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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND ABSTRACT

Educational administrators hold certain assumptions about organizations and the characteristics of those organizations as they try to understand, predict, control or otherwise cope with the problems that they encounter in their organizational role (Corwin and Edelfelt, 1976: 3). From time to time, however, administrators are baffled by factors not intentionally built into their organizational structures. Some of these factors have negative impacts upon the organization and its members. One such negative factor is burnout, a space-age term which, in addition to its original usage with respect to rocket stages, has been used to describe what happens to human beings when in the course of their professional lives they become exhausted or spent in their work (Metz, 1979:2).

The term "burnout" has been defined by many according to their professions. In this study, the term burnout is defined as the consequence of an individual's inability to empathize with and support his/her role expectation.
According to many writers, including Gies, 1979; Maslach, 1979; Metz, 1979; Spaniol and Caputo, 1979; White, 1978a Perrow, 1970; Scott, 1969; and Veninga, 1979, during the lifetime of an organization some negative and positive factors enter that are not derived intentionally. One such negative factor is burnout which until recently was thought to have derived from the inability of an individual to successfully manage stress. Clearly, burnout indicates the inability of a person to cope with a given situation. However, according to White (1978B:1) "the issues of burnout should be addressed by defining it as an organizational process and not solely in terms of the personalities of our casualties."

If this definition holds true, more research will be needed on organizational structures that may be causing burnout. More information is required on burnout sources anchored in organizational structures. Thus, this study may serve as a foundation for further work in this area, for its focus will be to identify organizational characteristics that educational administrators perceived to promote individual burnout.

According to Maslach, 1979 and Metz, 1979, some burnout factors are personal while others are thought to be organizational. Furthermore, much research has been done on personal factors that contribute to the burning
out of individuals but little has been written on organizational factors that contribute to burnout.

According to Corwin and Edelfelt, organizations usually are established to perform specific functions for society. Their purposes are to provide greater efficiency and coordination in particular areas that individuals alone cannot achieve. However, organizations vary greatly in their goals, and functions, for example, order, economic and culture. Educational organizations also vary in their characteristics, such as highly bureaucratized or standardized (Gies, 1979; White, 1978A; Perrow, 1970; Scott, 1969; and Merton, 1957). Consequently, organizational structures methods, and procedures utilized in accomplishing these goals vary as well. For example, some organizations that are thought to impact negatively upon workers or burn them out may contain structures that are too rigid or flexible. Such organizations, according to Gies, White and many others, are thought to negatively impact workers. Evidence of this can be seen in high degrees of turnovers, high absentee rates and the overall rates of sick leaves taken by their employees, resulting in lower work productivity, and morale problems (Veninga, 1979:7). In an effort to support this study, a review of the literature on burnout factors in other professional areas will be selected, listed, summarized and
categorized to develop a list of common factors that may contribute to burnout in organizational structures.

Unger (1980:129) has summarized the personal burnout factors of Bies, Cherniss, Daley, Edelwich, Freudenberger, Gillespie, Kann, Lagana, Maslach and Mattingly into fifteen basic characteristics: 1) inability to establish priorities and make decisions, 2) loss of emotional control, 3) lowered self-concept, 4) feelings of pessimism and frustration, 5) decrease in energy level, 6) feeling alienated, 7) overly conscientious, 8) feelings of anger and resentment, 9) undue pressure from community and school board, 10) physical symptoms, 11) exhibits low level of enthusiasm for the job, 12) rigidity to change, 13) wishing for or seeking escape via another job or early retirement, 14) close to retirement age, and 15) decrease in or lack of specific job skills. In the research of Unger, the above were all personal characteristics that described superintendents of schools who suffered burnout (see Table 1 on page 5).

Considering these varied personal characteristics of educational organizations and their impact upon employees, the purpose of this study will then be to determine those structural characteristics of organizations that seem to contribute to the phenomenon burnout. The literature also revealed structural factors that professionals in these studies perceived to contribute to burnout in educational
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Unger</th>
<th>Maslach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowered Self-Concept</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Alienated</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in Energy Level</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Conscientiousness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wishing For or Seeking Escape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Training/ Decrease in or Lack of Specific Job Skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Lack of Communication Skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Lack of Business Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Lack of Public Relation Skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Lack of Time Management Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Delegating Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Enthusiasm for Job</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity to Change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Disorganized or Unable to Complete Job Tasks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of Anger and Resentment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Symptoms</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing Loss of Emotional Control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of Pessimism and Frustration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Formal Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of No Success and Control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Relationships with Clients/ Patients</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Job Attitude</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Attitudes Toward Profession</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Significant Rank</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organizations. The following structural factors as stated by Metz, 1979) were: 1) lack of administrative support, 2) lack of encouragement from colleagues, 3) work overload, 4) high frequency of staff meetings, 5) unclear goals/goal ambiguity, 6) no time-out, 7) inflexible work schedules (routines or repetition), 8) lack of direction, 9) lack of proper communication channels, 10) overly bureaucratized or structured (rigidity in structure), 11) underly bureaucratized or structured (too much flexibility in structure), 12) administrative incompetence, 13) inadequate facilities and materials, 14) routines, and 15) lack of time. Finally, Maslach maintains that: 1) an over abundance of time spent in administrative duties, 2) a negative or unhealthy work environment, 3) poor work relationship(s), 4) high staff-client or administrator-staff ratio, 5) amount of time spent in direct contact with staff or ratio of clients to staff administrators, and 6) no input into institutional policy making are all structural factors that contribute to burnout (see Table 2 on page 7).

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Maslow (1965) warned some years ago that "if you take away the external determinants which shape behavior, behavior will be shaped by the internal and intra physics or organizations." Many organizations today do not have external determinants such as goals, values, direction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Metz</th>
<th>Maslach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Administrative Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Encouragement from Colleagues</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Frequency of Staff Meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear Goals/ Goal Ambiguity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Time-Outs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexible Work Schedules</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Proper Communication Channels</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly Bureaucratized or Structured</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underly Bureaucratized or Structured</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Incompetence/ Disrespect for Organizational Leader(s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Facilities and Materials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Abundance of Time Spent in Administrative Duties</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Negative or Unhealthy Work Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Work Relationship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Staff-Client or Administrator-Staff Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Time Spent in Direct Contact with Staff or Ratio of Staff/ Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into Institutional Policy Making</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Direction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and definitions. Such organizations often over-or-under emphasize achieving determinants and definitions which introduce other factors that result in the behavior of individuals determining and defining organizations. Thus, many writers suggest that the over-or-under emphases to achieve determinants and definitions by some organizational leaders could possibly cause the burning out of others. In studying burnout in organizational structures, insight could be obtained from the perception of individuals who could provide further information on the development of this phenomenon (Meyer, 1979:9).

**Burnout Factors in Individuals**

Many have defined burnout in terms of individuals employed in various settings. For example, burnout among social workers has been defined by Maslach (1976) as a loss of all concern, all emotional feelings, for clients; and emotional exhaustion when the professional no longer has any positive feelings, sympathy, or respect for clients or patients.

Burnout has been defined by Pine and Maslach (1978: 233) in the human services profession as a syndrome of physical and emotional exhaustion involving the development of negative self-concept, negative job attitude, and a loss of concern and feelings for clients.
Freudenberger (1974:195, 1977:26) defines burnout as wearing out, failing or becoming exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength or resources. Freudenberger postulates that burnout includes a change in attitudes and behavior patterns with symptoms ranging from being cynical and negative to having a tendency toward rigidity.

Lamb (1979:369) maintains that the seeds of staff burnout began when mental health professionals who work with long-term patients do not recognize that such patients vary greatly in their potential for rehabilitation. This situation leads to unrealistic expectations and frustrations for staff. Thus, an ambivalence of the staff member about gratifying the dependence needs of patients and uncertainty about their own needs and motivations also can lead to burnout.

Daley (1979:372) defines burnout as the inability of individuals to handle continued stress on the job that results in demoralizations, frustration, and reduced efficiency. Mattingly (1977:127) defines burnout as a painful response to stress resulting in physical and psychological exhaustion. Riccio (1978, 1980) views burnout as a result of unfulfilled and unrealistic expectations that may include a change in attitude. While Spaniol and Caputo (1979:57) maintain that burnout is the feeling of being locked into a job routine.
Burnout, continues Spaniol, "disproportionately strikes those in the helping professions—teachers, counselors, and social workers." Spaniol and Caputo (1979:57) further relate burnout to stress which may be caused by a single event or factor.

Burnout can last for years, as there are three levels:

1. First Degree or Mild Burnout—During this stage indicators present themselves, thus, signs and symptoms are experienced very mildly, ranging from occasional to short-lived. Relaxation and other forms of leisurely activities could alleviate signs and symptoms.

2. Second Degree or Moderate Burnout—At this stage, symptoms are more pronounced, last longer and are more difficult to remove.

3. Third Degree or Severe Burnout—At this stage signs and symptoms of burnout persist. Severe cases show physical and psychological problems that appear as ulcers, depression and prolonged migraine headaches. Frequently, medical and psychological treatments can not bring immediate relief (1979:57).

Many writers have addressed burnout in individuals and have suggested factors that may cause its occurrence in such helping professions as the mental health area (Maslach, 1976, 1977, 1978; Pine and Kafry, 1978), psychiatrists (Looney, Harding, Plotcky and Barnhard, 1980; Maslach and Pine, 1977; Reed, 1977; Freudenberger, 1974), hospital technicians (Calhoun, 1980), nurses (Fields, 1980; Shubin, 1978), medical interns (Siegel and Donnelly, 1978) police officers (Chandler and Jones,
1979; Ellison and Genz, 1978; Maslach and Jackson, 1979), school administrators (Swent, 1978), and school Counselors (Tiedeman, 1979; Parker, 1979), teachers (Bardo, 1979; Dubrin et al.,; Hendrickson, 1979; McGuire, 1979; Moe, 1979; Reed, 1979; Scribens, 1979; Sparks, 1979; Walsh, 1979), principals (Lee, 1980; Seligman and Huck, 1978) and ministers (Collins, 1979; McCann, 1980). The inability of individuals to manage stressful situations was found to be a common factor in all these studies.

Other writers have also addressed burnout as stress, which includes the stresses of group working in isolation, such as explorers at the United States Antarctic bases (Appley and Trumbull, 1976), aquanauts working beneath the ocean (Radloff and Helmreich, 1968), and miners working in underground mines (Gavin and Axelrod, 1977). Still other writers use the term burnout as a part of their definition of stress. For example, Feshbach and Campbell (1978) regard stress as the subjective reception of demands of teachers from the environment. Hans Selye (1978:60) views stress from a medical point of view as the wear and tear on the body. Furthermore, Selye maintains that intense and prolonged stress manifests itself as a "Stress Syndrome," such as evidence of adrenal stimulation, shrinkage of lymphaticorgam, gastrointestinal ulcer, and loss of body weight with
characteristic alternations in the chemical composition of the body.

Burnout Factors in Organizational Structures

Some researchers of burnout have begun to view the problem of burnout as not entirely inherent stress in the individual or a reaction to environmental stress but burnout that results from the impact of stressful factors upon an individual such as inadequate professional training, poor organizational structures, and supervisors who burnout themselves (Spaniol and Caputo, 1979:57). Larson, Gilbertson and Powell (1978:564) postulate that the mental health environment and attitudes, as currently structured, facilitate burnout.

White (1978A:6) has developed a systems approach to burnout. This approach focuses on the manner in which organizational structure, internal organizational relationships, and the organizational relationship of the group with the environment affects the physical and emotional health of individual members. Thus, to White, the problem of burnout is an interactional problem which may require a modification in the high stress environment as well as a modification in the style of the individual management of stress. Specifically, White indicates that there may be a problem with the ability of individuals to manage stress in their work environment as well as a
problem in the environment which could possibly be extremely stressful.

Researchers are now beginning to view burnout from other perspectives. Most recently, they have begun to look at organizational structures as possible sources and causes of burnout in individuals. According to White, "the issue of burnout should be addressed when we begin defining it as an organizational process and not solely in terms of the personalities of our casualties." (1978A:1).

Meyer notes that Lavoie and Culbert (1978:419) support the lack of structure as a source of burnout. Lavoie and Culbert state that:

helping people link with the natural progression requires a precise awareness of the characteristics which identify the ontological pattern that a developing organization can produce. Such road maps are necessary for articulating strategies that allow organizational members to see, appreciate, and experiment with higher levels of functioning (1978:419).

Writers such as Merton, 1957; Gies, 1979 and White, 1978A maintain that overly structured and closed organizations are sources of burnout for their organizational members, while other view underly structured organizations as sources of burnout.

Metz (1979:56-57) states that a lack of communication; lack of flexibility in schedules; lack of variety in curriculum; lack of time; lack of administrative support; lack of encouragement from colleagues, parents,
administrators; lack of academic or intellectual stimulation; non-teaching duties; demands of teachers, student, parents; repetition; administrative incompetence; inadequate facilities and materials; routine; discipline; student achievement and apathy are all sources for the burning out of teachers.

Many who have studied burnout professionally state that causes of burnout are primarily external; therefore, coping with this condition may be enhanced within the situational setting once the condition is recognized (Metz, 1979:7). The following writers on burnout have referred to burnout as occurring in certain situational settings. For example, according to Reed (1979:62), if burnout is inherent in the person then professional counseling is needed but if burnout is inherent in the structure as Reed (1979) and White (1978A:10) suggest then a systems approach is needed in coping with burnout. Basic information is needed, such as common factors in the structure that are thought to cause this phenomenon.

Maslach (1976) and others at the University of California at Berkeley have studied extensively the dynamics of burnout among poverty lawyers, physicians, prison personnel, social welfare workers, clinical psychologists in a mental hospital, child-care workers, and psychiatric nurses. Through observation, personal
interviews, and survey techniques, Maslach and her coworkers have found that people who work intensively with people are not always able to cope, or simply, they incur burnout (Metz, 1979:16). Also, Maslach and others have discovered that burnout varies in severity among different professions and is called frequently by different names. Nevertheless, the same basic phenomenon seems to be occurring in all areas where persons make continued contact with clients (Maslach, 1976:16). In the opinion of Maslach, "steps can be taken to reduce the occurrence of burnout because many of its causes are rooted not in the permanent traits of people, but in specific social and situational factors that can be changed" (1979:20). In the words of Maslach, "one of the major signs of burnout is the transformation of a person with original thought and creativity on the job into a mechanical, petty bureaucrat" (1976:17).

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND PURPOSE

The problem was to identify organizational characteristics that educational administrators perceived to promote individual burnout. The first step in this research has been completed. It was to determine certain common characteristics or factors in educational organizations that contributed to burnout in administrators through a review of the literature. This review has revealed those structural burnout factors identified through research efforts
in other areas such as the mental health and teaching professions, the legal profession and other public services.

Administrative Burnout was defined for the purpose of this study as the consequence of an individual's inability to empathize with and support his/her expectation. Seemingly, organizational structures are insensitive to individual human needs in the quality of work life. Organizations are concerned with goals, definitions, collective values and not individual personal needs (Merton, 1957; Perrow, 1970; Gies, 1978; White, 1978A, 1978B). The purpose was then to report the literature reviewed. The second step was to survey a purposiveful selected sample of educational administrators to determine their perception of organization characteristics associated with individual burnout.

Thus, administrators in higher education were presented with the characteristics of individuals who appeared to have burnout in other areas. These administrators were asked whether they saw any connection between features of the organization and the burnout characteristics of individuals. The data gathering approaches used addressed their perceptions of these relationships. The responses did not provide absolute evidence of casual relationship but, whether or not persons in administrative roles perceived such relationships to exist. It will remain a task of future researchers to determine causality.
Two general questions were used to guide this research.

1. Do administrators in higher education perceive organizational burnout factors as obtained from the literature to be related to individual burnout factors, also obtained from the literature?

2. If so, which organizational factors and/or characteristics are believed to contribute the most and the least to individual burnout as identified through a search of the literature?

METHODOLOGY

As indicated above, organizational characteristics that contribute to individual burnout as well as the characteristics of persons suffering from burnout have been obtained through a review of the literature. Data were gathered through the use of interviews and questionnaires designed to determine the organizational characteristics that administrators perceive to be related to individual burnout, and to identify which organizational structures and/or characteristics are believed to contribute the most/least to burnout. Thus, this study utilized a combination of literature review plus survey research and semi-structured, open-ended interviews.

According to Kerlinger (1973:410), survey research studies large and small populations (or universes) by selecting and studying samples drawn from the population
to uncover the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables. This is understandable, as the procedures and methods of survey research were developed mostly by psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, economists, political scientists, and statisticians. Thus, the survey researcher should be interested in the accurate assessment of the characteristics or perceptions of whole populations of people concerning certain phenomena. The perceptions of educational administrators were needed in this study to understand which organizational structures contributed to the burning out of administrators. Consequently, this study should be placed under the general category of survey research that was exploratory and descriptive in nature, as a sample was drawn from the population to gain further insight into the phenomenon "burnout."

Population and Sample

The study population consisted of all Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans, and Department Chairpersons in the seventeen Colleges at The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. The designation of Ohio State was due to the following perceived advantages:

1. Potential cooperation from the academic administrators at The Ohio State University.

There was no reason to believe that
administrators in higher education at this institution are any different from other administrators in other universities.

2. Potential cooperation of the personnel department, Deans of Colleges, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans and Department Chairperson. Moreover, the concept of burnout is an extremely sensitive issue, one on which many administrators would have been reluctant to express their views. However, because of the close working relationship that The Ohio State University Community has with its members, and the university's research orientation, the potential for cooperation is thereby enhanced.

3. Potential for enhancing the content validity of the instrument based on the responses of administrators from The Ohio State University.

Interviews

Two field tests were conducted. The first involved the four (4) doctoral committee members of this researcher. The second field trial interviews were held with six (6) higher educational administrators drawn from other institutions. These field tests refined and enhanced the quality of the instrument and the data produced through its administration. The trial group of administrators had opinions
on the length of the questionnaire, amount of time required, clarity of items, relevancy and ways for improving the instrument. These interviews determined to some degree, the extent to which the directions were clear, and if the tasks required of respondents could, in fact, be done.

The survey instrument (questionnaire) field tested as described above, was developed as follows:

1. characteristics of persons suffering from burnout were derived from the literature; (See page 5).
2. organizational variables that appear to contribute to burnout were derived from the literature; (See page 7).
3. directions to respondents were prepared asking them to:
   a. identify the organizational variables that they perceive to contribute to individual burnout characteristic by characteristic; and
   b. assess those organizational variables that they perceive contribute the least or the most to the burning out of individuals.
4. Two field tests described above were conducted.

In summary, the field test of the instrument were conducted to assess its accuracy and to provide an initial estimate of instrument validity. The field tests were
conducted using a purposeful sample of educational administrators, specifically, the doctoral committee of the researcher and six (6) other educational administrators from other institutions. These administrators were asked to complete the questionnaire and to note how long it took them to complete the questionnaire. For a more thorough explanation of the type of information that was asked of those in the field test, please review Appendix F, page 214.

The final instrument used to measure burnout was based on a review of the literature and the results of the field tests. For an example of how the personal interviews contributed to the final instrument, see Appendix F.

In conjunction with the burnout instrument, a biographical data questionnaire was developed using a modified version of the Moore and Wagstaff (1974) instrument. The Moore and Wagstaff instrument was used to survey Blacks on White Campuses. The Questionnaire was refined through reactions to the instrument during the field tests.

**The Data Collection**

The data were collected through the use of surveys (See Appendix F). This data collecting method attempted to measure the perceptions of educational administrators on organizational factors that could possibly contribute to administrative burnout.
1. Four (4) doctoral committee members were interviewed for practice purposes as well as to obtain constructive criticism of the interview schedule's clarity, preciseness and effectiveness.

2. Six (6) administrators from other higher educational organizations were interviewed as a second field test for the purpose of obtaining information to improve the instrument.

3. The names of all Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans and Department Chairpersons were provided by the personnel department of The Ohio State University.

4. All of the above were mailed a letter requesting their participation in the survey and an instrument.

5. Subjects were requested to respond within five to seven days and to return the questionnaire in an envelope which was provided.

6. At the end of the given time designated for respondents to respond (5-7 days) follow up letters were sent to respondents reminding them to complete the questionnaire and return them in the self-addressed envelopes provided.
7. Personal telephone calls were made to non-respondents after three (3) weeks if the questionnaires were not returned in response to the follow-up letters.

8. A sample of six (6) non-respondents were interviewed and their responses compared; a test of significant differences verified that the non-respondents were no different from the respondents.

DATA ANALYSES

Data analyses were primarily limited to the use of descriptive statistics since this study was essentially descriptive and exploratory in nature. Several methods of data analysis were used to determine what organizational factors contributed the most and the least to the burning out of educational administrators.

The first step of data analyses dealt with the interview data that were derived from the two field test. The interview data were subjected to Quantitative Content Analysis.

This analysis technique called for the notation of frequency with which particular responses were given. The analysis was based upon pre-existing response categories (See Appendix F). Quantitative Content Analysis is a statistical technique for obtaining descriptive data on content variables. Its value in this respect is that it
offered the possibility of obtaining more precise, objective, and reliable observations about the frequency with which given content (Organizational characteristics) occur either singly or in conjunction with individual characteristics. In other words, this method of analysis, the quantitative approach, substitutes controlled observation with the systematic counting for impressionistic ways of observing frequencies of occurrence. Thus, an inference (or prediction) was made in content analysis which involved at least the following: 1) some indicators or class of indicators that can be identified in the message sequence, 2) some state or process in the individual producing or receiving the message and, 3) some dependency between these two such that the presence, absence, or degree of the former is correlated more than by chance with the presence, absence, or degree of the latter (Osgood, 1959:36).

The second step was that of assembling and coding the returned survey instrument (The Instrument For Assessing Organizational Factors That Are Related To Administrative Burnout). Each of the individual and organizational characteristics were assigned a code. Responses were then transferred onto IBM Fortran Coding Forms for key punching onto IBM Computer Cards. After the responses had all been coded properly and transferred to IBM Computer Cards, the Statistical Analysis System (SAS), a system of computer
programs was used to assist in the computer analysis. Stepwise Regression Analysis was used to classify items.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to understand the magnitude and direction of the relationship of the independent variables to the dependent variables.

A Cronbach Alpha and Guttman Split-Half found in the SPSS Program Package was computed in order to establish the reliability of the instrument and items in the instrument. Furthermore, output from the SAS Program included the following:

1. means;
2. frequencies of all variables and percentages of the demographical variables.

Output from the SPSS Program included the Cronbach Alpha, and Guttman Split-Half Test of Reliability.

The final step dealt with the tabulation and reporting of certain demographical data of the four groups responding to Part I of the IAAB. At which time, each group was described and tables were presented that should have indicated and identified the percentage and frequency of responses on certain organizational characteristics thought to contribute the least and most to individual burnout.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was exploratory and descriptive in nature, and was not designed to establish cause and effect
relationship. The study sample of educational administrators were the total population of Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, and Department Chairpersons at a single institution, further limiting its generalizability as the sample was not randomly selected.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The significance of the study was supported by the absence of literature on common characteristics of educational organizations that promoted the phenomenon burnout. Educational administrators should profit from any opportunity to sharpen their awareness of characteristics of organizations and how they impact upon employees. They may need to reexamine their assumptions about their organizations and their administrative responsibilities within them. Also, the results of this research may help educational administrators avoid being the victims of organizational structures that promote burnout (Corwin and Edelfelt, 1976:3). Moreover, according to Corwin and Edelfelt, if an administrator aspires to change or improve an organization, being able to analyze how it works and to be able to identify characteristics that promote negative phenomena such as burnout can assist the administrator in influencing its direction, purposes or goals, and procedures in constructive ways.
Evidence that would shed light into this area of growing concern for individual educators and for educational administrators alike will be important in helping people deal personally and professionally with these emerging areas of concern.

