1982

Teacher Burn-Out: An Investigation of the Relationship Among Locus of Control, Job Satisfaction, Self-Esteem and Depression of Teachers of the Emotionally Disturbed

Donald Feinstein
Loyola University Chicago

TEACHER BURN-OUT: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG LOCUS OF CONTROL, JOB SATISFACTION, SELF-ESTEEM AND DEPRESSION OF TEACHERS OF THE EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED

by

Donald Feinstein

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfullment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

January

1982

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is given to the members of my committee, Dr. Ronald Morgan, Dr. Jack Kavanagh, and Dr. Steven Miller for their unique and valuable contributions and suggestions toward the development of this dissertation.

My sincere appreciation is also extended to my wife and son, Denise and Jonathan, for their continuing patience and support in this endeavor. Finally, my gratitude is shared with all my colleagues and co-workers who helped make this dissertation a reality.

VITA

The author, Donald Feinstein, son of Jack and Eve Feinstein, was born September 24, 1945 in Chicago, Illinois. He attended elementary and high school in Chicago, Illinois graduating from Von Steuben High School in 1963. In September of 1963, he entered the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle Campus and in June of 1968, received the degree of Bachelor of Science with a major in accounting. In August of 1973, he graduated from Northeastern Illinois University, being awarded the Master of Arts in Special Education degree, majoring in the education of emotionally disturbed children.

Presently, Donald Feinstein is the City-wide Coordinator for the Programs for Emotionally Disturbed Children for the Chicago Board of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A recent pedagogical phenomenon called teacher burn-out is becoming prevalent in the educational arena. This psychological state is produced by stress and can result in a myriad of symptoms such as loss of will, suicide, colitis, depression, and lowered self-esteem. Teacher burn-out has reportedly resulted in physical, emotional, and attitudinal exhaustion (Chicago Teacher Union Survey, 1977). Christina Maslach (1977) has reported that burn-out often leads to a deterioration of physical well-being. This failure to cope can be manifested in a number of ways (e.g., impaired performance, mental illness, marital conflict). Burn-out as a phenomenon can be described as an active process or a final state in which an individual is either becoming or has achieved a psychological state of mental drain, emotional exhaustion, stagnation, or physical fatigue. Burn-out can also be defined as a reaction to job stress, characterized by exhaustion, depression, and disengagement (Cherniss, 1980). Specifically, burn-out is characterized by emotional exhaustion where an individual cannot deal successfully with the overwhelming emotional stress of the job.

According to Jerry Edelwich (1980), burn-out refers to a progressive loss of idealism, energy, and purpose. Teacher burn-out has a debilitating effect on the process of education, the teacher's personal health, and the delivery of services to students (Weiskopf,

1980). While teacher burn-out exists at all levels of the educational system, the present investigation focuses only on those teachers of handicapped children who require constant care, supervision, and support. The stress innate in special education may lead to emotional strain, resulting in physical or emotional exhaustion. When the emotional stress continues without relief, the teacher, unable to cope with the stress, may begin the process of burning out (Weiskopf, 1980). Because of this effect, a need exists to help educators develop a better understanding of the burn-out syndrome.

Initially, a burn-out victim may have only a vague feeling of personal distress. As burn-out evolves, fatigue and irritability, along with mild depression, boredom, and feelings of overwork surface (Freudenberger, 1977). The teacher may become less flexible, cynical, and sarcastic. If the subtle signs of burn-out go unnoticed and the stress continues, problems such as alcohol and drug abuse, absenteeism, marital conflict, mental illness, and depression can emerge (Cooper and Marshall, 1976; Maslach, 1977). Burn-out can also be seen as a process of disillusionment that commonly occurs in the following hierarchial arranged stages: enthusiasm, stagnation, frustration, and apathy (Edelwich and Brodsky, 1980).

Burn-out has multi-faceted dimensions such as depression, negative self-evaluation, job dissatisfaction or, as Jackson and Maslach (1971) have reported; emotional exhaustion, negative attitudes towards recipients, negative self-evaluation as a helper and emotional distance from recipients. How teachers perceive negativism in relation to their own personal belief system could be a major determinant or trait

indicating the degree to which they would experience burn-out (Jackson and Maslach, 1979). That is to say that "one cannot smooth out the turf, but one can ride the waves."

