are intimately involved with troubled human beings in a professional care giving capacity.

The process of burnout is seen to be in response to job-related stress. The professional who is unable to resolve his daily conflicts and stressors is seen as taking them home with him where they are later resurrected. The process of burnout is a gradual depletion of available reserves, deteriorating social and professional function, and the emergence of a host of somatic and emotional disorders often below the level of awareness of the concerned individual. As much as anything, one can compare the process of worker burnout to that of a divorce from one's occupation (Maslach, 1978b).

The process of burnout is viewed as damage to an individual that also has dire consequences for the worker's agency and clients. The process of estrangement and damage to the individual worker makes clients who are viewed as being in dire need as being confronted by an indifferent, even hostile worker. Agencies are seen as being hurt in a multiplicity of ways. Not only is the work slowed, or even
stopped, but the process of burnout is seen as somewhat contagious. It is seen as a major factor in low morale, absenteeism, high job turnover, and other indices of job stress (Pines & Kafry, 1978).

The sources of burnout in the occupational hazard theory are seen as both intrinsic and extrinsic work stressors (Pines & Kafry, 1978; Daley, 1979a, 1979b). Among these theorists is a great deal of consensus about the following sources:

1. Task variety is defined as that characteristic of the job which may be viewed as the challenging involvement of one's intellectual and cognitive resources.

2. Autonomy is defined as the ability of the individual to use creative and discretionary judgment.

3. Task significance is defined as the perception of the worker that his or her efforts has a beneficial effect on the problems or lives of his or her clients.

4. Success is defined as the judgment of the individual of his or her progress towards some career goal or in relation to his or her peers.

5. Feedback is defined as the essential information about one's work activity that provides information about the adequacy of one's professional performance.

Many other characteristics of one's work life are frequently cited by occupational hazard burnout theorists as
sources of burnout. However, these tend to be occupa-
tionally specific such as a perceived lack of respect by
physicians as a source for nurses; lack of alternatives to
foster home placement for child abuse workers; excessive
paperwork and perceived bureaucratic conflicts and/or
barriers for welfare workers.

This theory typically calls for achieving a work
atmosphere perceived as nurturing. The specific suggestions
suggested to improve the environment for the individual
workers are typically the following:


2. Develop a more realistic view of the outcomes of
the professional's task (Freudenberger, 1975).

3. Change or vary the work tasks (Freudenberger, 1975; Maslach, 1976). In fact, Gardner and Hall (1981) go so far
as to suggest that positive benefits would accrue from
varying one's off-work activities.

4. Alteration of caseloads to reflect realistic levels
in terms of the ability of professionals to make successful

5. Periods in which workers can escape from their job
pressures, frequently suggested as retreats, time off,
etc. (Daley, 1979a).

Observations on the Occupational Hazard Theory

It is apparent the occupational hazard theories' focus of burnout is from the perspective of the worker as a victim of a demanding, stress filled work environment. The worker is portrayed as having been betrayed by his ideals in a harsh "real world." Remedies for the situation may be seen as focused upon enhancing the work environment to broaden the worker's opportunities. This position is no different from those of job enrichment advocates writing in the fields of organizational behavior and industrial psychology. Job enrichment advocates believe that most employees seek personal growth in their work (Heneman & Schwab, 1978). This solution is still open to question. Burnout theorists have not reported on the effects of implementing their ideas. Industrial psychologists have given it attention for over 20 years.

Hackman (1974) states that it looks as if the redesign of work is to be the solution of the mid-1970's. However, as he points out in criticism,

"Reports of work redesign successes tend to be more evangelical than thoughtful; for example, little conceptualizing is done that would be useful either as a guide to implementation of work
redesign in other settings or as a theoretical basis for research on its effects." (Heneman & Schwab, 1978).

Another limitation of the occupational hazard theories of burnout is their failure to offer accurate predictions of whom among the professional work force is more at risk of burnout. They offer a number of symptoms whereby an individual may diagnose himself as suffering from burnout. However, it is questionable if this diagnosis is accurate. For instance, an individual displaying the symptoms of burnout must make the assumption that it stems from work-related stress. Could, however, the individual be showing the symptoms as the result of family-related stress? Many suggest this is possible (Gardner & Hall, 1981).

A third limitation of this theory is that it fails to take into account adequately the interactive effect of the worker on the work environment. While Freundenberg (1980) describes in detail the downward spiral of functioning which is the result of the demands on the professional increasing (and correspondingly the level of stress) as a result of the professional's decreased ability to perform the required tasks, little else is mentioned. However, Maslach (1975) and Freundenberg (1980) also state that poor work attitudes may negatively affect others in the work environment.
The Transactional Theory of Burnout

The proponents of the transactional theory of burnout differ sharply from the occupational hazard theorists. While proponents associate the development of burnout with job related stress, their definition suggests that burnout is a progressive loss of idealism, energy, and purpose experienced by people in the helping professions as a result of the conditions of their work (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980). A second major difference is the emphasis on basing one's approach to burnout as a continual phenomenon (Carroll, 1979). Transactional theorists state that a positive approach to burnout is centered upon the realization that it will happen repeatedly in a person's career and must be dealt with on an ongoing basis. Some theorists go so far as to suggest that burnout may have positive benefits. Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) state that burnout may energize a person to break out of a rut. Daley (1979a) has suggested that one positive benefit of the extreme form of dissatisfaction (burnout) might be in its affording to the worker's supervisor the first major opportunity to counsel with one who has made an incorrect career choice.

However, the major contribution and characteristic of the transactional theory of burnout is the concept of stages of burnout. Edelwich and Brodsky present a five-stage model.
The Stages of Disillusionment Model

Edelwich and Brodsky divide the process of burnout into the stages of enthusiasm, stagnation, frustration, apathy, and intervention.

Stage I: Enthusiasm. This is described as the initial stage characterized by a period of unrealistic expectations, an abundance of energy, and high hopes of individual effectiveness. The individual in this stage is described as one whose profession dominates and consumes his energy and thoughts (e.g., his life).

Stage II: Stagnation: This stage is described as the period in which one's profession no longer encompasses the largest majority of the individual's life. The reality of the worker's effectiveness has come through so as to encourage this transfer of attention toward the nonwork aspects of life. The individual's emphasis is now on meeting one's own personal needs, and the issues of money, working hours, and career development now become important.

Stage III: Frustration. At this point, one calls into question one's professional effectiveness in the job, one's perception of one's personal effectiveness, and the value of the job itself. As Maslach and the other occupation hazard theorists describe in their concept of disengagement, the worker perceives the clients in a negative manner, describing their activities as fruitless because of the obstacles of the "bureaucracy" and/or the client's apathy. The limitations of
the job situation are now viewed in this stage as not simply
detracting from one's personal and professional satisfaction
but threatening to defeat the purpose of what one is doing
by one's professional tasks.

**Stage IV: Apathy.** Apathy is defined as the natural
coping mechanism which occurs in response to chronic job
frustration. It is the result of continuing in a position
that one perceives as self-defeating (or less destructive),
yet needs the position to survive. It is described by the
attitude of "a job is a job is a job". It manifests itself
by such as the following behaviors:

1. Clockwatching--the worker puts in the minimum time
   required.

2. Avoidance--of either clients and/or challenges.

3. Protecting one's position--the worker seeks mainly
to keep from endangering his or her secure position.

**Stage V: Intervention:** This is defined as any action
or activity which breaks the above cycle. It may be as
massive as leaving one's profession, or as simple as taking
a few days vacation. The concept of intervention as a stage,
hinges upon two considerations.

First, burnout is a "highly contagious" phenomenon.
Second, the progression of an individual through these stages
is not linear, nor inevitable, but is a cyclic phenomenon.

**The Stress-Strain-Coping Model of Cherniss**

The second major model, and possibly the most compre-
hensive of any transactional theory of burnout, is the
Stress-Strain-Coping Model of Cherniss (1980). Cherniss considers burnout as consisting of 3 stages:

1. Stress—Involves an imbalance between the available resources and the demands.

2. Strain—the immediate short term emotional response to this imbalance, characterized by feelings of anxiety, tension, fatigue, and exhaustion.

3. Coping—Any number of changes in attitudes and behavior, such as a tendency to treat clients in a mechanical or detached fashion. Burnout is one specific coping device.

It should be clear that burnout is a process that is self-reinforcing. Discouragement and withdrawal most likely lead to more failure in the helping role because enthusiasm, optimism, and involvement are often necessary for success.

Burnout is not the same as temporary fatigue or strain (although such feelings may be an early sign of burnout). Burnout is different from socialization or acclimatization as the process in which a staff person's attitudes and behaviors change in response to the social influences extended by colleagues or clients. Rather, burnout is an adaptation to stress.

Finally, burnout is different from turnover (McKenna et al., 1981). Burnout may cause staff to quit, but staff may remain on the job. Also, people may leave for positive reasons irrelevant to dissatisfaction. The basic model is seen in Figure 1.
Figure 1: Transactional definition of burnout.

Source: Cherniss, C. Staff Burnout: Job Stress in the Human Services.

Sources of Burnout

Stress should mobilize the individual to take actions that attempts to correct the imbalance between demands and resources. There are two sources of stress: external and internal demands.

External demands may result from the loss of a job as result of failure to perform that job. Typical sources of these demands are found in the following:
1. Policies of the agency,
2. Written demands of the profession,
3. External needs requirements, i.e., clients, paperwork, etc.

Internal demands are less explicit sources. They are typically the:
1. Values of the person,
2. Values of the profession, and
3. Internal and intrinsic needs of the individual.

The level of stress depends upon the perceived consequence of failure to meet the demand. Therefore, it is the function of the perceived discrepancy between resources and the demand and the perceived degree of harm occurring if demands are not met that determines whether an individual will "burnout".

Coping refers to the efforts to manage these demands and subsequent conflicts. It may be cognitive, behavioral, or a combination (e.g., decreased emotional stress through the changing of one's expectations).
Coping is a natural response to stress and frequently is adaptive. (But it can have long term effects that are maladaptive, i.e., drinking, smoking, etc.).

Key Elements of Stress in Burnout

The burnout situation tends to increase intrapsychic defense mechanisms and decrease problem solving. Effectiveness is a key demand. If this goal is blocked, the person's self-esteem is threatened and the stress response is strong. Additionally, among professionals, competence appears to be a primary need.

Human service work involves direct responsibility for the well being of other people. It creates a demand for high levels of effective performance. It is to the practicing professional more than just a job. Generally, it is a "calling" that involves one's identity and self esteem. Therefore, there is a tendency to equate work failure with personal failure.

The quest for competence is often a frustrating or difficult one, because of:

1. relative lack of feedback from clients,
2. general lack of data on outcomes, and
3. if/when a client's life improves, it is often true that the client has many forces in his life and the personal responsibility for their life improvement makes it questionable if the worker was the cause.
Helpers generally have little control over many of the systematic forces impacting, often negatively, on the world the clients must live in.

**Psychological Success: The Need for Predictability and Control**

Cherniss (1980) cites an important component of stress as the need for psychological success. Successful performance of a valued task leads to increased self esteem, the desire to set higher goals, more commitment, and increased motivation. Psychological success is distinguished from externally defined success by the presence of the following conditions:

1. challenging but attainable levels of aspiration;
2. the goal is defined by the person;
3. the goal is central to one's self-concept; and
4. the person works independently to achieve the goal.

If the above conditions are not present, even successful performance will not improve self-esteem, goal setting, or task involvement as much.

Therefore, Cherniss argues jobs that are high in autonomy, challenge, and feedback will be more likely to contribute to psychological success and lower burnout levels. Burnout can be seen to occur when a person must work in a situation structured for failure, a situation where success occurs rarely, or where the conditions for psychological success are not present. Argyris (1957) showed this relationship clearly in his study. Evidence today can be
seen in literature from studies of Departments of Public Welfare (Daley, 1979a; Horejsi, Walz, & Connolly, 1977).

Psychological success also implies the ability to predict and/or control one's environment. Lack of ability equates with increased psychological distress. Even when outcomes are positive, lack of control over outcomes can be negative.

**Role of learned helplessness.** Learned helplessness is the belief that one has no control over important rewards and punishment. It is the result of previous experiences with helplessness. Results of learned helplessness are the following:

1. Motivation is impaired;
2. The ability to believe that a response has worked is impeded. (The person will actually miss or deny information that suggests control is now possible); and
3. It disturbs one's emotional balance—leading to anger, depression, or anxiety. This is summarized in Figure 2 (Cherniss, 1980).

Sources of stress in the organization design are:

1. Job Design
   a. high case loads and clientele;
   b. few opportunities for learning new skills and perspectives;
   c. poor attitude toward experimentation and innovation;
   d. impaired or poor relations with co-workers.
Figure 2. Basic sources of burnout in human service programs.

2. Role Conflicts and Ambiguity
   a. overload is only one type of problem.
   b. incompatible demands are also highly involved.
      (For example, a staff member who is paid by a state hospital but assigned to a local mental health center and is given instructions by mental health center personnel that are in violation of hospital policies has a difficult dilemma to resolve.)
   c. person-role conflict--these are those behaviors required which are not compatible with a person's values, beliefs, or motivation.

3. Power Structure - The pattern and mechanism of the necessary decision-making within the agency is a leading contributor to the perception of "helplessness."
   a. centralization
   b. formalization
      are highly associated with high burnout levels
   c. bureaucratizations--(Berkley Planning Association, 1977) highly bureaucratic forms tend to low autonomy with higher burnout levels.
   d. leadership style--highly autocratic styles are highly associated with increased burnout levels.

4. Goal structure of the agency--the goals of the program--its philosophy of treatment and low levels of employee identification are related to a higher level of burnout.
Interventions Suggested by the Transactional Theory of Burnout

The transactional theorists reject several of the major suggestions of the occupational hazard theorists.

1. They reject the notion of the "workshop" to increase motivation, citing this as a short-term, temporary emotional "high" only (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; Cherniss, 1980).

2. Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) make a special point to reject the concept of flexible time off, stating it is used as a stop gap. Only a completely comprehensive and above board program would be acceptable.

3. Since the transactional theorists see the "burnt out" worker as an active participant in the phenomenon, simply changing jobs accomplishes nothing without a corresponding change in attitude (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; Cherniss, 1980).

Basically, the approach of the transactional theorists is towards the individual in response to the environment, and toward altering the basic environment.

Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) tend to emphasize that the major requirement is for the worker to learn to cope with the on-going process of the burnout cycle. True interventions involve the recognition that change is never final, together with the reality of lasting progress. Unfortunately, they go so far as to declare, "The person who deals realistically and successfully with burnout is like the addict or alcoholic who creates what amounts to a new life by taking one day at a time."
Both Cherniss and the team of Edelwich and Brodsky believe it is vital for workers to learn to set realistic goals, focusing on the treatment process rather than strictly on a result. Problem-solving and negotiation with fellow workers and administrators is valued highly.

Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) match their four stages of burnout with four specific "remedies".

1. Enthusiasm. The appropriate intervention is the result of teaching appropriately realistic goals and/or measures of success.

2. Stagnation. The intervention method for this stage is that of movement. They suggest further education and other interventions designed to remedy what they view as a "stalled career" going again are especially useful.

3. Frustration-Satisfaction. They suggest that at this stage the energy mobilized by the worker's discontentment with the environment is the motivation for change.

4. Apathy. They view the person who is apathetic as one who cares enough to be disappointed.

Cherniss' (1980) remedies reflect his definition of burnout as a particular coping device in response to stress and strain from the job. Therefore, his recommended interventions take the following approaches:
1. reduce or eliminate external job demands;
2. change personal goals, preferences, and/or expectations;
3. increase the worker's resources for meeting the demands; and/or
4. provide coping substitutes for the withdrawal characteristics of burnout.

It is important to note that, like many of the occupational hazard theorists, his recommended point of intervention is the job or work setting. It is, he states, probably easier to restructure the job setting than the character of the individual. Secondly, prevention is stressed as far more effective and less costly than treatment.