Past research in the area of burnout had been limited to investigation of burnout among people in the helping professions such as mental health workers, nurses, teachers, physicians, and social workers (Metz, 1979:10). Up to this point limited research has been done to explore the phenomenon of burnout in administration of higher education. Additional insight could be gained about a complex problem, thus, inviting further research efforts in this area.

Furthermore, this study was developed at an important time. It is anticipated that the decade of the 80's would continue to be stressful due to limited resources, (financial, natural and human), declining student enrollment, a cry for relevance and more accountability in education, retrenchment and programs cuts.

Finally, a better understanding of organizational structures that promote burnout in educational administrators is important if educational organizations are to continue to increase their quality and productivity in a decade of increasing fiscal and human constraints (Newcomb, 1980:1).
BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The Directive-state theory maintains that central states influence perceptions (Kerlinger, 1964:135). Attitudes, needs, values, motives, wants and emotions are all central states; they should, therefore, all influence perceptions. The specific deduction was that the need for a better quality of life for individual workers within the organization should be the goal that all administrators seek, if productivity is positively related to quality of work life.

On the basis of so-called directive-state and social perception theory (which is a broad theory of perception stating in effect that our perceptions of cognitive objects are colored by our emotions, needs, wants, motives, attitudes and values. The latter states are, so to speak, directive states within the individual influencing his perception and judgement), it was thought that in order to understand organizational items that are related to individual burnout characteristics the perceptions or judgement of administrators were needed.

Individual employees are concerned with specific job operations, but administrators are concerned with the operation of the total organization. Therefore, understanding, predicting, controlling and coping with organizational problems should be the role of the administrator.
With this in mind, the possibilities that their knowledge of organizational characteristics that promote individual burnout would be invaluable to this study as well as to other educational and business organization leaders.

Characteristics of Persons Who Suffer from Burnout

According to Maslach (1978:7-14) and Unger (1980:129-130) some characteristics of persons who suffer from burnout are shown in Table 1.

Organizational Variables That May Be Related to Burnout

Metz (1979:56-57) and Maslach (1978:7-14) have researched various variables which seem related to the issues of burnout in organizational structures. These variables are shown in Table 2.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

**BURNOUT**

In this investigation, the term is used to represent the consequence of an individual's inability to empathize with and support his/her role expectation

**EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS**

The term is used to represent administrators in higher educational organizations, specifically colleges and universities and four year technical institutions.
INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS

The term individual characteristics refer to those burnout factors manifested by an individual through his/her personality, physical and mental state of being. Such a state of being indicates that the affected person has reached or exceeded his or her stress capacity. Unger summarized the individual characteristics of burnout of Bies, Cherniss, Daley, Edelwich, Freudenberger, Gillespies etc., as:

1) inability to establish priorities and make decisions,
2) loss of emotional control,
3) lowered self-concept,
4) feelings of pessimism and frustration,
5) decrease in energy level,
6) feeling alienated,
7) overly conscientious,
8) feelings of anger and resentment,
9) undue pressure from community and school board,
10) physical symptoms,
11) rigidity to change,
12) exhibits low level of enthusiasm for the job,
13) wishing for or seeking escape via another job or early retirement,
14) close to retirement age,
15) decrease in or lack of specific job skills (Unger, 1980:129).

INABILITY TO ESTABLISH PRIORITIES AND MAKE DECISIONS

Refers to the shifting of responsibilities of one's own actions to others; more interested in getting task completed as opposed to making certain that the job has been done correctly; continually postponing decisions; lacking initiative; trying to achieve too many tasks in an inappropriate amount of time; feeling overwhelmed so as to avoid responsibilities; always reacting to impetuous actions; lacking in focus in setting goals that produce constant turmoil in a work setting; hesitant or reluctant to make decisions; indecisiveness; and/or, the inability to switch gears and organize.

LOSS OF EMOTIONAL CONTROL

A state of mental depression involving tensions to the extent of being unable to relax; worried accompanied with feelings of guilt for not being able to perform certain duties (1980:129).

LOWERED SELF CONCEPT

Refers to a feeling of insecurity; deterioration of self-concept; fear; and/or lacking in self confidence (1980:129).
FEELINGS OF PESSIMISM AND FRUSTRATION

Refers to the individual as having a pessimistic attitude; a loss in sense of humor; having a critical or negative attitude toward others; not being able to view self from a humorous objective view; having a sense of futility; and/or, a low tolerance for frustration (1980:129).

DECREASE IN ENERGY LEVEL

This phrase refers to being tired; feeling worn out; dwindling competitiveness; decrease in drive and energy; a decline in time for creative planning; and a lack of energy with possibly sleeping more than usual (1980:129).

FEELING ALIENATED

Refers to being withdrawn; feeling isolated; feeling paranoid; and being suspicious of others.

OVERLY CONSCIENTIOUS

Is being overly sensitive; seeking to be too many things to too many people; overly humanistic; tending to person alike problems; becoming too close to the job; and, possibly taking everything too personal (1980:129).

FEELINGS OF ANGER AND RESENTMENT

A feeling of bitterness; uncaring; disgust; and a possible feeling of discouragement.

PHYSICAL SYMPTOMS

Refers to the manifestation of physical illnesses such as heart attacks, over eating, ulcers, alcoholism, chain smoking and other medical problems.

LOW LEVEL OF ENTHUSIASM

Refers to the lack of eagerness to serve; lack of enthusiasm for the job; apathy toward the job; boredom; disinterest; and a possible decrease in commitment to position.
RIGIDITY TO CHANGE

Is a lack of openness to new ideas and being unreceptive to innovation and change.

WISHING FOR OR SEEKING ESCAPE

Is seeking to acquire a job with less responsibilities or seeking early retirement because of dissatisfaction with present job.

DECREASE IN OR LACK OF SPECIFIC JOB SKILLS

Is a lack of diminished human relations skills, business skills, time management skills, delegating skills, public relations skills and/or communication skills.

ORGANIZATIONAL OR STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF BURNOUT

The phrase organizational or structural characteristics refers to those factors that are manifested by an organization which tends to negatively affect the individuals therein. According to Metz (1979:56-57) and Maslach (1978:7-14), such factors are: 1) lack of administrative support, 2) lack of encouragement from colleagues, 3) work overload, 4) high frequency of staff meeting, 5) unclear goals/goal ambiguity, 6) no time-outs, 7) inflexible work schedules, 8) lack of proper communication channels, 9) overly bureaucratized or structured, 10) overly bureaucratized or structured, 11) administrative incompetence/disrespect for organizational leader, 12) inadequate facilities and materials, 13) routines, 14) lack of time, 15) an abundance of time spent in administrative duties, 16) a negative or unhealthy work environment, 17) poor work relationship, 19) amount of time spent in direct contact with staff or ratio of clients to staff administrators and 20) no input into institutional policy making are all structural factors that contribute to burnout (See Table 2).

LACK OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

According to Metz (1979), lack of administrative support refers to the inability of an employee to obtain the necessary sanctions (positive or negative), human or natural
resources (for example, office supplies, equipment, staff) needed to accomplish the job task.

**LACK OF ENCOURAGEMENT FROM COLLEAGUES/PARENTS**

The phrase lack of encouragement from colleagues, parents or administrators refers to the inability of an employee to obtain support from coworkers, parents or superordinates. Support may be given in the form of aid, countenance, (backing, advocating) or promotions. Support from colleagues and the opportunity to express feelings related to the work situation help the worker cope with stress (Maslach, 1976; Freudenberger, 1975).

**WORK OVERLOAD**

Is the inability of an individual to set limits on the demands that others require of the individual as it relates to the job task; the need to balance work and reject the notion of being all things to all people (Larson and Gilbertson, 1978:564). Freudenberger (1974:161) refers to work overload from the perspective of being too dedicated and committed which too often results in working too much, too long and too intensely.

**HIGH FREQUENCY OF STAFF MEETINGS**

Is defined here as the non-productive process of bringing together employees to air changes in policies, decisions, etc., by superordinate(s). If done frequently, such meeting tends to disrupt productivity, as such monologues could be sent out in the form of memorandums. Maslach believes that the function of staff meetings should be to enable the staff to socialize informally, to give each other support, to confer about problems, to clarify their goals, and to exert some direct influence on the policies of the institution. In these professions the frequency of staff meeting are negatively correlated with burnout.

**INSUFFICIENT TIME OFF**

Refers to allowing more opportunities for short and/or long term breaks in regular work routines. According to Maslach, this is not merely a short break but an opportunity for professions to voluntarily choose to do some other, less
stressful, work while other staff members take over client/patient responsibilities (Maslach, 1976:17-18).

**INFLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULES**

Refers to a work schedule which is established as a constant (such as never subjected to change) throughout the duration of the employee's worklife with the organization; a schedule which does not allow for change nor take under consideration time-out(s) or breaks (short or long) for the employee(s).

**LACK OF PROPER COMMUNICATION CHANNELS**

Refers to inadequate means or methods used by the organizational leaders in transmitting information pertinent to the well-being and in some instances the survival of the organization.

**OVERLY BUREAUCRATICIZED OR STRUCTURED**

Is a rigidly organized unit that tends to over emphasize the use of rules, regulations and policies; an organization that does not take under consideration the social and emotional needs of its members.

**ADMINISTRATIVE INCOMPETENCE/DISRESPECT FOR ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERS**

An administrator who is capable of managing his/her organizational affairs because of a lack of management skills: delegating skills, public relations skills, business skills, communication skills and time management skills. Disrespect of incompetent administrator(s) by other members could possibly develop as a result of their inviability toward his/her lack of these skills.

**INADEQUATE FACILITIES**

Is an inability to successfully accomplish a task by an employee due to needed space and/or equipment.
ROUTINES

Refers to any regular procedure of business adhered to by habit. A regular repeated course of business.

LACK OF TIME

Is a perceived need for more time to complete paperwork, respond to correspondences and to do the job task assigned.

AN OVER ABUNDANCE OF TIME SPENT IN ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

This phrase refers to a perceived need by an administrator for more time to do other job functions besides completing paperwork which consists of responding to correspondences or writing memorandums.

A NEGATIVE OR UNHEALTHY WORK ENVIRONMENT

An environment that is physically, socially or organizationally structured as to hamper the productivity of the total organization (for example bad lighting, rigid clocking in-an-out systems, individuals within groups who refuse to cooperate or work effectively with each other).

POOR WORK RELATIONSHIP

Refers to individuals within the organization who are covertly or overtly negative in their business interactions with others to the point of affecting the total working environment.

HIGH STAFF-CLIENT OR ADMINISTRATIVE-STAFF RATIO

Represents the inability of an administrator to effectively operate an organization due to an improper ratio of persons needing his/her services, thus, creating an emotional as well as a work overload on the administrator in direct charge. According to Maslach (1976:17), such an overload operates in the same manner as a wire that has too much electricity flowing through it, the person just burns out and emotionally disconnects.
AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT IN DIRECT CONTACT WITH STAFF
OR RATIO OF CLIENTS TO STAFF ADMINISTRATION

Is defined here as an organizational factor that is neutral; however, in this study, it is defined as an over abundance or excessive amount of time spent in direct contact with staff or having an excessive amount of clients in proportion to time and endurance.

NO INPUT INTO INSTITUTIONAL POLICY MAKING

Is defined as organizational structured limitations placed on employees by the institutional leaders which does not allow for its members contributing toward policy making or changing.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS

The findings, conclusions and recommendations which resulted from this investigation were presented in the following manner:

In Chapter Two, a Review of Related Literature was reported in two major parts: 1) Characteristics of Individual Burnout and 2) Characteristics of Organizational Structures that may possibly contribute to individual burnout.

In Chapter Three, the Methodology was discussed. In Chapter Four, findings pertaining to the study were described. Chapter Four included the findings and analysis of the data obtained from the responses of administrators: Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans and Department Chairpersons.

The study was concluded in Chapter Five with Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations for Practice and Recommendations for Further Study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents research and literature on the items used in assessing organizational factors that were thought to contribute to administrative burnout. A plethora of instruments and information were found on the topic of individual burnout in other professions, however, the review of literature proved unsuccessful in locating an instrument that could be used to assess organizational factors that contributed to individual burnout. Nevertheless, the review did produce studies, articles, and other research which were related in varying degrees to this research endeavor. With this information, it was anticipated by this investigator that organizational items relating the most and least to individual burnout could be obtained from a review of the literature, statistically treated and verified.

Characteristics of Individual Burnout Factors

According to a recent Harris Poll (Boston Globe, April, 1979), by the turn of the century, "emphasis will not be on physical production but on human creativity as
more than 80% of this nation's workers provide services rather than finished goods" (Meyer, 1979:1). Meyer continues by stating that Maslach (1977) supports this contention as more and more people, whether they be trained professionals, para-professionals, or volunteers, are now in the business of helping others. Thus, according to Meyers, Maslach isolates a problem common to this increased demand, the training of providers of the services. "As the number of recipients and the range of services have increased; so has the criticism that such services have become impersonal and dehumanizing." She defines the phenomenon of burnout as that of losing concern for the people for whom one is providing services. In addition to physical exhaustion, and sometimes even illness, burnout was characterized by an emotional exhaustion in which the professional no longer had any positive feelings, sympathy or respect for clients or patients (Maslach:1977:3-4, 1978:113-114).

**Lowered Self-concept**

The problem of burnout manifests itself in a variety of forms, resulting from the many ways in which different individuals can respond to the same type of stress. According to Maslach, 1976; Collins, 1977; Daley, 1979; Mattingly, 1977; and Gillespie and Cohen, 1980; there may be a logical progression of factors contributing to worker burnout. For instance, Gillespie and Cohen state that a
worker who is not burned out probably has high levels of communication, a sense of mutual support and teamwork, strong self-confidence in professional judgement and self, positive feelings toward work, high degrees of involvement with clients, and creative decision-making/problem solving ability. They are impassioned, professional workers. Those factors that lead to burnout would be the opposite of the above, for example, low levels of communication; a sense of isolation and loneliness, a low self-confidence in professional judgement and self, negative feelings towards work, disengagement from clients, routinization, and inflexible decision making. In the words of Gillespie and Cohn, these characteristics may be found in burned out workers (1980:4).

Numerous research studies have hypothesized the self-concept of a person is significantly correlated with his or her performance in areas such as academic achievement, occupational success, and the ability to withstand stressful situations. Self-concept, according to Fitts who developed the Tennessee Self-concept Scale:

The manner in which an individual views himself/herself (their self-concept) has been demonstrated to be highly influential in much of his/her behavior and also to be directly related to his/her general personality and state of mental health. Those people who see themselves as undesirable, worthless, or "bad" tend to act accordingly. Those who have a highly unrealistic concept of self tend to approach life and other people in unrealistic ways. Those who have very
deviant ways. Thus, a knowledge of how an individual perceives himself is useful in attempting to help that individual, or in making evaluations of him/her (1965:2).

In an attempt to affirm or disaffirm Pitts, Garvey in 1970 administered The Tennessee Self-concept Scale to a group of 150 Allegheny College seniors several months prior to their term of student teaching. The results of this study indicated that those students who rated high in student teaching reported higher levels of self-concepts, especially in relation to identity. Furthermore, they demonstrated less confusion, uncertainty, and conflict in self-perception, particularly in scores of net conflict and total variability scales. This study clearly indicated that success in student teaching was affected, but was not necessarily determined by a positive self-concept and good adjustment.

Campbell and Martinez-Perez (1977) conducted a study with sixty-four students enrolled in science methods courses in elementary education at Florida International University which found significant correlations between achievement scores and attitudes toward science and student self-concept scores. In this instance, the Tennessee Self-concept Scale data revealed that self-concept was the only predictor of achievement.
In a study conducted in Great Britain, the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between attitudes toward self and others adjustment to the teaching profession was supported by Crane in 1974.

In general the results of these studies concerning self-concept clearly indicate that for persons who begin with low self-concepts professional achievements are significantly lower than for those persons with high self-concepts.

In addition to the studies mentioned above, Maslach, and Jackson, 1978, developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory, a questionnaire which measures four dimensions of burnout--emotional exhaustion, negative attitudes toward recipients, negative self-evaluation as a helper, and emotional distance from recipients (Maslach and Jackson, 1978). Maslach and Jackson, 1978, noticed that a negative self-evaluation as a helper (low self-concept) was a subscale in their burnout inventory instrument.

Pines, Aronson and Ditsa (1981:18) maintained that exhaustion is characterized by the development of negative attitudes toward self, toward work, and toward life. People who develop tedium often report dissatisfaction with their work and way of life and a lowered self-concept; they feel inadequate, inferior, and incompetent.

According to Pine, Aronson and Ditsa, 1981, burnout leads to job dissatisfaction, arriving late, leaving early,
extending work breaks, or avoiding work entirely. Likewise, it can lead to an "I don't give-a-damn" attitude in people who once were very idealistic. Armstrong studied burnout among personnel who treated cases of child abuse and neglect. She identified symptoms of burnout as daily resistance to going to work, clockwatching, postponing client contacts, resisting client phone calls and office visits, stereotyping client contacts, inability to concentrate on what the client was saying, feeling intolerant of clients, and a blaming attitude. Nurses working in intensive care units were found to be significantly more depressed, somewhat alienated in thoughts and actions, and more anxious than nurses in less stressful units (1981:20).

Feeling Alienated

Seeman (1959) defines alienation as powerlessness or the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcome. Alienation develops in the individual when she/he does not receive reinforcements, is unclear as to what she/he ought to believe, when minimal standards for clarity in decision-making are not met, and when situation in which the social norms regulating individual conduct have broken down or are no longer effective as rules for behavior.
Alienation has been stated to be closely related to the burnout phenomenon and has been the focus of several studies. Adams (1969, 1976) studied: (1) the relationship between teacher alienation and the organizational structure of the schools; and (2) alienation and the negotiation process. His studies lend support to the contention that a sense of involvement of a teacher and power to affect conditions over his/her work are directly related to his/her perception of the organizational structure of the school.

Clark (1959) maintains that a measure of alienation must be a measure of the discrepancy between the power man believes he has and what he believes he should have; his enstrangement from his rightful role. Clark believes that it is necessary for people to consider themselves deserving a role in the social situation before she/he can experience feelings of alienation. Thus, in his study of Agricultural Cooperative Organization, as a social system, a random sample of 361 of the 3000 members were studied. In this study it was found that alienation was highly related to the satisfaction of members with their organization (r= .62).

Bakakat, in a study conducted in Michigan in 1966, found that a sense of alienation of teachers was directly related to the degree of bureaucracy in a school system. Foryth and Hay, studying isolation and alienation in educational organizations, found that "interactions with
friends and respected coworkers is more important to professional educators than contacts with those in authority" (1978:80).

Spaniol and Caputo (1979:15-18) included alienation as a personal sign or symptom of burnout. Specifically, they stated that alienation occurs when an individual perceived him/herself isolated both personally and physically from peers and friends. As burnout develops, withdrawal from friends, colleagues and family could occur. The alienation could be increased further by the person finding it difficult to talk about problems, thus turning away from family, friends and work associated who could help the individual.

Decrease in Energy Level

Freudenberger (1977:26) states:

people who are in the throes of burning out often fail to see their situation as stemming from inside themselves. Instead they find fault with everything and everyone around them, complaining about the organization and reacting cynically to whatever is suggested or attempted by others.

Nevertheless, there are physical and psychological reactions which have been associated with burnout. Individuals experiencing burnout have reported that they seem to be tired all the time and cannot seem to get enough sleep. Muscles seem to become flaccid and weakened with mild increases in exercise. Spaniol and Caputo (1979:15-18)
maintain that fatigue is a symptom of burnout. According to
these two researchers, fatigue may be experienced as tired­
ness, feeling worn out, sleeping more than usual or feel­
ing a lack of energy on or off the job. McCann (1980:15)
describes the burned out syndrome in ministers by stating
that, physically, they will feel constantly drained of
energy. They will not sleep well and a number of minor
ailments will plague them, such as cold, chronic backaches,
headaches or allergies.

According to Pines, et al. (1981), physical exhaus­
tion was characterized by low energy, chronic fatigue, weak­
ness, and weariness. People who were burned out reported
such things as accident-proneness, increase susceptibility
to illness, frequent headaches, nausea, muscle tension in
shoulders and neck, back pains and changes in eating habits
and weight. Also mentioned in the literature are psycho­
somatic complaints, increased frequency of illness, nag­
ging colds, and frequent attacks of virus of flu. To Pines,
Aronson, et al. (1981), tedium and burnout were character­
ized by physical depletion, by feelings of helplessness
and hopelessness, by emotional drain, and by the develop­
ment of negative self-concept and negative attitudes toward
work, life, and other people. Tedium and burnout were, in
their words, similar in terms of symptomatology but differ­
et in origin. Both were clusters of exhaustion reactions.
Tedium was the result of prolonged chronic pressures (mental, physical, or emotional); burnout was a result of constant or repeated emotional pressure associated with an intense involvement with people over long periods of time. Such intense involvement was particularly prevalent in health education and social service occupations, where professionals have a "calling" to take care of other people's psychological, social, and physical problems. Thus, burnout was the painful realization in help-providers that they can no longer help people in need and that there is nothing within them left to give. One person could react to burnout as primarily somatic; while others react with their emotions. Pines, Aronson, et al., 1981, warns that if an individual should have all these physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion reactions, one would be in the midst of a severe burnout or tedium crisis.

Bardo (1979:252) maintains that teachers are leaving their profession because they are casualties of professional burnout and no longer have the energy and enthusiasm necessary for effective teaching.

Spaniol and Caputo (1979:15-18) state that fatigue, experienced as tiredness, feeling worn out, sleeping more than usual or feeling a lack of energy on or off the job, is a sign and symptom of burnout. Likewise, Freudenberger (1975:159), (1977:26) states that burnout means
"to fail, wear out, or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength, or resources." Spaniol and Caputo (1979:1-2) view burnout as the "wearing yourself out doing what you have to do" and "the inability to cope adequately with the stresses of the work environment and/or on personal lives." They also felt that burnout was being locked into a job routine and found that burnout can last for years. Consequently, these researchers postulated that burnout has three distinct levels:

First Degree Burnout: First degree burnout signs and symptoms are experienced very mildly. It could be occasional and short-lived. What one ordinarily does to take care of self removes the symptom. An individual could distract him/herself, rest for awhile, take a break from his/her work, or simply relax. If any of the above mentioned methods are done, success in preventing burnout is accomplished and the individual returns to normal.

Second Degree Burnout: At this level, symptoms are more regular, last longer and are more difficult to alleviate. What an individual does normally can not alleviate these symptoms, for after hours of sleeping one could still feel tired and exhausted. At this level extra efforts to take care of these symptoms are needed.

Third Degree Burnout: At this level signs and symptoms of burnout are continuous. An individual could possibly develop physical or psychological problems such as ulcers or depression. What she/he normally does, does not take care of these signs or symptoms and even medical and/or psychological assistance may not bring quick relief. At this level the existence of life or the meaning of life is questioned.

Cherniss (1980:71) states that the most common symptom of burnout is exhaustion, both emotional and physical.
The physical symptoms include headaches, problems sleeping, low energy levels, or severe exhaustion and gastrointestinal disturbances. According to Mattingly (1977:134), as exhaustion sets in individuals no longer are able to process the complex data of the dynamic situation. Partial perceptions are then quickly channeled into preconceived categories that allow the exhausted person to survive psychologically and render some service.

In response to the impending feeling of exhaustion, workers frequently substantially underevaluate or over-evaluate their professional perogative and capacities. Thus, burned out people often experience painful self doubt and certainty about themselves and their professional practices. Lee (1980:6) in his study of burnout of school principals noted the tragic results of the burning out of principals to lead to if not cause, the burning out of teachers who in turn burnout students. So what was occurring was a loss for all. Thus, Lee suggests and emphasizes that education can not afford this loss of all involved.