One area of research that might increase our understanding of teacher burn-out focuses on the conditions which influence the tendency to ascribe responsibility to personal forces (e.g., ability and effort), or to impersonal forces over which the individual has little control (e.g., situation and luck). One personality dimension which appears to play a major role in influencing the nature of causal attributions is the internal-external control of reinforcement (I-E). The I-E variable represents a generalized expectancy that reinforcement is causally related to one's own behavior (Davis and Davis, 1972). It is expected that the relationship between I-E and attribution of responsibility would be mediated by the nature of the outcome in a behavioral activity (e.g., teaching emotionally disturbed children).

This factor of internality-externality may affect the amount of burn-out that one person develops relative to another. The internal versus external control of reinforcement concept developed from social learning theory (Rotter, 1954) and refers to the extent to which an individual feels that he or she has control over the environment or reinforcement contingencies. It has been hypothesized that depression tends to be associated with people who possess a strong generalized expectancy that outcomes are their own responsibility (Rotter, 1966). Merton has discussed the belief in luck (externality) as a defense behavior, as an attempt "to serve the psychological function of enabling people to preserve their self-esteem in the face of failure." He states

it may also, in some individuals, act to curtail sustained endeavor. Is the "external" cognitive style more effective in buffering against negative emotions than the internal style? Conversely, studies have shown that externals tend to report a greater incidence of depression (Abramowitz, 1966).

The framework of teaching emotionally disturbed children provides one with a naturalistic situation that can apparently produce stress, frustration, and other negative behavioral characteristics. Teachers of the emotionally disturbed/behavior disordered children are continually confronted with occupational stress, professional frustration, and prolonged teacher-student confrontation. They would appear to be prime candidates for becoming burned-out.

It is anticipated that, by looking at the internal-external dimension within the stressful and potentially frustrated or defeating framework of special education, one could gain a greater understanding regarding the internal-external control dimension and attribution of responsibility for success and failure within this naturalistic framework. In addition, by analyzing teacher burn-out utilizing the independent variables of locus of control and years of teaching experience, new information surrounding this syndrome could be generated. For example, does a longer time in the teaching profession tend to generate a higher probability of burning-out manifesting itself in greater depression, lowered self-esteem and/or lowered job satisfaction?

Many variables pertaining to teacher burn-out must be systematically studied and analyzed in order to generate additional information and bring further clarification and understanding to this phenomenon.

Habkin and Struening (1976) point out that the relationship of teacher burn-out to internality-externality, psychological styles, and job satisfaction are some areas currently being investigated. "What remains to be investigated to understand the nature of stress associated with teaching events is the relationship of perceived stress to "internal factors" such as personality type, psychological defenses, past experiences, and a sense of mastery over one's fate." Within the context of working with severely handicapped children, it appears that teachers with an internal orientation may be more susceptible to a greater amount of burn-out as manifested by a higher degree of dissatisfaction, and/or depression, and/or lowered self-esteem. Furthermore, relationships may exist between years on the job and job satisfaction (e.g., longer on the job, greater dissatisfaction for both cognitive styles) or among some combinations of the dependent variables (e.g., higher depression--lowered job satisfaction, higher depression--lowered self-esteem, higher job satisfaction--high self-esteem).

The relationship between the concept of psychological success and burn-out was made especially clear by Argyris (1959). He asked "What happens when a person must work in a situation structured for failure, a situation in which success occurs rarely, or the conditions for psychological (i.e., self-controlled) success are not present?" His answer was that the person will increasingly use intrapsychic defenses. The result will be apathy, increased concern with material rewards, heavy use of psychological defense mechanisms (such as denial, avoidance, and repression), fighting the organization, changing one's position, or leaving the organization. If these coping strategies fail, the person

may become more dependent and passive, his or her time perspective will shorten, self-esteem and self-confidence will decrease, and fear of new tasks will increase. The person also will increasingly expect to fail, give up quickly, lose interest in work, and tend to blame others.

Overall, the present field study addresses the phenomenon of teacher burn-out by analyzing the dependent variables of depression, job satisfaction, and self-esteem. By identifying specific relationships between the dependent variables and the independent variables of locus of control and years of teaching experience, a greater understanding of the teacher burn-out phenomenon will hopefully develop.