The following are specific measures recommended as effective treatment (and preventive treatment) measures of burnout:

1. Staff development programs designed to teach improved effectiveness and more realistic goals.
2. Job redesign--changing the job to reduce role overload, ambiguity, and conflict while enriching the job as well through enhanced variety, stimulation and learning.
3. Reducing work loads.
4. Providing time-outs and relief.
5. Providing career ladders. This would provide a vehicle for recognizing one's accomplishments and professional growth through enhanced status and responsibility.

Observations on the Transactional Theory of Burnout

These theorists have added two important concepts to the theory of burnout, the cyclic nature of burnout and the development of the interaction between the worker and the environment. Cherniss (1980) appears to this author to have the more complete theory.

However, both Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) and Cherniss (1980) seem to present somewhat unrealistic and/or simplistic solutions to this problem. The suggestion that the job may be changed more readily than an individual's character seems questionable in that it implies that such would be preferred. In fact, the worker may both be ready for and anticipate more personal benefit from "guided character change." It is certainly arguable that changing the role requirements of such a job as a psychiatric social worker in the military health care setting is "easier" than changing the character of a willing participant.

As before, this model focuses upon the victimization of the worker as well as upon deficiencies in the work environment. One of the prime, even necessary ingredients is, again, the presence of a "crippling degree of unrealistic" ideals on the worker. Both of these suggestions appear
somewhat simplistic. As cited previously, Hackman (1974) states eloquently that one of the weaknesses of the logical outgrowth of this thinking is the fallacy of considering job re-design as an immediate panacea to these kinds of personnel problems.

As before, these theorists still offer no advice that would lead to an accurate prediction of whom among all workers in an agency is more at risk or likely to burnout than the next worker.
CHAPTER TWO

Job Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction and Worker Motivation

Burnout has been described by most authors from a purely phenomenological approach. Their writings suffer from this restriction. The fields of industrial psychology and organizational behavior have had a great deal to say about the phenomenon described in Chapter 1. It would, therefore, be appropriate to examine in detail some of the more relevant works from industrial and organizational psychologists.

Job Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction Theories

Introduction

The question of what motivates individuals to perform the necessary tasks for the organization which employs them is an extremely complex one. It is postulated that in the "helping" professions much of this motivation comes from their "professional self-image" (Hanlan, 1970; Clearfield, 1977). This image is a set of attitudes, combined with their self-concept which influences their behavior (Clearfield, 1977, p. 23).

While a great deal of literature is available on the psychological and sociological aspects and costs of the whole phenomenon of dissatisfaction, burnout, etc., it is
heavily value laden. As mentioned previously, there is little question that the costs, even when considered purely objectively, are extremely high ones for professionals.

A large number of authors have reported studies that indicate that many professionals appear to be losing their enthusiasm and commitment for their professions. In fact, professional worker turnover is becoming critical in the area of direct clinical service positions (Daley, 1979a, 1979b; Emener, 1975; Freudenberg, 1975, 1977; Kahn, 1978; Larson, Gilbertson, & Powell, 1978; Maslach, 1978a; Maslach & Pines, 1977; Mattingly, 1977; Pines & Kafry, 1978; Thacker, 1979). As some have suggested, an appropriate place to begin to identify and correct this growing problem is with those factors which cause the phenomena of worker motivation, job satisfaction, and job dissatisfaction.

This chapter will address some of the current thinking about these problems from the perspective of the "traditional" organization and behavior and/or industrial psychology approach. It will include current definitions, characteristics, and effects, including an attempt to describe the similarity of costs to the organization concerned, reported by burnout theorists. Both traditional job satisfaction theories and the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory are presented together with a brief summary of some of the criticisms and support in the literature for these theories. Throughout this presentation there is a careful attempt to define terms and to reduce the considerable semantic
confusion which exists in current writings. The discussion will be confined to a few of the most observable aspects of this phenomenon.

Definitions of Job Dissatisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as the way an employee feels about his or her job, that is, a generalized attitude toward the job based on evaluation of different aspects of the tasks (Wexley & Yukl, 1977). The definition of job dissatisfaction would appear logically to be the result of a negative evaluation of one or more aspects of the tasks. This definition would likely be accepted by most authorities. However, even this simplistic description depends on the point of view that describes job satisfaction as a concept which is fundamentally associated with individuals working within organizations (Hanna, 1975). Any discussion of definitions must acknowledge that there exists a problem with many authors referring to the same effect by other names which here is being called "dissatisfaction" (Pines & Kafry, 1978). It has also been described variously as occupational tedium (Pines & Kafry, 1978), worker alienation (Keniston, 1972), burnout (Daley, 1979a, and b; Emener, 1979; Freudenberger, 1975, 1977; Kahn, 1978; Larson, et al., 1978; Maslach, 1978; Mattingly, 1977) and the professional worker syndrome (Gardner & Hall, 1981).

Obviously the above definition depends upon those aspects of the job being evaluated by the worker (Denton,
1976). In general, these characteristics have been broken up into two classes called variously the intrinsic vs extrinsic factors, or content vs context factors (Herzberg, 1966; Armstrong, 1971; Graen, 1968). Generally, intrinsic (or content) factors are identified as such aspects of work as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and the possibility of growth. Job context or extrinsic factors are often identified as such aspects of the job as salary; interpersonal relations with subordinates, peers, and superiors; status; supervision; company policy and administration; working conditions; and job security (Armstrong, 1971; Atchinson & Lefferts, 1972; Graen, 1968b; Herzberg, 1966; King, 1970; Macarov, 1972).

Since any definition of these observable aspects would be, in part, a reflection of one's view of the nature of the problem (Adams, 1963), e.g., the causality of the phenomenon, it is appropriate to mention the two main views briefly. The traditional theories of job satisfaction picture the phenomenon as a continuum beginning from a highly negative value to a highly positive one, i.e., beginning from dissatisfaction (Wexley & Yukl, 1977; Porter, et al., 1971; Robbins, 1976). The alternative view is that those aspects of the job which cause dissatisfaction are different from those which cause a worker to be satisfied (Armstrong, 1971; Atchinson & Lefferts, 1971; Herzberg, 1966; King, 1970). Perhaps this might explain much of the confusion over terms.
Job dissatisfaction in the human service professions then can be further defined as the relationships between those intrinsic or extrinsic characteristics of the interactions between the worker and the job's characteristics which negatively affect the individual's performance and by extension the operations of the organization.

The Need-Satisfaction Theories

Often referred to as "traditional" theory, the need satisfaction theory (an application of Maslow's theories), states that, from the standpoint of motivation, although no need is ever fully gratified, a substantially satisfied need no longer motivates (Robbins, 1976). Maslow separated his five needs (the hierarchy) into higher and lower levels. Physiological, safety, and love needs were described as lower-order, and self-esteem and self-actualization as higher order needs.

Porter et al. (1975) states:

In general, it appears that satisfaction is determined by the difference between the amount of some valued outcome that a person receives and the amount of income he feels he should receive. The larger the discrepancy, the greater the dissatisfaction. Moreover, the amount a person feels he should receive has been found to be strongly influenced by what he perceives others like himself are receiving. People seem to
balance what they are putting into a work situation against what they feel they are getting out of it and then compare their own balances with that of other people. If this comparison reveals that their outcomes are inequitable in comparison with those of others, then dissatisfaction results. Adams (1963) supports this position.

**Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory: the Two-Factor Theory**

According to the two-factor theory of job satisfaction, the primary determinants of job satisfaction are the intrinsic aspects of the job, called motivators, whereas, the primary determinants of job dissatisfaction are extrinsic factors, called hygienes (Herzberg, 1966). (See Figure 3.)

Basically, King (1970) sums up the literature by saying there are five versions of the two-factor theory. These are the following:

1. All motivators combined contribute more to job satisfaction than to job dissatisfaction, and all the hygienes combined contribute more to job dissatisfaction than to job satisfaction.

2. All motivators combined contribute more to job satisfaction than do all hygienes combined, and all hygienes combined contribute more to job satisfaction than do all motivators combined.
Figure 3. The components of Herzberg's two-factor theory.

3. Each motivator contributes more to job satisfaction than to job dissatisfaction, and each hygiene contributes more to job dissatisfaction than to job satisfaction.

4. Theory 3 holds, and in addition, each principal motivator contributes more to job satisfaction than does any hygiene, and each principle hygiene contributes more to job dissatisfaction than does any motivator.

5. Only motivators determine job satisfaction, and only hygenies determine job dissatisfaction.

Regardless of these differences in approaches between Herzberg's basic theories, there is the commonality that the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction traditionally believed (King, 1970). In other words, removing dissatisfying characteristics from a job does not necessarily make the job satisfying, nor vice versa (Herzberg, 1966). Herzberg (1966) instead proposes a dual continuum: the opposite of satisfaction being no satisfaction, the opposite of dissatisfaction being no dissatisfaction.

An Integration of These Theories

Robbins (1976) suggests that Maslow's satisfaction-of-needs theory and Herzberg's motivation-maintenance theory are comparable and compatible as Figure 4 suggests.
Maslow's Needs Hierarchy

- Self-actualization
- Esteem
- Love
- Safety
- Physiological needs

Herzberg's Motivation Maintenance Theory

Motivators
- Work itself
- Achievement
- Possibility of Growth
- Responsibility

Maintenance Factors
- Advancement
- Recognition
- Status
- Interpersonal Relations
- Supervision
- Company Policy and Administration
- Job Security
- Working Conditions
- Salary

Figure 4. Integration of Theories
Research Evidence

The traditional approaches have a significant amount of variability in their results. If the person studied is a high-order, or high-growth needs person, the theory may afford an understanding of what motivates or demotivates him (Herzberg, 1966). From an organizational point of view, what is needed is predictability for effective cost-analysis (Hanlan, 1970).

This author, in spite of the criticisms, views the research findings for Herzberg's theory as persuasive for the human service organization. The major criticisms of Herzberg's work are generally the following five perceived weaknesses (Robbins, 1976):

1. The procedure that Herzberg used is criticized as being limited by its methodology. Robbins (1976) argues that when things are going well people tend to take credit themselves. Contrarily, they blame failures on the extrinsic environment.

2. The reliability of Herzberg's methodology is questioned. Since raters are making determinations there is a possibility of "contamination" or unexplained error variance (Stanley & Campbell, 1963).

3. No overall measure of satisfaction was used.

4. Some criticize it as ignoring situational variables.

5. Many criticize Herzberg for assuming that there is a relationship between satisfaction and productivity.
However, much of this criticism lacks complete force when applied to human services professionals who are presumably motivated. Helping professionals seldom utilize elaborate technologies to accomplish their tasks. A failure then is often viewed by professionals not as the failure of a remote technology but as the failure of the professional's ability. The evidence of Maslach and Pines (1977) suggests that the ability of the worker to accomplish the task is strongly influenced by the nature of the organization's structure and its extrinsic characteristics. It is doubtful the first criticism is appropriate, as most helping professionals would not claim "credit" for themselves for the the client.

The issue of reliability is one of prediction, rather than simply replicability. Atkinson and Lefferts (1972) clearly demonstrate that job turnover can be more accurately predicted by the Herzberg model than by more traditional ones. From a research perspective, the Herzberg method is deserving, perhaps, of criticism. However, from the pragmatic viewpoint of the administrator of a human service agency, if it predicts turnover, it is a better indicator of the "state of health" of the agency (Denton, 1976).

It is quite true that the absence of an overall measure of satisfaction is missing from Herzberg's theory, and that he assumes the relationship between productivity and satisfaction. However, for the typical human service agency, motivation to accomplish the task is strongly guided by
intrinsic and internal value systems. The evidence that shows a relationship between values and entrance into the profession suggests proof of this (Clearfield, 1977). It is doubtful that any organization could instill this personal value system, where it probably could reinforce one. The crucial relationship is that of the effects of dissatisfaction and/or burnout on the organization's effectiveness. Clearly, such a relationship exists (Daley, 1979b).

As Hackman and Oldham (1974) agree, it is to the credit of the Herzberg theory that it has prompted a great deal of research, and inspired several successful change projects involving the redesign of work. However, this theory does not provide for differences among people in how responsive they are likely to be in "enriched" jobs. Nor, does this theory in its present form specify how the presence or absence of motivating factors can be measured for existing jobs.

**The Job Characteristics Model**

The job characteristics model of Hackman and Oldham (1975) is a representation of the relationship between job characteristics and individual responses to work. This model is presented in Figure 5 and in the following discussion.

Three psychological states—experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for the outcomes of the work, and knowledge of the results of the work activities—are the causal core of the model. Following
Figure 5. The Job Characteristics Model of Work Motivation

Hackman and Lawler (1971), the model postulates that an individual experiences positive affect to the extent that he learns (knowledge of results) that he personally (experienced responsibility) has performed well on a task that he cares about (experienced meaningfulness). Self-generated motivation would be highest when all three of the psychological states are present.

Of the five characteristics of jobs shown in Figure 4 as fostering the emergence of the psychological states, three contribute to the experienced meaningfulness of the work, and one each contributes to experienced responsibility and to knowledge of results.

**Toward experienced meaningfulness.** Three job characteristics combine additively to determine the psychological meaningfulness of a job (Hackman & Oldham, 1974). They are:

1. **Skill Variety.** The degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities in carrying out the work, which involves the use of a number of different skills and talents of the person.

When a task requires a person to engage in activities that challenge or stretch his skills and abilities, that task almost invariably is experienced as meaningful by the individual. Many parlor games, puzzles, and recreational activities, for example, achieve much of their fascination because they tap and test the intellectual or motor skills of the people who do them. When a job draws upon several skills
of an employee, that individual may find the job to be of enormous personal meaning—even if, in any absolute sense, it is not of great significance or importance.

2. **Task Identity.** The degree to which the job requires completion of a "whole" and identifiable piece of work—that is, doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome.

   If, for example, an employee assembles a complete product (or provides a complete unit of service) he should find the work more meaningful than would be the case if he were responsible for only a small part of the whole job—other things (such as skill variety) assumed equal.

3. **Task Significance.** The degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of other people—whether in the immediate organization or in the external environment.

   When an individual understands that the results of his work may have a significant effect on the well-being of other people, the meaningfulness of that work usually is enhanced. Employees who tighten nuts on aircraft brake assemblies, for example, are much more likely to perceive their work as meaningful than are workers who fill small boxes with paper clips—again, even though the skill levels involved may be comparable.
Toward experienced responsibility. The job characteristic predicted to prompt employee feelings of personal responsibility for the work outcomes is autonomy. To the extent that a job has high autonomy, the outcomes depend increasingly on the individual's own efforts, initiatives, and decision—rather than on the adequacy of instructions from the boss or on a manual of job procedures. In such circumstances, the individual should feel strong personal responsibility for the success and failures that occur on the job. Autonomy is defined as follows:

Autonomy. The degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out.

Toward knowledge of results. The job characteristic that fosters knowledge of results is feedback, which is defined as follows:

Feedback. The degree to which carrying out the work activities required by the job results in the individual obtaining direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his or her performance.

Motivation in the Work Environment

Many authors have studied the question of how the above conflicts are resolved under the heading of work motivation. The object of studies of human motivation in the work life
is twofold. First, it deals with the content issues—what it is that energizes human behavior (i.e., what "turns people on" about their jobs). The second issue deals with the processes of motivation.

Process issues are concerned with two primary questions:

1. how human behavior is maintained or sustained, and
2. what directs or channels this behavior?

These are two major content theories (Hammer & Organ, 1978)—need theory and activation theory. Need theories are most often represented by Maslach’s hierarchy.

Several characteristics of Maslow’s theory are important for understanding motivation (Hammer & Organ, 1978):

1. The hierarchy is dynamic—the prepotent need takes precedence in motivating behavior.

2. Any behavior tends to be determined by several or all basic needs simultaneously rather than by any one of them.

3. The basic needs are only one class of behavioral determinants. It is almost always biologically, culturally, and situationally determined as well.

4. There are relative degrees of satisfaction.

The stages of career theory is another common need theory with relevance to work life dissatisfaction (Hall, 1976).
A career stage is the period of time in a person's life characterized by distinctive needs and activities. The stages of a person's career development and his or her corresponding need status are shown in Figure 6.