Over Conscientiousness

After having experienced a degree of burnout, Freudenberger (1974:159) wrote an article entitled "Staff Burn-Out" in which he spoke of those who are prone to burnout. Freudenberger postulated in this article that
those who are overly dedicated and committed are prone to burnout. Those who work in free clinics, therapeutic communities, hot lines, crisis intervention centers, women's clinics, gay centers, and run-away houses were people who seek to respond to the recognized needs of people. They would rather put up than shut up. What they put up was their talents, skills and long hours with a bare minimum of financial compensation. Precisely because of dedication, however, they were into a burn-out trap. They worked too much, too long, and too intensely. They felt a pressure from the outside to give and they responded by giving. Moreover, when the staff member or administrator felt an additional pressure from institutional leaders to give even more, she/he was then under a three-pronged attack (1974:161).

Guilt, continues Freudenberger, promoted even further "giving" and ultimate exhaustion. Those who worked in the movement of "people giving" often forgot that there was a difference between mature commitment and involvement, and commitment as a sign of a personal need to be accepted and liked.

In Sheehy's (1977) book, entitled Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life, persons in the age category of 29-34 questioned life, work, relationships but those in the 35-43 age bracket characterized a period of mid-life
explosion or over-conscientiousness.

Metz (1979:36) noted that the studies of Maslow (1954, 1968, 1971) on self-actualizing people may be still another way of understanding the adult conscientiousness or this need to give until it hurts. She continues by noting that Robert Williams (1979) applied Maslow's Hierarchy of needs to teacher motivation and satisfaction. Williams postulates that teachers move from the lower motivational levels of the hierarchy of Maslow (for example, physiological, security) to the higher levels (social, esteem, and self-actualization) as they progress in their careers as educators. Williams suggests that educators may be confusing the symptoms (dissatisfaction, tedium or burnout) of unrest among teachers with the causes (inappropriate levels of motivation) of unrest. In response to Williams' suggestions, consideration should be given to the belief that the responsibility of an adult to his/herself should be the task of that individual. However, if organizational leaders know the theory of human motivation, perhaps burnout could be decreased or even prevented.

Wishing For or Seeking Escape

Most writers use the term "stress" as a part of their definition of burnout. In this reference individuals were viewed by Mattingly (1978), Freudenberger (1977), Maslach (1977, 1979), Pines (1981), Shubin (1980), Skinner (1975),
and others as seeking to or wishing to escape the stress in their work situation. Maslach (1977) in her study of "Characteristics of Staff Burnout in Mental Health Settings," terms this individual variable as "time in mental health work." The longer the staff had worked in the mental health field, the less they liked working with patients, the less they liked their individual jobs, the less successful they felt with them, and the more custodial rather than humanistic were their attitudes toward mental illness. Thus, Pine and Maslach findings showed that mental health workers experienced personal stress as a result of working closely and intensively with patients over an extended time. They then found several steps, both physical and social, that could be taken either to reduce the amount of stress the staff member felt, and the subsequent burnout, or to help her or him cope successfully with the stress. The following set of recommendations emphasized institutional changes such as:

- Reducing the patient-to-staff ratio
- Shortening the work hours
- Allowing more opportunities for time-outs
- Sharing the patient load
- Changing the function of staff meetings
- Improving work relationships
- Holding retreats for staff members
Taking precautions as an individual

Training Students to Deal with Future Stresses (Maslach, 1978:236-237).

Bardo (1979:252) noted that a record number of teachers voluntarily left education, causing shortages in scattered Southern California schools where there had been heavy surpluses. They were leaving, according to Bardo, because they are casualties of professional "burnout" and no longer had the energy and enthusiasm necessary for effective teaching.

Maslach and Pines (1977:101-104) describe several techniques used by social workers to achieve dehumanization. They were:

1. Use of certain types of language--Changes in the language used to describe patients of clients (for example, animals, or here they come from under their rocks).

2. Compartmentalization--Professionals who often make a sharp distinction between their job and their personal life, by refusing to "talk shop."

3. Intellectualization--Professionals who try to be objective by recasting a situation in more intellectual and less personal terms.

4. Withdrawal--Withdrawal was, in the words of Maslach and Pines, another means of escaping a very stressful situation. This occurs when the professional tries to minimize their involvement in stressful interactions in a number of ways: spending less time with other persons, standing further away, not making eye contact, communicating with the other person in more impersonal ways, interacting with other staff on the ward (rather than patients) etc. (1977:105).
The findings in this study indicated that voluntarily withdrawal from work when one was feeling strained and under pressure seems to be an important factor in preventing staff burnout. The most positive form of voluntary withdrawal is "Time-Out" (Maslach and Pines, 1977:108). Time-outs are not merely short breaks from work (such as rest periods or coffee breaks). Rather, they are opportunities for the staff member to voluntarily choose to do some less stressful work while other staff take over his or her responsibilities with the clients. (Please note that in this investigation "No Time Out" is referred to as "Insufficient Time Off.")

Lack of Job Enthusiasm

Edelwich (1980:28-30) indicates people experiencing burnout go through four stages:

Enthusiasm--According to Edelwich, burnout begins with the initial period of high hopes, high energy, and unrealistic expectations, when one does not yet know what the job is all about. It is when one does not need anything in life but the job, because the job promises to be everything. Over-identification with clients and excessive and inefficient expenditure of one's own energy (including voluntary overwork) are major hazards of this stage.

Stagnation--During this stage an individual is still performing his/her job responsibilities but the job is no longer a challenge.

Frustration--At this point one calls into question all that is concerned about the job. The limitations of the job situation are viewed not simply
as detracting from personal satisfaction and status, but as threatening to defeat the purpose of what has been done.

Apathy—This is the typical and very natural defense mechanism against frustration. This stage occurs when a person is chronically frustrated on the job, yet needs the job to survive.

Cherniss (1980), Edelwich (1980), Freudenberger (1977), et al., maintain that a lack of job enthusiasm is a personal characteristic of burnout and tedium.

In a study on professional burnout by Metz (1979:94), some educators thought that the "over-active," enthusiastic, conscientious, dedicated, committed teacher could be subject to burnout because of the tremendous amount of energy that kind of person extended in his/her work.

McCann (1980:15) states that the idealism and enthusiasm in ministers causes them to overextend themselves and possibly burn out. Mattingly (1977:131) continues by stating that a person who is burning out is often over enthusiastic, over-stimulated and very sensitive even in his/her personal life. For example, she/he attempts job tasks that are over-exerting.

**Rigidity To Change**

According to Freudenberger (1975:90), rigid and inflexible attitudes toward change have been linked with burnout. In other words, as stress reaps its toll and exhaustion sets in, the person literally cannot depart from
a set schedule and treatment approaches without paying a very high and personal price (Unger, 1979:39). Freudenberg suggests that workers may find themselves unable to be effective and confident in situations that require flexibility and innovation and may feel an increased need for specific regulations to guide their professional practice (1980:39).

Likewise Mattingly (1977:134) suggests that rigidification of perceptions and ideas can be seen in the language of the burned out person. Thus, persons who are burning out often develop a very limited, often applied, evaluative vocabulary with regard to their clients.

A human behavior model under stress that was similar to burnout was described by Costello and Zalkind (1963:126). This model presents the environmental stressors interacting with aspects of the personality of the individual to produce tensions that vary in degrees and intenses. For instance as stress increased in both intensity and duration, stronger mechanisms of resistance developed within the individual. The beginning stage of this reaction, entitled the "alarm state," was an emergency mobilization of the defense mechanisms that the body employs, often resulting in either increased striving to maintain levels of aspiration and effective performance, or in internal conflict produced by the continued inability to accomplish the
goals of the individual. This stage then leads into the "resistance state," in which the energies of the individual are constantly exerted to manage this stress. The final resistance state gives way to exhaustion, which represents a breakdown in the adaptive capability of the individual. At this stage, the worker is no longer able to manage job-related stress, and frustration and severe anxiety consequently develop. The employee was then faced with two choices: 1) leave the job, or 2) burnout. According to these writers, many employees leave the job or positions which results in job turnovers for the organization.

Lack of Job Skills

An article written by Longworth and Neikirk (1979:2) revealed that American workers wanted to work but often hated the job with which she/he was involved. The problem, in the words of pollster Yankelovich, was the "mismatch between what people demand from their jobs and what the available jobs provided." This mismatch between jobs and people often leads to career burnout. Simply, over time, particular tasks become upsetting, boring, and even embarrassing to perform, even though necessary. This type of professional interaction arouses strong feelings of emotional and personal stress, which can often be disruptive and incapacitating. Too often, the resentment for certain tasks clearly indicates avoidance in learning the job
skills necessary to master the job or position.

Gies (1979:3) noted that technological innovations new tools, new machines, new process affect not only human society but directly and immediately the producing workers. Needless to say, workers typically have not welcomed innovations in production technology; and as a result, are moved out of their positions due to lack of certain job skills or knowledge of the new technology.

Some people believe burnout indicates that they have chosen the wrong career. Many teachers, for instance, realize they hate teaching soon after standing alone before a class of pupils (Pines, Aronson et al., 1981:24). To some degree this may be true, as the skills needed to perform a job such as teaching too often has to be acquired over time. In the meantime, the ambitious, young teacher becomes disillusioned and if unwilling to apply her/himself to acquiring these teaching skills, burns out.

Lack of Enthusiasm For Profession

In many cases, young, ambitious teachers lose enthusiasm for the teaching profession entirely and leave the profession after one or two years of simply coping. Individuals quit their jobs also, when they realize that they were burned out and have made the wrong career choice, while others stay, particularly those who cannot
financially afford to quit and those who believe that quitting would waste their investment in their careers. From this group, enthusiasm was missing from the onset (1981:19).

Lack of Sense of Success

Probably the most frustrating problems that the average workers face are the lack of a tangible indexes of success for use with other people. Clearly, the workers make decisions about constituents success or failure but these evaluations are based on subjective criteria. The worker was, therefore, often uneasy about his/her competence (Unger, 1980:56). To compound this problem, almost everyone qualified to offer critical comments about the appropriateness of the decisions of the worker and did not hesitate to do so. This criticism was a devastating blow to the worker, particularly to a worker who was basically insecure about the soundness of her/his decisions (Daley, 1979:377).

Pines and Kafry (1978:502-504) researched job characteristics relative to burnout and occupational tedium. Their findings indicated that lack of variety, lack of autonomy, lack of success and lack of significant feedback were major contributors to burnout and tedium.

Achievement and success are important in human societies enhancing economic development, cultural growth, and individual well-being (Pine, Aronson, et al.
McClelland, a Harvard psychologist who studied achievement motivation, showed that men with high needs to achieve are more successful, especially in the business world, than those with low achievement needs (1981:146). In Pines, Aronson, et al., 1981 study of a sense of success and achievement, it was found that success and achievement were negatively correlated (-.16) with burnout and tedium. Finally, success and achievement are positive aspects of life that can alleviate to a great extent burnout and tedium as well as provide the individual with a sense of fulfillment.

Extremely Disorganized Individual

Persons who are burning out frequently feel disorganized, overstimulated and very sensitive even in their personal environment (Mattingly, 1979:131). Pines and Kafry (1978:499) maintain that when work demands exceed an individual's endurance and ability to cope, disorganization, frustration and a sense of being overwhelmed results. If that individual can no longer tolerate the occupational pressures and feels totally overwhelmed by work stresses, she/he is likely to reach a breaking point and experience a cluster of symptoms termed "tedium." Pines and Kafry (1981:499) defined tedium as a general experience of physical, emotional, and attitudinal exhaustion. The experience of physical, emotional, and attitudinal exhaustion. The
experience is characterized by feelings of strain and "burnout," by emotional as well as physical depleting, and by negation of one's self and one's self and one's environment (1978:499).

Feelings of Anger and Resentment

In addition to being disorganized, a burned out person, as stated by Freudenberger (1975:78-79) display sign of:
a) a person who remains silent, sits in the corner, and says nothing; b) the person who appears to be resentful, angry, disenchanted, fatigued, bored, discouraged and confused;
c) the burned out victim appears edgy, quick to anger and frustrated at what would ordinarily be something of unimportance; and d) the burned out person begins to feel that just about everyone is against him or her.

Spaniol and Caputo (1979:15-18) maintains that the personal signs of burnout are:

Fatigue--This is the experiencing of tiredness, feeling worn out, sleepy, accompanied by a general feeling of lack of energy.

Worry--At this point an individual spends an enormous amount of time going over and over his/her work situation. This stage involves feelings of depression/and hopelessness.

Inability to Make Decisions--This sign marks the point when all decisions become overwhelming.

Guilt--Many individuals begin to experience guilt about the ways in which they are providing services.
Physical Symptoms—These symptoms are characterized by migraine, backaches, tension, stress or pain in some part of the body.

Alienation—Denotes a feeling of isolation both personally and physically, from peers and friends.

Cynicism/Griping—Is a feeling that all is "wrong here"; it is a way of striking back or a way of releasing our own feeling of hopelessness over unfulfilled expectations.

Anger/Resentment—At this point burned out individuals become short tempered, snappy and quick to become involved in arguments. This, to Spaniol and Caputo, is another means of releasing emotions that represent dissatisfaction with the work or its environment.

Accident Proneness—This symptom is noted by the individual's ability to jury him/herself. According to Spaniol and Caputo, even serious accidents are quite often thought to be linked to burnout.

Pine, Aronson, et al. (1981:17) noted that burnout was not an isolated phenomenon that characterizes a limited number of individuals, but a state which occurs very often. Furthermore, people who burn out develop a negative self-concept and negative job attitude. Their concern and feeling for people they work with becomes dulled and in some cases they treat their clients in detached, hostile and uncaring ways.

Lack of Training

To some degree the teacher who stands in front of a class alone and discovers that there is much more to teaching than talking at people is a perfect example of lack
of training. Everything, however, can not be taught in a classroom, too much remains situational. In this instance, more training was needed in the area of the psychology of control to influence student behavior. Many educators have noted that the classroom does not offer a total teaching experience. Consequently, teacher consultant programs were developed in an effort to assist teachers, especially new teachers, in improving their classroom experience or skills. Such programs could be another preventive measure that could be used to prevent the burning out of new teachers.

In still another area, industrial workers are being sent back to school to learn how to operate new computerized equipment and machines. It was noted earlier in this chapter by Gies (1979:3) that technological innovations would affect human society as well as the individual worker. For too often workers resist improvements, new training, etc. and find themselves unable to cope. This inability to cope frequently leads to burnout or early retirement.

**Lack of Sense of Control**

Lack of control over the environment of the individual is a highly stressful experience (Pines and Aronson, et al., 1981:69). Seligman suggested that when animals and people continuously undergo negative experience over which they have no control, the result is "learned helplessness" and "depression." Consequently, people who
develop "learned helplessness" do not believe that success is the result of their performance but attribute failure to themselves (1981:80). Pines and Aronson, et al., discovered through their literature researches that social psychologists have found that people can stand more pain when they have control over its duration and intensity than when they do not. Thus, their research verified that a perceived lack of autonomy appeared to be a powerful antecedent of tedium and burnout. Furthermore, frustration resulting from lack of autonomy is a common antecedent of tedium in bureaucratic organizations.

According to Cherniss (1980:71), one of the major factors that contributes to individual burnout is lack of control over the work and environment of the individual worker. Administrators frequently feel that they must deal with so many constituencies, so many pressure groups, so many regulations, that they have little control over their own organizations. It is that lack of control, the sort of thing a teacher might feel in an inner-city classroom with thirty active pupils, that is a major factor that can contribute to burnout. Cherniss further reports that burnout is found not only in older people, but also in younger people, specifically those who have finished their training and are in an over controlled situation (1980:72).
Finally Pines and Aronson, et al., noted that lack of autonomy can be aggravated by a communication gap between those at the top and those at the bottom of the organization hierarchy. This gap may be due to the inherent inefficiencies of communication in large organizations or to the different points of view available to management (1981:71). The lack of personal control was more clear and stressful in the lower ranks of the organization than in the higher ranks of the organization. Also it was found by Pines and Kafry that autonomy was negatively correlated (-.17) with tedium and burnout.

A Poor Job Attitude

Many of the characteristics of burnout identified in the literature dealt with negative changes in work-related attitudes and behavior in response to job stress (Unger, 1980:40). White (1978B:6), states that: 1) grandiosity, 2) boredom, 3) cynicism, 4) sick humor--aimed particularly at clients, 5) air of righteousness, 6) hypercritical of program and/or peers, and 7) expressions of hopelessness and frustration are all indicators of attitudual changes which lead to burnout in staff member (see page 65). Whereas, Cherniss (1978:6) lists loss of concern for the client, and a tendency to treat clients in a detached, mechanical fashion. Still other changes listed by Cherniss include increasing discouragement, pessimism,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Indicators</th>
<th>Excessive Behavior Indicators</th>
<th>Emotional Adjustment Indicators</th>
<th>Attitude Indicators</th>
<th>Relationship Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue and chronic exhaustion</td>
<td>Increased consumption of caffeine, tobacco, alcohol, over-the-counter medications, psychoactive prescription drugs, illicit drugs</td>
<td>Emotional distancing</td>
<td>Grandiosity</td>
<td>Isolation from or overbonding with other staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent and prolonged colds</td>
<td>High risk taking behavior, e.g., auto/cycle accidents, falls, &quot;high risk&quot; hobbies, general proneness to accidents and injuries</td>
<td>Paranoia</td>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>Responding to clients in mechanical manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>Depression, e.g., loss of meaning, loss of hope</td>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>Increased isolation from clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep disturbances</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased impulse control</td>
<td>Sick humor—aimed particularly at clients</td>
<td>Using clients to meet personal, social, sexual needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulcers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased feelings of guilt</td>
<td>Air of righteousness</td>
<td>Increased interpersonal conflicts with other staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastro-intestinal disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martyrdom</td>
<td>Hyper-critical of program and/or peers</td>
<td>Increased anger at clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden losses or gains in weight</td>
<td>Extrems mood and behavioral changes</td>
<td>Fear of &quot;going crazy&quot;</td>
<td>Expressions of hopelessness and frustration</td>
<td>Increased problems in marital and other interpersonal relationships away from work, including relationships with ones children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flare-ups of pre-existing medical disorders, e.g., diabetes, high blood pressure, asthma</td>
<td>Increased propensity for violent and aggressive behavior</td>
<td>Increased amount of time day-dreaming/fantasy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries from high risk taking behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constant feelings of being trapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table summarizes the indicators of staff burnout most frequently mentioned by individuals who were interviewed during William White's studies on staff burnout. It is essential that these indicators be viewed as emerging from a breakdown in the relationship between the individual and the organization and not be viewed as a matrix of symptoms to be used for the clinical diagnosis of individual staff.
fatalism about work, decline in motivation and efforts, lessening involvement in work, increasing apathy, negativism, frequent irritability and anger with clients and colleagues, preoccupation with the comfort and welfare of the person for him/herself, a resistance to change, rigidity and a loss of creativity.

Shubin (1978:24), states that burnout is disillusionment, a lack-luster performance, a demeaning attitude toward others, and preoccupation with the technical aspects of the job. Storlie (1979:2108) explains a demeaning attitude toward others as the literal collapse of the human spirit. One sees apathy rather than openness and suspicion rather than trust.

A Lack of Feeling Educationally Accomplished

In their study on "Characteristics of Staff Burnout in Mental Health Settings," Pines and Maslach found that various personal characteristics of staff members were highly correlated with their perception of their jobs, of the patients, and of the mental health field. For example, for staff members with a higher education, that is, some kind of graduate degree, it was noted that their reasons for going into mental health work was for self-fulfillment rather than job conditions. These persons entered the mental health professions with higher expectations of
patients but over time they began to view themselves as more apathetic, weak, and powerless. They became more pessimistic about the possible effects of their work, seeing little chance of curing schizophrenia. Furthermore, they saw themselves as more tense, distant and introverted. Needless to say, that if persons are extremely achievement-oriented or future-oriented, attaining success is usually not associated with happiness but rather with disappointment. Success and achievement are positive aspects of life that can alleviate tedium and provide the individual with a sense of fulfillment (Pines, Aronson, et al., 1981:149).

Organizational Characteristics of Burnout

Stress, which is often used interchangeably with burnout, is a major problem in the contemporary United States. Furthermore, organizational stress negatively affects the lives of millions of Americans. It causes an array of physiological, psychological and social malfunctions for workers. On an economic level, the effects of stress probably cost the nation over $100 billion annually (Warshaw, 1979). Moreover, available evidence suggest that stress-related maladies are on the rise (Warshaw, 1979:3). Stress affects personality, modifying our perceptions, feelings, attitudes and behavior. It reaches beyond its immediate victims to affect the political, social and work
organizations whose activities they direct and carry out. Organizations as living functional entities, are also affected by stress. Their growth and survival are very much related to the ability of individual workers to cope with stress.

The majority of the literature on the topic "stress" clearly indicated that organizational structural items (for example rigid or flexible work schedules, clear goals, etc.) interact upon the individual both negatively and positively. Most often this interaction produces stress upon the individual, and in response an individual could cope with this stress successfully or unsuccessfully. If the individual is unable to successfully cope with the stress, one result could be the burning out of that individual.

Why should an organization care about its ability to assist its members in managing stress in their work setting? The simplistic answer is that productivity and viability depends on people and how well or how badly they perform (1979:5).

A new theory, first accepted in California and now recognized in several other jurisdictions, holds that such chronic conditions as coronary artery disease, cancer, stroke, and end-stage hypertensive kidney disease can be caused by the cumulative effect of repeated or continuous exposure to work stressors over an entire career. When
such claims are successful, the last employer of record may be financially responsible for all of the benefits or they may be apportioned among all of the employers listed in the work history of the individual, depending on the law in the particular jurisdiction (1979:8). Thus, many work situations are stressful because of their fast, repetitive, strenuous pace usually accompanied with insufficient time offs.

**Insufficient Time Off**

Opportunities for withdrawing from a stressful working environment are critically important for those professionals in strenuous, fast pace situations (Maslach, 1976:19). Furthermore, the type of withdrawal that is available may spell the difference between burnout and successful coping. In the words of Maslach, the most positive form of withdrawal was what she has titled "time-out." Time-outs were not merely short breaks from work such as rest periods or coffee breaks, but they were opportunities for the professional to voluntarily choose to do some other, less stressful work while other staff take over client/students/patients responsibilities. Time-out is a positive form of withdrawal, or "escapes," in which the breaks of the professional come at the expense of the client. The use of approved time off as opposed to the guilt-arousing
escape approach is dependent upon the organizational structure. Thus, Maslach recommends the creation of flexible structures that will give workers more opportunities for such temporary respite without inconveniencing clients (1976:505). Consequently, Pines and Kafry found that time-out was negatively correlated (−.27) with tedium. In addition Pines and Maslach found that time-outs were more often available in centers that were well staffed, had shared work responsibilities, had flexible work policies, and offered a variety of job tasks for each staff member (1978:108).

Lack of Direction

Pines, Aronson et al. (1981:162), reported that the most difficult stress to cope with is that stress generated by frustrated hopes. Burnout and tedium are usually associated with the loss of awareness of hopes and ambitions. Organizational misdirection or lack of direction is costly to both the individual and the organization. Pines recommends that individuals and organizations continually reappraise both their long-term and short-term goals. Moreover, it is important that the goals that an organization sets are realistic. If goals are not realistic they become destructive to all involved.

According to Pines, Aronson, et al., when setting and clarifying goals, it is important to distinguish between problems that can and cannot be changed. The two most common
mistakes are: giving up too early and hanging on too long. Individuals can both see how to solve a problem and distinguish the problems that can be solved from those that cannot. Some people have a dysfunctional tendency of focusing on fifty things that cannot be changed and thus either frustrating or depressing themselves. One can be most effective by focusing on a few things that can be changed.

Therefore, before setting goals it remains a task of those in charge of its operations to clarify priorities, assign various functions to various workers, as well as to set the tone and direction of the organization. These combined efforts, if clearly defined, decrease the possibilities of burnout.

Lack of Proper Communication

Gillespie and Cohen listed a set of organizational characteristics which tend to burnout workers as:

1. Overloaded responsibility—Too many responsibilities being placed on one or several workers.

2. Lack of recognition—Too little respect from the organization as to the accomplished task of the worker or not enough positive reinforcement.