Furthermore, this study addresses itself to the numerous inconsistencies and contradictions found within the literature regarding the specific relationship between locus of control and depression. Which locus of control style teacher (the internal or external) is more likely to experience relatively greater levels of depression under similar circumstances (which may be frustrating)? When engaging in this analysis, a cognitive model of motivation is considered in which ascriptions concerning the causes of success and failure mediate between achievement outcomes and subsequent achievement-related behavior (Weiner, et.al., 1972). Consequently, the basic paradigm of a cognitive theory of motivation (Baldwin, 1969) is that mental events following the perception of a stimulus determine the behavioral response to that stimulus.

To summarize, staff burn-out in human service programs is a process in which stress produces strain. Workers are strongly motivated

to achieve a sense of efficacy and psychological success in their work, but their efforts are frustrated in a work setting characterized by unpredictability and lack of personal control. When staff chronically feel ineffective, unsuccessful, and powerless, learned helplessness is a likely outcome. Learned helplessness leads to the passive, defensive coping behavior associated with burn-out (for example, emotional withdrawal, apathy, depression, dissatisfaction, cynicism, and preoccupation with the self) (Cherniss, 1980).

Locus of control is a personality dimension that has been linked to differences in stress reactions. According to Rotter (1966), individuals differ in the degree to which they believe that they control important sources of reinforcement in their lives. "Internals" tend to believe that they control their destinies. If they want something, they assume they can get it. If they fail, it is because they lacked the will or ability. "Externals" believe they are at the mercy of fate or powers beyond their control. Whether life turns out well or poorly for them, they attribute the cause not to their own efforts or abilities but to external forces (Seligman, 1975).

Seligman (1975) suggested that "externals" are more prone to learned helplessness. In other words, they are more likely to believe that they are helpless and have no control over a situation and consequently, will tend to give up and withdraw in the face of stress and frustration. Internals, on the other hand, will tend to persist in the face of frustration. They are less likely than externals to manifest the deficits associated with burn-out. However, in the present study, it is hypothesized that a sense of self-direction may further one's

sense of mastery over life, but in specific social situations will this internal cognitive style actually create a greater degree of negative emotions than the external cognitive style? Furthermore, do some of the variables associated with teacher burn-out, such as depression and job satisfaction, have a relationship between each other that would help us better understand the burn-out syndrome further? The present investigation systematically addresses these areas in conjunction with the teacher burn-out phenomenon in an attempt to provide answers to the above questions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The lack of research on I-E expectancies and teacher related burn-out is quite striking. However, the current heightened blending of interest in individual difference variables and the burn-out syndrome is most likely resulting from an increased focus on the philosophy of prevention and on changing social and financial educational perspectives. Increasing awareness is becoming evident in which individual responsibility for one's own health is being emphasized. Increasing education costs have caused continuing concern and motivation on the part of the educational system to protect and further develop human resources.

The following selective review of the literature focuses on three major areas of research: locus of control, depression, and teacher burn-out. Even though all three areas are presented as independent subsections, the information selected in each subsection is shown to be interrelated and germaine to the other areas reviewed. Research with the I-E dimension suggests that beliefs about locus of control of reinforcement are not only influential, but rather controversial in relation to one's affective domain. That is to say, that external locus of control orientations and not internal orientations, have been reported by various sources (e.g., Seligman, 1975) to be the better cognitive style for coping in situations of stress, frustration,

and depression. Overall, the systematic investigation of teacher burn-out and related variables is still in the stage of infancy, as evidenced by a lack of significant numbers of research studies and information.

Locus of Control

The internal-external control of reinforcement (I-E) dimension is an expectancy variable situated within Rotter's social learning theory (Lefcourt, 1976; Phares, 1976; Rotter, 1954; Rotter, Chance, and Phares, 1972; Strickland, 1977). I-E refers to the degree to which an individual perceives the events that happen to him/her as dependent on his/her own behavior or as a result of luck, chance, fate, or powers beyond one's personal control and understanding. The concept was first outlined by Rotter and defined as follows: When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted in this way by an individual we have labeled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control (Rotter, 1966).