**Activation theory.** Briefly stated, this is the view that the power of the individual to perform is determined by the degree of general excitation of the brain from stimulation by all sources. At low activation levels, performance is handicapped by low levels of alertness, lack of muscular coordination, etc. Scott (1966) has reviewed a number of studies that show how people react to chronic states of under-activation at work by engaging in arousal-enhancing behaviors, some of which have clearly dysfunctional consequences for work effectiveness. The findings Scott summarizes suggest that activation theory may be of considerable use in understanding jobs that are highly repetitive—and in planning for task designs that minimize the dysfunctional consequences of under-activating work. Activation theorists have given relatively little attention to jobs that may be over-stimulating, even though many such jobs exist for professional workers in contemporary organizations.

**Process models motivation.** These present behavior as channelized or directed toward a goal object based on the person's value system. These theories are primarily the following:
An Integrative Model of Career Stages


Figure 6. An Integrative Model of Career Stages
1. *Expectancy theory*—this states that a person's purpose in behaving must be analyzed with respect to the perceived likelihood that a certain outcome will occur with respect to the value or attractiveness of the goal.

2. *Goal theory*—has two cognitive determinants:
   a. values, and
   b. intentions (goals).

   Value is that which one acts to gain and/or to keep. The fundamental effects of goals on mental or physical action are directed. They guide people's thoughts and overt acts to a specific end over another. Not every goal leads to an activity or end specified by the goal. A particular goal may not lead to an effectuated action because it conflicts with the individual's other goals.

   In general, all the theories dealing with the maintenance of desired behaviors deal with the internal and external reward structures of the individual.

**Reciprocity**

One important aspect of the social environment is one's work experience. In our culture, most who work full time spend approximately one half their waking hours on the job. Frequently, the norm for professionals is significantly more than one half. For social workers, in particular, the work life experience often entails memberships in organizations which continues over many years. Additionally, one
characteristic of a profession is frequently the presence of an "organization" which reflects that profession's attempt to regulate itself through the establishment of standards and to which members of a profession also belong (Greenwood, 1957).

When people engage in an activity to, for, or on the behalf of their organization or for other people, others in turn will respond in some fashion to them. One way of viewing the work experience is as the operationalization of a reciprocal process involving two major dimensions (Levinson, et al. 1962). These are as follows:

1. In the work situation, a person will be a member of the organization and will have certain minimal conditions and requirements that must be met if he/she is to remain a member. Similarly, the person demands of the organization the minimal guarantees of continuity, financial reward, and other acknowledgements that he/she is contributing toward the larger organizational purpose (Levinson, et al., op cit.).

2. One's work life also involves other people and other groups. There is the concomitant demand on the individual that he/she contribute to group purposes as well.

Generally, new employees are tasked with the learning of those ways of behaving which are traditionally acceptable to the new group. It is expected that he/she will identify with that group in which he/she is a member in their dealings
with individuals outside their profession. Tasks may be described as having their own formal requirements to which the person will bring his own unique capacities, interests, and skills which permit the fulfillment of those requirements more or less effectively.

The Psychological Contract

The frequency with which the individual's expectations of the organizations are met is an important characteristic of an individual's work life. When employees express their expectations, there is an obligatory quality to them. This quality is present even though the expectations were unexpressed. Levinson's (et al. 1962) study indicates that people behave as if the organization is duty bound to fulfill these unexpressed expectations. The organization has expectations of its own which in turn expresses through such vehicles as its policies and practices in varying degrees, all the people are aware of these.

The psychological contract is the product of these mutual expectations. The psychological contract has two major characteristics:

1. It is implicit and usually unspoken;

2. It often antedates the relationship of the person to the organization. In order to maintain one's emotional equilibrium and to gratify one's needs, one must constantly resolve those conflicts which arise between one's internal demands for need's gratification and those external controls
imposed upon the ways in which those needs may be gratified in the work environment (See Figure 7).

The Levinson, et al. (1962) study classifies those organizational based needs as clustering around and reflecting the concerns of the individual about:

1. The problems of dependency - the balance between the necessary reliance on the environment for psychological support and structure versus the need to achieve some degree of autonomy and interdependence as an adult;

2. The achievement of appropriate and psychologically rewarding relationships with other people, thus avoiding both inappropriate intimacy and chronic isolation; and

3. Coping with the stressful aspects of the inevitable changes which occur within oneself and in the environment over the passage of time.

Conclusions

The phenomenon reported by burnout theorists is neither as simple, nor as limited, as has been suggested. As can be seen, the phenomenon of burnout may logically be identified as a special case of worker dissatisfaction. Organizational behaviorists have studied well the processes inherent in the development of worker burnout.

However, industrial and organizational psychologists have limited their studies somewhat to the major, usually highly specialized, work places (e.g., The Westinghouse
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Figure 7. Factors of Organizational Behavior.
Studies by Herzberg). What would seem necessary to understand the phenomenon of burnout is a comprehensive theory of the professional work place as a part of the types of stress reactions so far discussed.

Any such theory of burnout would require the addition of concepts discussed in this chapter to its theoretical discussion of burnout.
CHAPTER THREE

The Life Management Model

Introduction

As can be seen from the preceding discussion, burnout or worker dissatisfaction is a complex issue involving an understanding of both the processes of the worker's environment and the job itself. A model of burnout should attempt to examine each aspect—the job, the worker, and the contextual relationships between the two if it is to offer a clearer understanding of this phenomenon.

A Systems Model of the Human Services Organization

Organizations do not exist in a vacuum. They exist in a community system in competition with other societal systems. These demands, as often stressed by management theorists, are an important factor in the life of any organization, and are not unique to the human services. However, these demands (or the organization's interactions with other societal systems) are frequently qualitatively different for human services organization than for others, business organization for example.

There are many organizations that fulfill society's demands. In fact, a strong case can be made that some of
the more innovative technical organizations clearly create some of the demands in their environments. The history of the human service organizations strongly suggests a reactive rather than a proactive response to the environment. As the business organization can create in its environment the expectation that successful production of its product can improve and extend the "quality of life", the human services organization can seldom provide as tangible a test of its answers to the problems that it was created to answer. This creates the basis of an ongoing, continually fluxuating level of stress between human services systems and environmental systems.

Additionally, it is generally accepted that for the business organization, the efficient creation of products enhances the survival of that organization. This belief has become so strong that there now appears to exist an implication that efficiency and effectiveness are synonymous in their meanings. The best organizational competitor has been defined by society as the one that can create, market, and distribute the most desirable product. However, the difficulty is in trying to apply this same test to the human services. By its very nature the qualitative aspect of services is the principal output used in identifying the nature of the organization, but this conflicts with the "universal" definition of a good organization. For instance, the best psychiatric facility is not necessarily the one that
has the most patients for the least organizational expense. Especially for the human services, bigger is not always synonymous with better. This inherent conflict creates another interactive source which determines the level of ambient stress found within organizations.

In an environment of conflicting demands, the integrity of the organizational systems' and subsystems' boundaries becomes a key, if not critical, effort. While information, materials, and energy must penetrate, environmental sensors must still provide information for the effective control of the organization (Miller, 1955, 1978). The desired output must still be made available to that part of the environment demanding it—if the organization is to survive (Benne, et al., 1969). The boundary must not be too open. A certain selectivity in the filtering of input to prevent the creation of unresolvable or destructive tensions is often at the core of the management process and is a function of the boundary. Thus balance of tension and the maintenance of equilibria (homeostasis) is identified as another key element of the management activity.

The human service organization may then be defined as the uniting of a social system and a psychosocial-technical system with other resources to affect improved social functioning, and/or to identify, and reduce social deviance, and accomplish other designated social-cultural goals through a series of interactions.
Where in this definition is the human being—the employee? Obviously, they are the source of much of all that is done by any organization, but especially in the labor intensive markets of the human services. It is unfortunate then that a major source of burnout has been identified in the literature to be the unrealistic "squandering" of these human resources. One likely source of this unrealistic commitment lies in the nature of the psychological contract between the worker and the agency. A worker who gains employment as a "counselor" may be unaware or resistant to the non-counseling or non-therapists requirements of the position. Any organization expects a mix of roles of any employee. It is likely, therefore, that burnout occurs, at least in part, to the nature of this "mix" and its attendant demands for coping.

The Major Subsystems of an Human Service Organization

The major subsystems in which any (and all) employees might be expected to be affiliated to a varying degree are hypothesized to be the following:

1. The professional employee subsystem. The actual functions of the human service organization can be thought of as the bringing together of some professional techniques, standards, and other values upon some demand by some element of the environment.

2. Goals and values. This subsystem is not only those goals and values of the society, but the resolution of the
continuing process of interaction between environmental inputs and goals and values subsystems.

3. Technical support subsystem. In order to facilitate the performance of the agency goals and to enhance survival of the agency, certain technical support components and elements for the system are required (e.g., financial accounting components, etc.). The support subsystem is identified through its focus primarily on the continued functioning of the agency whole.

4. Societal communications subsystem. This is concerned with direct output to the environment of preventive, interventive, or community education based efforts.

5. Internal structure subsystem. This is the formal, power-relationships and lines of both authority and accountability reflected in the formal organizational charter. It also includes the informal status and working relationships of the individuals within the organization. Essential elements of this subsystem are the pre-existing relationships between professions in general and their reflection in the behaviors of their representatives in the agency.

6. Managerial subsystem. This is defined by a number of processes and functions. The major components of this subsystem are planning, control, and system change management.
Figure 8. A systems model of the agency structure
As can be seen, this system is composed of interactive subsystems. The managerial subsystem is depicted as providing much of the basis for the system's interactions. The boundary maintenance and the supportive functions, with the effect of the sub-systems interactions, represent a realistic picture of the points of input-output exchange with the environment. These points, as Cherniss (1980) demonstrates, are often the sources of continual stress that lead to the strain which may develop into those symptoms, psychiatric, physical, social, and/or organizational, which comprise much of the descriptive definition of burnout.

A Systems Theory Description of Job Dissatisfaction

There are certain similarities among the theories of job dissatisfaction which may best be viewed from the systems perspective.

1. The way to "cure" dissatisfaction is to make the organization more responsive to the individual's needs (Adams, 1963; Armstrong, 1971; Braude, 1975; Denton, 1976; Grigaliunas & Herzberg, 1971);

2. The individual is seen as reacting to the stimuli from the organization; and

3. Dissatisfaction will naturally change in some developmental scheme. By this, one who is a little dissatisfied, assuming things remain constant, will become more and more dissatisfied (Robins, 1976).
From an organizational level this seems to be a little one-sided. A general systems theory model of dissatisfaction would be the following:

1. The key to understanding the output of the employee subsystems is through an understanding of the interdependencies of the various relationships (Berrein, 1968).

2. Each employee subsystem has a boundary through which information, materials, and energy passes (Berrein, 1968; Benne, et al., 1969; Miller, 1955). However, human subsystems have a preferred level of tension, the adaptation level (Berrein, 1968).

3. If the quality of the organizational system's interchanges, i.e., inputs, thru-puts, and out-puts, have a significantly greater or lesser amount of tension, changes in the ability of the component subsystem's ability to freely exchange energy, materials, and information might be affected (Berrein, 1968). The quality thus referred to would be the ambient stress levels. Typical effects of difference in ambient stress frequently contribute to dysfunctional work attitudes. (See Figure 9). It is important to note that the dysfunctional situation is hypothesized as being the result of the individual's inability to cope in this adaptation process.

Is There Burnout?

The organization's environment is a complex one with many factors affecting its functioning, both extrinsic and
In this case the level of stress of the organizational environment (O.E.) is significantly less than that of the human subsystem (H.S.). As systems theory states an equilibrium will be sought. The human subsystem is forced into a greater openness, or vulnerability, increasing the possibility of dysfunction.

In this case, the higher quality of stress has caused the H.S. to reinforce its boundary significantly. This situation is potentially dangerous for the Organizational System as its subsystems will be less able to accomplish its function.

Figure 9. Non-functional responses to ambient stress.
intrinsic. The same is true for the individual. Is it reasonable to describe the phenomenon of burnout by attributing it to strictly work related stress as the occupational hazard theorists do? Is it reasonable to define it by the combination of strictly work related stress and immature characteristics of the individual? Probably not. Individuals do not live in limited input social environments. As Veninga and Spradley (1981) have shown, that which is described as burnout is by no means limited to the human services professions.

Therefore, the phenomenon described as burnout is suggested to be a region of points at the extreme end of a continuum of one's satisfaction with one's entire career (or career choice). (See Figure 10.)

The Life Management Model

Individuals showing the effects of stress in the workplace must be viewed in the context of their lives. Individuals have a finite amount of personal resources with which to function in the living of their lives. It is likely that the display of burnout symptoms is noticed first in the human services work environment as opposed to other work environments because of the intensely personal scrutiny from accountability requirements and the marked degree of personal involvement of the professional. Just as "burnout" or the presence of this group of dysfunctional symptoms can
Figure 10. Career Continuum
be seen in the workplace, so it may be seen in the other aspects of the individual's life, one's family, and one's intimate social network.

The phenomenon of work dissatisfaction in relation to single employment, regardless of its severity, is suggested to be more than a cause and effect response to simple forces. Rather, the individual's response in any life situation, work or elsewhere, is seen to be the result of a multi-dimensional interaction.

On one level, the individual's physical and emotional resources determine the upper limits of one's possible responses. An individual deprived of the necessary inputs of energy, material, and/or information cannot respond either as completely, or, in terms of the individual's goals, as successfully as the one whose initial resources are at their maximum levels.

On a second level, the individual is engaged in interactions with others in three major systems:

1. The individual's social involvement in the work environment;

2. The individual's involvement with his or her immediate family; and

3. The individual's intimate social network, his or her friendship community. The individual reported "over-committed" at work (by the burnout literature as "over-involved" with work) would be seen as having a different
interactive mix of these major social systems than the individual who has been reported as being alienated from his fellow workers.

As system theory clearly demonstrates, any system interaction both gives and demands resources from all interactive parts. In practical terms, human beings are involved in demand fulfillment with all those social systems with whom he or she is interdependent. The adequacy or inadequacy of any individual to respond to stress in any area, such as the work place, is in part determined by the adequacy of these interactions. One whose social interactions have been themselves stressful to a sufficient degree so as to create strain would be less able to respond to that crises in the work environment which demanded an increased quantitative or qualitative personal output.

The third dimension, and perhaps the most crucial, is that of the individual's coping ability. As Miller (1978) has defined a boundary, the total of one's experiences and his memory of his responses to them comprise much of the individual's boundary. Coping has been defined similarly by many. McLean (1976) defines it as having five components.

1. Self-knowledge. An individual under stress will successfully respond only if he recognizes its presence in his life.
2. Many interests. He states that an individual is better able to respond if he has many sources of involvement and/or resources. The individual with many different interests is more flexible in response to a situation than one with only limited or few interests.

3. Variety of reactions. The individual who has a greater repertoire of responses to situations and/or emotions is seen as more competent to deal with stress than one with few or restricted choices of response.

4. Accepts others' values. Open-minded, flexible individuals are more successful because of their skills at accepting different inputs and because of their relative freedom from the "knee-jerk" responses in coping with stress than those who are less open. In systems theory terms, individuals with greater control and/or skill over the permeability of their boundary can survive greater levels of ambient stress.

5. Active and productive. As has been shown by many (Hackman & Oldham, 1974; Herzberg, 1966; McLean, 1976) the feedback from the environment which contributes to the individuals sense of being successful in his actions is crucial to the mental well being of the individual.

In short, as Cherniss (1980) has defined it, coping is an adaptation to psychological stress.

In terms of the life management model, one's coping is the basis of the entire process of interaction with all
of the systems (and sub-systems) within which the individual finds himself. Coping is crucial for a professional whose effective performance on the job demands honest confrontation with other individuals. Most burnout theorists call for enhanced coping skills, in particular, knowledge of one's self, where they recommend pacing one's self, having more realistic expectations, etc. Coping when viewed as a third dimension in the organization, and adaptation processes of the individual, is that ingredient that reflects the essence of one's flexibility. For instance, an individual who is surrounded by emotional support, yet is unable to adapt or to avail himself of this, would be expected to demonstrate those symptoms mentioned by burnout theorists and industrial psychologists. Additionally, it is expected that one could and probably does "burnout" in one's marriage, one's social organizations, or with one's immediate friends.