3. Poor communication—Poor transmission of thoughts, ideas, and responsibilities or being ignored by supervisor.

Inadequate worker-supervisor relationships are characterized in a general way by poor communication. Poor communication was less important than overloaded responsibility and lack of recognition but was significant as a

Perlman and Hart (1980:6) indicate that administrators communicated the contagious condition of burnout. As one staff appears to suffer, others begin to suffer burnout as well. Here, burnout seems to be contagious (Cherniss, 1978: 16). Consequently, negativism, and pessimism is transmitted through communication from one worker to another. According to Cherniss (1980:72), when workers interact on the job with other workers who are under the same stress, they can quickly turn an entire group into a collection of burnouts. Schwartz and Will (1961, 564:583) found that when a dedicated and energetic psychiatric nurse returned to a mental hospital ward where burnout among staff was of high frequency, she quickly succumbed herself (Unger, 1980:45). Finally, in any organizational setting where there is a large percentage of staff members who are burned out, new staff members entering the organization are at risk of burnout as well.

Insufficient Number of Staff Members to Accomplish Job Objectives

In a study of institutional variables that promoted burnout by Pines and Maslach in 1978, it was found that the larger the ratio of patients to staff, the less staff members liked their jobs, and the more they tried to
separate their work from their personal lives.

In a setting with larger patient-to-staff ratio, staff said they would change their jobs if given a chance. They did not seek self-fulfillment or social interaction in their work; to them the best thing about their work was the job conditions—for example salary. They limited their after-hours involvement with the institution or the patients to handling emergency cases (1978:234).

Thus, findings indicated that as the number of patients for whom a staff member is providing care increases, the staff member may experience cognitive, emotional, and sensory overload; as the ratio decreases, the quality of care improves.

**Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity**

No variable in the organizational literature has been viewed as a focal concept in so many areas of research as uncertainty (ambiguity) (Breaugh:1977:1).

Sergiovanni and Carver (1973:50) define goals to refer to general statements which define the directions of an organization. There are three sets of goals, according to Etzioni. These sets of goals are identified in the Etzioni formulation as order goals, economic goals, and cultural goals. Order goals focus on control of actors or people in the organization. Economic goals focus on increasing or maintaining output at favorable cost to the organization. Cultural goals focus on socializing, institutionalizing,
preserving, extending and applying value and life systems (1973:50). Clearly, educational organization maintain cultural goals for the whole of society. What happens, however, when the goals of an educational organization are unclear and ambiguous? According to Pines and Aronson, et al. (1981), burnout and tedium are associated with the lost awareness of hopes and ambitions. It is not clear whether losing the awareness of goals is the cause of the result of burnout, but their coexistence implies a recommendation that administrators continually reappraise both long-term and short-term goals of their organization (1981:162). Furthermore, to these writers it is important personal goals of the administrators and organization goals be realistic both for the administrator and for those with whom they deal.

Pines, Aronson et al. (1981) suggest that goal ambiguity could be a result of not prioritizing goals. In this way problems that can and cannot be solved are distinguished. Also, some goals are long-range while others are short-range. If long-range goals are confused as short-range goals, dysfunctional results could occur to individuals within the organization, thus, affecting the organization itself.

Many researchers suggest that timely evaluation of where an organization is, as opposed to where it is headed should be a first priority.
Finally, goal ambiguity leads to role ambiguity on the parts of organizational members and role ambiguity could result in the burning out of those members.

**High Client Ratio To Professionals**

In a study conducted by Pines and Maslach (1975) with seventy-six (76) staff members from various mental health institutions in the San Francisco Bay Area, it was found that the quality of interactions between staff and patients was related to the perception staff members had about the institution, other staff members, the work and the patients. When staff-patient interactions were good, staff members liked their work, felt successful about it, and found self-fulfillment in their work. They appreciated the other staff members and conferred with them more often when having a problem with a patient. They also rated the institution highly, described patients after working hours. Furthermore, the lower-ranking personnel such as attendants and volunteers spent more time in direct contact with patient than did higher ranking staff such as psychiatrists and psychologists. In addition, the more time staff members had spent working with schizophrenic patients in the past, the less direct contact they currently had with patients. As might be expected staff who has lost direct contact with patients were more likely to spend their time in administrative work and in staff meetings.
Maslach in 1975 maintained that higher-ranking staff members spent more time in administrative work than staff members who worked with a higher percentage of schizophrenics. Thus, staff members who were occupied extensively with administrative work liked their jobs less and liked working with patients less. Over time, in the words of Maslach, they developed negative attitudes toward patients and spent less time in direct contact with them (Pines and Maslach, 1978:235).

Loosely Structured Organization

In recent findings by Pines and Kafry (1978:501), "significance" was an organizational variable suggested by these researchers as not being found in loosely structured organizations. It was expected that workers who felt that their efforts produced significant effects would prove to be better able to handle work stresses and to avoid tension.

In essence, Pines and Kafry view loose structures in organizations as sources of burnout. Kermish and Kushin, according to Pines and Kafry, studied the reasons for high turnovers in social service staffs and found that the reasons for job dissatisfaction was an inability of workers to help clients, a lack of respect given, and no opportunities for initiative and creativity.
High Frequency of Staff Meetings

High frequency of staff meeting was correlated with very negative and dehumanizing attitudes toward clients. According to Pines and Kafry, it was also correlated with higher average age, higher rank, avoidance of direct contact with patients and a view of the average schizophrenic patient as tending to be bizarre, cruel, cold, uncaring, and not understanding (Pines and Maslach, 1978:235).

Overly Structured Organizations

While it initially seems inappropriate to discuss the tedium of assembly line work in conjunction with higher administrative positions, in both cases organizational control is exerted upon individual workers through structures and routines (Dispatch, Section B-3). According to Perrow (1970:50), every organization of any significant size is bureaucratized to some degree or, to put it differently, exhibits more or less stable patterns of behavior based upon a structure of roles and specialized tasks. Through bureaucratization control of outside influences is sought. Thus, the bureaucratic organization seeks to stabilize and routinize its own processes in the interest of internal efficiency (Perrow, 1970:59). Consequently, bureaucracies in this sense are used synonymously with the phrase "rigid structures" (Perrow, p. 50). To Perrow,
bureaucratization is valuable only up to a certain point; as there are some occasions when the efficiency that bureaucracy produces is not worth the inflexibility, routine, etc.

If we were to compare educational organizations to industrial organizations, we would find when organizational control, which is translated into pressure and rigidity, meets with still another pressure, organizational stresses from the general environment (for example, recession, desegregation, etc.) negative consequences result in both types of organizations. We could maintain that workers in both situations may become alienated because of the stress factors and rigidity that they perceive in the organizational structure. In fact, the same negative consequences would be experienced in rigidly structured educational organizations as on an assembly line. It is possible that the regimentation necessary in running the college or university coupled with organizational stresses may in some cases lead to burnout among those individuals employed by the school administration.

In a recent article, Joseph C. Gies, author of several works on the impact of technology traces the results of changing technological innovations, for example, new tools, new machines, new processes. He suggests that changes affect not only human societies, but also, directly and immediately, the producing workers. He continues by
presenting evidence of how automation in some cases deprived workers of their dignity.

... an observer at a British Trade Union Congress in 1890 recorded the difference in appearance between the old aristocracy of craft unionists, with their respectable dress, often including top hats and watch chains, and the "new" unionists, the shabby, non-descript factory workers. (Section B-3).

He further points out that the "Hawthorne Effect" on worker performance, often invoked by the mere fact that workers were being consulted, asked to cooperate and dealt with as human beings, was reduced by automation and routinization. Modern industrial organizations have tried to reduce this problem. "Flextime," by which workers are allowed to arrange their own schedules within certain limitations, has enjoyed some success (measured in part by a reduction in absenteeism) in a number of American and European plants and offices. Job enrichment, the development of a person within a job function, aimed at combating "anomie," (used here synonymously with burnout) has been successful (Section B-3).

Job Task Overly Repetitive

What Merton, and later Gies, called the boredom of repetitive work, has also had some success. However, the consequences of more radical forms of job enrichment, such as non-assembly-line production of automobiles in Italy and Sweden, are not yet clear (Section B-3).
Vroom in 1964 wrote in his book entitled *Work and Motivation* that specialization has been an important guiding principle in the design of jobs in educational and industrial organizations for optimal productivity (p. 237). According to Vroom, Smith in 1976 noted the causal relationship between specialization and productivity in his statement that "the division of labor, however, so far as it can be introduced, occasions, in every act a proportionable increase of the productive powers of labor (1964:237). Application of such a principle, continued Vroom, has resulted in a substantial increase in the repetitiveness of jobs and a decrease in the number of different operations which a worker performs.

While specialization for the short-term has resulted in an increase in industrial productivity and in increase standards of living, in the long-term it has increased repetitiveness of job tasks resulting in greater dissatisfaction and turnover. Thus, specialization enables organizations to select and place workers in jobs which are most conducive to their particular skills and to train workers in just those skills required for functions which have to be performed in different locations. Specialization, however, over a period of time, takes the variety from work. Supporting this assertion is evidence that frequent rotation of workers from one job to another has resulted in
greater productivity (Vernon and Wyatt, 1924; Wyatt and Fraser, 1928), and that increases in the number of operations performed by workers has resulted in greater productivity (Walker, 1950, 1954; Elliott, 1953; Guest, 1957; Mark reported in Davis, 1957).

Finally, an excessive amount of specialization can eventually decrease productivity while not enough specialization can either increase or decrease productivity.

For, as Dodge and Martin (1970) point out, stress (used here interchangeably with burnout) is a product of specific socially structured situations in the organization of modern technological societies. Furthermore, many work situations are stressful because of their fast, monotonous, repetitive, strenuous pace.

Ferguson (1973) compared seven hundred and fifty (750) Australian telegraphists' absences due to illness rates to that of eight hundred (800) clerks and engineers and three hundred and eighty (380) mail-sorters. In addition, he compared detailed medical examinations of over five hundred (500) telegraphists to those of one hundred and fifty (150) mail-sorters and found that among telegraphists psychosomatic illnesses ranked highest. There were more incidents of peptic ulcers, indigestion, occupational cramp and chronic eczema among telegraphists. Furthermore, the most common attribute of their symptoms was that the job
was often beyond their ability, too fast, excessively noisy and too monotonous.

In all analyses attitudes toward work were found to be more adverse where stress or burnout was higher.

The conclusion reached by Ferguson (1973:60) was that stresses at the place of work were probably adequate to explain many adverse attitudes and to precipitate neurotic reaction.

Thus, he identified causes of stress in the organization environment as monotony, machine-pacing, and highly skilled but repetitive work carried out by telegraphists in noisy conditions.

Fraser (1947) summarized his findings concerning stress on 3,000 male and female employees in thirteen British light and medium engineering factories and stated that stress was derived from boredom and overly structured routines.

Walker and Guest (1952) investigated the relationship between repetitiveness in assembly-line work and job attitudes in American car workers and found that of those performing more than five operations, 69 per cent found their jobs fairly or very interesting. Of those performing two to five operations, 44 percent gave the same responses while of those workers performing a single operation, only 33 per cent felt their work to be fairly or very interesting. Many of these single task workers complained of the repetitive and monotonous nature of their work.
According to Herzberg (1957:39-40), various working conditions promote or demote job satisfaction. Among those conditions considered under wages are, pay, income, salary, earnings, economic factors (such as budgets), profits etc. Herzberg considered "wages" to include all aspects of the job involving present monetary remuneration for work done. In the 1957 study of Herzberg, workers were asked how important wages were to them. From this study it was found that wages ranked number six. To Herzberg the valence of sufficient institutional financial resources was considered to have high positive valence. This can be interpreted to mean that an individual views adequate institutional financial resources as a factor that an individual prefers to attain as opposed to the negative valence of lack of institutional financial resources.

Peak discussed the valence concept in detail and hypothesized that attitudes, such as, affective orientations toward objects, are "related to the end which the object serves." Thus, if an object is believed by a person to lead to desired consequences or to prevent undesired consequences the person is predicted to have a positive attitude toward it. If, on the other hand, the object is believed by the person to lead to undesired consequences or to prevent desired consequences the person is predicted to have
a positive attitude toward it. If, on the other hand, the object is believed by the person to lead to undesired consequences or to prevent desired consequences the person is predicted to have a negative attitude toward it (1957:16). So it is with "Lack of Sufficient Institutional Financial Resources." Individuals view lack of sufficient institutional finances as a negative valence. In conjunction with these negative attitudes was the possibility of an increased stressful situation and finally the burning out of some individuals in the organization.

Poorly Defined Organizational Roles

Research into role conflict and role ambiguity have been conducted by Kahn et al. (1964). According to these researchers roles describe specific forms of behavior associated with given tasks; they develop originally from task requirements. In their pure or organizational form, roles are standardized patterns or behavior required of all persons playing a part in a given functional relationship regardless of personal wishes or interpersonal relations (Warr and Wall, 1975:147).

Many factors combine to determine the role adopted by an individual in his/her work situation. An important influence will be the requirement imposed upon an employee by his superiors. Others influences come from the expectations
of the peers of an individual and subordinates concerning his/her behavior in a given situation.

According to Warr and Wall (1975:178), both role conflict and role ambiguity refer to a degree of uncertainty about what a worker is expected to do on the job. Thus, to these writers, uncertainty of role is just one variable that is related to extreme degrees of stress and eventual burnout.

Most recently White (1978B:7) viewed role ambiguity as one of ten stressors developed from a lack of clear and consistent information necessary to perform the role of an individual in the organization. Role ambiguity may involve a lack of:

1. knowledge of role expectation (what tasks are to be performed),
2. knowledge of the degrees of importance to the organization of varying tasks (priorities),
3. knowledge of the accountability structure (who is the person directly responsible to), and
4. knowledge of the consequences of satisfactory and non-satisfactory role performance (rewards and punishments).

Role ambiguity, to White, consistently emerged as a source of stress and possible burnout for individual workers. The stress generated from role ambiguity was closely related to problems in two other areas (role feedback and role overload).
The research of Lyons (1971:104) on role ambiguity found that when higher perceived role ambiguity was experienced, a stronger job related tension was found among one hundred and fifty-six (156) nurses. This study used a short scale comprised of four items:

1. How clear are you about the limits of your authority in your present job?

2. Do you feel you are always as clear as you would like to be about how you are supposed to do things in this job?

3. Do you feel you are always as clear as you would like to be about what you have to do in this job?

4. In general, how clearly defined are the policies and the various rules and regulations of the hospital that affect your job?

House and Rizzo (1972), with a population of research, development and engineering personnel, investigated the relationship of perceived role ambiguity with measures of job attitudes that did not include the job-tension index. Their results confirmed those already considered. Individuals who experienced greater ambiguity were less satisfied with their work (as measured on eight different indices) and were also more likely to report feelings of fatigue and uneasiness. Similar results were reported by Caplan (1971) and French and Caplan (1973).

With role conflict personality variables have been shown to moderate the relationship between role ambiguity, and job attitudes (Warr and Wall, 1975:154). Kahn et al.
(1964), for instance, found that the need for cognition of
the individual, or a measure of tolerance of ambiguity
(Cohen, Statland and Wolfe, 1955) was important. The rela-
tionship of experienced ambiguity to reported job-related
tension was considerably more pronounced among those with
a high need for cognition. Lyons (1971) reported a compar-
able finding using a measure of "need for clarity," (Warr
and Wall, 1975:155).

Specifically, House and Rizzo (1977), in a study in-
volving two hundred (200) research, development and engin-
eering personnel asked each respondent to describe the
role conflict characteristics of his own position by indi-
cating the degree to which the following kinds of circum-
stances arose. The questions were as follows:

1. Do you receive incompatible requests from
two or more people?

2. Do you have to back a rule or policy in order
to carry out an assignment?

The index of perceived role conflict obtained was found
to be negatively related to measurements of individual sat-
isfaction, and to adequacy of authority, recognition and
job security. Additionally, those experiencing greater con-
lict also reported higher levels of job-induced anxiety,
tension and feelings of general fatigue and uneasiness.

The relevance of personality characteristics to the
experience and effects of role conflict has been considered
Two personality dimensions were found to be important; anxiety and flexibility. Anxiety-prone individuals experienced role conflict more acutely and reacted to it with greater tension than did people who were less anxiety-prone; and more flexible individuals responded to high role conflict with stronger feelings to tension than did their more rigid counterparts. It is interesting to note, however, that Krant (1965) failed to replicate this last finding (Warr and Walls, 1975:153).

In addition to their study of role conflict, Kahn et al. (1964) looked at the second form of stress introduced earlier, that arising from role ambiguity. A role ambiguity index was derived from each of the fifty-three focal persons. The index represented the degree to which the individual felt that his/her role senders made their expectations and evaluations concerning his/her behavior clear to him/her, and the degree to which the content and scope of authority of the job were made explicit. The level of ambiguity reported by individuals was then related to their job attitude and feelings. The results showed that those reporting greater role ambiguity also experienced high job-related tension, lower job satisfaction, a stronger sense of futility, were less trustful of their role senders and felt less self-confident. These results largely mirrored those obtained for role conflict and ambiguity overlapped,
since no substantial empirical relationship between the two indices was obtained. It is rather that both conflict and ambiguity have similarly negative effects.

According to Cohen and March (1974:195-204), educational administrators, in particular, college presidents are always faced with four fundamental ambiguities. The first is the ambiguity of **purpose** which is produced by our insistence on treating purpose as a necessary property of a good university. Purpose is then ambiguous because educational organizations tend to produce goals that are either meaningless or dubious documentation. The second ambiguity is that of **power** in which the amount of power that the organizational leaders delegate to the president is vague. The third, is ambiguity of **experience**, that is, can an experience be useful in different situations. Thus these administrators (educational) tend to be unaware of the extent to which the ambiguities they feel with respect to purpose and power are matched by similar ambiguities with respect to the meaning of the ordinary events of presidential life (p. 201). The fourth and last ambiguity is that of **success**. Because success is measured by promotion and by widely accepted, operational measures of organizational output, the question then is to determine the index that will be used to measure a successful organization in the quality or quantity of its output of both.
Lack of Support from Administrative Superior

In a study by Metz (1979:57) "Lack of Administrative Support" was listed as the fourth major source of professional burnout along with: 1) administrative incompetence, 2) bureaucratization, 3) discipline problems, 5) lack of positive feedback, 6) lack of opportunities for change by choice and 7) powerlessness.

Freudenberg (1977:95), Maslach (1978:236) maintained that administrative support could possibly be understood as well as established by encouraging support systems within the organization. Specifically, administrative support could be obtained in the words of Freudenberg by:

1. Sifting people out—or rather helping them to sift themselves out when volunteers come in offering to help.

2. Helping your trained staff to judge and evaluate the difference between a realistically dedicated or committed person and an unrealistically dedicated person, and by

3. Avoiding sending the same staff member into a given job over and over again.

Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness

Sergiovanni and Carver maintain that decision-making is at the center of administrative and educational activity
and is the key concept in bringing about administrative effectiveness for school executives (1973:231). Sergiovanni and Carver state, judgement skills depend upon four systems and when properly arranged in the mind of the individual, application to educational problems take the form of an intellectual or mental system approach. Within this approach are four systems: 1) the Belief System, 2) the Human System, 3) the Organizational System and 4) the Action System. The first three systems, according to these writers, are substantive in nature in that their complex interdependence forms the model structure, the theoretical approach, and the content through which school executives move in developing action strategies for administrative effectiveness.

But what happens when an organization is disorganized to the extent that the organization blocks and/or prevents administrative effectiveness? In the words of Cohen and March all educational organizations are organized anarchies, that is, they operate on a number of inconsistencies such as problematic preferences, fluid participation, and unclear technology which leads eventually to unclear goals. Viewing educational organizations as organized anarchies implies that administrative effectiveness is hampered. Thus, if the organization is disorganized to an extreme degree, time, energy and efforts are lost in each attempt to resolve problems that "crop up." The results of such
disorganization could possibly serve to place an undue amount of wear and tear on the organizational members and leaders. The final result over a period of time could be the burning out of administrators and members.

Nevertheless, it is the responsibility of the organizational leader to make sure that the organization is operating effectively through proper coordination and scheduling of organizational units. Thus, leadership becomes an important aspect of administrative effectiveness.

**Work Overload**

French and Caplan, studying occupational stress at the Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan have done extensive research on the effects of the organizational work environment on psychological and physiological variables; the effect of organizational stress on individual strain (Pines and Aronson, et al., 1981:67-68).

Pines, Aronson, et al. use the concept of role overload as a key variable in job stress and its effect on health. Pines and Aronson continue on by stating that French and Caplan distinguished objective from subjective overload by noting that objective overload denotes the actual volume of information that the individuals are expected to process per unit of time (for example, the number of telephone calls to answer, letters to write, office visit to receive, etc.), whereas subjective
overload, in contrast, refers to people believing that they have too much work to do or that the work is too hard for them. Quantitative overload implies that they have more work than they can do in a given time period. Thus, individuals experience quantitative overload when they have the skills necessary to perform the tasks but do not have the time to get them done. Individuals have qualitative overload when, no matter how much time they are given, they do not have the skills to perform the tasks at acceptable levels.

In a national survey, 44 percent of male white-collar employees reported that many of them suffer from a quantitative overload that is mostly self-induced and related to their achievement orientation (Lipowski, 1975:199-221). Lipowski also noted another study of university professors which showed that many of them suffer from a quantitative overload that was mostly self-induced and related to their achievement orientation. In a study by Pines and Aronson, 724 human service workers were asked to identify the most stressful aspects of their work. Over 50% of the stresses mentioned pertained to overload.

Another problem confronting the administrator is frustration about completing the job because administrators take pride in a job well done. Unfortunately, because of pressures stemming from large loads of work and mandatory
deadlines, they are frequently unable to complete all projects (Daley, 1979:377).

According to Pines and Aronson, both quantitative and qualitative overload are correlated with psychological and physiological indices of stress. Overloaded subjects show increased heart rate and serum cholesterol levels, they smoke more, have more job dissatisfaction and tension, and show lower self-esteem (French and Kaplan, 1973).

Pines and Maslach (1978:236) found that staff members working with only the more seriously ill patients seem to burnout more easily, thus sharing the load of the more difficult patients by rotation of staff between wards and by work-sharing are two ways of taking some pressure off staff members and of making their jobs more varied and stimulating. In Pines and Kafry study of 1978, caseload was positively correlated with tedium (.21), and with the development of negative attitudes toward the agency (.24), and wanting to leave the agency (.25). Caseload was negatively correlated with liking the job (-.28), liking the agency (-.21) and with overall job satisfaction (-.29). (In all preceding correlations there was a significance difference of .05 (p. 237).

Finally Pines and Aronson suggest that organizations can reduce employee overload by defining their priorities for employees. The priority list includes both internal
organizational goals and more general goals such as service to the public and a good image for the organization. A priority list for work activities can also ease overload. Thus, the basic strategy is to help people live with overload, set priorities, and reduce the stress caused by worry or guilt. Finally, when overload is accepted as a necessary evil and is not accompanied by worry and strain, it is coped with more easily.

Demographical Factors

In the Metz study of 1979 it was found that more males between the ages of 30 and 49 were in the burnout group. Educational level has a minor predictive power on burnout. Master's degree level people tend to burnout less frequently than workers with lower degrees (Berkeley Planning Associates, 1977:5) (Price, 1977:28-29,35). According to Edelwich (1980:24) professionals with doctorates enjoy good pay, job security, and a sense of security in their professional standing; they do face the problems of work overloads, isolation, doubts about the value of their work, and possible family and health problems that may lead to burnout.

Pines and Maslach (1978:235-236) found that lower-ranked staff members had more direct contact with patients while higher-ranked staff members enjoyed less contact with people. Thus, lower-ranked staff members attitudes
toward work, patients and the setting tended to change negatively in time.

In a study of Herzberg on "factors related to job attitudes" working conditions were found to be substantially more important to women than men. One of the consistent findings of Herzberg was that intrinsic aspects of the job were more important to employees with greater education and to employees at higher occupational levels. On the other hand, security appears to be less important to these same employees. Furthermore, the influence of age was most important with increased age. Wage factors also increased in importance with age, and opportunities for advancement were considered more important to the more intelligent while social aspects and wages were emphasized by those of lower I.Q.