Rotter, 1954; Rotter, et.al., 1972 postulated behavior to occur as a function of expectancy and reinforcement within a specific situation. If a situation is novel or ambiguous, then an individual will

depend on generalized expectancies that have served him/her in the past. More specific expectancies are used when the aspects of the situation are straightforward or routine. The I-E dimension is a generalized expectancy that occurs when individuals have learned that events are contingent or non-contingent on their behavior. Individuals holding internal expectancies are more likely than externals to take responsibility for their actions (Davis and Davis, 1972; Phares, Wilson and Klyver, 1971) and to attribute responsibility to agents who activate chance (Hochwich, 1972; Phares and Wilson, 1972; Schiavo, 1973; Sosis, 1974). In performance task situations, internals are perceptually alert and attentive (DuCette and Wolk, 1973; Lefcourt and McDonald, 1973; Lefcourt, 1969; Wolk and DuCette, 1974) and appear to gather and process information effectively for problem solving (Davis and Phares, 1977; DuCette and Wolk, 1972; Pines and Julian, 1977). Research on social action (Gore and Rotter, 1963; Levenson and Miller, 1965; Pawlik and Almquist, 1973; Sanger and Alger, 1972) suggests that individuals who believe that events are related to their own behaviors are more likely than persons trusting fate or powers beyond their control to take steps to change aversive life situations. Phares (1976, p. 78) proposed that the cognitive and motivational aspects of the I-E dimension leads internals to a superior position exerting power and control over their environment.

Joe (1971) and Lefcourt (1972) indicate that the locus of control construct has been examined as a personality dimension from which prediction of human behavior could be inferred over widely diverse situations in terms of generalized expectancies. Rotter's internal-external

(I-E) locus of control theory is based upon the degree to which an individual believes he has direct control over acquiring reinforcement contingent to his or her behavior. Internals reportedly believe that reinforcement is influenced through one's own abilities to directly control the reinforcing contingencies. An external, however, is more likely to feel as if the reinforcing contingencies are controlled by either luck, chance or fate, or by forces not subject to one's own sphere of influence. Rotter (1966) suggests that an internally-oriented person should exhibit relatively more self-control. He or she may be more alert to his or her environment for data upon which to base his or her choices, and he or she should be more concerned with failure because he or she holds himself or herself more responsible than would an external. The internal is also expected to see others more as he or she sees himself or herself and to be considerate of another's point of view.

On the other hand, the external reportedly believes that agents other than himself or herself are responsible for life's events. We might assume that he or she feels more alienated from his or her destiny (Rotter, 1971). Less concerned with achievement, the external is likely to accept failure calmly, secure in the belief that blame may be attributed outside oneself (Rotter, 1966). Phares (1971) found that externals who had been failed on a standardized test under normal conditions were more likely to exhibit blaming behavior (a defense reaction) than in a condition which contained real distractions. The research of Lewis and Blanchard (1971) seems to suggest that externals do not perceive subtly coercive situations as particularly threatening,

indeed, they may welcome such situations. If flight from responsibility is characteristic of the external, then one can easily explain the external's tendency to anxiety (Hountras, 1970) and neuroticism (Platt, et.al., 1970). Indications that the external is less dominant, less assertive, more dependent, and more dogmatic (Hersch and Schiebe, 1967; Clouser and Hjelle, 1970) would support the view that the external teacher is pessimistic about personal power, fearful of responsibility, and consequently apathetic.

Clouser and Hjelle (1970) found a correlation between external locus of control and high scores on a dogmatism scale. External locus of control has been found to correlate positively with neuroticism (Platt, Pomeranz, and Eisenman, 1970), with manifest anxiety (Hountras and Scharf, 1970), and with blaming behavior (Phares, Wilson, Klyver, 1971). Lewis and Blanchard (1971) found that "internals" are resistent to subtle suggestions, and Bartel (1970) found that they attributed performance more to motivation than to ability. The results of a study by Weight (1970) suggest that "internals" are more confident in attributing good quality to an interpersonal relationship. Tseng (1970) found that they tended to make higher scores on scales which measured "compliance with rules", "ability to work with others", and "work tolerance". According to Hersch and Schiebe (1967), "internals" score higher on scales of dominance, tolerance, sociability, efficiency and well-being.

An internal cognitive orientation is one in which an individual believes in direct control over the contingencies of reinforcement. This type of individual's attribution of responsibility under conditions

of success or failure is seen as mainly reflecting characteristics of the self (e.g., ability and skill). Attribution may be external in which case the outcome is seen as primarily due to outside influences over which the person has little or no control (N. T. Feather, 1969).