Coping is frequently difficult to discuss as it is both process and product. Knowing one's limitations can be a product of coping; the act of using that knowledge to set or establish successful goals is the process of coping. The limitations on the directions of the individual's possible responses to those forces impacting on his life is that which is meant by the process of coping. Figure 11 demonstrates how this might work.
Figure 11. The process model of coping
The demands external to the individual are such as work, family, or friend role requirements. The homeostatic demands are such as one's expectations, one's perception of need for emotional support, and one's physical well being (appetite, fatigue, etc.). Homeostasis by definition is analogous to inertia. The extrinsic demand forces movement if it is in excess of this inertia. The limitations on the direction that this conflict between forces is resolved are the process of coping. As memory services a homeostatic boundary function, once one's mixed demands are resolved successfully, it is frequently repeated, occasionally to the point that habit patterns are established.

The individual's responses to any situation are the sum product of this combination of forces acting upon the individual. This may be seen in Figure 12. Homeostasis is a characteristic of all systems, and necessary for survival (Berrein, 1968). This model views those points on the continuum of satisfaction--dissatisfaction as the result of choice. The individual copes with the situation creating a great demand on his resources through any behavior that prevents serious harm to his system. Thus, as Cherniss (1980) suggests, burnout is a coping mechanism. It is one which is appropriate given the choices, experiences, and resources of the individual.
Figure 12. The Interactive Systems of the Life Management Model.
This model would allow prediction of whom among any group of workers represents the greatest "at risk" population through an analysis of personal resources vs. demands. One last dimension must be considered, however. That dimension is time. Time, and its attendant changes by the individual that are the result of its passage, makes the life management model of burnout a dynamic one. This is consistent with most major burnout theorists (Freudenberger, 1980; Maslach, 1976; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; and Cherniss, 1980) and by Hackman and Oldham (1974). The analysis of the individual's resources vs. demands (and, hence, the degree of burnout) describes the situation as one at a frozen slice of time. Thus, time may alter the individual's position on the continuum, as it does the available choices open for one to cope with any situation.
CHAPTER FOUR

Methodology

Purpose of the Research

There is a growing need to understand the phenomenon of work-life dissatisfaction, especially as it appears in its extreme form of burnout in the human services profession. It is believed that the life management model provides an appropriate approach toward achieving this understanding. This study will attempt to explore the validity of this approach.

There is also a practical side to this research. If the interactive effects of the major life systems can be seen to affect job performance, then both individuals and organizations will have a more realistic knowledge base from which to evaluate the demands of the particular position, and/or environment. More importantly, this understanding could aid individuals in gaining that important "realism". If individuals really appreciate the demands they are meeting vs. the resources with which they have available to meet these demands, then greater flexibility, more tolerant self-judgments, and better planning are likely.
Research Question

This study proposes to be an exploratory effort to examine professional worker burnout as a work-life manifestation of a specific coping device. This device is made necessary as the demands upon an individual within the work environment exceed the total resources of one's satisfaction with one's work, family, friends (intimate social network), and one's own individual coping style. This is in contrast to the major theoretical positions that some individuals are inherently vulnerable to burnout.

Definition of Terms

Burnout is defined for this study as those negative attitudes and feelings of a professional employee that reflect alienation from the job. It is characterized by the following:

1. There is a detachment in the worker-client relationship which is associated with decreased effectiveness (Maslach, 1977).

2. There is frustration from an inability to maintain effective performance usually accompanied and/or compounded by an increased striving to maintain effective performance (Maslach, 1977).
3. Feelings of estrangement and/or isolation from the organization, one's profession, one's colleagues, and one's clients.

4. It is a time-related phenomenon gradually occurring, often below the level of awareness of the affected individual. Generally, it is seen to have occurred in the first three years of the professional's beginning his employment.

Symptoms of burnout are defined in this study to be those compiled by Cherniss. They are the following:

1. High resistance to going to work every day.
2. A sense of failure.
3. Anger and resentment.
4. Guilt and blame.
5. Discouragement and indifference.
7. Isolation and withdrawal.
8. Feeling tired and exhausted all day.
10. Great fatigue after work.
11. Loss of positive feelings toward clients.
12. Postponing client contacts; resisting client phone calls and visits.
13. Stereotyping clients.
14. Inability to concentrate on or listen to what the client is saying.
16. Cynicism regarding clients; a blaming attitude.
17. Increasingly "going by the book".
18. Sleep disorders.
19. Avoiding discussion of work colleagues.
21. More approving of behavior-control measures such as tranquilizers.
22. Frequent colds and flus.
23. Frequent headaches and gastrointestinal disturbances.
24. Rigidity in thinking and resistance to change.
25. Suspicion and paranoia.
26. Excessive use of drugs.
27. Marital and family conflict.

**Work-life dissatisfaction** is defined for the purposes of this study to reflect the individual's negative attitude toward his entire work-life experiences, including an example of career, growth of responsibility, specific activities or position, expectations of future situations and/or responsibilities, and comparisons of the individual of other's situations.

**Major Hypotheses**

1. Individuals who describe themselves as being satisfied with their family life will show a lesser amount of those symptoms associated with professional worker burnout.
2. Individuals who describe themselves as being satisfied with their intimate social network will show a lesser amount of those symptoms associated with professional worker burnout.

3. Individuals who describe themselves as being satisfied with their work life (as opposed to any specific employment) will show a lesser amount of those symptoms associated with professional worker burnout.

4. Individuals who describe themselves as being satisfied with the adequacy of their individual coping mechanisms will show a lesser amount of those symptoms associated with professional worker burnout.

The Research Design

This study will be an exploratory cross-sectional survey of individuals practicing within human services organizations with emphasis on those in the mental health area. The independent variables are those individual's perceptions of his level of satisfaction with each of the following:

1. Family life,
2. Work life,
3. Intimate social network,
4. Coping style, and
5. Relevant demographic characteristics.

The dependent variables are those associated in the literature with the phenomenon of professional worker burnout.
Major Variables

There were five independent variables (or groups of variables) included in the study:

1. Work environment variables (10 groups of variables, scaled down to represent specific characteristics).

2. Family environment-support variables (three groups of variables, scaled down to represent specific characteristics).

3. Group social support (three groups of variables scaled down to represent specific characteristics).

4. Coping style - (four groups of variables, scaled down to represent specific variables).

5. Demographic characteristics (14 variables).

There were twenty variables related specifically to the characteristics of burnout. These items scaled down to four characteristic variables. Those psychiatric symptoms reporting characteristics of burnout were 11 variables which scaled down to two major characteristic variables.

The Research Instrument--The Operationalization of the Variables

The variables were measured in a 12-page, self-administered, 134-item, mail-type questionnaire. The questionnaire followed the format of the Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978). The basic characteristics of this method are the following:

1. The booklet was printed as a 14-page booklet.
2. No questions were asked on either the front or back cover.

3. The questionnaire was photographically reduced and printed on plain white paper.

4. Questions were ordered along descending degree of importance and/or relevance to the study. Also, questions with similar content were grouped. (Dillman, 1978, cites two purposes as being served by this. First, easing the mental effort to switch from one kind of question to another facilitates the answer response rates. Secondly, grouping encourages well thought-out answers as the respondents are asked questions in an order which appears logical to them.)

5. Transitions were built into the questionnaire so that questions about one's work life led logically, and naturally into questions about one's perception of family support.

6. In keeping with the above, demographic items were the last items listed.

**Item Selection**

While there were no clearly defined divisions in the actual instrument, the scheduled items were selected in the following manner:

1. The coping variables on the research schedule were the twenty items of McLean's (1976) coping checklist. The Coping Checklist was designed to provide a measure of a respondent's relative satisfaction with the adequacy of his coping mechanisms.
2. The 40-item (short form) of the Moos (1974) Work Environment Scale (WES) was selected to comprise the perception of the respondents of the social climate of their specific work units. The WES focuses on the measurement and description of the interpersonal relationships among employees and between managers and employees; on the directions of personal growth and development which are emphasized in the work unit; and on the basic organizational structure of the work unit (Moos, Insel, & Humphries, 1974).

The WES (short form) has ten sets of four items grouped to form ten scales. These scales are the following:

A. Involvement - Measures the extent to which one is committed to one's job.

B. Peer Cohesion - Measures the extent to which individuals are friendly and/or supportive of one another in the work place.

C. Staff Support - Measures the extent to which one feels one is supported by "management" and the extent one feels that his fellow workers are supportive of him.

D. Autonomy - Assesses the extent one feels one has sufficient authority and self-sufficiency to make responsible decisions.

E. Task Orientation - Assesses the extent to which the internal climate of the organization puts marked emphasis on planning and efficiency issues.
F. Controlled - Measures the perception of one as being controlled or confined by rules and regulations.

G. Clarity - Measures the extent to which one can predict and is aware of the daily routines and of those demands most likely to be made upon one.

H. Work Pressure - Measures the extent to which one feels dominated by one's work. It is a measure of perceived work overload.

I. Innovation - Measures the fluidity of the work environment, that is the extent to which change, and variety are present in the work place.

J. Physical Comfort - Assesses the extent to which one feels the physical setting of the work place contributes to a positive and pleasant surrounding.

Moos (1974) has tested and standardized this instrument in human services professions. He groups the Involvement, Peer Cohesion, and Staff Support subscales as the relationship dimension of the work environment. This dimension explores the types and the intensity of those personal relationships which exist among the various individuals in the work place.

The Autonomy and Task-Orientiation subscales are grouped together as the personal development or personal growth dimensions. This dimension is conceptualized by Moos et al. (1976) as being those factors in the work environment that promote the development of the individual's competencies.
The Work Pressure, Clarity, Control, Innovation, and Physical Comfort subscales are grouped to comprise the system maintenance and system change dimension. The balancing of system maintenance vs. system change is defined by Miller (1955) as growth of a system. If system maintenance is too strong, homeostasis is viewed as destructive. If it is too weak, the system is viewed as too vulnerable to destructive changes.

3. The family support variable was measured through the use of the relevant subscales of the Moos Family Environment Scale (FES). The FES assesses the social climates of all types of families. The three subscales used in this study were the Cohesion, Expressiveness, and Conflict subscales. They are grouped by Moos (1976) into the relationship dimension of family relationships. He states that this dimension assesses the extent to which family members feel that they belong to and are proud of their family, the extent to which they feel free to utilize their family to express themselves. The subscales are defined as follows:

A. Cohesion - This assesses the extent to which family members identify themselves with, are committed to, help or support the other members of the family.

B. Expressiveness - This measures the extent to which an individual feels permission to freely and uninhibitedly share their feelings openly.
C. Conflict - This assesses the extent to which an individual feels that the milieu of the family is characterized by a relatively high degree of open conflict among family members.

D. The group support items (10) were designed after the format of Moos' Family Environment Scale.

E. The twenty items comprising the characteristics of burnout were offered in a straightforward, Likert-scale format. The items were selected from Cherniss (1980). Cherniss' list was determined through a process of comparison with those characteristics of burnout reported by Maslach (1978), Berkley Planning Associates (1977), and Freundenberger (1980).

F. Those psychiatric and behavioral characteristics reported by Maslach (1976), Freundenberger (1973, 1980), Edelwich and Brodsky (1980), Gardner and Hall (1981), and Cherniss (1980) were compared to a twenty-two item standard psychiatric screening tool (Langner, 1962). The screening tool was designed to provide an indication of where people lie on a continuum of impairment in life functioning due to very common types of psychiatric symptoms such as those associated with a reactive depression or anxiety disorder. Those items selected for this study were those items from the screening tool which matched the reported symptoms of burnout.

The symptoms were selected for inclusion in the questionnaire for other reasons as well. Items selected
had a relatively high degree of face validity for this study. These items have also passed standard tests for validity and were taken from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) which has become the standard tool for psychiatric diagnosis (Langner, 1962).

G. The demographic information consisted of fourteen variables: length of present job in years, highest educational degree, number of earned degrees, field of professional training, longest professional job in years, shortest professional job in years, career total number of professional jobs, type of one's employing agency, one's living arrangements, marital status, number of children, yearly income, age, and sex.

**Sampling Design**

The study population was comprised of two major categories:

1. The professional worker category, and
2. The semi-professional worker category.

The sample population for the professional worker category was derived by randomly selecting from all Franklin County, Ohio, residents from the following lists:

1. The Ohio Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers,
2. The Central Ohio Psychological Association, and
3. The Ohio Psychiatric Association.
The semi-professional worker sample population was randomly selected from the mailing lists for the last three years of graduates from each of the following:

1. The Bachelor's degree program, The College of Social Work, Ohio State University; and

2. The Bachelor's degree programs in Social Welfare, Capital University and Dominican College.

It was considered important that the sample be representative of both groups of workers as the burnout literature contends that the development of the symptoms is a result of the worker's responsibilities. In many human services organizations (e.g., children's service, public welfare, etc.) bachelor's level personnel are charged with the responsibility of delivering direct services, thus making them eligible for this study.

The actual selection of respondents was done through a stratified random sampling. However, in order to insure that the sample included appropriate numbers of the various sub-populations (e.g., psychiatrists, psychologists, master's level social workers, and bachelor's level social workers) a larger percentage of the total possible sample was selected for the psychiatrists. The list of psychiatrists used the same random numbers table to determine selection as the other lists, but it was applied to this list twice. This modification was based upon an expected poor response rate from the psychiatrists. Other studies made with physicians
suggest that this was a reasonable expectation (Dillman, 1978; Kilty & Behling, 1980).

This study was conducted primarily in the professional community of Franklin County, Ohio. Naturally, the majority were residents of the City of Columbus, as well. Relatively few individuals were residents of this state at the time this study was conducted. However, they had each been residents of Franklin County within a two year period prior to this study.

Sample size was 327. One hundred fifty of these were the bachelor level social workers. One hundred seventy seven were the professional worker sample size. With the exception previously noted, this represented approximately a 25% sample of respondents eligible for the sample.

Data Collection

This study utilized a mail-type questionnaire with a three-part mailing (See Appendix B). Part 1 consisted of the research instrument, informed consent information, and an introductory letter. Part 2, mailed approximately 15 days later, consisted of a post-card follow-up sent to all those whose questionnaires had not been received. Part 3, mailed approximately one month after Part 1, consisted of a second questionnaire, a second follow-up letter requesting return, and informed consent information. In order to insure receipt of the questionnaire to the correct party, the third mailing was sent by registered mail (Dillman and Frey, 1974).
Response Rates

Response rates for this study were calculated as the percentage of contracts with eligible respondents that result in completed questionnaires. This was the method recommended by Dillman (1978) as most appropriate for a mail questionnaire study without sample substitution.

The formula for the response rate is the following:

\[
\frac{\text{Response Rate}}{\text{Number Returned}} = \frac{\text{Number in sample} - (\text{Noneligible} + \text{nonreachable})}{100}
\]

The response rates for this study are summarized in Table 1.

Of the psychiatrist's sample, the non-eligible respondents were one who is retired, and one who is no longer a psychiatrist. The non-eligible social worker's (professional sub-sample) consisted of two who were retired, one unemployed, and one deceased. Of the non-eligible psychologists, both were unemployed at the time of the study.

Of the bachelor level social workers, all seven were unemployed and stated they had never been employed professionally. A total of nine questionnaires (4 professional and 5 bachelor level) were received after the cutoff date and were not included in the analysis.

The Study Population

The following is a descriptive analysis of the study population according to 14 demographic variables. This information is summarized in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Returns</th>
<th>Non-Reachable</th>
<th>Non-Eligible</th>
<th>Response Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrists</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW's</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Sample</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Sample</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Study Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Length of present jobs in years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One through three</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four through ten</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven through twenty</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over twenty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mean)</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Highest Educational Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./D.S.W.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Total Number of Earned Degrees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Profession**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Variable

#### 5. Length of Longest Professional Job in Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or less</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (Mean) 137 8.117

#### 6. Length of Shortest Professional Job in Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and up</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (Mean) 133 3.376

#### 7. Career Total of Professional Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (Mean) 133 3.301
### Variables

#### 8. Type of Employing Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Practice</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Agency</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9. Living Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lives alone</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with roommate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with parent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with spouse</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives alone with children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with spouse and children</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 10. Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 11. Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mean)</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Variables**

12. **Yearly Income ($000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Mean)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Mean)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the Sample Population

Length of Present Job. A high proportion (44.5%) of the respondents had less than 3 years in their present position. However, the mean was over 6 years.