Unger summarized the list of personal sources of burnout of Spaniol and Caputo (1979:4-8) as:

- Not setting limits;
- Not paying attention to our own needs and wants;
- Not communicating our feelings;
- Isolating ourselves physically and psychologically;
- Political nature of work;
- Powerlessness;
- Ignoring positive attention from others;
- Lack of professional identity;
- Lack of professional survival skills;
Inability to live with the 'grey areas' of life;
Also Spaniol and Caputo found that there were sources of organizational burnout such as:
Not including staff in making policy procedures;
Lack of a structure that allows people to share strong positive and negative feelings;
Lack of positive feedback;
Lack of ability to personalize workspace;
Not sharing wants and needs and not encouraging others to do the same;
Lack of adequate supervision;
Dead-end jobs;
Lack of skill-based training;
Few external rewards;
Limited vacation time;
High client/staff ratio (Unger, 1980:64-65).

In summary the basis for burnout is enormous. Consequently, what causes burnout in one person may be a challenge motivating another. It is unlikely that a single approach will be effective in its prevention. However, waiting for signs of burnout to appear before taking action will probably doom the effort to failure (Unger, 1980:65).

Thus, Larson (1978:565) and Sergiovanni and Carver (1973:231) maintain that it is the responsibility of management to set the tone for staff, and to reconstruct the environment or the organizational structure so as to
prevent the burning out of individuals in an organization. Managers must be willing to allow, indeed to encourage, staff to work within a nurturing as well as functional environment. There must be a commitment to the need for group identification, individuality, autonomy and self-respect of professionals and clients. Thus, it is up to the manager, then, to structure the work environment to allow staff differentiation, if not to set the stage for its occurrence (Unger:1980:65).

SUMMARY

For the purpose of research and study, burnout has been analyzed in terms of individual and organizational characteristics. In this chapter, a review of pertinent literature indicated a multitude of personal and situational factors are related to burnout within an organizational setting.

Identification and verification of such factors is a critical first step in alleviating burnout in our increasingly service providing society. Cognizance of burnout characteristics by administrators can result in preventative or corrective measures being applied in cases of individual or organizational dysfunction.

Using the burnout characteristics discussed in this chapter as a basis, this researcher developed a methodology to investigate burnout within the context of higher
educational administration. The design and implementation of this methodology is discussed in the next chapter.
According to Kerlinger (1964:416), the research design for survey research is a "flow plan" used to outline the design and subsequent implementation of a survey. The first step of these plans already has been executed. This chapter is concerned with presenting this flow of plans. Thus, this chapter describes the research design: the sample, instrumentation, interviewing procedures, interviewing, data collection, reliability testing, construct validity testing, and data analysis.

The Setting

This investigation was conducted as a doctoral research project in cooperation with the Department of Educational Administration at The Ohio State University in the Fall Quarter of the 1981-82 academic year. The Ohio State University was established as a land-grant university in Columbus, Ohio in 1870, and was opened in 1873. Currently it is comprised of eight undergraduate colleges, a graduate school, and professional schools of law, medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, and optometry. A
number of characteristics pertinent to the nature of the administration of these areas for the academic quarter during which this investigation occurred have been released by The Department of Personnel Services and should provide some insight in the setting of this study.

According to the Department of Personnel Service at The Ohio State University, during the Spring Quarter of the 1980-81 academic year, there was a total of nineteen (19) Deans, twenty-eight (28) Associate Deans, one hundred and seventeen (117) Department Chairpersons, thirty-six (36) Assistant Deans, and one hundred and fifty-five (155) Program Directors. Of this 355 total, one hundred and ninety-six administrators made up the population of Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans and Department Chairpersons. From this population, one hundred and thirty administrators, [(sixteen (16) Deans, nineteen (19) Associate Deans, twenty-three (23) Assistant Deans, seventy-two (72) Departmental Chairpersons)] comprised the sample used in this study.

Population and Sample

The investigator studied, as a sample, the entire population of Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans, and Department Chairpersons of the total population of 355 administrators at The Ohio State University during the Autumn of the 1981-82 academic year. The sample group consisted of one hundred and ninety-six (196) administrators,
nearly two-thirds of the entire population of 355 administrators. This sample was purposefully selected in the assumption that all members in the sample would represent most appropriately the academic segment of administrators at this educational organization. Program Directors were excluded because they were involved in academic and non-academic employment.

Consequently, the study sample consisted of all Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans, and Department Chairpersons in the seventeen colleges at The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. The Ohio State University was selected because of the following perceived advantages to the researcher:

1. Potential cooperation from the academic administrators at The Ohio State University, as there was no reason to believe that administrators in higher education at this institution were any different from other administrators in other universities.

2. Potential cooperation of the personnel department, Deans of colleges, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans and Department Chairpersons. Moreover, the concept of burnout is an extremely sensitive issue, one on which many administrators would be reluctant to express their views. However, because of the close working
relationship that The Ohio State University community has with its members, and its research orientation, the potential for cooperation was thereby enhanced.

3. Potential for enhancing the content validity of the instrument based on the responses of administrators from The Ohio State University.

INSTRUMENTATION

The initial stage of instrument construction consisted of reviewing, recording, and selecting items for the biographical information section and the assessment section. This research believed that these items should reflect the essence of the facet they were designed to capture. For example, the demographical information items, much of Part I, was a result of the research efforts of Maslach (1980). However, the format of the biographical information section was a result of the efforts of Wagstaff and Moore's (1979) questionnaire designed to assess the responses of Blacks on White campuses. In Part II, the assessment instrument items, such as "Insufficient Time Off," were classified by the literature as an organizational factor that were thought to contribute to individual burnout. After items were derived from the literature, two field tests were conducted. The information gathered from the two field tests served to enhance the content validity of the instrument by making
vague items more precise. Thus, the survey instrument (questionnaire) to be field tested was developed as follows:

1. characteristics which would describe persons suffering from burnout were derived from the literature;

2. organizational variables that appear to contribute to burnout were derived from the literature;

3. directions to respondents were prepared asking them to:
   a. identify the organizational variables that they perceived to contribute to individual burnout, item by item;
   b. assess those organizational variables that they perceived to contribute the least or the most to the burning out of individuals.

4. The two field tests described above were conducted.

In summary, the field tests of the instrument were conducted to assess the instrument's accuracy and preciseness in identifying organizational characteristics that are most and least related to individual burnout, and to provide an initial estimate of the instrument's clarity. The field tests were conducted using a purposiveful sample of selected educational administrators; specifically, the
doctoral committee of the researcher and six (6) other educational administrators from other institutions. These administrators were asked to complete the questionnaire and to note how long it took them to complete the instrument. (For a more thorough explanation of the type of information that was asked of those in the field test, please review Appendix F.)

In conjunction with the burnout instrument, a biographical information section was developed by modifying the Moore and Wagstaff (1974) instrument that was used to survey Blacks on White campuses. The questionnaire was refined in response to reactions to the instrument during the field tests.

During the field test, the doctoral committee members and six (6) other educational administrators from other institutions were asked to assist in providing an initial estimate of the content validity of the instrument. Each sample field test administrator (10) was sent a letter and an instrument (Appendix G) or test booklet which contained a set of general instructions that guided him/her through the task (See Appendix G). They were to note the amount of time it took to complete the entire booklet and to record the amount of time needed to complete the entire task in the appropriate space located in the lower right hand corner of the last page of the booklet. Several days
later, the sample administrators (10) were contacted for an interview appointment. On the day of the interview, the materials sent to them were collected and their reactions to the instrument were recorded, along with any other comments or suggestions on how to make the instrument more relevant, explicit, accurate, and precise.

From the information collected in the field test, the instrument was refined. During the second step of this investigation, one hundred and ninety-six administrators from academia were surveyed at The Ohio State University through the campus mail. One hundred and ninety-eight administrators: seventeen (17) Deans, twenty-eight (28) Associate Deans, one hundred and seventeen (117) Department Chairpersons, and thirty-six (36) Assistant Deans were asked to complete the assessment instrument and to return the booklet as soon as possible.

Of the one hundred and ninety-eight administrators surveyed, one hundred and fourteen respondents completed and returned the instrument. In addition, several instruments were returned unanswered with notes stating or indicating that such a person was no longer with that particular department due to death or retirement from the position.

During the second mailed survey, a second instrument was sent to non-respondents with an attached note which read, "If you already responded to the first instrument
please overlook this instrument." Ten administrators com­
pleted and returned the second instrument. With this addi­
tion, the total number of administrators who responded to 
the instrument was one hundred and twenty-six, a 62% return. 
From the second administration, several instruments were 
returned with notes stating or indicating that such a 
person was no longer holding such a position.

Specifically, when employing a mailed questionnaire,
double sampling is sometimes used to obtain a more rep­
resentative sample. This precaution was taken as some 
respondents did not return their instruments. It was thought 
that the missing data could have biased the results of the 
study if people who failed to reply to the query differed 
in some fundamental way from the other subjects in respect 
to the phenomena being studied. To eliminate this bias, a 
second sample was drawn at random from the non-respondents 
and interviewed. This was done in an effort to avoid non-
response error that could have later possibly prevented 
generalizing back to the population. Thus, six adminis­
trators were randomly selected and interviewed from the 
62 non-respondents. The data gathered from these six non-
respondents were compared with six (6) randomly selected 
respondents; a test of significance was computed on these 
groups (6 respondents and 6 non-respondents) which indi­
cated that the two groups did not differ significantly.
Thus, the number of the sample totaled one hundred and thirty (130). Of that number, sixteen (16) were Deans, nineteen (19) were Associate Deans, twenty-three (23) were Assistant Deans and seventy-two (72) were Department Chairpersons.

Selection of Assessment Items

Organizational burnout factors and individual burnout factors were used as items on the Instrument For Assessing Organizational Factors That Are Related To Administrative Burnout or the IAAB. These items were selected through a review of the literature, and information obtained from two interview sessions or pilot tests with the four (4) doctoral committee members of this researcher and six (6) higher educational administrators drawn from other institutions.

Compilation of Development Pool

Assessment items which were applicable as organizational burnout factors, as reported by the literature, were selected from the following: 1) organizational burnout factors labeled institutional variables by Pine and Maslach (1978:233-237) in their research study on "Characteristics of Staff Burnout in Mental Health Settings"; and, 2) Metz's organizational factors found in her research dissertation entitled, "An Exploratory Study of
Individual burnout factors were found in a dissertation written by Unger (1980:129) entitled, "Superintendent Burn-Out: Myth or Reality." In this dissertation Unger summarized the personal burnout factors found in the research of Bies, Cherniss, Daley, Edelwich, Freudenberger, Gillespie, Kahn, Lagna, Maslach and Mattingly.

In addition, biographical or demographical data items were developed using a modified version of the Moore and Wagstaff (1974) instrument and the Maslach and Jackson Burnout Inventory (1979).

Reduction or Additions of Developmental Pool

Four (4) doctoral committee members of the researcher and six (6) educational organizational leaders from other institutions (panel of experts) reviewed and completed the assessment instrument. This researcher anticipated that by completing the instrument, ambiguous, inaccurate and/or repetitive items would be eliminated as well as items added. These administrators were asked to determine structural characteristics that contributed the most or the least to the burning out of individuals. Finally, through general consensus, items agreed upon by all would serve as structural assessment items for evaluating organizational structures most likely to burn out administrators.
The background information instructions suggested that the respondents place a check mark in the section to the right which would indicate a response to the statements of the questionnaire. The instructions to the assessment instrument noted a set of characteristics of persons suffering from burnout in the horizontal column across the top of the instrument and a set of organizational variables that appeared to contribute to burnout could be seen in the vertical column. The administrators were then asked to begin with the vertical item of "Insufficient Time Off" and across all horizontal items that they agreed were related to "Insufficient Time Off." All eighteen vertical items were to be completed in the same manner. After completing items 1-9 and items 10-18, the respondents were then asked to indicate in the lower right-hand space provided on the last page of the booklet how much time it took them to complete the entire booklet. Completion time was important at this point, as it could later assist in producing a more accurate, clear and precise instrument, which in turn could promote a greater return of the instrument and less measurement error.

The consensus method of elimination and additions resulted in thirty-five (35) assessment items for inclusion in The Instrument For Assessing Organizational Factors That Are Related To Administrative Burnout (See Appendix G).
Development of Assessment Items

The thirty-five (35) assessment items selected by the four doctoral committee members and six (6) educational administrators from other institutions were randomized and placed in a booklet form with the abbreviation and title of the instrument comprising the front cover. "About This Instrument" explained the nature and purpose of the instrument. Specifically, the instrument was constructed to survey the perceptions educational administrators had toward organizational factors or structures that could contribute to the burning out of administrators. The instrument was not designed to be a personality inventory, an interest inventory, an achievement test, or an aptitude test. Rather, it was designed as a device that should identify those structures that impact negatively upon its organizational leaders. The instrument consisted of two parts which were designed to assess perceptions of educational leaders of organizational structures. In addition, comments were solicited by means of an inserted question. This inserted question asked respondents to include any items that they viewed as significant to this study that were not included. Finally, its overall purpose was to determine if certain organizational structural items had a negative impact on individuals.
Construct Validity

While there was no formal step-by-step procedure for demonstrating the construct validity of a measure, a num­ber of methods existed which, when taken in combination, could have offered strong support for the validity of the measure (Breaugh, 1977:9). The methods outlined below were suggested by Cronbach (1970, Magusson (1967), and Runkel and McGrath (1972). They were not intended to be all inclusive (Cronbach and Meehl, 1955 and Breaugh, 1977).

The construct validity of a measure can be estab­lished by:

1. examining the correlation between different tests which are assumed to measure the same construct;

2. examining the correlation between items making up the overall measure to the extent test items exhibit high internal consistency on the same construct;

3. factor analyzing the existing measure to see if the predicted pattern of loading is, indeed, exhibited;

4. analyzing whether the pattern of relationship one would expect between the given construct and other variables actually exists between the operationalization of this construct and measures of the other variables;

5. a comparison of the convergence of different methods of measuring the same construct;

6. studying whether differences exist between groups which should differ according to the theory of the construct;
7. evaluating the degree to which the operationalization of the construct appears to logically map the underlying variable. Locke (1975) has stressed the importance of meeting this criterion; he labels it "Logical Validity." (Bureagh, 1977:9).

To obtain construct validity, this researcher chose to examine the correlations between items making up the overall measure and by evaluating the degree to which the operationalization of the construct appears to logically map the underlying variable which establishes also content or logical validity.

For the purpose of developing this instrument, items were selected from a review of the literature, recommendation of respondents and doctoral committee members.

Tests of Reliability

Synonyms for reliability are: dependability, stability, consistency, predictability, accuracy (Kerlinger, 1973:442). Thus, reliability is the accuracy or precision of a measuring instrument. There are several types of reliability coefficients. They may be obtained by:

1. Alternative Forms Reliability or Parallel-Forms Reliability;
2. Split-Half Reliability;
3. Test-Retest;
4. Kuder Richardson Form (20 and 21) or Rational Equivalence Reliability; and the
5. Cronbach Alpha.

In this study the Guttman Split-Half and the Cronbach Alpha Tests of reliability were used. This investigator anticipated that such an effort would assist in establishing reliability, that is, under the same condition, using the same procedures, the information obtained would be consistent and reliable.

Specifically, these measures of reliability would be obtained by determining whether the two halves of this assessment instrument would measure organizational characteristics that were related to individual burnout. This method required only one form and one administration of the instrument. The test was subsequently divided into two parts by the computer, presumably equivalent halves, usually odd numbered items constituted one half and even-numbered items the other. Scores were then obtained for each respondent on each half of the test, and the two sets of scores are correlated.

If the correlation coefficient (r) computed between the two halves of the test is, for example r=.70, this statistic represents the reliability of the instrument only half as long as the total instrument and would underestimate the reliability of the total instrument (Van Dalen, 1979:139). This problem arose because reliability was related to the length of the instrument: generally,
the longer the instrument, the more reliable the instrument, because the greater length permits a more stable sample of the respondents' possession of a property. Thus, the split-half reliability coefficient was entered into the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula to obtain an estimate of the reliability of the whole test. This formula then gave an estimate of what the reliability was if each half of the instrument were twice as long (1979: 140). However, the Crobach Alpha accounts for this correction factor automatically. That is, such a factor is built into its formula. (See Tables 17 and 18 on pages 163 and 164.

Dependent Variables

As evidence of the construct validity of the instrument for Assessing Organizational Factors That Are Related To Administrative Burnout (IAAB), a number of dependent variables were selected for examination (See Appendix for specific individual items).

Although no existing instrument closely paralleled the conceptualization of the researcher on organizational factors related to individual burnout, items were selected as well as the organizational items of Maslach, Cherniss, Kahn, Daley, Pines and Kafry, Emener, and Gillespie and Cohen.
In an effort to estimate reliability, a Cronbach's Alpha Program and Guttman Split-Half was computed using the SPSS Statistical Program Package. This statistical analysis technique was designed to indicate statistically if the instrument measures what it measured consistently.

In summary, these particular organizational factors or independent variables were chosen because of their predicted relationships with individual burnout of the dependent variables. Moreover, the data were gathered from three different sources; (for example, the doctoral committee of the researcher, six other educational administrators from surrounding institutions, and one hundred and ninety-six respondents), thus, reducing the chances of method bias. Furthermore, an examination of the specific items demonstrates logical or content validity (Locke, 1975). Given the strengths of the instrument (for example, multiple sources, high reliability coefficients, moderately high to moderate correlation coefficients) these variables when taken together provided a reasonable test of the construct validity of the instrument.
Interviews

As reported earlier in this study, the first part of this chapter dealt with the process of obtaining information about organizational factors that were related to administrative burnout from a total of one hundred and ninety-six educational administrators.

Ten (10) administrators were interviewed using an open-ended semi-structured interview schedule which queried fifteen questions (See Appendix F). Six of the respondents were the doctoral committee members of the research. Interviews were conducted between the dates of August-October, 1981. All interviewees agreed to be tape recorded. Moreover, the length of the shortest interview session was thirty minutes and the longest was one (1) hour and fifteen minutes. The average interview length was thirty-five minutes. Subjects were characterized as varying in characteristics. Three subjects were black males, three were white females and four were white males. The interviews were open-ended, thus allowing respondents to define their feelings in their own terms (Lofland, 1971:76). The interview guide (See Appendix F) "Administrative Burnout Interview Schedule" consisted originally of sixteen questions that were later revised to total only fifteen questions.
Specifically, an interview schedule that queried fifteen informational questions (See Appendix F) was designed to assess the accuracy and preciseness of the instrument in identifying organizational characteristics that most or least related to individual burnout and to provide an initial estimate of the clarity of the instrument. Moreover, a purposiveful sample of administrators from other institutions was obtained by this researcher, during the months of July-August, 1981. During the month of July, 1981, an initial visit was made to the office of each respondent to seek approval for their participation in the study, to assure them of anonymity, inform them of interview plans and to determine the time of their availability. The nature of the study was explained; furthermore, the purpose of the research and reason why their input was important was conveyed. Consequently, a brief telephone conversation confirmed the approaching interview appointment. While interviewing, the technique of probing was often employed to motivate the respondents to enlarge, clarify and/or explain the rationale behind what was stated. This process was utilized to assist respondents in focusing on specific content and to avoid irrelevant and unnecessary information. This technique was used throughout the interviewing period in an effort
to obtain the full meaning of the respondents answers. This researcher guarded not only verbal behaviors, but nonverbal behavior which could have influenced the answers of the respondents while probing. Thus, a total of ten persons were queried on the same series of questions assuring a uniformity of data.

The interviewer tape recorded each interview after obtaining permission from the respondent. These recordings were transcribed later by the researcher. This researcher further sought to analyze and summarize the information obtained from the interviews. Consequently, Content Analysis was applied to the information obtained from the interviews.

In summary, two field tests were conducted. The first involved the four doctoral committee members of this researcher. The second field test was held with six (6) higher educational administrators drawn from other institutions. These field tests refined and enhanced the quality of the instrument and the data produced through its administration. The trial group of administrators gave their opinions on the length of the questionnaire, amount of time required, clarity of items, relevancy and ways for improving the instrument. These interviews determined to some degree the extent to which the directions were clear, and if the tasks required of respondents could, in fact, be done.
The following data were collected during the interviews and subjected to content analysis. Like statements were grouped so that response patterns could be identified and reported. The notation of frequency with which particular responses were given, and the categories of responses that emerged from each question are as follows:

1. Did "About This Instrument" inform you of the nature of this assessing instrument?
   If not explain.
   All ten administrators responded "yes" and none responded "no." However, two field test administrators in the second field test made suggestions for improving the written presentation "About This Instrument."

2. Were the instructions at the beginning of the instrument clear?
   All administrators responded that the instruction at the beginning of the instrument were clear, however, one noted that this researcher should omit the statement "a few statements require a different response," but they are self-explanatory; as he could not find a statement that did not require a check mark.

3. What should be added to the instructions?
   All administrators (ten) indicated that they had no additional comments to add to the instructions.

4. Should any variable be added or left off the instrument?
All respondents maintained that the background question covered, in general, basic information related to personal factors that are related to burnout. However, one respondent sought further explanations on the definition of religion. One respondent viewed salaries and past socioeconomic background as major factors that contributed to burnout, for some individuals' backgrounds were highly stressful, as these individuals' coping skills may exceed others. Plus, salaries could be thought of as nominal rewards that could be a retardent for the burning out of individuals.

5. In your opinion are there other factors or variables that should be added to the original fourteen statements.

All respondents maintained that question number four (4) was similar to question five and in answering number four (4), number five would be answered also.

6. Did the fourteen items under background information cover all information needed in relationship to factors that burn out individuals.

All respondents suggested that questions four (4) and five (5) covered this question, however, this question was needed as it sought certain specific information.
7. Which statement or items under background information should be included but were not?

All 10 respondents in both field tests answered "no."

8. Were there any statements or items under background information that you considered to be misleading?

All respondents answered "none" with one exception, statement ten (10). Statement ten (10) was questioned on the basis that varying interpretations that each person has as to their own definition of religion could possibly contaminate the data. This item was later excluded because of its vagueness and possible misinterpretations.

9. In Part two (2) of this survey instrument, are the instructions clear?

All respondents informed this researcher that reading this portion was time-consuming, as certain information and examples should be given to clarify what is being sought.

For example:

1. In "Please Notice That" on the next page should be placed in front of sixteen characteristics of persons . . . .

2. An example should be placed at the bottom of these instructions alerting the respondents that check marks should be placed in a left to right manner.
10. Is "Please Notice That" and "You Are To" necessary?

All respondents in the second pilot test indicated that the items were essential to understanding what is expected of the respondents.

11. Are there variables that are unclear?
Are there variables that need to be explained further?

All respondents noted typographical errors in individual characteristics I and P. One respondent noted that items I and P were unclear. Furthermore, "Lack of Financial Resources" was questioned as to whether it included salaries. Thus, item seventeen (17) was changed to read "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources.

12. Are there variables that should be included?
List them.

All respondents in the two field test perceived that they had no items to add.

13. Please indicate if you hold tenure in a department.

All respondents suggested that this question be omitted as statement number fourteen (14) covered this question.

14. Please indicate which of the following best describes your relations to the department.
All respondents agreed that this question should be omitted.

15. What are your reactions to the ability of this instrument to assess organizational structural items related to individual burnout?

All respondents in the second field test suggested that this question should be omitted and substituted with "Are there any overall general comments?"

Assessment of Instrument by Field Test Administrators

All eighteen organizational characteristics obtained through a search of the literature were selected for inclusion in the IAAB by all field test administrators. Item 15, "Lack of Financial Resources," was not clear in the field tests one and two. Three field test administrators questioned whether monies referred to the salaries of the administrators or the funds of the institution. Consequently, item 14 was changed to read "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources." Item 1, "No Time Out" was questioned as well. Suggestions were made and accepted that would clarify the item to read "Insufficient Time-Off" instead of "No Time Out." Finally, administrators in the second pilot test agreed that "Feelings of Frustrations" should be included as an individual characteristic.
Data Collection

The data were collected through the use of surveys (See Appendix F). This data collecting method was attempted to measure the perception of educational administrators on organizational factors that could possibly contribute to administrative burnout.