Highest Educational Degree. The distribution of the major categories appears to be sufficiently balanced for the purposes of this study.

Total Number of Earned Degrees. Consistent with the highest educational degrees, the majority of all respondents had 2 or less degrees.

Profession. While the numbers appear unbalanced, response rates indicate a different relationship. The comparison between the psychologists is actually revised as the 12.5% distribution of the psychiatrists actually reflect a 69.2% return rate. Whereas, the 18.4% distribution of the psychologists reflects a much lower 43.5% return rate. However, sufficient numbers are present to provide for a fairly reliable statistical analysis.

Lengths of Shortest to Longest Time in a Professional Job. As would be expected from the age of the sample and the number of degrees the average longest job is 8.1 years contrasted with the average shortest period being 3.376. However, these means are somewhat skewed, as some 57.5% have held jobs less than 7 years and 55.6% have worked for one year or less.
Total Number of Jobs in One's Professional Career. 63.9% have had 3 or less jobs in their career. However, this is a relatively young sample which can explain a part of this.

Type of Employing Agency. The distribution of these various work settings represents a good distribution across all the major organizational environments. The distribution appears to be sufficiently large enough to support a rigorous statistical examination.

Living Arrangements. Slightly over one-fifth of this sample lives alone with 5.4% more reporting to be single parents. Only 29.3% report a traditional family setting of spouse and children, but an additional 26.3% are married.

Marital Status. The majority of all respondents are married with 27.7% never married and the rest either divorced, separated or widowed.

Number of Children. As would be expected from the relatively low number of individuals reporting having any children, the mean is reported as 1.067. However, this is highly skewed by 50.7% reporting having no children. Most respondents with children had two or less.

Yearly Income. The distribution on this characteristic appears to fairly normally distribution with the mean income estimated to be in the $15,000 to $30,000 range. However, considering the number of individuals with better than their master's degrees, this looks slightly low. Seventeen individuals are making over $50,000 a year.
Age. This population mean appears fairly valid and normally distributed (Kurtosis is 0.87). The average age is 37.6 years. However, considering the number of individuals with advanced educational degrees, this represents a reasonable number for a somewhat younger work force than might be expected from the average longest job having been 8.1 years and the average total number of jobs being 3.3.

Sex. There appears to be a slight favoring of females over males in this sample. However, this is not as great as one might have expected considering that the social work profession tends to have many more women than men, and that the social work profession represents 69.1% of the total sample.
CHAPTER FIVE

Analysis of the Data

As the research instrument is a 134-item survey, reduction of the data was a necessary first step. Two issues were involved with this effort. First, items which were a part of a scale were examined to determine if an acceptable degree of reliability, or relatedness was present for this data set. As the scales used were a part of multiple-item additive scales, the alpha reliability coefficient was calculated. A minimum alpha of .55 was the standard applied (although the majority of all scales had stronger alpha coefficients). Any scale which failed to obtain this minimum standard was determined insufficient. The items were not considered to be an adequate measure of that which they were purported to measure and, therefore, were dropped from the analysis as a scale score.

Work Environment Scale

The work environment scale (Moos, Insel & Humphries, 1976), as noted earlier, was an essential component of this study. Consisting of 10, four-item subscales, the WES is a measure of the social climate of the work place. The evaluation by the worker of the social climate is an important aspect of an individual's life. It is especially
important to a professional's self-image (Clearfield, 1977). As the W.E.S. focuses on interpersonal relationships, it measures an important dimension of the life management model previously presented. These specific sub-scales also measure these specific sources of burnout associated with the organizational environment cited by Freudenberger (1973, 1980), Maslach (1973, 1976, 1978a and b), Maslach and Jackson (1979), Maslach and Pines (1977), Pines and Kafry (1978), Edelwich and Brodsky (1980), and Cherniss (1980). The results of the alpha coefficient test for reliability for the WES subscales are summarized in Table 3.

These subscales with the exception of the Physical Comfort Subscale (alpha = .371) passed the decision criterion and were included as factors for the multivariate analysis.

Support Subscales of the Family Environment Scale

To measure another dimension of the life management model, the family support component (Moos, Insel & Humphries, 1976), the relationship subscales of Cohesion, Expressiveness, and Conflict were used. These subscales focus on the social climate of the individual's family. Each of these subscales consist of four items with a simple TRUE/FALSE format. These subscales also assess the relationship deficits noted as characteristic of burnout by Freudenberger (1980) and by Edelwich and Brodsky (1980).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Innovation</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff Support</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarity</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involvement</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Autonomy</td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work Pressure</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Task Orientation</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peer Cohesion</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Control</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Physical Comfort</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All subscales met the basic decision criterion. The results of the alpha coefficient test for reliability is summarized in Table 4.

**Psychiatric Screening Tool**

The Psychiatric Screening Tool (Langner, 1962) measures the somatic symptoms of a generalized anxiety disorder or of a reactive depression. As noted previously, these are typical of those physical symptoms reported by Freudenberger (1975, 1980), Maslach (1976, 1978), and Cherniss (1980). For the purposes of this study, the 12 items selected were grouped into two subscales. The first, the Somatic-Anxiety Symptoms Subscale, is an eight-item, multiple response subscale. The second, the Somatic-Depressive Subscale, is a four-item, multiple response subscale which focuses upon those physical symptoms diagnostically characteristic of depression. The results of the alpha coefficient test for reliability (reported in Table 5) indicates that both subscales meet the criterion for acceptance for inclusion in the multi-variate analysis.

**Factor Analysis of the Data**

The 13 standardized scales previously described only accounted for two of the independent variables and one of the dependent variables. There were several different independent and dependent variables remaining which needed to be reduced to simpler variables. This was accomplished through factor analyses using the principle components method with varimax rotation to simple structure (Child,
Table 4

Alpha Reliability Coefficient for the Family Environment Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Alpha Reliability Coefficient for the Psychiatric Screening Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somatic-Anxiety Symptoms</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic-Depression Symptoms</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Child points out that factor analysis not only allows one to describe and group data into a few factors or dimensions but permits it to be done so with a substantial degree of reliability.

The technique used to decide upon the number of factors to extract was the skree test of Cattell (Child, 1970). Factor loadings were required to have a coefficient of .50 or greater for the item to be included in the dimension.

**McLean's Coping Checklist**

A major component of this study is the individual's perception of the adequacy of his coping mechanisms. McLean's Coping Checklist (1976) provides a 20-item, multiple-response assessment of this dimension. By using the principle components method with varimax rotation to simple structure, this data set was factor analyzed. The skree test (shown in Figure 13) suggests a four factor structure that accounts for 44.7% of the variance. These factors are presented in Table 6.

The first factor contained the largest number of scale items as well as controlling for the most substantial proportion of the total variance (19.3%). In order of the loadings from highest to lowest, the following items had loadings .50 or greater:

1. Interested in many different topics.
2. Often argues with others of different thinking.
3. Cares about other's feelings and opinions.
Figure 13. Skree Test of McLean's Coping Checklist
Table 6
Principle Components Factor Analysis of the McLean's Coping Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion Statements</th>
<th>Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Rolls with punches when problems arise.</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thinks about work all the time.</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cares about work all the time.</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recognizes and accepts own limits and assets.</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has quite a few good friends.</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enjoys use of skills and abilities on and off job.</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I get bored easily.</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enjoys people with different ideas.</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Often bites off more than can chew.</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Weekends are usually active with things.</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prefers to work with people like one's self.</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Works to live, not for the enjoyment.</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Often argues with those who think differently.</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Has a realistic idea of own strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Statements</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Has trouble getting much done on the job.</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Interested in many different topics.</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I get upset when things don't go my way.</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Often unsure of own stand on controversial issues.</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Finds ways around blocks from goals.</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Often disagrees with the boss and others on the job.</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of total variance

19.3  9.4  8.6  8.2  44.7

n = 132
4. Enjoys people with different ideas.
5. Enjoys the use of skills on and off the job.
6. Recognizes and accepts one's own limitations and assets.

As a result of this ordering, the scale was titled *Many Interests*.

The second factor contained three items and accounted for 9.4% of the total variance. This factor consisted of the following from highest to lowest:

1. I get bored easily.
2. Works to live and not for enjoyment.
3. I get upset when things don't go my way.

As these items represented that component of McLean's Coping Checklist identified as how well one knows one's self, this factor was named *Knows Self*.

The third factor contained three items and accounted for 8.6% of the total variance. This factor consisted of the following three items from the highest to the lowest:

1. Often unsure of one's stand on controversial issues.
2. Can find ways around blocks from goals.
3. Has trouble getting much done on the job.

This factor was titled *Accepts Others Values* as suggested by McLean.

The fourth and final factor accounted for 8.2% of the total variance and consisted of three scales. From the highest to the lowest, these were the following:
1. Thinks about work all the time.
2. Weekends are usually very active with things.
3. Often bites off more than one can chew.

These factors accounted for 17 of the 20 scale items. The divisions were consistant with the coping mechanisms cited by McLean (1976). It was interesting to note, however, that many interests (Factor I) placed so substantially ahead of all other factors and had twice the number of scales.

**Intimate Social Network--Friends Group**

One of the major independent variables of this study was the perception by the individual of the adequacy of support viewed from his intimate social network--the friends relationships. This consisted of 10 items with a TRUE/FALSE format. Working of each item was patterned somewhat by the McLean's Family Environment Scale. However, they covered those characteristics cited by the major burnout theorists (Freudenberger, 1973, 1980; Maslach, 1976; Cherniss, 1980) as frequently showing the stress related effects of burnout. Again, these data were factor analyzed using the principle components method with varimax rotation to simple structure. From the skree test (Figure 14) a three factor structure using 9 of the 10 scales was obtained which accounted for 54.5% of the total variance.

The factor matrix obtained by this method is presented in Table 7. Each factor accounted for roughly the same degree of variance. The only item not achieving a
Figure 14. The Skree Test of Intimate Social Network Support Scale
Table 7

Principle Components Factor Analysis of the Intimate Social Network Support Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion Statements</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My friends really help and support me.</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Friends can lose their tempers and it's ok.</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I tell my friends my personal problems.</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My friends argue a lot.</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am often bored with my friends.</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-.285</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I rarely get to do what I want with my friends.</td>
<td>-.626</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I go out a lot with my friends</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. We put a lot of energy into having a good time.</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It's hard to relax and not make my friends angry.</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I and my friends feel like a close group.</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>-.336</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of total variance 19.3  18.8  16.4  54.5%

n = 133
loading greater than or equal to 0.5 was item one—"My friends really help and support me." However, this scale had loadings that rounded off to .5 on both Factors I (.480) and II (.477). It is not surprising that this scale would reveal this factorizing as it is dealing with what the life management model would declare to be the heart of the issue—perceived support.

The first factor consisted of five scale items that accounted for 19.3% of the total variance in this data. This is the largest number of items of any of the factors. Using the minimum loading of .50 or greater criterion, the following scales from the highest to the lowest comprise the first factor:

1. We put a lot of energy into having a good time.
2. My friends and I go out a lot.
3. I rarely get to do what I want with my friends
   (This is negatively correlated).
4. I and my friends feel like a close group.

This factor was titled Has a Good Time with Friends.

The second factor is only two items, both with significantly substantial loadings. They are:

1. Friends lose their tempers and it's ok.
2. I tell my friends my personal problems.

This factor is titled Confidence in Friends--Trust. With one exception, it should be noted that these factors have the highest loadings of any scale in any factor. This factor accounts for 18.8% of the total variance.
The final factor consists of three scale items, and accounts for 16.4% of the total variance. The three items comprising this factor from the highest to the lowest are the following:

1. It's hard to relax and not make my friends angry.
2. My friends argue a lot.
3. I am often bored with my friends.

This factor is entitled Rigidity of Social Group.

The Burnout Syndrome Characteristics

Comprising the major behavioral and attitudinal characteristics of burnout as compiled by Cherniss (1980), this 22 item, multiple-response set represents the principle dependent variable. Reduction of this data to as few component factors was the most advantageous strategy. While Maslach and Jackson (1981) have developed a scale for measuring the burnout phenomenon, it was not appropriate for use in this study due to the extensive repetitiveness of many of their scale items. None of the other burnout theorists had available for use any other pretested scales. Therefore, it was necessary to subject these data to the same analysis as the other scales, i.e., factor analysis by principle components with a varimax rotation to simple structure.

Using the scree test, a four factor structure that included 19 of the 22 items was obtained. This structure obtained four factors.
Figure 15. The Skree Test of the Burnout Syndrome
As noted previously, all items must have a minimum loading .50 for inclusion. The first factor, accounting for 21.6% of the total variance included by far the majority of scale items. (It had as much as three times the number of items as any other factor, and more than all the others three factors combined.) The principle components factor analysis for Burnout may be seen in Table 8. The scales which comprise the first consisted of 12 symptoms. Six of these items are positively related and six negatively. They are from the highest to the lowest the following:

1. Feels like they are in the wrong profession.
2. Feels professional employees are tardy/absent more often than other employees.
3. Happy with own authority. (Negatively related)
4. Enjoys their work. (Negatively related)
5. Happy with one's progress toward their own goals. (Negatively related)
6. Think about looking for another job. (Negatively related)
7. Often is required to do things one would not have chosen to do.
8. Works harder but gets less done.
9. Feelings about going to work. (Negatively related)
10. Feels work is routine and segmented.
11. Feelings of frustration about job. (Negatively related)
12. The rules, and policies at work are too restrictive.
Table 8

Principle Components Factor Analysis of the Burnout Syndrome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom</th>
<th>Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Feelings about going to work.</td>
<td>-.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feelings about level workload.</td>
<td>-.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feels frustrated over job.</td>
<td>-.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thinks about looking for a new job.</td>
<td>-.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enjoys their work.</td>
<td>-.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Frustrated--not doing well.</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does not feel recognized for work.</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Often worries about losing job.</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Feels like they are in the wrong profession.</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Often does what one would not have chosen to do.</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Works harder but gets less done.</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Work uses too much of person's time.</td>
<td>-.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Work policies are too restrictive.</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. All real decisions on the job are made by a small group.</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Does not enjoy fellow workers on the job.</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Does not want to socialize with other workers.</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Feels people do not get along well on job.</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Happy with progress toward personal goals.</td>
<td>-.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Happy with own authority.</td>
<td>-.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Feels work is routine and segmented.</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Feels salary is adequate for the job and one's training.</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Believes professional workers are tardy or absent more than other employees.</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of total variation: 21.6 12.5 10.8 8.0 53.0

N=123
The second factor consisted of three items, all with significantly high loadings (.80 or better). This factor was entitled *Social Relations in the Workplace*. It accounts for 12.5% of the total variance. The three items from highest to lowest are the following:

1. Does not want to meet socially with other employees.
2. Does not enjoy their fellow employees on the job.
3. Feels that people do not get along very well on the job.

The third factor consists, like the second factor, of 3 scale items. However, while two of these factors have loadings of .74 or better, the third is lower with .57. It should be noted, however, that this third item is also loaded on factor 1, Burnout, at approximately the same loading (.56). This factor accounts for 10.8% of the total variance and is entitled *Overload*. It is comprised of the following scale items from the highest to the lowest:

1. Feelings about level of work load.
2. Feels that work consumes too much of a person's time.
3. One works harder but gets less done.
The final factor, accounting for 8.0% of the total variance, is entitled Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards. It consists of three scale items, one of which is negatively related. From the highest to the lowest, these items are the following:

1. Feels salary is adequate for the job and one's training. (Negatively loaded)
2. Thinks about looking for a new job.
3. Does not feel one is recognized for the work one does.

Multivariate Analysis

The primary purpose of this study was to determine to what extent the combination of variables (both external to the work place and internal to it) may be used to predict the presence or absence of those attitudes, behaviors, and symptoms most frequently used to define the condition known popularly as "burnout." This can be accomplished through the use of a multiple regression approach (Lewis-Beck, 1980). This approach will accommodate any number of independent variables and control for each.

Overview of Multiple Regression

The specific aspects of the regression equation of interest from a descriptive point of view are the unstandardized regression coefficient (B), the standardized regression slope or the standardized regression coefficient, the multiple correlation coefficient (multiple R), and the accuracy of prediction ($R^2$). The standardized regression
coefficient indicates the average standard deviation change in the dependent variable associated with a standard deviation change in the independent variable when the other independent variables are held constant (Lewis-Beck, 1980). The accuracy of prediction \( R^2 \) assesses the goodness of fit of a multiple regression equation. The \( R^2 \) value indicates the proportion of variance in the dependent variable "explained" by all the independent variables (Lewis-Beck, 1980). It should be noted that this is not a causal model of analyses but simply one that tests the existence of a relationship between variables.

**The Issue of Multicolinearity**

The multiple regression equation would be seriously weak if a high correlation between two of the independent variables existed. To test for this, the Pearson's Correlation coefficient was calculated for each independent variable against every other independent variable used in the multiple regression equation. Kim and Kohout (Nie, et al., 1975) declare that a problem of high multicolinearity exists between variables with a Pearson's correlation coefficient value of .80 or greater. No relevant relationships were found to exist for these variables greater than or equal to .60. It would appear that there were no significant problems with multicolinearity.

This analysis was done in two parts. In the first part, the following list of independent variables was used:
1. **Work Environment Measures**
   A. Subscale--Innovation
   B. Subscale--Peer Cohesion
   C. Subscale--Staff Support
   D. Subscale--Autonomy
   E. Subscale--Task Orientation
   F. Subscale--Work Pressure
   G. Subscale--Clarity
   H. Subscale--Control
   I. Subscale--Involvement

2. **The Family Environment Measures**
   A. Subscale--Expressiveness
   B. Subscale--Cohesion
   C. Subscale--Conflict

3. **The Intimate Social Network Measures**
   A. Scale--Has Good Time with Friends
   B. Scale--Confidence in Friend's Trust
   C. Scale--Rigidity of Social Group

4. **Adequacy of Coping Devices Measures**
   A. Coping Checklist Scale--Many Interests
   B. Coping Checklist Scale--Knows Self
   C. Coping Checklist Scale--Accepts Other's Values
   D. Coping Checklist Scale--Level of Goal Commitment

5. **Demographic Variables--Work History**
   A. Length of Present Job
   B. Highest Educational Degree
   C. Number of Earned Degrees
D. Profession
   1. Psychiatrist
   2. Social Worker
   3. Psychologist
E. Longest Professional Job
F. Shortest Professional Job
G. Career Total of Professional Jobs

6. Demographic Variable--Individual Attributes
   A. Living Arrangements
   B. Marital Status
   C. Number of Children
   D. Yearly Income
   E. Age
   F. Sex

This list of independent variables was regressed against each of the following six dependent variables in separate regression equations.

Burnout Scales--Work Environment Behaviors
   A. Burnout Characteristics Scale--Burnout
   B. Burnout Characteristics Scale--Social Relations in the Workplace
   C. Burnout Characteristics Scale--Overload
   D. Burnout Characteristics Scale--Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards
Individual Symptoms

A. Psychiatric Screening Tool--Somatic-Anxiety Symptoms
B. Psychiatric Screening Tool--Somatic-Depression Symptoms

For all analyses the degrees of freedom were more than 60 and less than 120. Therefore, the minimum significance for the analyses of variance testing the regression of the F value was F=4.00, for significance at the .05 level.

After this procedure, the regression equations were repeated using only those independent variables whose standardized weights were significant at the .05 level. This process allowed for improved accuracy and simplicity of the overall regression equation.

Regression Analyses For Scale--Burnout

For this equation, the number of cases used was 96. Not all individuals answered all questions. In fact, it should be noted that in several questionnaires returned, two specific pages were repeatedly overlooked by a number of respondents. This scale had several items on these two pages.

In the first step of this equation, the Work Environment Scale (WES) subscale Involvement proved to generate a significant F value (38.79) with an $R^2 = .292$. In the second step, the Coping Checklist Subscale--Knows Self was added. It was significant (F=11.37) and improved the equation's ability to account for the variation in the sample by a total of $R^2 = .369$. 
The third step was to add the WES Subscale Work Pressure. This was also significant with an F value of 12.284. The addition of this variable improved slightly the F value of Coping Knows Self as well. The equation was not improved with an $R^2 = .444$.

The fourth step was to include yearly income. This had an F value of 18.631 and an $R^2$ value of .538. This was the last variable to be statistically significant. The final equation is summarized in Table 9. Note that the addition of Yearly Income improved the F values of WES Involvement, and Coping--Knows Self.

**Regression Analyses for Scale--Social Relations in Work Place**

For this dependent variable, four independent variables were significant to the .05 level. These are WES subscales Peer Cohesion and Involvement, Intimate Social Network (ISN) scale Rigidity in the Social Group, and the WES Subscale Innovation. The final regression equation for these variables accounts for 47.7 percent of the total variance. Each variable was entered in the same step-wise fashion as previously discussed. The results of this analyses are summarized in Table 10.

**Regression Analysis for Scale--Overload**

Three independent variables proved significant predictors at the .05 level for the dependent variable Overload. These are Coping--Level of Goal Commitment, WES subscale--Work Pressure, and Coping--Accepts Other's Values. This
Table 9
Summary Table for the Multiple Regression
For Scale--Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Involvement</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping--Knows Self</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Work Pressure</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Income</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant = 38.641

N = 96
Table 10

Summary Table for the Multiple Regression

For Scale--Social Relations

In the Work Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Peer Cohesion</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Involvement</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISN Scale--Rigidity in the Social</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Innovation</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant = 1.734

N = 96
equation has an $R^2$ value of .385. The results of this equation are shown in Table 11. The lowest value for F was 5.75.

**Regression Analysis for Scale--Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards**

The final equation, Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards, included 7 steps significant at the .05 level, accounts for 43.9 percent of the variance with the final value for F being 4.18. The seven independent variables were the following:

1. Yearly Income
2. Coping--Accepts Others' Values
3. WES Subscale--Staff Support
4. Shortest Professional Job in Years
5. INS--Confidence in Friends--Trust
6. Number of Children
7. INS--Has a Good Time with Friends

The results of this regression are summarized in Table 12.

**Regression Analysis for Somatic-Anxiety Symptoms**

This regression equation accounts for 40.1 percent of the variation and was a seven-step process. Those independent variables which were significantly related to the Psychiatric Screening Tool--Somatic Anxiety Symptoms are the following:

1. Coping--Knows Self
2. Coping--Level of Goal Commitment
3. Age
4. FES--Subscale Expressiveness
Table 11

Summary Table for the Multiple Regression Results for Scale--Overload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coping--Level of Goal Commitment</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>-.374</td>
<td>-.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Work Pressure</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.504</td>
<td>-.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping--Accepts Others' Values</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>-.242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant = 13.997

N=96
Table 12
Summary Table for the Multiple Regression
For Scale---
Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>R^2 Change</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Income</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.782</td>
<td>-.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping--Accepts Others Values</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>-.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Staff Support</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.622</td>
<td>-.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortest Professional Job</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS--Confidence in Friends--</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS--Has a Good Time with</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-.499</td>
<td>-.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant = 16.247

N = 96
5. WES Subscale--Clarity
6. WES Subscale--Task Orientation
7. WES Subscale--Innovation

The results of this regression are summarized in Table 13.

Regression Analysis for Somatic-Depression Symptoms

This regression equation accounted for 26.4 percent of the variation. Four independent variables achieved F values at the .05 level of significance:

1. Coping--Knows self
2. Age
3. WES Subscale--Clarity
4. INS--Rigidity in the Social Group

The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 14.
Table 13

Summary Table for the Multiple Regression For

Somatic-Anxiety Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coping--Knows Self</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping--Level of Goal Commitment</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.583</td>
<td>-.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES Subscale--Expressiveness</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>-.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Clarity</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Task Orientation</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>-.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Innovation</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>-.152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant = 1.055

N = 96
Table 14
Summary Table for the Multiple Regression For
Somatic-Depression Symptoms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coping--Knows Self</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES Subscale--Clarity</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS--Rigidity in the Social Group</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-.194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant = .986
N = 96
Chapter Six
Discussion and Conclusions

It was the purpose of this research to explore the phenomenon of the extreme forms of professional worker dissatisfaction known as burnout. That which was examined was the possibility of a relationship between an individual's complete social environment (work place, intimate social network, and family) and the manifestation of "symptoms" in the work portion of one's life. It was hypothesized that the mix of resources to demands from all the sources of one's social environment was the basis of dysfunction demonstrating itself.

To fulfill this purpose the analysis technique of multiple regression was chosen. Multiple regression is a general statistical technique which provided a method of describing relationships, if such exist, between a series of independent variables (acting in concert) upon a specific dependent variable. As Kim and Kohout (Nie, et al., 1975) note, multiple regression may be viewed either as a descriptive tool by which the linear relationships of one variable on others is summarized and decomposed, or as an inferential tool by which the relationships in the population are evaluated from the examination of sample data.
This study utilized the descriptive function of the multiple regression technique on which to base much of the following discussion. It should be emphasized that this technique was used only as a vehicle for discovering associative relationships. It did not, and was not intended to impute causality for the dependent variable used in the specific regression equation.

When each possible independent variable was regressed against the dependent variables, only a relatively few appeared to have significance. However, for all six dependent variables, the multiple correlation was not only significant, but also substantial. Table 15 presents a summary of the variables that had an adequate regression weight (i.e., a beta greater than .100) with each of the independent variables.

The Work Environment Measures

As can be seen, of the ten measures of the work place, seven had significance for the six burnout indicators. The subscale Involvement addressed the level of one's commitment to the job. As predicted by Maslach (1976), Pines and Kafry (1978) and Freudenberger (1980), it was significant for the specific dependent variable which was a measure of job-related stress (Burnout Characteristics--Burnout) and for the Social Relations in the Work Place variable. The significant effect on the Social Relations scale was consistent with the Life Management model. Involvement was positively related to each dependent variable. The Life
Table 15
Summary of Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Social Relations in the Burnout Work Place</th>
<th>Overload Rewards</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Cohesion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Environment Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Social Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a Good Time with Friends</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident in Friend's Trust</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity in Social Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Checklist Scales</th>
<th>Social Relations in the Burnout Work Place Overload Rewards</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knows Self</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts Other's Values</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Goal Commitment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Income</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortest Professional Job</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management Model acknowledged that both stress and support were components of the work place that had effects upon each individual.

The WES subscale Work Pressure was significant for the Burnout Characteristics scales of Burnout and Overload. This was expected from the very definition of the subscale Work Pressure as the measure of the extent to which one feels dominated by one's work and supports Maslach (1976), Daley (1976b), and Cherniss (1980). With both the Burnout scale and Overload scale, Work Pressure was negatively correlated.

It was quite interesting to note that the WES subscale Clarity, a member of the system's change/maintenance dimension, was strongly associated with one's demonstration of those psychiatric symptoms reported in the Somatic-Anxiety Scale (Beta = .539) and Somatic-Depression Scale (Beta = .370). Clarity measured the extent to which one could predict control and was aware of daily routines as well as of those demands most likely to be made upon one. This was consistent with what Cherniss (1980) calls an important source of burnout, the need for predictability and control. This relationship also suggested the dilemma of the problems of dependency--the balance between the support one received from the work environment against the need for some degree of autonomy. The presence of physical psychological symptoms were suggested by the DSM III and Langner (1962) to be in part the result of a lack of clear guidelines for the
individual to predict, plan, or control his energy expenditures. It is suggested that this might be the heart of the phenomenon of burnout as it has been defined by the occupational hazard theorists (Maslach, 1976, Freudenberger, 1975). This is supported by the significantly negative relationship between the WES subscale Task Orientation with the presence of Somatic-Anxiety scale symptoms.

The last WES Subscale to have a significant correlation with the dependent variables is that of Staff Support. Staff Support is the measure of the individual's perception of personal support by one's fellows and one's superiors. Interestingly, Staff Support is significantly correlated (Beta = .218) with the dependent variable, Burnout Characteristics--Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards. Acknowledgement and support, particularly from superiors, is a normal and important component of the psychological contract between the worker and the employing agency (Levinson, et al., 1962). This relationship is also consistent with contributing to the task significance of the job (Hackman & Oldham, 1974) which is a component of the experienced meaningfulness of the work.

Family Environment

Expressiveness--the measure of the individual's perceived permission to spontaneously express emotions--was the only one of the three FES subscales to demonstrate a
significant (Beta = -.147) weight in the regression equation for the dependent variable, Somatic-Anxiety Symptoms. However, the relationships between freedom of expression and the presence of somatic-anxiety symptoms is implicit in the family-social characteristics used by the DSM III (1980) for the diagnosis of psychiatric complaints. A lack of freedom of expression is a characteristic of the degree of isolation of the individual. The Life Management Model would view this as another source of stress or strain upon the individual's function.

The nature of the population most likely had a significant effect upon the outcome of this portion of this study. Much of the population was under the age of 30 (33.6%), not living with their family (34.3%). With slightly over one third of the sample having no immediate family environment, and with the sample size of this study only 137, the effects of the family environment may still be of impact on worker burnout in a sample with a different composition. However, in this study the family environment was a relatively weak indicator for the burnout phenomenon.

**Intimate Social Network**

All three subscales of this group proved to be significantly related to three of the six indicators of burnout. Rigidity in the Social Group was significantly related to two dependent variables, Social Relations in the Workplace (Beta = .102) and the Somatic-Depression Symptoms Scale
(Beta = -.194). These results are consistent with the systems approach of the Life Management Model. The relationship of the support one receives from one's friends is quite important to the individual. Limitations on the utility of that support such as may be hypothesized to present in highly rigid groups, could naturally and spontaneously induce the individual into questionable office relationships in reaction. It is most probably a safe assumption that rigid social groups imply a lack of flexibility. As many crisis theorists have pointed out (Parrad, 1965; Rappaport, 1963) decreased flexibility of one's resources in responding to stress places one in enhanced risk of experiencing a crisis. The picture of the individual from a rigid social background forced into increased openness and enhanced vulnerability is precisely that situation discussed previously in Figure 9, Non-Functional Responses to Ambient Stress.

The Has a Good Time with Friends is associated with the dependent variable, Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards. This relationship is quite substantial (Beta = -.238). There are several possible explanations for this. As the interactive systems approach of the Life Management Model suggests, one's intimate social network would, in its support function, enhance the intrinsic rewards of an occupation by reflecting their positive attitudes and/or respect. As Glasser (1975) has stated, one of two most basic needs of an individual which is fulfilled by interaction with other people is the
need to give and receive respect. An addition to this explanation is offered by the Career Stages Model (Hall, 1976). This model implies that the comparison of one's extrinsic rewards system with that of peers is an ongoing process which comprises one source of motivation. Herzberg acknowledges this component as well in his discussion of the motivator factor--recognition. There is an additional factor which might reflect the predictability of Has a Good Time with Friends with Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards. A significant portion of the sample (30.2%) make less than $15,000 a year. When one considers that 33.6 percent of sample was 29 years of age and younger, it may well be that a substantial portion simply cannot afford to engage in activities which they and their friends would find an enjoyable variety.

The Confidence in Friends--Trust scale is also substantially correlated with the Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards (Beta = .296). It is likely that this relationship is the result of such similar forces as discussed in the above section, Has a Good Time with Friends. It is not likely that one will achieve enhanced self respect if the source of that reflection/feedback is devalued by a lack of confidence and/or trust. It should be noted that this group of scales had no consistently strong indicator of the different indicators of burnout.
Coping Checklist Scales

The Coping Checklist Scales represent a measure of the perceived adequacy of the individual's coping mechanisms. Three of the four scales had significant substantial relationships to five of the six dependent variables. The first of these, Knows Self, is the only independent variable showing a relationship with three of the six dependent characteristics. It is associated with three dependent variables that are indicative of the individual's behaving in a manner that is the classic description of burnout. These dependent variables are Burnout Characteristics, Burnout Scale (Beta = -.33), and both Psychiatric Screening Tool Scales, Somatic-Anxiety Symptoms (Beta = .293) and Somatic-Depression Symptoms (Beta = .315).