1. Four (4) doctoral committee members were interviewed for practice purposes as well as to obtain constructive criticism of the interview schedule's clarity, preciseness and effectiveness.

2. Six (6) administrators from other higher educational organizations were interviewed as a second field test for the purpose of obtaining information that should improve the instrument.

3. The names of all Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans, and Department Chairpersons were provided by the personnel department of The Ohio State University.

4. All of the above were mailed a letter requesting their participation in the survey.

5. Subjects were requested to respond within five to seven days and to return the questionnaire in envelopes which were provided.

6. At the end of the given time designated for respondents to respond (5-7 days) follow-up
letters were sent to respondents reminding them to complete the questionnaires and to return them in the self-addressed envelopes provided.

7. Personal telephone calls were made to non-respondents after three (3) weeks if the questionnaires were not returned in response to the follow-up letters.

8. A sample of non-respondents, six (6) were interviewed and their responses compared; a test of significant differences verified that the non-respondents were no different from the respondents.

Analysis of Instrument Data

The completed IAAB Assessment Instrument for one hundred and twenty-four (124) respondents were returned to this researcher. Also, the six non-respondents' responses were included in the data analysis as well. These one hundred and thirty (130) instruments were checked in an effort to determine if all information requested was completed.

The information obtained from the inserted comment sheets was subjected to Quantitative Content Analysis. The information most often left vacant in Part I of the instrument was question five (5), "What is the type of administrative position that you hold?" The respondents were to check "line," or "staff." If this was found unanswered, the information was supplied by the researcher. Therefore,
there were no missing data to consider. The instrument was then coded so that it could be reproduced on key punch cards. This process resulted in a data deck with all the necessary information for analysis using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) and the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). Output from the SAS Program included the following:

1. variable means for each of the items on the IAAB;
2. variable frequencies and percentages for Part I;
3. variable standard deviations for each of the items on the IAAB;
4. Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficients for all items on Part II on the IAAB;
5. Step-wise Regression Analysis for items on Part II;
6. Cluster Analysis on all items in Part II; and
7. Analysis of Variance on the items by groups.

Output from the SPSS Program included the following:
1. A Cronbachs Alpha for testing the reliability of the items in Part II; and
2. A Guttman Split-Half for reliability testing.

Frequencies, means (measures of central tendencies) and standard deviations for the eighteen organizational and seventeen individual characteristics were computed and analyzed in order to understand their similarities or differences and variability.
Percentages were calculated and analyzed to reduce different sets of numbers to a comparable set of numbers with a common base. Simply, frequencies were transformed into percentages in order to facilitate statistical manip­ulation and interpretation (Kerlinger, 1973:152).

To better understand organizational characteristics that related to individual characteristics that perceptions of educational administrators on these two sets of characteristics were measured by the total scores on the IAAB and correlated. All items on Part I and Part II were, therefore, included in the computation of all coefficients. A two-tailed test of statistical significance was applied to each coefficient. From the correlation coefficients inference was made as to the direction and magnitude of the relationships. Thus, the organizational burnout factors were assessed and correlated to determine the degree of association that organizational characteristics have with individual characteristics, that is, the relationships and magnitudes of these relationships. While correlations do not directly establish a causal relationship, it could furnish clues to causes (Hopkin and Glass, 1978:146).

Furthermore, Kerlinger, 1973:324 interpreted correlation coefficients to range from:

- $r = \pm .00$ to $\pm .20$, negligible relationship
- $r = \pm .20$ to $\pm .40$, low relationship
- $r = \pm .40$ to $\pm .70$, marked or moderate relationship
- $r = \pm .70$ to $\pm 1.00$, high to very high relationship
Specifically, Stepwise Regression was used to classify an item as a member in "The Most Burnout Category" or "The Least Burnout Category." Thus, it was appropriate to enter the independent variables (all eighteen [18] organizational characteristics) one by one on the basis of the pre-established statistical criteria calculated by the computer program. This procedure was used because this researcher wished to isolate a subset of available predictor variables that would yield an optimal predictions equation with as few terms as possible. Thus, the independent variables were entered only if they met certain statistical criteria. The order of inclusion was determined by the respective contribution of each variable to explain variance.

According to Kerlinger (1973:574) if two concepts are close together in semantic space, they are alike in meaning for the individual or group making the judgement. Conversely, if they are separated in semantic space they differ in meaning. Thus, cluster analysis measures the distance between the concepts to determine which concepts are closest to the other in meaning.

Simply, this method identified clusters of like organizational items by finding interrelated groups of correlation coefficients.
The Analysis of Variance was used to compare the means of organizational characteristics among four administrative groups.

The final step dealt with the tabulation and reporting of certain demographical data of the four groups responding to Part I of the IAAB. At that point each group was described and tables were presented that should have indicated and identified the percentage and frequency of responses on certain organizational characteristics thought to contribute the least and most to burnout. A total of three background informational items were used per table.

SUMMARY

The design, instrumentation and procedure for the study were discussed in this chapter. The presentation included the selection of the instrument items; construction of the IAAB; tests of construct validity; tests of reliability; and methods of data analyses.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to identify organizational characteristics that educational administrators perceived to promote individual burnout. This chapter is concerned with a discussion of the analysis and interpretation of data collected to understand the perceptions of educational administrators toward organizational factors which were thought to contribute the most and least to individual burnout.

THE INSTRUMENT FOR ASSESSING ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS THAT ARE RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE BURNOUT

The IAAB instrument consisted of 35 items. Eighteen of these items were organizational factors which were thought to contribute to individual burnout and seventeen of these items were individual burnout characteristics as reported from the literature. Furthermore, administrators in this sample were asked to place additional organizational items that they considered as contributors to individual burnout on a separate sheet inserted in the instrument.
Correlation of Each Organizational Item to Individual Items

The Pearson-Product Moment correlation coefficient was computer calculated for each item on the IAAB. The correlation coefficients are presented by item numbers in Tables 4 and 5. Assessment items which exhibited the highest internal consistency (.60 or higher) on the same construct were singled out (See Tables 4 and 5). On an average, all organizational characteristics correlated moderately (.40 to .70) to high (.70) with all individual characteristics of burnout (A-P). Specifically, "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.56); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.53); "Lack of Enthusiasm," item F (.52); "Feeling Alienated," item B (.51); and, "Extremely Disorganized," item K (.52) correlated highest with "Insufficient Time Off," item 1.

"Feeling Alienated," item B (.70); "Feeling of Anger and Resentment," item L (.64); "Feelings of Frustration," item Q (.64); item B (.63); and "Lowered Self-Concepts," item A (.59) correlated highest with "Lack of Direction," item 2.

"Lack of Enthusiasm," item F (.68); "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.67); "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession," item I (.66); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.65), "Extremely Disorganized," item K (.63); and "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.61); correlated
**TABLE 4**

Correlation Coefficients of the Eighteen Organizational Characteristics with the Seventeen Individual Characteristics

N=130

| Organizational Characteristic | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
| 1 Insufficient Time off     | .40 | .51 | .48 | .38 | .49 | .52 | .45 | .44 | .50 | .53 | .51 | .56 | .32 | .46 | .44 | .42 | .38 |
| 2 Lack of Direction         | .59 | .68 | .58 | .28 | .58 | .69 | .34 | .32 | .54 | .63 | .52 | .64 | .31 | .60 | .60 | .30 | .64 |
| 3 Lack of Proper Organization | .54 | .64 | .53 | .38 | .56 | .68 | .39 | .33 | .66 | .61 | .63 | .65 | .30 | .57 | .67 | .41 | .63 |
| 4 Insufficient Number of     | .60 | .64 | .65 | .30 | .67 | .71 | .48 | .41 | .62 | .70 | .56 | .67 | .30 | .68 | .63 | .42 | .54 |
| Staff Members to Accomplish |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 5 Unfavorable/ Goal Amalgamity | .61 | .67 | .64 | .42 | .66 | .74 | .51 | .48 | .69 | .73 | .66 | .69 | .43 | .64 | .69 | .42 | .57 |
| 6 High Client Ratio to      | .51 | .50 | .51 | .22 | .50 | .32 | .49 | .49 | .66 | .64 | .19 | .19 | .54 | .42 | .54 |
| Professional                |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 7 Poor Over-                   | .53 | .58 | .67 | .37 | .64 | .69 | .43 | .44 | .48 | .65 | .65 | .39 | .58 | .52 | .57 | .41 |
| thine of the time            |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| spent on Administrative      |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Duties                      | .31 | .39 | .36 | .34 | .48 | .48 | .36 | .30 | .41 | .47 | .41 | .49 | .25 | .33 | .43 | .31 | .39 |
| 8 Loose Structured           |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Organization                |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 9 High Frequency of Staff    | .53 | .59 | .51 | .32 | .69 | .60 | .54 | .40 | .53 | .59 | .55 | .59 | .34 | .50 | .58 | .38 | .48 |

*Correlation Coefficients of Organizational Characteristics with Individual Characteristics of .60 and above.

†All r's are positive and significant at the .0001 level.
## TABLE 5

Correlation Coefficients of the Eighteen Organizational Characteristics with the Seventeen Individual Characteristics

N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Characteristics</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>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITEMS 10-18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Overly Structured Organization</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Inflexible Work Schedule</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Lack of Support from Colleagues</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Job Task Overly Repetitive</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Lack of Institutional Financial Resources</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Poorly Defined Organizational Roles</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Lack of Support from Administrative Superior</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Work Overload</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Coefficients of Organizational Characteristics with Individual Characteristics of .60 and above.

All r's are positive and significant at the .0001 level.
highest with "Lack of Proper Communication," item 3.

"Insufficient Number of Staff Members to Accomplish Job Objectives," item 4, correlated highest with: "Lack of Enthusiasm," item F (.71); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.70); "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.68); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.67); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.67); "Decrease in Energy Level," item C (.65); "Feeling Alienated," item C (.64); "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.63); "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession," item I (.61); and, "Lowered Self-Concept," item A (.60).

Item 5, "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity" correlated highest with: "Lack of Enthusiasm," item F (.74); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.73); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.69); "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.69); "Feeling Alienated," item B (.67); "Extremely Disorganized," item K (.64); "Decrease in Energy Level," item C (.64); "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.64); and, "Lowered Self-concept," item A (.61).

"High Client Ratio to Professionals," item 6, correlated highest with: "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.66); "Lack of Enthusiasm," item F (.64); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.64); "Feeling Alienated," item B (.60); Wishing for or Seeking Escape," Item E (.60); and, "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.60).
"An Over-abundance of Time Spent on Administrative Duties," item 7, correlated highest with: "Decrease in Energy Level," item C (.67); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.65); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.65); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.64); "Lack of Enthusiasm," item F (.60); and "Extremely Disorganized," item K (.60).

"Loosely Structured Organized," item 8, correlated highest with "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.48); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.49); and, "Lack of Enthusiasm," item F (.48).

"High Frequency of Staff Meetings," item 9, correlated highest with: "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.69); and, "Lack of Enthusiasm," item F (.60).

"Overly Structured Organization," item 10, correlated highest with: "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.67); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.66); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.66); "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job," item F (.65); and, "Feeling Alienated," item B (.61).

"Inflexible Work Schedule," item 11, correlated highest with: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job," item F (.77); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.73); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.73); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," (.71); "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.70); "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.69); "lowered
Self-Concept," item A (.65); "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession," item I (.64); and, "Feeling Alienated," item B (.62).

"Lack of Support from Colleagues," item 12, correlated highest with: "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.72); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.71); "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job," item F (.67); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.67); "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.67); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.64); "Feeling Alienated," item B (.61); and, "Extremely Disorganized," item K (.61).

"Job Task Overly Repetitive," item 13, correlated highest with: "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.67); "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job," item F (.67); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.65); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.64); "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.61); and "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.60).

"Lack of Institutional Financial Resources," item 14, correlated highest with: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job," item F (.68); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.65); "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.62); "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.61); "Decrease in Energy Level," item C (.60).

"Poorly Defined Organizational Roles," item 15, correlated highest with: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job," item F (.74); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.74);
"Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.70); "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.70); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.68); "Extremely Disorganized," item K (.67); "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.67); "Feeling Alienated," item B (.61); and, "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession," item I (.61).

"Lack of Support from Administrative Superior," item 16, correlated highest with "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job," item F (.76); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.73); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.72); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.67); "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.67); "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.67); "Lowered Self-Concept," item A (.67); "Decrease in Energy Level," item C (.64); and, "Feelings of Frustration," item Q (.60).

"Organizational Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness," item 17, correlated highest with: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job," item F (.76); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.74); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.69); "Decrease in Energy Level," item C (.67); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.66); "Lowered Self-Concept," item A (.64); "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.64); "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession," item I (.63); "Feeling Alienated," item B (.61); and, "A Poor Attitude," item O (.61).
Finally, "Work Overload," item 18, correlated highest with: "Extremely Disorganized," item K (.68); "Wishing for or Seeking Escape," item E (.67); "Lack of Sense of Success," item J (.64); "Decrease in Energy Level," item C (.63); "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job," item F (.61); "Feelings of Anger and Resentment," item L (.60); and, "Lack of Sense of Control," item N (.60).

In summary, respondents perceived that item D (Over Conscientiousness), item H (Lack of Job Skills) and item M (Lack of Training) correlated the least with the eighteen (18) organizational characteristics, however, to these persons items D, H, and M were not as important to them as other individual characteristics items, as 90% of the administrators in this sample had a Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., D.D.D., or J.D. and 10% had Master's degrees. Thus, educational preparation and training would not be an item of extreme concern for these administrators. Also, most administrators perceived that a certain amount of work conscientiousness was an inherent part of being an administrator. Consequently, over conscientiousness was not seen correlating as highly as other individual items with organizational characteristics.
Correlation of Organizational Items to Instrument

The means, and standard deviations of the eighteen (18) organizational characteristics and correlation coefficients of these eighteen items to the total instrument are presented in Table 6. All items correlated with the instrument from moderate to high and were significant at the .0001 level. However, item 5, "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity," correlated the highest (.83) with the total instrument while item 8, "Loosely Structured Organizations," correlated the lowest (.53) to the instrument.

Correlations of Individual Items to Instrument

The means and standard deviations of the seventeen (17) individual characteristics and correlation coefficients of these seventeen (17) items to the total instrument are presented in Table 7. All items correlated positively with the instrument from moderately to moderately high and were significant at the .0001 level. However, administrators in this sample felt that the individual characteristics, item F, "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession," (.87); item L, "Feelings of Anger and Resentment" (.86); item E, "Wishing for or Seeking Escape" (.85); item N, "Lack of Sense of Control" (.80); and, "A Poor Job Attitude," item O (.80) best correlated to the eighteen (18) organizational characteristics.
Table 6
Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients of the Eighteen Organizational Characteristics
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Insufficient Time-Out</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lack of Direction</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lack of Proper Communication</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Insufficient number of staff members to Accomplish Job Objectives</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Unclear goals/goal ambiguity</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 High Client ratio to Professionals</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 An Overabundance of time spent on administrative duties</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Loosely Structured Organization</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 High Frequency of Staff Meetings</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Overly Structured Organization</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Inflexible Work Schedule</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Lack of Support from Colleagues</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Poorly Defined Organizational Roles</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Lack of Institutional Financial Resources</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Job Task Overly Repetitive</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Lack of Support from Administrative Superiors</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Work Overload</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All r's significant at .0001 level.
2 Correlation Coefficients of Organizational Characteristics with Total Instrument Score.
### Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients of the Seventeen Individual Characteristics of Burnout

\( N = 130 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All \( r \)'s were significant at \( .0001 \) level.

2 Correlation Coefficients of Individual Characteristics with Total Instrument Score.
Individual and Organizational Items, Means and Standard Deviations

The mean sums and standard deviations for the individual and organizational items are presented in Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9. With all items (individual and organizational) the means tended not to differ significantly, thus indicating where the data are clustered.

Step-Wise Regression Analysis of Organizational Characteristics

To understand which organizational items contributed the most to individual burnout, a step-wise regression analysis utilizing Maximum R-Square Improvement and Minimum R-Square Improvement. The items (organizational characteristics) which contributed the most and least to individual burnout can be seen in Table 8 and Table 9.

Through the use of a step-wise regression, analysis of items were classified as a member in "The Most Burnout Category" and "The Least Burnout Category." To understand which organizational items contributed the most and least to individual burnout, a step-wise regression analysis revealed that item 5, "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity, explained 69% ($R^2 = .69$) of the variance in the dependent variable "burnout." Fourteen (14%) percent more of the variance ($R^2 = .84$) was explained by item 18, "Work Overload," while 8% more of variance ($R^2 = .92$) was
Table 8
Mean, Standard Deviation and $R^2$'s of the Eighteen Organizational Characteristics that Administrators Perceived To Contribute the Most to Burnout
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Order of Entry</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Cumulative $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 5: Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18: Work Overload</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10: Overly Structured Organization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16: Lack of Support from Administrative Superior(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6: High Client Ratio to Professional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8: Loosely Structured Organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14: Lack of Support from Administrator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Lack of Support from Colleague</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Mean, Standard Deviation and $R^2$'s of the Eighteen Organizational Characteristics that Administrators Perceived to Contribute the Least to Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Order of Entry</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Cumulative $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 8: Loosely Structured Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Insufficient Time Off</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9: High Frequency of Staff Meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7: An Overabundance of Time Spent On Administrative Duties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18: Work Overload</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6: High Client Ratio to Professional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10: Overly Structured Organization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: Lack of Direction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15: Job Task Overly Repetitive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
explained by item 10 "Overly Structured Organization"; an additional 3% of the variance (R^2 = .95) was explained by item 16, "Lack of Support from Administrative Superior"; an additional 1% of the variance (R^2 = .96) was explained by item 8, "Loosely Structured Organization"; an additional 1% was explained by "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources," item 14; "Insufficient Time Off," item 1 (R^2 = .98) and "Lack of Support from Colleagues" (R^2 = .98) accounted for less than an additional 1% variance.

Thus, all variables mentioned explained the variance of all organizational items that contributed the most to the burning out of administrators.

Finally, the Step-Wise Regression Analysis revealed that "Loosely Structured Organizations," item 8, explained the least amount of variance (R^2 = .28). (See Table 9 on page 112). "Insufficient Time Off," (R^2 = .51) was the second variable to explain the least additional amount of variance; "High Frequency of Staff Meeting," item 9, was the third variable to explain the least additional amount of variance; "An Overabundance of Time Spent on Administrative Duties," item 7, was fourth; "Work Overload," item 18, was fifth; "High Client Ratio to Professional" was sixth; "Overly Structured Organizations," item 10, was seventh; "Lack of Direction," item 8 was eighth and "Job Task Overly Repetitive," item 15, was
the ninth variable to explain the least amount of variance.

In an effort to understand the overlapping of some variables into the "Least Burnout Category" and "The Most Burnout Category," a study of the demographical data revealed that 28% of the respondents reported spending 41%-50% of their time in direct contact with their clients while 54 respondents or 42% reported spending 51% or more of their time in direct contact with clients. When comparing these two analyses the conclusions reflected that while some enjoyed this direct contact others did not and felt that such contact had a negative effect upon them.

Furthermore, the overlapping of "Loosely Structured Organizations," item 8, as a least and a most burnout characteristic, tends to indicate that this variable was viewed also by some administrators as having no effect upon them while others viewed this variable as having a negative effect upon them.

Variance in Individual Characteristics of Burnout as Explained by Organizational Characteristics Based on Step-wise Regression Analysis

Through the use of step-wise regression analysis an attempt was made to explain variance in each individual characteristic of burnout items with the help of eighteen organizational characteristics as independent variables. The criteria for selecting the best variable model was
based upon increments of additional variance increasing at least 1%. Consequently, the last regression model indicating additional variance of a 1% increase was selected as the best model. All other models below this point were not considered. Furthermore, those individual characteristics of burnout items with $R^2$s of 75% or more were considered as most responsive to change by the manipulation of certain organizational characteristics. Items with $R^2$ of greater than 60% but less than 75% were considered as moderately responsive but items that contributed less than 60% of variance were considered as items less responsive to changes in organizational structural characteristics. The results of analysis are shown in Table 10 and Table 11. The explanation of each regression equation is provided below.

In Tables 10 and 11, $R^2$s were presented in percentages. F Values, Probability greater than F, and Rank Order based on $R^2$s were also presented. The rank order based on $R^2$s revealed that item M: "Lack of Training" was the individual burnout characteristic that administrators in this study thought most out of the control of the organization, as most of the acquiring of job skills for management is due to the persons and not to the organization. Furthermore, the rank order based on $R^2$s revealed also that item F: "Lack of Enthusiasm" was the individual burnout item that could be changed in individuals by the manipulation of
TABLE 10
R²s, F Values, and Rank Order of R² of individual Characteristics of Burnout as Explained by Organizational Characteristics Based on Step-wise Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Characteristics</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>In sufficient Time off (Vacations, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lack of Proper Communication</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Insufficient Number of Staff Members to Accomplish Job Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lack of Direction</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 High Client Ratio to Administrators</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Inadequate Number of Time/Space on Administrative Duties</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inadequate Staff Structure Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 High Frequency of Staff Meetings</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² in %: 57.1, 61.6, 66.1, 75.9, 61.6, 75.2, 61.6, 75.1, 65.0, 66.9, 66.4, 63.1, 56.2

F Value: 41.6, 35.6, 60.9, 10.4, 71.1, 20.4, 12.6, 22.7, 66.0, 54.8, 64.2, 261.9, 59.4, 50.3, 42.0, 19.3, 31.9

Rank Based on R²: 11, 8, 7, 17, 1, 1, 14, 15, 10, 2, 9, 3, 16, 5, 6, 13, 12

All F Values reported in this table were significant at the .0001 level.
### TABLE 11

R², F Values, and Rank Order of R² of Individual Characteristics of Burnout as Explained by Organizational Characteristics Based on Step-wise Regression Analysis

| Individual Characteristics | A       | B       | C       | D       | E       | F       | G       | H       | I       | J       | K       | L       | M       | N       | O       | P       | Q       | R²     | F Value | Rank Based on R² |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|
| 10 Overly Structured Organ | .212    | .222    | .246    | .143    | .232    | .402    | .247    | .259    | .162    |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         | .37     | 11       | 8            |
| 11 Inflexible Work Schedule | .216    | .132    | .224    | .422    | .143    |         | .232    | .402    | .247    | .259    | .162    |         |         |         |         |         |         | .35     | 12       | 7            |
| 12 Lack of Support from Colleagues | .079 |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         | 17         |
| 13 Job Task Overly Repetitive |         |         | .197    | .178    |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         | .16      | 18       | 6            |
| 14 Lack of Institutional Financial Resources |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         | .06     | 19       | 11           |
| 15 Poorly Defined Organizational Policies | .203 |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         | .39     | 20       | 10           |
| 16 Lack of Support from Administrative Superior |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         | .30     | 21       | 13           |
| 17 Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         | .30     | 22       | 10           |
| 18 Work Overload | .151    | .239    | .216    | .256    | .239    | .149    |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         | .27     | 23       | 7            |

R² in x 57, 163, 66, 129, 574, 1, 80, 643, 942, 159, 6, 75, 263, 675, 1, 35, 0, 66, 966, 4, 53, 1, 262.

All F Values reported in this table were significant at the .0001 level.
certain organizational items.

Item J: "Lack of Sense of Success" (75.21%); item E: "Wishing for or Seeking Escape" (74.12%) and item F: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession" (80.59%) could be changed in the individual by the manipulation of certain organizational items since these three variables each explained 75% or more variance.

In Tables 10 and 11, item A: "Lowered Self-Concept" was best explained with a four variable model. The four variables or the three organizational characteristics consisted of item 2: "Lack of Direction,"; item 7: "An Overabundance of Time Spent on Administrative Duties"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"; and item 17: "Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness."

Item B: "Feeling Alienated" was best explained with a five variable model. These five variables were item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity"; item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"; item 10: "Overly Structured Organizational Roles"; item 14: "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources"; and item 18: "Work Overload."

Item C: "Decrease in Energy Level" was best explained with a four variable model. These variables were item 2: "Lack of Direction"; item 7: "An Overabundance of Time Spent on Administrative Duties"; item 13: "Job Task Overly Repetitive"; and item 17: "Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness."
Item D: "Over Conscientiousness" was best explained with a five variable model. These variables were item 1: "Insufficient Time Off"; item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity"; item 8: "Loosely Structured Organization"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule" and item 15: "Poorly Defined Organizational Roles."

Item E: "Wishing for or Seeking Escape" was best explained with a five variable model. These variables were item 9: "High Frequency of Staff Meetings"; item 10: "Overly Structured Organization"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"; item 17: "Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness" and item 18: "Work Overload."

Item F: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job" was best explained with a five variable model. These variables were item 2: "Lack of Direction"; item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"; item 8: "Loosely Structured Organization"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule" and item 17: "Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness."

Item G: "Rigidity to Change" was best explained with a three variable model. These variables were item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"; item 13: "Job Task Overly Repetitive" and item 18: "Work Overload."

Item H: "Lack of Job Skill" was best explained with a four variable model. These variables were item 2: "Lack of Direction"; item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity";
item 12: "Lack of Support from Colleagues" and item 18: "Work Overload."

Item I: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession" was best explained with a four variable model. These variables were item 1: "Insufficient Time Off"; item 3: "Lack of Proper Communication"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule" and item 17: "Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness."

Item J: "Lack of Sense of Success" was best explained with a four variable model. These variables were item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity"; item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"; item 10: "Overly Structured Organization"; item 16: "Lack of Support from Administrative Superior."

Item K: "Extremely Disorganized" was best explained with a four variable model. These variables were item 3: "Lack of Proper Communication"; item 13: "Job Task Overly Repetitive"; item 15: "Poorly Defined Organizational Roles" and item 18: "Work Overload."

Item L: "Feelings of Anger and Resentment" was best explained with a six variable model. These variables were item 1: "Insufficient Time Off"; item 2: "Lack of Direction"; item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professional"; item 8: "Loosely Structured Organization"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"; and item 14: "Lack of
Item M: "Lack of Training" was best explained with a five variable model. These variables were item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity"; item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professional"; item 8: "Loosely Structured Organization"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule" and item 14: "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources."

Item N: "Lack of Sense of Control" was best explained with a four variable model. These variables were item 4: "Insufficient Number of Staff Members to Accomplish Job Objectives"; item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule" and item 17: "Work Overload."

Item O: "A Poor Job Attitude" was best explained with a five variable model. These variables were item 3: "Lack of Proper Communication"; item 9: "High Frequency of Staff Meetings"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"; item 12: "Lack of Support from Colleagues" and item 15: "Poorly Defined Organizational Roles."

Item P: "Lack of Feeling Educationally Accomplished" was best explained with a seven variable model. These variables were item 2: "Lack of Direction"; item 4: "Insufficient Number of Staff Members to Accomplish Job Objectives"; item 10: "Overly Structured Organization"; item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"; item 12: "Lack of
Support from Colleagues”; item 14: “Lack of Institutional Financial Resources” and item 18: “Work Overload.”

Item Q: “Feelings of Frustration” was best explained with a five variable model. These variables were item 2: “Lack of Direction”; item 3: “Lack of Proper Communication”; item 6: “High Client Ratio to Professionals”; item 14: “Lack of Institutional Financial Resources” and item 16: “Lack of Support from Administrative Superior.”

A Comparison of Organizational Items

In an effort to assist future researchers with the refinement of other instruments of this nature, it would be important for them to know which items were similar. Consequently, in this section items that were similar are reported. Thus a Cluster Analysis was used to determine which organizational items were similar. Simply, by employing a clustering by minimum distance method, it was discovered that organizational item 5: “Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity”; item 3: “Lack of Proper Communication” and item 2: “Lack of Direction” were similar. Item 11: “Inflexible Work Schedules” and item 15: “Job Task Overly Repetitive” were similar. Item 17: “Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness”; item 16: “Lack of Support from Administrative Superiors” and item 13: “Poorly Defined Organizational Roles” clustered together.
Not only did items 18: "Work Overload" and item 7: "An Overabundance of Time Spent in Administrative Duties" clustered together but also, item 2: "Lack of Direction" clustered with item 18: "Work Overload" and item 7: "An Overabundance of Time Spent on Administrative Duties."


A Comparison of Group Means of Organizational Items

The Analysis of Variance was used to determine whether the means of the four groups of administrators
Table 12
Organizational Characteristics or Items That Clustered Together*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 17 | 16  | 2   |
|    | 13  | 15  |
| 11 | 15  | 3   |
|    | 11  | 5   |

*All items that clustered together were similar in meaning
differed on the organizational items. A presentation of these means can be seen in Tables 13-16. Consequently, it was determined statistically that the means of the four groups on each organizational item did not differ significantly. Thus, inference could be made about the entire population of administrators. In effect, the null hypothesis of no difference between the means of the four groups could not be rejected.

Coefficients of Reliability
For the IAAB

The methods used for testing the reliability of this instrument were the Cronbach Alpha and a Guttman Split Half. The Cronbach Alpha test of reliability yielded a coefficient .95 on organizational items thought to be related to individual burnout and a coefficient of .94 on individual items. The Guttman Split Half yielded a coefficient of .91 on organizational items thought to contribute to individual burnout and a coefficient of .95 for individual items. Tables 17 and 18 present a comparison of these reliability coefficients, Number of Items, and Number of Cases. Considering these high reliability coefficients, it could be stated that items in the instrument were very reliable.
Table 13
Comparing the Means of the Four Groups with Organizational Characteristics, Items 1-5
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 1: Insufficient Time-Out</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 2: Lack of Direction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 3: Lack of Proper Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4: Insufficient Number of Staff Members to Accomplish Job Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 5: Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 6: High Client Ratio to Professionals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 7: An Overabundance of Time Spent on Administrative Duties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 8: Loosely Structured Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 9: High Frequency of Staff Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 10: Overly Structured Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15
Comparing the Means of the Four Groups with Organizational Characteristics, Items 11-15
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 11: Inflexible Work Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12: Lack of Support from Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13: Poorly Defined Organizational Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14: Lack of Institutional Financial Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15: Job Task Overly Repetitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16
Comparing the Means of the Four Groups with Organizational Characteristics, Items 16-18
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 16: Lack of Support from Administrative Superiors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 17: Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 18: Work Overload</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Deans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17
Comparison of Reliability Coefficients, Number of Items
and Number of Cases for Organizational Characteristics
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Number of Organizational Items</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha for Part I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha for Part II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttman Split Half</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-Length Spearman-Brown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal-Length Spearman-Brown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Correlation between Parts = .85.
* Test to Consider as These Items Were Equal.
Table 18
Comparison of Reliability Coefficients, Number of Items and Number of Cases for Individual Characteristics
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Number of Organizational Items</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha for Part I$^1$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha for Part II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttman Split-Half</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal-Length*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-Length</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$Correlation between Parts = .90.

*Test to Consider as These Items Were Unequal.
Frequencies and Percentages of Demographical Items

All of the one hundred and thirty (130) respondents were educational administrators (Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans and Departmental Chairpersons) at The Ohio State University. A comparison of the characteristics of administrators whose perceptions (total scores on the IAAB) on what organizational variables related to individual burnout was presented in Tables 19 through 22. Two administrators held two positions, for example, a dean and a chairperson. In such cases, the first position held was considered over the second position held.

In an effort to understand similarities, differences and variabilities, frequencies and percentages were employed. These frequencies and percentages were presented in Tables 19 through 22.

In Table 19, the age category of 46-55 characterized the average age of this sample of administrators (Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans, and Departmental Chairpersons). Thus, of this group 51% fell in the age category of 46-55.

The sex category of this sample (N=130) clearly indicated that 90% of these persons were males while only 10% were females. Thus, 116 were male administrators in this sample, while only 14 females were represented in this sample.
Table 19
Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Age, Sex and Marital Status
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 26-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 36-45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 46-55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 56-65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>89.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>86.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate or Divorced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Nature of Position, Length of Time in Position, Ethnic Background, Number of Hours Worked Per Week
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Position in Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>94.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time in Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-35 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 or more years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Asian American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino, Mexican, Mexican American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Caucasian</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>96.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours Worked Per Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or more hours per week</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 hours per week</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 hours per week</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 hours per week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 hours per week</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 hours per week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21
Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Academic Degree, Position and Nature of Position
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Academic Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. or B.S.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., D.D.D., J.D.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Administrative/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Administrative</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Time Spent in Direct Contact with Clients, Time Spent in Responding to Correspondence and Completing Administrative Forms, Type Administrator
N=130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent in Direct Contact with Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% - 20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% - 30%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% - 40%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% - 50%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - or more</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent in Responding to Correspondence and Completing Administrative Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or less</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% - 20%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% - 30%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% - 40%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% - 50%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>85.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No tenure offered in this position</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of this sample, 112 (86%) persons indicated that they were married and 8 or 6% indicated that they were divorced or separated.

This variable, "Highest Academic Degree" obtained by the majority of the sample was a Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., D.D.D., or J.D., and in some cases a combination of these degrees. One hundred and seventeen (90%) persons were included in this group while only thirteen persons (10%) had Master's degrees.

Ninety-nine persons (76%) held a line position while only thirty-one persons (24%) indicated that they were considered staff.

Sixty-four individuals (49%) in this sample (N=130) considered themselves "Full-time Administrators" while sixty-three respondents (48%) in this sample considered themselves Part-time Administrative Faculty.

Of the sample (N=130), one hundred and twenty-three respondents (94%) considered themselves academic while seven individuals (5%) considered themselves non-academic. However, those who considered themselves non-academic were in error, as all administrators in this sample were purposefully sampled because of their being solely in academia.

Of the sample (N=130), sixty-seven individuals (51%) had held their positions from 1-5 years. Thirty-four individuals (26%) had held their positions from 6-10 years.
Twenty-two individuals (17%) had held their position from 11-15 years. Four respondents (3%) had held their positions from 16-20 years and three individuals (2%) had held their positions from 21 to 35 years.

The ethnic background of this sample (N=130) included one hundred and twenty-five (96%) white and five (4%) Blacks.

Forty-five respondents (35%) reported that they worked 51-60 hours per week; thirty-nine respondents (30%) reported that they worked 41-56 hours per week; twenty-nine respondents (22%) reported that they worked 61 or more hours per week while ten respondents (8%) worked 31-40 hours per week; six (5%) worked 21-30 hours per week and one person reported working less than 20 hours per week.

Seventy-six respondents (28%) reported that they spent 41%-50% of their time in direct contact with clients. Twenty respondents (15%) reported that they spent 21%-30% of their time in direct contact with clients while fifteen (11%) spent 31%-40% of their time in direct contact with clients and fifty-four (42%) reported spending 51% or more of their time in direct contact with clients.

Forty-nine respondents (38%) reported spending 11%-20% of their time responding to correspondence and completing administrative forms. Thirty-nine respondents (30%) reported spending 21%-30% of their time returning
correspondence and completing administrative forms. Nineteen respondents (15%) reported spending from 31%-40% of their time on returning correspondence and completing administrative forms. Eleven respondents (8%) reported spending 41%-50% of their time returning correspondence and completing administrative forms. Only one respondent reported spending 51% or more of his/her time responding to correspondence and completing administrative forms.

One hundred and eleven respondents (85%) reported that they were tenured while eight persons (8%) reported that no tenure was offered in their position.

Content Analysis of Additional Organizational Characteristics

By using content analysis, a notation of frequency of responses was obtained. From this analysis various additional organizational items were obtained that administrators in the sample felt contributed to individual burnout. These additional organizational items were:

1. Lack of Authority;
2. An Initial Orientation Program for New Employees;
3. A Gradual Phase-In of Responsibilities;
4. Too Great a Variety of Job Tasks;
5. Lack of Mobility in Career;
6. Inappropriate Reward System;
7. External Factors—Political, Media, and Societal Interferences;
8. Frequent Interruptions;
9. Identification of Who is the Decision-maker, and
10. Lack of Monetary Compensation.

Some additional individual burnout characteristics were:

1. Inability to Attend to "Normal Developmental Stages";
2. Poor Career Development;
3. Personal Unresolved Issues Brought to Work;
4. Poor Health, Including Chemical Abuse; and
5. Loss of a Sense of Purpose.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER

This chapter included a presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data utilized in the development and testing of the IAAB.

Organizational, individual and demographical items were discussed as well as other additional items thought to contribute the most and the least to individual burnout.

Various data analysis techniques were used to analyze the data collected. The means, standard deviations, frequencies, percentages, correlation coefficients and reliability coefficients were obtained in an effort to describe and make inferences about the population from which the sample was drawn. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to correlate the organizational items
with individual items. In using this technique the degree of association was determined. That is, the magnitude and direction of these relationships. A cluster analysis was used to determine which items were similar. An analysis of variance was used to compare the means of each group of administrators on each organizational item.

Finally, Step-wise Regression was used to classify items.
Understanding predictors of individual burnout has created an accentuated concern among all professions. In a research project by Armstrong (1978:230-238), organizational structures were described as a major determinant of job performance, satisfaction and burnout. Large agencies that are formed, centralized in decision-making, and hierarchical were found to have high turnover, low job satisfaction and rapid burnout. According to Pines, Aronson, et al. (1981:109), burnout and tedium were more likely to occur in certain organizational settings than in others. Because burnout and tedium are largely an inevitable function of system characteristics, researchers should focus on organizations rather than on selecting individuals (p. 115). For example, many organizational leaders tend to burnout their members by assigning difficult tasks to the "only" person who can handle them and imposing deadlines on the "only" person, invariably the busiest, who can be trusted to complete tasks on time. Variety in these routines can prevent work overload and can provide relief from excessive stress upon such an individual.
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Considering the previous information, this study involved the following: 1) the selection of organizational and individual items compiled from a review of literature, and by the two field tests as valid for measuring administrators' perception of organizational items that are related to individual burnout; 2) the formulation of the IAAB; 3) obtaining the correlation between items in the assessment instrument; 4) the use of Step-wise Regression Analysis for items on Part II of the IAAB to determine the organizational characteristics that contributed to individual burnout; 5) Cluster Analysis of items to determine which items were similar; 6) Analysis of Variance to compare the means of the four groups of educational administrators on organizational characteristics, and finally; 7) reliability tests were used to determine if the assessment instrument was consistent in what it measured.

The purpose of the study was to answer the research questions:

1. Do administrators in higher education perceive organizational characteristics as obtained from the literature to be related to individual burnout factors, also obtained from the literature?

2. If so, which organizational factors and/or characteristics are believed to contribute
the most and the least to individual burnout
as identified through a search of the litera-
ture?

To provide the researcher with a working knowledge
of organizational characteristics that are related to in-
dividual burnout, many perspectives on the topic of burn-
out were reviewed. An investigation was conducted into
the organizational characteristics that were thought to
interact negatively with individuals. Various organiza-
tional characteristics relevant to the meaning of burnout
were reported by Metz, 1979; White, 1978, 1979; Maslach,
1979; Spaniol and Caputo, 1979; Pines, Aronson et al.,
1981; Lavoie and Culbert, 1978; Larson, Gilbertson and
These studies supported the theory that various organiza-
tional characteristics have a positive or negative rela-
tionship with identified individual burnout. Furthermore,
Bies, 1980; Cherniss, 1978, 1980; Daley, 1979; Edelwich,
1980; Freudenberger, 1977, 1974; Gillespie, 1980; Kahn,
1978; Lagana, 1978 and Mattingly, 1977 studies individual
characteristics that were related to burnout.

In addition, a positive relationship was estab-
lished between organizational characteristics and indiv-
dual characteristics. Strong arguments that individual
burnout was not just inherent in the individual but in
organizational structures were presented by White, 1978, 1979; Spaniol and Caputo, 1979; Pines, Aronson et al., 1981; Lavoie and Culbert, 1978; Metz, 1979 and Maslach, 1979. These studies further supported the theory that various organizational characteristics have a positive or negative impact upon individuals in the structure.

The Measurement of Perceptions and Attitudes

The measurement of perceptions and attitudes have long been a highly controversial area of educational and psychological testing. Murphy (1972) and Oppenheim (1966) agree that techniques which are accurate and appropriate for the task have been developed. In this study the emphasis was placed on the assessment of perception using a checklist method. These assessments were then operationally defined as measurements for the purpose of statistical treatment.

The Research Effort

A developmental pool of organizational and individual items was compiled from a review of the literature. The items were primarily collected from the studies by Metz, 1979; Maslach, 1979; Spaniol and Caputo, 1979 and Pines, Aronson et al., 1981. These items were then evaluated by two field tests. Eighteen organizational characteristics and seventeen individual characteristics were
derived from the evaluation by the field test administrators. These thirty-five (35) items were selected for the study using criteria established by the researcher.

An assessment instrument (IAAB) was constructed and this survey was sent to one hundred and ninety-six administrators. From this group, one hundred and thirty (16 Deans, 23 Assistant Deans, 19 Associate Deans, and 72 Departmental Chairpersons) responded.

Correlation coefficients and reliability coefficients were then computed for all items. Content or logical validity was established by compiling measurement items for the IAAB from the two field tests and a review of the literature. Construct validity was established by:

1) examining the correlation between items making up the overall measure to the extent that the test items exhibit high internal consistency on the same construct; and 2) evaluating the degree to which the operationalization of the construct appears to logically map the underlying variable (Locke, 1975).

The Findings

An analysis of the data revealed several findings.

1. All the organizational characteristics appeared to be positively related to all the individual characteristics at the .0001 level of significance using a two-tail test.
2. The reliability coefficients of the items on the IAAB varied from .89-.95. Thus revealing statistically that all items within this assessment instrument were highly reliable.

3. Organizational items perceived by administrators to contribute the most to the burning out of individuals were:
   a. Item 5: Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity
   b. Item 18: Work Overload

4. Organizational items perceived by administrators to contribute the least to the burning out of individuals were:
   a. Item 8: Loosely Structured Organization
   b. Item 1: Insufficient Time Off

5. Item 8: "Loosely Structured Organization" correlated the least with the instrument.

6. Item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity" correlated the highest with the instrument.

7. Item 1: "Insufficient Time Off" correlated highest with
   a. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   b. Lack of Sense of Success,
   c. Lack of Enthusiasm,
   d. Feeling Alienated, and
   e. Extremely Disorganized
8. Item 2: "Lack of Direction" correlated highest with
   a. Feeling Alienated,
   b. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   c. Feelings of Frustration and
   d. Lowered Self-Concept

9. Item 3: "Lack of Proper Communication" correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Enthusiasm,
   b. A Poor Job Attitude,
   c. Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession,
   d. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   e. Extremely Disorganized and
   f. Lack of Sense of Success

10. Item 4: "Insufficient Number of Staff Members to Accomplish Job Objectives" correlated highest with
    a. Lack of Enthusiasm,
    b. Lack of Sense of Success,
    c. Lack of Sense of Control,
    d. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
    e. Wishing for or Seeking Escape,
    f. Decrease in Energy Level,
    g. Feeling Alienated,
    h. A Poor Job Attitude,
11. Item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity" correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Enthusiasm,
   b. Lack of Sense of Success,
   c. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   d. A Poor Job Attitude,
   e. Feeling Alienated,
   f. Extremely Disorganized,
   g. Decrease in Energy Level,
   h. Lack of Sense of Control, and
   i. Lowered Self-Concept

12. Item 6: High Client Ratio to Professionals correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Sense of Success,
   b. Lack of Enthusiasm,
   c. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   d. Wishing for or Seeking Escape, and
   e. Lack of Sense of Control

13. Item 7: An Over-abundance of Time Spent on Administrative Duties correlated highest with
   a. Decrease in Energy Level
   b. Lack of Sense of Success
   c. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
d. Wishing for or Seeking Escape,
e. Lack of Enthusiasm for Job, and
f. Extremely Disorganized.

14. Item 8: Loosely Structured Organization correlated highest with
   a. Wishing for or Seeking Escape, and
   b. Lack of Enthusiasm.

15. Item 9: High Frequency of Staff Meetings correlated highest with
   a. Wishing for or Seeking Escape, and
   b. Lack of Enthusiasm.

16. Item 10: Overly Structured Organization correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Sense of Success,
   b. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   c. Wishing for or Seeking Escape,
   d. Lack of Enthusiasm for Job and
   e. Feeling Alienated.

17. Item 11: Inflexible Work Schedule correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Enthusiasm for Job,
   b. Lack of Sense of Success,
   c. Feelings of Anger and Resentment, and
   d. Wishing for or Seeking Escape.
18. Item 12: Lack of Support from Colleagues correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Sense of Control,
   b. Lack of Sense of Success,
   c. Lack of Enthusiasm,
   d. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   e. A Poor Job Attitude,
   f. Wishing for or Seeking Escape,
   g. Feeling Alienated, and
   h. Extremely Disorganized.

19. Item 13: Job Task Overly Repetitive correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Sense of Control,
   b. Lack of Sense of Success,
   c. Lack of Enthusiasm,
   d. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   e. A Poor Job Attitude,
   f. Wishing for or Seeking Escape, and
   g. Extremely Disorganized.

20. Item 14: Lack of Institutional Financial Resources correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Enthusiasm for Job,
   b. Wishing for or Seeking Escape,
   c. Lack of Sense of Control,
   d. A Poor Job Attitude, and
   e. Decrease in Energy Level.
21. Item 15: Poorly Defined Organizational Roles correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Enthusiasm for Job,
   b. Lack of Sense of Success,
   c. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   d. A Poor Job Attitude,
   e. Wishing for or Seeking Escape,
   f. Extremely Disorganized,
   g. Lack of Sense of Control,
   h. Feeling Alienated, and
   i. Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession.

22. Item 16: Lack of Support from Administrative Superiors correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Enthusiasm for Job,
   b. Wishing for or Seeking Escape,
   c. Lack of Sense of Success,
   d. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   e. Lack of Sense of Control,
   f. A Poor Job Attitude,
   g. Lowered Self-Concept,
   h. Decrease in Energy Level, and
   i. Feelings of Frustration.

23. Item 17: Organizational Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness correlated highest with
   a. Lack of Enthusiasm for Job,
   b. Wishing for or Seeking Escape,
24. Item 18: Work Overload correlated highest with
   a. Extremely Disorganized,
   b. Wishing for or Seeking Escape,
   c. Lack of Sense of Success,
   d. Decrease in Energy Level,
   e. Lack of Enthusiasm for Job,
   f. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
   g. Lack of Sense of Control.

25. Item J: "Lack of Sense of Success" (7521%); item E: "Wishing for or Seeking Escape" (74.14)
    and Item F: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession"
    (80.59%) could be changed in the individual by
    the manipulation of certain organizational
    items since these variables each explained 75%
    or more variance.