These relationships provide strong support for the operation of coping within the Life Management Model as they point out, quite dramatically, that the presence of burnout is likely a deliberate choice, although of questionable rationality, by the individual to survive forces he can no longer competently control or predict. It is realized that this statement is somewhat strong. However, consider that the Life Management Model describes coping as defining the limitations of directions one is likely to take to cope with extensive periods of stress. After all, there is for the individual under stress, a certain intuitive appeal to the notion of withdrawing from an environment which he has perceived as personally damaging.
The Accepts Other's Values scale is significantly correlated with the dependent variables (Beta = -.242) and Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards (Beta = -.223). These negative relationships fit the classical description of burnout's description of the individual's becoming increasingly withdrawn and isolated. As the coping mechanisms become perceived as less and less effective, the perceptions of the work and/or workplace become less influenced by those internal to oneself. If there are those who are in the environment supportive of the individual, these relationships describe the individual as less able to acknowledge the legitimacy of their opinions, and hence, be supported. Natural deterioration of functioning would seem the logical course to predict, for such an individual.

The Level of Goal Commitment in many respects is an association by the individual of one's person with that which he does. Such a decision, as many therapists (Ellis & Harper, 1975; Glasser, 1975) have suggested, was irrational and often included several extreme consequences. Therefore, it is not surprising that this independent variable was associated with the perception of Overload (Beta = -.341) and the presence of the Somatic-Anxiety Symptoms (Beta = .064). In fact, this independent variable had the strongest correlation of all the independent variables associated with Overload. This would imply that the key characteristic symptom of burnout may be the coping decisions one makes regarding that in which he will invest
his personal identification and/or the mix of these
decisions. Such a relationship is relatively ignored by the
Occupational Hazzard and Transaction Theorists (with the
exception of Cherniss). However, it fits rather well the
Life Management Model's dynamic process orientation.

Demographic Characteristics

Of the fourteen demographic variables included as
independent variables in the regression equation, four
achieved significant and substantial correlations with the
four of the six dependent variables. Not surprisingly,
Yearly Income was strongly correlated (Simple B = .273;
Beta = .40) with the Burnout Characteristics Scale--Burnout
and Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards (Beta = -.386). However,
it is appropriate to note that for both of these dependent
variables, Yearly Income had the greatest relative effect
on the regression equation. Since this variable and the
Burnout variable were worded in such a manner that a posi-
tive increase in Yearly Income meant a corresponding change
in one's perception of burnout and lowering of one's attitude
about the adequacy of the extrinsic rewards. This last is
quite obvious as the single most noticeable and often of
first concern to the individual is one's annual remuneration.
Apparently, the more one makes, the more one feels burnout,
and the less one feels appropriate rewarded. The implica-
tions of this are somewhat grim. However, it is likely the
relatively large proportion of married, young people might
help to account for this. However, one aspect of the Life
Management Model is that of the inevitability of change and the necessity for continually improving coping mechanisms and support systems. These findings would be viewed by this model as the natural consequence to inappropriate mixes of resources to demands, possibly through a failure of both the individual and the employing agency to recognize and plan opportunities for enhanced secondary extrinsic rewards, such as status, and support systems.

The finding is that one's Number of Children and Length of Shortest Job appears to be associated with the perception of the Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards (Beta = .359, and -.303 respectively). A high score on the Adequacy of Extrinsic Rewards scale is a negative attitude. The relationship appears to be obvious—the more children one has the less adequate one feels one's extrinsic rewards are the more likely one is to be on a job for a short period of time.

**Discussion of the Major Hypotheses**

1. Individuals who describe themselves as being satisfied with their family life will show a lesser amount of those symptoms associated with professional worker burnout.

This study demonstrated a relationship between one's family support measure and the dependent variables. However, as mentioned earlier, while this single result does provide some support for this hypothesis, by itself it is weak.
Much of the sample has little immediate family; 24.3 percent live alone or with a roommate which corresponds to the 27.7 percent which are unmarried, and the 12.5 percent which are divorced, separated, or widowed. Of those married, 50.7 percent have no children. Therefore, the failure of the other aspects of the family scales to achieve significance is probably effected by this high proportion of respondents who do not have the traditional familial support the Moos' FES scale was designed to measure.

It is suggested that a different set of family indicators might be somewhat more effective than scales measuring expressiveness, conflict, and cohesion. A better set of indicators might measure one's attitudes towards his need for family support, family decision making patterns, or the degree to which one feels stimulated towards growth producing actions.

2. Individuals who describe themselves as being satisfied with their intimate social network will show a lesser amount of those symptoms associated with professional worker burnout.

This study demonstrated moderate support for this hypothesis as it was positively correlated at the .05 level of significance with three of the six characteristic scales which represented the phenomenon of professional worker burnout.
3. Individuals who describe themselves as being satisfied with their work life (as opposed to any specific employment) will show a lesser amount of those symptoms associated with professional worker burnout.

The seven sub-scales of the Moos' Work Environment Scale which achieved significant results reflect support for this hypothesis. Three of the subscales (Innovation, Clarity, and Work Pressure) represent three of the four components of the system's measure of system maintenance vs. system change. The implication that those members of an agency which promotes individual growth or the individual whose career reflects this growth pattern, appears less likely to report those characteristics of professional worker burnout.

All three of the subscales which measured the relationship dimension of the work environment proved significant indicators (Involvement, Peer Cohesion, and Staff Support). These findings also support this hypothesis as it defines the presence of burnout as the result, at least in part, of the perceived adequacy of the social climate of one's professional activities.

4. Individuals who describe themselves as being satisfied with the adequacy of their individual coping mechanisms will show a lesser amount of those symptoms associated with professional worker burnout.

This study provides fairly strong support for this hypothesis. The three relevant subscales are positive
predictors of five of the six characteristics generally associated with the phenomenon of professional worker burnout. The relationships present are, for the most part, substantial.

Discussion of the Life Management Model

The Life Management Model consists of the following major components:

1. A systems model of the organization's environment, both external and internal.

2. It defines the major subsystems of an organization along functional lines while depicting the individual as participating to some definable extent in each.

3. The individual's organizational behaviors, especially stress related manifestations, must be viewed from the context of the total resources and demand structure of the individual's major life roles. The relevant major roles are defined as those associated with one's profession, family relationships, and intimate social network.

4. The individual's coping is viewed as both process and product. This is perhaps the most crucial "determinant" of both negative and positive work behaviors.
5. Finally, this is a dynamic model which is presented as inevitably fluctuating over time.

The findings of this study provide a substantial amount of support for the Life Management Model within certain limits. Those restrictions are the following:

1. The aspect of behavior examined was confined to the dimension of the individual's organizational behavior. There was no examination of the interactive effects of the individual upon the organization and, by extension, the organization's environment.

2. The dimension of time was not addressed. However, as is true of any systems model, it does not attempt to represent itself as a developmental model even though some serial relationships between the analyses of relationships may, upon a casual examination, appear as providing some information to predict future behavior upon the past. This would, however, be an abuse of this model. As any system model, this approach examines relationships at a "frozen slice of time." It is inappropriate on the basis of such a model alone to speculate on why those relationships exist or what will be the outcome to the system at some future time for relationships now under examination (Miller, 1978).

This study did attempt to explore possible relationships between the observable and reportable organizational behaviors of the individual within the context of
his major life roles' demands and resources as defined by this model.

As was seen in the first part of the data analyses, the factor analyses to simple structure reveal six different indicators or "kinds" of burnout. This is quite different from the occupational hazzard theorists, (Maslach, 1976; Freudenberger, 1980) and the transactional theorists (Cherniss, 1980; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980). Burnout in this study can now be operationalized in one (or in a combination) of six different ways. Four of these are related to the work behaviors of the individual, burnout, the social relations on the job, the extrinsic reward system, and the quantity vs. difficulty of the work (overload). The remaining two forms are similar to depression. In fact, it would be quite difficult to distinguish this clearly. It is not suggested that all professional employees who are depressed are depressed because of work related stress. It is suggested that those whose work life is under strain, in the absence of adequate support from outside the work environment, are frequently depressed. The finding that much of the "average" mental health professional population displays these indicators (in differing amounts) is interesting. It is supportive of the work of Veninga and Spradley (1981). It is, perhaps, quite significant that those "symptoms" most frequently cited as indicators of burnout can be reduced to six descriptors.
It is possible that this might represent the origin of a typology of professional worker burnout. Maslach (1976), Pines and Kafry (1978), Fruedenberger (1975, 1980), Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) and Cherniss (1980) represent much of the bulk of the work which defined burnout. They each have confined their speculations (and implied causality) strictly to the relationship of the work environment with the individual. This study differs significantly. While no claims for causality are being made, it is evident that more than the work environment is involved. In fact, of the five different classes of independent variables, representative indicators of no fewer than two were associated with each type of burnout indicator with representative scales of four different classes associated with some descriptive indicator of burnout. The $R^2$ values for the regression equations were, for the most part, moderately to substantially strong. These non-work associations are unique to the Life Management Model approach.

The mix of specific independent variables with the individual dependent variables generally was logically consistent with the presentation of this model. As these have been discussed specifically earlier in this chapter, they will not now be repeated. The rather surprisingly supportive results of this initial study provide a reasonable expectation that more than mere identification of burned out professionals is possible. A life management analysis of the whole life context of the individual within
the "whole life context" of the organization might logically be expected to provide a method for prediction of individuals or organizations who may be expected to "burnout" and the site of the manifestation of the "burnout symptoms."

Finally, this study provides support for the approach to the study of negative work effects such as burnout on personnel. The traditional studies of Hackman and Oldham (1974), Porter, et al. (1971), and Hackman and Lawler (1971) tend to focus on the job related effects and their causes. The burnout theorists tend to focus on work related effects both in the work place and in some aspects of their non-work lives. This study indicates that this might have been too much of a simplistic approach. The six different kinds of burnout previously discussed suggests that an individual does not simply have it or not but may have a variety of types or combinations. The cyclic phenomenon reported by Cherniss (1980) and Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) was supported. This is consistent with the multi-dimensional nature of burnout. The effects of time, continued stress, and changes in resources appeared to all impact on the attitudes of respondents.

Reliability and Validity Issues

The Research Design

This study was an exploratory effort. It was hoped that two purposes would be met: to provide for a better
understanding of the phenomenon, and to develop a beginning method for a more accurate study of the phenomenon. Inasmuch as the basic definition was expanded by the addition of the major classes of independent variables beyond that of the definition of burnout, as simply those characteristics seen as the result of strictly job-related stress.

The unit of analyses was designed to represent the spectrum of typical mental health professional work environments from the autonomous and private medical (psychiatric) practice to the bachelor level social worker in a county child welfare agency. It is believed that this concern was somewhat successfully met: 37.2 percent of all respondents were from the bachelor level, 38.7 percent from the master's level, and 33.1 percent from the doctoral level of practice. Social Work was somewhat overrepresented with respect to the profession of the employee, however, even when one takes into account that the bachelor's level population were Social Workers. All the major types of employing professional work settings were represented. The mental health setting slightly overrepresented (35.1 percent) at first glance. However, some respondents worked in hospital and/or community based mental health agencies, thus providing a difference in settings that would not be immediately obvious but which might influence an individual's responses. As the individual's perceptions of life, and his environment was the information being
sought, it may be assumed that this was information they had. Finally, the overall response rate of 60 percent is considered to be sufficient (Babbie, 1979). However, one limitation of this study is the 40.0% non-response rate. It is not appropriate to generalize the results of this study when this large a proportion of the population did not participate.

What was measured was a cross-section of a specific occupational class. Even though the sample population was confined to the urban environment due to feasibility restrictions, the burnout characteristics reported in the literature are reportedly more associated with the practice of one's profession than with the geographic locale. A stratified random sample of the population can be thought of as offering reliable information as possible under the feasibility restrictions present in this study. As discussed previously, the population was divided into the two groups to improve the reliability of comparisons between professions, position, and the other relevant descriptive characteristics. However, the total population size is somewhat too small to enable generalizations to the general population.

Reliability and Validity of the Measurement

In the sense that this study purported to measure attitudes by focusing upon observable responses, the format of the various sections of the questionnaire were consistent with current research practices. In this sense, the
measurement of the particular behavioral characteristics measured the extrinsic form of work life dissatisfaction of burnout. Only those items reported as positive indicators from a minimum of three previous studies were used.

Every attempt to assure reliability was taken. Standardized scale items were used wherever possible. As previously reported, each scale was tested for reliability using the Alpha Coefficient of Reliability Test. All other scale items were grouped by similar content and factor analysis. As Carmines and Zellar (1979) observe, there is a very close connection between factor analysis to reliability and validity assessment. In the process of determining factor loadings, the loadings thus obtained represent an underestimation of reliability. Therefore, using a criterion of .5 as the minimum acceptable loading may be seen as a realistic and conservative limit.

Implications for Future Research

This study suggests the validity of a multidimensional and interactive systems approach to the study of the organizational behavior of employees, in particular, the human services professional employee. Previous research has been somewhat limited in both the theoretical underpinnings and in practical application. This study suggests some of the areas which merit further study.
A number of major problems are immediately relevant. The Life Management Model hypothesizes that the major systems of an individual effects performance in the work place. It was suggested that one might be seen to "burnout" in one's marriage, family, etc. This should be tested. Such a study approach has the potential for some rather far reaching effects in such areas as family education and family therapy.

Another major implication of this study is that the professional's work behavior stems from sources that do not differ significantly from that of non-professional occupations. Should this implication be substantiated, it would probably effect the definition of a "professional". However, far more interesting is the possibility of the development of a "whole system" approach to management and organization development.

Implications for Social Work Practice

Social Work for the most part is an organizational based profession. The casualties of the phenomenon of burnout are manifested by the product of poor performance, a poorly served client population, and reciprocally, further damaged professionals. The Life Management Model proposes the role of a systems manager as an extension of the problem solving and goal facilitating approach of the professional social worker-manager. The "clientele" is simultaneously
the organizational environment, the organization, and those individuals with the auspices of the organization. Practically speaking, social work practice, and human services professions, will inevitably undergo tremendous changes in the future. It is suggested that a process model as opposed to a product model is going to be a necessary adjunct to practice in the future. The development of social workers as systems change managers is historically and ethically consistent with what has generally been accepted as the techniques, values, and mission of the profession.

The second major area for consideration is in the area of social work education. Not only does this study suggest the appropriateness of developing process oriented, systems managers, it also has implications for the development of social work practitioners. Coping skills are not formally incorporated into social work curriculums. However, an implication of this study is that such might be considered strongly. Inasmuch as is any human services profession, the practice of social work is an art form. The development of competencies within the individual who is to become the practitioner of this art would appear more than just a good idea, but a serious competitor for curriculum time and resources.
APPENDIX A

The Research Instrument
THE PROFESSIONAL’S WORK LIFE ENVIRONMENT:
A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF THE PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT
ON THE PROFESSIONAL

This survey is being undertaken to assess the effect of professional work environments on those people filling the professional caregiver roles. Please answer all of the questions. If you wish to comment on any questions or qualify your answers, please feel free to use the space at the end of the questionnaire. Your comments will be read and taken into account.

Thank you for your help.

Professional Work Life Project
3060 Wilce Avenue
Columbus, Oh 43202
(614) 262-6332

INTERFACE: Institute for the Study of People Environments.
The Professional's Work Life Study

Questionnaire

Instructions:

Please circle the number of the answer of your choice.