26. Item A: "Lowered Self-Concept" was best ex­
    plained with a four variable model:
27. Item B: "Feeling Alienated" was best explained with a five variable model:
   a. item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity"
   b. item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"
   c. item 10: "Overly Structured Organizational Roles"
   d. item 14: "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources," and
   e. item 18: "Work Overload"

28. Item C: "Decrease in Energy Level" was best explained with a four variable model:
   a. item 2: "Lack of Direction"
   b. item 7: "An Overabundance of Time Spent on Administrative Duties"
   c. item 13: "Job Task Overly Repetitive,"
      and
   d. item 17: "Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness"
29. Item D: "Over Conscientiousness" was best explained with a five variable model:
   a. item 1: "Insufficient Time Off"
   b. item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity"
   c. item 8: "Loosely Structure Organization"
   d. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule," and
   e. item 15: "Poorly Defined Organizational Roles"

30. Item E: "Wishing for or Seeking Escape" was best explained with a five variable model:
   a. item 10: "Overly Structured Organization"
   b. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"
   c. item 17: "Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness," and
   d. item 18: "Work Overload"

31. Item F: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Job" was best explained with a five variable model:
   a. item 2: "Lack of Direction"
   b. item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"
   c. item 8: "Loosely Structured Organization"
   d. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule," and
   e. item 17: "Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness"

32. Item G: "Rigidity to Change" was best explained with a three variable model:
a. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"

b. item 13: "Job Task Overly Repetitive,"

and

c. item 18: "Work Overload"

33. Item H: "Lack of Job Skills" was best explained with a four variable model:

a. item 2: "Lack of Direction"

b. item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity"

c. item 12: "Lack of Support from Colleagues,"

and

d. item 18: "Work Overload"

34. Item I "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession" was best explained with a four variable model:

a. Item 1: "Insufficient Time Off"

b. item 3: "Lack of Proper Communication"

c. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule,"

and

d. item 17: "Organizationally Induced Administrative Ineffectiveness"

35. Item J: "Lack of Sense of Success" was best explained with a four variable model:

a. item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity"

b. item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"

c. item 10: "Overly Structured Organization"

d. item 16: "Lack of Support from Administrative Superior"
36. Item K: "Extremely Disorganized" was best explained with a four variable model:
   a. item 3: "Lack of Proper Communication"
   b. item 13: "Job Task Overly Repetitive"
   c. item 15: "Poorly Defined Organizational Roles" and
   d. item 18: "Work Overload"

37. Item L: "Feelings of Anger and Resentment" was best explained with a six variable model:
   a. item 1: "Insufficient Time Off"
   b. item 2: "Lack of Direction"
   c. item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"
   d. item 8: "Loosely Structured Organization"
   e. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule" and
   f. item 14: "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources"

38. Item M: "Lack of Training" was best explained with a five variable model:
   a. item 5: "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity"
   b. item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professional"
   c. item 8: "Loosely Structured Organization"
   d. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule" and
   e. item 14: "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources"
39. Item N: "Lack of Sense of Control" was best explained with a four variable model:
   a. item 4: "Insufficient Number of Staff Members to Accomplish Job Objectives"
   b. item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"
   c. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule" and
   d. item 17: "Work Overload"

40. Item O: "A Poor Job Attitude" was best explained with a five variable model:
   a. item 3: "Lack of Proper Communication"
   b. item 9: "High Frequency of Staff Meetings"
   c. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"
   d. item 12: "Lack of Support from Colleagues"
   e. item 15: "Poorly Defined Organizational Roles"

41. Item P: "Lack of Feeling Educationally Accomplished" was best explained with a seven variable model:
   a. item 2: "Lack of Direction"
   b. item 4: "Insufficient Number of Staff Members"
   c. item 10: "Overly Structured Organization"
   d. item 11: "Inflexible Work Schedule"
   e. item 12: "Lack of Support from Colleagues"
   f. item 14: "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources" and
g. item 18: "Work Overload"

42. Item Q: "Feelings of Frustration" was best explained with a five variable model:
   a. item 2: "Lack of Direction"
   b. item 3: "Lack of Proper Communication"
   c. item 6: "High Client Ratio to Professionals"
   d. item 14: "Lack of Institutional Financial Resources" and
   e. item 16: "Lack of Support from Administrative Superior."

CONCLUSIONS

Since the purpose of this study was to identify organizational characteristics that promoted burnout in educational administrators, several conclusions concerning items that contributed the most and the least to the burnout of administrators were obtained. Consequently, the findings from the study would seem to justify the following conclusions.

Concerning the Measurement of Administrators' Perceptions Toward Organizational Factors

1. The percentage of returns was satisfactory in meeting the sample requirement.
2. Based upon the high reliability coefficients and the correlation coefficients that were found
to be significant at the .0001 level using a
two-tailed test, a reliable and valid instru-
ment can be developed to assess the perceptions
of educational administrators.

3. The items that correlated the most frequently
with the eighteen organizational items were:

a. Feelings of Anger and Resentment,
b. Lack of Sense of Success,
c. Lack of Enthusiasm for Job,
d. Feeling Alienated,
e. Feelings of Frustration,
f. Lowered Self-Concept,
g. A Poor Job Attitude,
h. Extremely Disorganized and
i. Lack of Sense of Control.

4. Item J: "Lack of Sense of Success" (75.21%);
item E: "Wishing for or Seeking Escape" (74.12%)
and item F: "Lack of Enthusiasm for Profession"
was perceived by administrators in this study
as most responsive to change by the manipula-
tion of certain organizational characteristics.

Concerning the IAAB

1. An assessment instrument which is reliable
enough to be useful in identifying organizational
characteristics which contribute the least and most to individual burnout can be developed.

2. All correlation coefficients ranged from positive low to moderate, however, all coefficients were significant at the .0001 level using a two-tailed test and all items correlated positively.

3. Although all items correlations' were significant at the .0001 level using a two-tailed test, some items correlated higher than others, thus items of .60 and higher should be considered when developing a scale or a similar instrument.

4. Certain organizational and individual items clustered together or were similar in meaning.

Conclusions Regarding The Findings

Based upon the responses, the majority of administrators in this study perceived that there was a positive but low to moderately high relationship between organizational items and individual items of the IAAB.

Second, in this investigation item H, "Lack of Skills"; item M, "Lack of Training" and item D, "Over Conscientiousness" correlated lowest of all the individual items to the organizational items or characteristics. This was understandable, as all administrators in this sample had at least a Master's degree while others had obtained
a Ph.D., and/or a M.D., D.D.D., or J.D. Furthermore, administrators in this sample perceived that item D, "Over Conscientiousness" had a low positive relationship to all the organizational items, for an administrator must be extremely conscientious of his/her role in the organization. Many viewed this over conscientiousness as a result of there not being any tangible milestone when she/he could stop and say, "now my job is finished." A manager must keep going and as a result she/he never has the pleasure of knowing even temporarily that there is nothing else she/he can do. No matter what kind of managerial job she/he has, she/he might be able to contribute just a little bit more. Hence, she/he assumes an unrelenting pace in his/her work which is quite often perceived by others as over-conscientiousness, nevertheless this over-conscientiousness is an understood inherent part of his/her role (Mintzberg, 1973:30).

Third, the organizational items perceived by administrators in this sample to contribute the most to the burnout of individuals were "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity" and "Work Overload." Possibly no variable in the organizational literature has been viewed as a focal concept in so many areas of research as ambiguity (Breaugh, 1977:1). According to this investigator, the effects of ambiguity have been investigated at both the organizational and individual level. At the macro level, ambiguity has been
viewed as a key variable affecting a host of factors including the effectiveness of the organization (Pugh, Hickson and Hinings, 1968), and in the long run its very survival (Thompson, 1967). At the micro level, ambiguity has been related to employee performance (Schuler, 1975), search behavior (March, Simon, 1958), turnover (Johnson and Green, 1973) and satisfaction (Kahn et al., 1964). Needless to say, educational administrators in this study perceived that "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity" was an organizational factor that contributed most to individual burnout. In line with Cohen and March's theory, educational administrators in this study perceived that one can not define some specific procedure for measuring the degree of goal achievement, for this was to them problematic, because as the line of generality that facilitates goal acceptance destroys the problematic nature of clarity of the goal, the level of specificity that permits measurement destroys acceptance. According to Cohen and March (1973:196), the object is to find a consistent set of preferences with implications that are acceptable to the staff and to the person making the decisions. Furthermore, a statement can be devised of the goals of a unit by some form of revealed preference test of past action, however, such goal statements have poor predictive power (p. 196). Also, administrators in this study perceived that "Work Overload" was a product of an
unchecked stress caused by the institution's impersonal and unyielding demands as well as the demands from the immediate environment in which . . . (professing) is done." (Hendrickson, 1979:37).

Fourth, organizational items perceived by administrators to contribute the least to the burning out of individuals were "Loosely Structured Organization" and "Insufficient Time Off." Many administrators in this sample perceived that in order for an organization to be most effective a degree of "Loose Structuring" was essential. According to Weick (1976:2) this concept "Loose Coupling," denotes a degree of interdependence, inpermanence, dissolvability and tactfulness, all of which are potentially crucial properties of the "glue" that holds organizations together. In line with Weick's theory of "Loose Coupling," administrators in this sample noted that such a system fostered perseverance, provided a sensitive sensing mechanism, localized adaptation, retained a greater number of mutations, novelized solutions and allowed for a seal off of various programs if there was a breakdown (financial, human, etc.) in any part of the system. Thus, administrators perceived that in these times of financial crises, a loosely structured or loosely coupled system would be less problematic than a tightly structured or overly structured organization or system. Finally, "Insufficient Time Off"
was perceived by administrators in this study as contributing least to the burning out of individuals as "Time Off" (for example, vacation time, sabbatical leaves, etc.) is an inherent part of the initial organizational structure.

Fifth, "Loosely Structured Organization" correlated the least with the instrument because administrators in this study saw little association between this item and the individual burnout characteristics in the IAAB.

Sixth, "Unclear Goals/Goal Ambiguity" correlated the highest with the instrument because administrators in this study saw a moderately high correlation or association between this item and the individual burnout characteristics.

Seventh, the individual items or characteristics that correlated the most frequently with the eighteen organizational items were: 1) Feelings of Anger and Resentment, 2) Lack of Sense of Success, 3) Lack of Enthusiasm for Job, 4) Feeling Alienated, 5) Feelings of Frustration, 6) Lowered Self-Concept, 7) A Poor Job Attitude, 8) Extremely disorganized and 9) Lack of Sense of Control. Simply, administrators in this sample perceived that the above listed items most correlated or covaried with all eighteen of the organizational items.
Based on the findings of this study and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are suggested. These recommendations concern organizational characteristics or structural items that contribute the most and the least to individual burnout.

1. Specifically, additional research efforts should be conducted to determine what factors caused the overlapping of perceptions of administrators in this study.

2. Since attitudes, wants, needs, values, motives, etc., are all central states, and affect perceptions, particular attention should be given to organizational structural items or characteristics that administrators in this study perceived to be related to burnout.

This study has shown one way burnout can be identified and evaluated within an organization. The instrument developed and used by this researcher has proved to be valid and reliable and thus can be used on a wider scale. With more widespread use more data will be generated and compared.

More research should be conducted, in an effort to discover other individual burnout items that explain 75% or more variance which in turn should assist educational
leaders in better understanding organizational items that could be manipulated to cause changes in individuals.

Furthermore, research should be conducted to understand and determine what other factors and the amount of variance that interact with organizational characteristics or items to cause individual characteristics of burnout.

In addition, researchers need to apply other techniques in conducting and evaluating research on this subject. Studies on administrative burnout should include in-depth interviews, case studies, and instrumentation focused on specific variables.

Researchers and schools of higher education need to disseminate findings on burnout among educational administrators so widespread feedback is developed within the field. Results of this process may be a more definitive statement on the causative factors of burnout and consequently awareness and acceptance of this condition, and finally, preventive and remedial action in alleviating burnout factors.

Administrators, in turn, need to become more cognizant of burnout as a destructive and detrimental force which not only contributes to individual psychological and physical problems, but also to organizational inefficiency and ineffectiveness. Burnout can easily be surmised as very costly in both human and organizational performance.
Burnout may not be eliminated but certainly it can be controlled in many situations. Through this study, the researcher has contributed to an empirical basis for the development of methods to control conditions which affect burnout evolution.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Request Letter
Dear Mr. Stoffel:

This letter is a request for certain information relative to my research project. Specifically, I would like to know how many Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairpersons and Program Directors there are in the seventeen colleges at The Ohio State University. In addition to that, I would also like their campus addresses and the name of their department. I am gathering this data so as to complete a doctoral dissertation entitled "Organizational Characteristics That Administrators Perceive To Be Related To Individual Burnout." This study is being conducted in cooperation with the Department of Educational Administration at The Ohio State University.

Researchers are now beginning to view burnout from other perspectives. Most recently, they have begun to look at organizational structures as possible sources and causes of burnout. According to White, "the issue of burnout will be addressed when we begin defining it as an organizational process and stop defining it solely in terms of the personalities of our casualties." (1978a:1).

Thus, this information will be used in a survey which will not be an attempt to assess Ohio State University in terms of such factors but rather to draw upon the experiences of OSU's administrators as a source for identifying such factors if they do in fact exist.

Thank you for your assistance and time.

Sincerely,

Dr. Luvern Cunningham
Fawcett Professor in Educational Administration

Delores Brookins
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Appendix B

Response Letter
April 28, 1981

Ms. Dolores Brookins
58 Hamilton Park
Apt. A-3
Columbus, Ohio 43203

Dear Ms. Brookins:

Enclosed you will find the information Dr. Cunningham requested in his letter sent to Mr. Stoffel on April 21. The contents of this package are:

1) List of Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Department Chairpersons, and Program Directors.

2) 1980-1981 Faculty and Staff Directory which contains the addresses of the above.

3) Director section of the O.S.U. Title Deck which will aid you in decoding the directors' title abbreviations.

If you have any further questions please contact me at 422-9370.

Sincerely,

Timothy J. Dolen
Personnel Research Specialist

Enclosures
Appendix C
Letter to Field Test Administrators
Dear

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a sample administrator for my field test to assist in the development of an instrument for assessing organizational factors that contribute to administrative burnout. In order to determine structural characteristics that contribute the most or least to the burning out of individuals (defined in this study as the inability of an individual to empathize with his or her role expectation), there must first be a general consensus regarding common factors that contribute to administrative burnout across the board. Consequently, your assistance is needed to accomplish such a task.

The test booklet contains a set of general instructions that should guide you through your task. Please note the amount of time it takes you to complete the entire booklet and record the amount of time needed to complete the entire task in the appropriate space located in the lower right hand corner of the last page.

Within a few days, I will call you for an interview appointment. On the day of your interview, I will collect the materials sent to you and record your reactions, comments and suggestions on how to make the instrument more relevant, explicit, accurate and precise.

Enclosed, please find all the materials needed to complete this task. I trust that these materials will be sufficient in guiding you in this endeavor. If you have additional questions, please feel free to call me at my home telephone number (614) 461-4848.

Again, thank you very much for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Dolores Brookins
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Dear

I am conducting a study entitled “Organizational Characteristics That Administrators Perceive To Be Related To Individual Burnout.” In an effort to complete this study, I will need your perception as an administrator in an educational organization to determine if organizational factors contribute to individual burnout.

All Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans and Department Chairpersons were selected at The Ohio State University as those persons whose responses would be most valued. Therefore, it is my hope that you will choose to participate in this study, as your information will contribute immensely to a better understanding of some developing problems in our profession. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous.

Most recently, researchers have begun to look at organizational structures as possible sources and causes of burnout. Thus, the results of this study will be an initial attempt to view burnout from an organizational perspective rather than solely from the individual perspective. Please note that this is not an attempt to assess Ohio State University in terms of organizational factors that contribute to individual burnout, but rather it will be an attempt to draw upon your experiences as an administrator in an educational organization as a source for identifying such factors if they do, in fact, exist.

Would you please take a few minutes of your time to read and respond to the instrument that is enclosed. An addressed envelope is provided for the return of your completed questionnaire.

I wish to thank you in advance for your very important contribution to this investigation.

Respectfully yours,

Jordes Brookins
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration

The Ohio State University
Appendix E

Cover Letter from Adviser
Dear

Ms. Dolores Brookins is conducting an important study of organizational factors which may be related to burnout of administrators in higher education. I am chairperson of her doctoral committee.

I hope that you will take a few moments to respond to her instrument. Ms. Brookins has simplified her instrument as much as possible to reduce the amount of time required for its completion. If you have questions or comments, please call me at 2-7700.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Luvern L. Cunningham
Novice G. Fawcett Professor of Educational Administration
Appendix F

Interview Schedule
Good morning, afternoon, etc., Dr. _______________. Thank you for completing the survey instrument titled The Instrument for Assessing Organizational Factors That Are Related To Administrative Burnout, or The IAAB. As a part of my dissertation research in educational administration, I am interviewing educational administrators in an effort to obtain their perceptions of organizational factors or structures that contribute to the burning out of individuals. Now that you have completed the instrument:

1. Did "About This Instrument" inform you of the nature of this assessing instrument? If not, explain.

2. Were the instructions at the beginning of the instrument clear?

3. What should be added to the instructions?

4. Should any variables be added or left out of the instrument?

5. In your opinion are there other factors or variables that should be added to the original fourteen?

6. Did the fourteen items under background information cover all information needed in relationship to factors that burnout individuals?

7. Which statements or items under background information should be included but were not?

8. Were there any statements or items under background information that you considered to be misleading?

9. In part 2 of this survey instrument, are the instructions clear?
10. Is "Please Notice That" and "You Are To" necessary?

11. Are there variables that are unclear? Are there variables that need to be explained further?

12. Are there variables that should be included? List them.

13. Please indicate which of the following best describes your relations to the department.

14. What are your reactions to the ability of this instrument to assess organizational structural items related to individual burnout?

15. Are there any overall general comments?
Appendix G

The Instrument For Assessing Organizational Factors
The Instrument For Assessing Organizational Factors That Are Related To Administrative Burnout is being developed as a research project in cooperation with The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, specifically. The Department of Educational Administration, 29 Woodruff Ave., 310 Ramseyer Hall.
The Instrument for Assessing Organizational Factors That Are Related To Administrative Burnout has been constructed to survey the perceptions educational administrators have toward factors comprising the organizational structures that may contribute to the burning out of administrators.

This instrument is not a personality inventory, an interest inventory, an achievement test or an aptitude test. Rather, it is a device designed to identify those factors that impact negatively upon its organizational leaders.

This instrument consists of two parts (Part I - Background Information, Part II - The IAAB Items or checklist) that are designed for you to record your perceptions of organizational factors you think promote burnout. Its purpose is to determine whether or not certain structural features in an organization have a negative impact on individuals.
### Part I

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In the section to the right marked "Answer column", please place a check (✓) mark to indicate your response to the statements of the questionnaire.

#### PERSONAL AND STATUS INFORMATION

1. **Age:**
   - 1. Less than 25...............................1. ✓
   - 5. Between 56-65..........................5.

2. **Sex:**
   - 1. Male..................................1.
   - 2. Female................................2.

3. **Marital Status:**
   - 3. Separated or Divorced...............3.

4. **Indicate your highest academic degree:**
   - 1. No degree................................1.
   - 2. Associate degree......................2.
   - 3. B.A. or B.S............................3.

5. **What is the type of administrative position that you hold?**
   - 1. Line..................................1. ✓
   - 2. Staff................................2.

6. **What is the nature of your position?**
   - 1. Part-time administrative/part-time faculty..1. ✓
   - 2. Full-time administrative..................2.
   - 3. Others.................................3.
7. Your position in this organization is considered.
   1. Academic...........................................1.
   2. Non-academic.....................................2.

8. How long have you held your present administrative position?
   1. (1-5) years......................................1.
   2. (6-10) years....................................2.
   3. (11-15) years..................................3.
   4. (16-20) years..................................4.
   5. (21-25) years..................................5.
   7. (31 or more) years............................7.

9. What is your nationality?
   2. Black..........................................2.
   3. Latino, Mexican, Mexican American...........3.
   5. White, Caucasian................................5.

10. Approximately how many hours per week do you work in your present administrative position?
    1. 61 (or more) hours per week ..................1.
    2. 51 - 60 hours per week .......................2.
    3. 41 - 50 hours per week .......................3.
    4. 31 - 40 hours per week .......................4.
    5. 21 - 30 hours per week .......................5.
    6. Less than 20 hours per week………………6.

11. Of the total working time, approximately what percentage of that time is spent in direct contact with clients, students or staff members.
    1. (10% or less).................................1.
    2. (11% - 20%)..................................2.
    3. (21% - 30%)..................................3.
    4. (31% - 40%)..................................4.
    5. (41% - 50%)..................................5.
    6. (51% or more).................................6.

12. Of your total working time, approximately what percentage of that time is spent in responding to correspondence and completing administrative forms.
    1. (10% or less).................................1.
    2. (11% - 20%)..................................2.
    3. (21% - 30%)..................................3.
    4. (31% - 40%)..................................4.
    5. (41% - 50%)..................................5.
    6. (51% or more).................................6.
13. Indicate if you are:

1. Tenured.................................... 1.
5. No tenure offered in this position............ 5.

**PART II**

**PLEASE NOTICE THAT:**

1. On the next page there are seventeen characteristics of persons suffering from burnout in the horizontal column across the top of the instrument (A-Q); and

2. Eighteen organizational variables that appear to contribute to burnout are printed in the vertical column (1-9 and 10-18).

**YOU ARE TO:**

1. Begin with the organizational variable of "Insufficient time off" and check across all individual characteristics that you agree to be related to "Insufficient time off". Complete all eighteen organizational variables (vertical items) in this same manner.

2. In the example below "Insufficient Time Off" (an organizational factor) relates to several individual factors, you are to check across all individual items that you believe relate to the organizational characteristics "Insufficient Time Off".

**EXAMPLE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Characteristic</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insufficient Time Off</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "Insufficient Time Off" relates to several individual factors, the following should be checked across all individual items:

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F
- G
- H
- I
- J
- K
- L
## Individual and Organizational Characteristics of Burnout

Read across each item and check all individual characteristics that you perceive relate to organizational characteristics of burnout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Characteristics</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>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items 1-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Insufficient Time Off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vacations, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lack of Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lack of Proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Insufficient Number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Members to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplish Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Unclear Goals/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 High Client Ratio to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 An Overabundance of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent on Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Loosely Structured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 High Frequency of Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Individual and Organizational Characteristics of Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Characteristics</th>
<th>Organizational Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate self-concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in energy level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly repetitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient intrinsic resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly defined organizational policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse administrative climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **Indicate if you perceive:**
- **Indicate the level of burnout:**

**Items:** 1-18

- 1. Lack of self-concept
- 2. Feelings
- 3. Alienation
- 4. Decrease in energy level
- 5. Low job satisfaction
- 6. Inadequate self-concept
- 7. Feelings
- 8. Alienation
- 9. Decrease in energy level
- 10. Lack of enthusiasm
- 11. Low job satisfaction
- 12. Overly repetitive job task
- 13. Insufficient intrinsic resources
- 14. Poorly defined organizational policies
- 15. Lack of support
- 16. Adverse administrative climate
- 17. Work overload
- 18. Inadequate self-concept

**Indicators:**
- 1. Feeling of failure
- 2. Feeling of meaninglessness
- 3. Feeling of hopelessness
- 4. Feeling of entrapment
- 5. Feeling of entrapment
- 6. Feeling of entrapment
- 7. Feeling of entrapment
- 8. Feeling of entrapment
- 10. Feeling of entrapment
- 11. Feeling of entrapment
- 12. Feeling of entrapment
- 13. Feeling of entrapment
- 14. Feeling of entrapment
- 15. Feeling of entrapment
- 16. Feeling of entrapment
- 17. Feeling of entrapment
- 18. Feeling of entrapment

**Levels:**
- 1. None
- 2. Mild
- 3. Moderate
- 4. Severe

**Scale:**
- 1. None
- 2. Mild
- 3. Moderate
- 4. Severe

**Interpretation:**
- Score 1: All items scored as '0' indicating no burnout.
- Score 2: One or more items scored as '1' indicating minor burnout.
- Score 3: Two or more items scored as '1' indicating moderate burnout.
- Score 4: Three or more items scored as '1' indicating severe burnout.

**Conclusion:**
- A score of 1 indicates no burnout.
- A score of 2 indicates minimal burnout.
- A score of 3 indicates moderate burnout.
- A score of 4 indicates severe burnout.

---

**Further Information:**
- The scale aims to identify burnout by assessing both individual and organizational characteristics.
- Each item is rated on a scale of 0 to 4, with 4 indicating the highest level of burnout.
- The scale is designed to help individuals and organizations address burnout effectively.
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