1. When leaving home for your job, how do you feel about going to work?
   1. VERY HAPPY
   2. SOMewhat HAPPY
   3. NEITHER HAPPY NOR UNHAPPY
   4. SOMewhat UNHAPPY
   5. VERY UNHAPPY

2. How do you feel about the level of your work load? (Circle number of answer.)
   1. VERY OVERLOADED
   2. SOMewhat OVERLOADED
   3. IT IS JUST ABOUT RIGHT
   4. SOMewhat LIGHT LOAD
   5. VERY LIGHT LOAD

3. Do you feel frustrated over your job? (Circle number of answer.)
   1. NO, NEVER
   2. YES, BUT LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH
   3. YES, ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH
   4. YES, SEVERAL TIMES A MONTH
   5. YES, SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK
4. Do you think of looking for another job? (Circle number of answer.)
   1. NO, I NEVER DO
   2. YES, BUT NEVER SERIOUSLY
   3. YES, BUT NOT OFTEN
   4. YES, OCCASIONALLY
   5. YES, VERY OFTEN

5. Do you enjoy your work? (Circle number of answer.)
   1. YES, I ENJOY IT VERY MUCH
   2. YES, I ENJOY IT SOMewhat
   3. NEITHER YES NOR NO
   4. NO, NOT REALLY
   5. NO, I DISLIKE IT VERY MUCH

Instructions:

The following is a series of statements. These statements are intended to apply to all work environments. However, some words may not be suitable for your work environment. For example, the term supervisor is meant to refer to the boss, manager, department head, or the person or persons to whom an employee reports.

You are to decide which statements are true of your work environment and which are false. If you think the statement is true then circle the TRUE following the question. If you think the statement is false, circle the FALSE following the question.

6. The work is really challenging.  TRUE  FALSE
7. People go out of their way to make a new employee feel comfortable.  TRUE  FALSE
8. Supervisors tend to talk down to their employees.  TRUE  FALSE
9. Few employees have any important responsibilities.  TRUE  FALSE
10. People pay a lot of attention to getting work done.  TRUE  FALSE
11. There is a constant pressure to keep working.  TRUE  FALSE
12. Things are sometimes pretty disorganized.  TRUE  FALSE
13. There is a strict emphasis on following policies and regulations.  TRUE  FALSE
14. Doing things in a different way is valued.  TRUE  FALSE
15. It sometimes gets too hot.  TRUE  FALSE
16. There's not much group spirit.  TRUE  FALSE
17. The atmosphere is somewhat impersonal.  TRUE  FALSE
18. Supervisors usually compliment an employee who does something well.  TRUE  FALSE
19. Employees have a great deal of freedom to do as they like.  TRUE  FALSE
20. There is a lot of time wasted because of inefficiencies.  TRUE  FALSE
21. There always seems to be an urgency about everything.  TRUE  FALSE
22. Activities are well-planned.  TRUE  FALSE
23. People can wear wild looking clothing while on the job if they want.  TRUE  FALSE
24. New and different ideas are always being tried out.  TRUE  FALSE
25. The lighting is extremely good.  TRUE  FALSE
26. A lot of people seem to be just putting in time.  TRUE  FALSE
27. People take a personal interest in each other.  TRUE  FALSE
28. Supervisors tend to discourage criticism from employees.  TRUE  FALSE
29. Employees are encouraged to make their own decisions.  TRUE  FALSE
30. Things rarely get "put off till tomorrow."  TRUE  FALSE
31. People cannot afford to relax.  TRUE  FALSE
32. Rules and regulations are somewhat vague and ambiguous.  TRUE  FALSE
33. People are expected to follow set rules in doing their work.  TRUE  FALSE
34. This place would be one of the first to try out a new idea.  TRUE  FALSE
35. Work space is awfully crowded.  TRUE  FALSE
36. People seem to take pride in the organization.  TRUE  FALSE
37. Employees rarely do things after work.  TRUE  FALSE
38. Supervisors usually give full credit to ideas contributed by employees.  TRUE  FALSE
39. People can use their own initiative to do things.
   TRUE FALSE
40. This is a highly efficient, work-oriented place.
   TRUE FALSE
41. Nobody works too hard.
   TRUE FALSE
42. The responsibilities of supervisors are clearly defined.
   TRUE FALSE
43. Supervisors keep a rather close watch on employees.
   TRUE FALSE
44. Variety and change are not particularly important.
   TRUE FALSE
45. This place has a stylish and modern appearance.
   TRUE FALSE

Instructions:

Much has been said about the effect of a person's attitudes towards the work environment. The following is a series of statements which reflect some of the attitudes often reported. Please read each one and answer if you agree or disagree with the statement. Circle number of your answer.

46. I am feeling frustrated because I am not doing as well on my job as I used to do.
    1. VERY MUCH AGREE
    2. AGREE
    3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
    4. DISAGREE
    5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

47. I do not feel I am properly recognized for the work that I do.
    1. VERY MUCH AGREE
    2. AGREE
    3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
    4. DISAGREE
    5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE
48. I often worry about losing my job. (Circle number of answer.)
   1. VERY MUCH AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
   4. DISAGREE
   5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

49. Sometimes I feel like I am in the wrong profession.
   1. VERY MUCH AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
   4. DISAGREE
   5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

50. I frequently have to do things in my work that I wouldn't do if it were up to me.
   1. VERY MUCH AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
   4. DISAGREE
   5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

51. I feel that I am working harder but getting less done.
   1. VERY MUCH AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
   4. DISAGREE
   5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE
52. My work consumes too much of my time. (Circle number of answer.)
   1. VERY MUCH AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
   4. DISAGREE
   5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

53. I feel that the policies at my job are too restrictive.
   1. VERY MUCH AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
   4. DISAGREE
   5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

54. I feel that all of the real decisions at my job are made by a small group of people.
   1. VERY MUCH AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
   4. DISAGREE
   5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

55. I do not enjoy my fellow workers on the job.
   1. VERY MUCH AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
   4. DISAGREE
   5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE
56. I do not want to meet with my fellow workers socially. (Circle number of answer.)

1. VERY MUCH AGREE
2. AGREE
3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
4. DISAGREE
5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

57. I feel that people do not get along very well with each other where I work.

1. VERY MUCH AGREE
2. AGREE
3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
4. DISAGREE
5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

58. How happy are you with the progress you are making toward the goals which you set for yourself?

1. COMPLETELY SATISFIED
2. SOMewhat SATISFIED
3. NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED
4. SOMewhat DISSATISFIED
5. COMPLETELY DISSATISFIED

59. How happy are you with the authority you have to do your job?

1. COMPLETELY SATISFIED
2. SOMewhat SATISFIED
3. NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED
4. SOMewhat DISSATISFIED
5. COMPLETELY DISSATISFIED
60. My work is routinized and segmented. (Circle number of answer.)

1. VERY MUCH AGREE
2. AGREE
3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
4. DISAGREE
5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

61. I do not feel my salary is adequate considering my training and the work I do.

1. VERY MUCH AGREE
2. AGREE
3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
4. DISAGREE
5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

62. I feel that more professional employees are absent or late than the other employees.

1. VERY MUCH AGREE
2. AGREE
3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
4. DISAGREE
5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE

63. I feel there is high turnover rate among my fellow professionals with less than three years on the job.

1. VERY MUCH AGREE
2. AGREE
3. NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
4. DISAGREE
5. VERY MUCH DISAGREE
Instructions:

Stresses in the job frequently affect one's feelings and attitudes towards their work environment. To what extent does each of the following fit as a description of you? (Circle one number in each line across.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>Quite true</th>
<th>Some-what true</th>
<th>Not very true</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>I &quot;roll with the punches&quot; when problems come up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>I spend almost all of my time thinking about my work.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>I treat other people as individuals and care about their feelings and opinions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>I recognize and accept my own limitations and assets.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>There are quite a few people I could describe as &quot;good friends.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>I enjoy using my skills and abilities both on and off the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>I get bored easily.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>I enjoy meeting and talking with people who have different ways of thinking about the world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Often in my job I &quot;bite off more than I can chew.&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>I'm usually very active on weekends with projects or recreation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>I prefer working with people who are very much like myself.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>I work primarily because I have to survive, and not necessarily because I enjoy what I do.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>I believe I have a realistic picture of my personal strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Often I get into arguments with people who don't think my way.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Often I have trouble getting much done on my job.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>I'm interested in a lot of different topics.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>I get upset when things don't go my way.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
85. Often I'm not sure how I stand on a controversial topic.

86. I'm usually able to find a way around anything which blocks me from an important goal.

87. I often disagree with my boss or others at work.

Instructions: Many professionals believe that the family has an important impact on the abilities of people to withstand stress.

Decide which of these statements are true of your family and which are false. If you think the statement is true or mostly true of your family, circle the TRUE following the question. If you think the statement is false or mostly false of your family, circle the FALSE following the question. You may feel that some of the statements are true for some family members and false for others. Circle the TRUE if the statement is true for most members. Circle the FALSE if the statement is false for most members.

88. Family members really help and support one another. TRUE FALSE

89. Family members often keep their feelings to themselves. TRUE FALSE

90. We fight a lot in our family. TRUE FALSE

91. We often seem to be killing time at home. TRUE FALSE

92. We say anything we want to around home. TRUE FALSE

93. Family members rarely become openly angry. TRUE FALSE

94. We put a lot of energy into what we do at home. TRUE FALSE

95. It's hard to "blow off steam" at home without upsetting somebody. TRUE FALSE

96. Family members sometimes get so angry they throw things. TRUE FALSE

97. There is a feeling of togetherness in our family. TRUE FALSE

98. We tell each other about our personal problems. TRUE FALSE

99. Family members hardly ever lose their tempers. TRUE FALSE
Instructions: The following questions or statements are characteristic of the types of behaviors seen in many people who are under stress in their work environments. Please circle the number of the answer which most describes you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100. I feel weak all over much of the time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. I have had periods of days, weeks, or months when I couldn't take care of things because I couldn't get going.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Every so often I suddenly feel hot all over.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair (cannot sit still very long.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Are you the worrying type (a worrier)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. I am bothered by acid (sour) stomach several times a week.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. I have personal worries that get me down physically (make me physically ill).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Do you feel somewhat apart even among friends (apart, isolated, alone)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Have you ever been bothered by your heart beating hard? (Circle number of answer.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SOME TIMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NEVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DON'T KNOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

109. Have you ever been bothered by shortness of breath when you were not exercising or working hard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SOME TIMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NEVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DON'T KNOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
110. Are you ever bothered by nervousness (irritable, fidgety, tense)? (Circle number of answer.)

1. OFTEN
2. SOMETIMES
3. NEVER
4. DON'T KNOW
5. NOT APPLICABLE

111. Do you ever have any trouble in getting to sleep or staying asleep?

1. OFTEN
2. SOMETIMES
3. NEVER
4. DON'T KNOW
5. NOT APPLICABLE

112. Would you say your appetite is poor, fair, good, or too good?

1. POOR
2. FAIR
3. GOOD
4. TOO GOOD
5. DON'T KNOW
6. NOT APPLICABLE

113. In general, would you say that most of the time you are in high (very good) spirits, good spirits, low spirits, or very low spirits?

1. HIGH
2. GOOD
3. LOW
4. VERY LOW
5. DON'T KNOW
6. NOT APPLICABLE
Instructions: Many professionals believe that our friends have a great deal of impact upon our ability to cope with stress. Please read each of the following statements and circle TRUE if you think it is true or mostly true for you. Circle FALSE if you think it is false or mostly false for you.

114. My friends really help and support me. TRUE FALSE
115. My friends can lose their temper and it's ok. TRUE FALSE
116. I tell my friends my personal problems. TRUE FALSE
117. My friends argue a lot. TRUE FALSE
118. I am often bored with my friends. TRUE FALSE
119. I rarely get to do what I want to do with my friends. TRUE FALSE
120. I go out a lot with my friends. TRUE FALSE
121. My friends and I really put a lot of energy into having a good time. TRUE FALSE
122. It's hard to relax and "blow off steam" without making some of my friends angry. TRUE FALSE
123. My friends and I really feel like a close group. TRUE FALSE

Instructions: In order to better understand the answers you have given, some knowledge about your background is necessary. (These questions will not allow anyone to be able to identify you as an individual.)

124. How long have you been employed in your present job? ____________ YEARS

125. What is your highest educational degree? ____________ DEGREE

126. How many degrees do you have from schools? ____________

127. In what field was your professional training? (Circle the number of your answer.)

1. MEDICINE
2. PSYCHOLOGY
3. SOCIAL WORK
4. OTHER (Specify)
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128. What is the longest time you have been employed as a professional?

______ YEARS

129. What is the shortest period of time you have been employed in your career?

______ YEARS _______ MONTHS

130. How many jobs have you had in your career?

_______ NUMBER

131. In what type of agency do you work (i.e., mental health, hospital, self-employed private practice, schools, other)?

_________________________

132. What are your living arrangements? (Circle number of your answer.)

1. I LIVE ALONE.
2. I LIVE WITH A ROOMMATE.
3. I LIVE WITH MY PARENTS.
4. I LIVE WITH MY SPOUSE.
5. I LIVE ALONE, WITH MY CHILDREN.
6. I LIVE WITH MY SPOUSE AND CHILDREN.

133. Are you single, married, widowed, divorced, or separated?

________________________

134. How many children do you have?______________________

135. What is your yearly income? (Circle number of your answer.)

1. LESS THAN $10,000 A YEAR
2. $10,001 to $15,000 A YEAR
3. $15,001 to $30,000 A YEAR
4. $30,001 to $50,000 A YEAR
5. $50,001 to $70,000 A YEAR
6. MORE THAN $70,001 A YEAR

137. What is your age? ________ YEARS

138. What is your sex? (Circle the number of your answer.)

1. MALE
2. FEMALE
Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your work environment or its effects on your fellows and yourself? If so, please use this space for that purpose.

Also, any comments you wish to make that you think may help us in future efforts to understand the effects of work environments on professionals will be appreciated, either here or in a separate letter.

Your contribution to this effort is very greatly appreciated. If you would like a summary of results, please print your name and address on the back of the return envelope (NOT on this questionnaire). We will see that you get it. Thank you.
APPENDIX B

Supplemental Mailing Materials
With the cutbacks in social services, and the increasing demands on those people still providing services, the environmental stress on professionals is becoming a major problem for many. However, no one really knows the extent of these effects.

You are one of a small number of mental health professionals who are being asked to give your opinion on these matters. In order that the results truly represent the thinking of professional people, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off of the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire itself.

The results of this research will be made available to program planners, and other interested professionals. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call. The telephone number is (614) 262-6332.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Keith Roberts, ACSW
Project Director

KR/bs

Enclosure
Two weeks ago a questionnaire seeking your opinions about the quality of your professional work-life was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a random sample of professionals in Franklin County.

If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative sample of professionals, it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of professionals practicing in Franklin County.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now, at (614)262-6332 and I will get another in the mail to you.

Sincerely,

Keith Roberts ACSW
Project Director
I am writing you about our study of the effects on professionals of the professional work environment. We have not yet received your questionnaire.

The large number of questionnaires returned is encouraging. But, whether we will be able to describe accurately how professionals feel about their work environments and its effects on their lives depends upon you and the others who have not yet responded. This is because our past experiences suggest that those of you who have not yet sent in your questionnaire may hold quite different beliefs than those who have.

This is one of the first studies of this type that has ever been done on the environment of you, the professional. It is the only study which has ever been done of this type in Ohio. Therefore, the results are of particular importance to many of your fellow professionals, and program planners now considering the structure of professional agencies. The usefulness of our results depends upon how accurately we are able to describe what it costs professionals to perform their functions.

It is for these reasons that I am sending this by certified mail to insure delivery. In case our other correspondence did not reach you, a replacement questionnaire is enclosed. May I urge you to complete and return it as quickly as possible.

I'll be happy to send you a copy of the results if you want one. Simply put your name, address, and "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope. We expect to have them ready early this summer.

Your contribution to the success of this study will be appreciated greatly.

Most sincerely,

Keith Roberts, ACSW
Project Director

KR/bs

Enclosure
APPENDIX C

Pearson's Correlation Coefficients Matrix
# Pearson's Correlation Coefficients Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

โปรดทราบว่าข้อมูลในตารางนี้เป็นค่าความสัมพันธ์ (correlation coefficient) ระหว่างตัวแปรต่าง ๆ โดยมีค่าระหว่าง -1 ถึง 1 ซึ่ง 1 หมายถึงความสัมพันธ์ที่มีอยู่อย่างใกล้เคียง 0 หมายถึงความสัมพันธ์ที่ไม่มีอยู่ ตัวเลขที่เป็นค่าลบ (-) หมายถึงความสัมพันธ์ที่เป็นลบ คุณควรใช้ตารางนี้เพื่อวิเคราะห์ความสัมพันธ์ที่มีอยู่ระหว่างตัวแปรต่าง ๆ
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