According to Weiner, Heckhausen, Meyer, and Cook (1979), ability and effort are perceived as internal (personal) causes of success and failure, while task difficulty and luck are external (environmental) determinants of outcome. They contend that locus of control influences the affective reactions to an event, with internal ascription magnifying emotional responses. Several researchers (e.g., Larson, 1977; Luginbuhl, Crowe and Kahan, 1975; Wortman, Constanzo, and Witt, 1973) have found evidence for a "self-serving bias" (Miller and Ross, 1975) in causal attributions; that is, people tend to attribute their successes to internal factors (e.g., ability and effort) and their failures to external factors (e.g., luck or task difficulty). In their review of the literature, Miller and Ross originally suggested that non-motivational factors relating to perception and information processing may account for this self-serving bias.

Studies attesting to the relationship between locus of control and attribution of responsibility theory seem to indicate that internals assume greater responsibility for their failure than do externally orientated individuals. Butterfield (1976), in discussing the locus of control construct, suggested that externals generally regard obstacles as insurmountable in comparison to internals, who regard them as generally surmountable since they believe that they control reinforcement. These results suggest that the more internal a subject

is, the more he or she reacts to frustration in a constructive manner, and the less intropunitive (self-blaming) are his or her reported reactions, whereas, the more external a subject is the more he or she reacts intropunitively and the less constructively.

Feather (1968) suggested that differences may exist in terms of attribution of responsibility if the success or failure of the outcome is connected with positive or negative self evaluation. For example, Feather reported that unexpected success on a problem-solving task was associated with greater satisfaction, but carried a stronger tendency to attribute success toward external attribution (good luck) than when success was expected. Similarly, unexpected failures was associated with greater dissatisfaction, with a stronger tendency to blame failure upon external attribution or bad luck. Previous research has shown that incidents of job dissatisfaction are more likely to be attributed to external agents (e.g., coworkers, superiors) than are incidents of job satisfaction (Adler, 1980).

Locke (1973) and Schneider and Locke (1971) suggest that in the organizational context, external agents in fact may do more to promote experiences of dissatisfaction than experiences of satisfaction. Phares and Wilson (1972), have reported that the clearer the cues are regarding the actual causes for satisfaction and dissatisfaction, the less motivationally based biases affect attributional behavior.

In sum, the previously cited studies described characteristics or personality traits which seem to be attributed to either an internal or external cognitive orientation. Specifically, the I-E literature has provided conflicting information with regard to I-E and coping

abilities under frustrating or adversive situational conditions. Consequently, the question still remains concerning which type of person (I or E) is apt to become more depressed or dissatisfied with work under frustrating or negative conditions.

Depression

Problems in personal adjustment can often be traced to the attributions individuals make regarding the causes of their behaviors (cf. Abramson, Seligman, and Teasdale, 1978; Valins and Nisbett, 1971). Although the failure to deal satisfactorily with environmental stresses and demands generally leads to loss of self-esteem and self-confidence, these effects are far more pronounced when the cause of the failure is attributed to oneself. Such negative self-attributions, whether veridical or erroneous, lead to feelings of inadequacy and further undermine the individual's ability to deal effectively with subsequent problems (Storms and McCaul, 1976).

Klein, Fencil-Morse, and Seligman (1976) found that depressed subjects who attributed failure to anagrams to their own incompetence rather than to the difficulty of the test demonstrated less adequate patterns of adjustment. As Abramson, et.al. (1978) have noted, uncontrollable outcomes can lead to feelings of helplessness rather than to environmental factors.

Research on the I-E variable and the reporting of psychological and/or emotional difficulties is much more extensive than that on I-E and physical disorders. At a general level of overall functioning, internal individuals including the elderly (Felton and Kahana, 1974;

Wolk and Kurtz, 1975) are significantly more likely to report themselves as content with their life situations than externals (Naditch, Gargan, and Michael, 1975; Palmore and Luikart, 1972). The relationships among I-E and adjustive behavior and attitudes, however, is apparently moderated by the nature of the settings in which people reside (Wolk, 1976). With regard to dysfunctional difficulty, investigators have found a belief in external locus of control to be related to debilitating anxiety (Butterfield, 1964; Feather, 1967; Finch and Nelson, 1974; Platt and Eisenmann, 1967), to the holding of irrational value (MacDonald and Games, 1972) to mood disturbances (Kilpatrick, Dubin and Marquette, 1974), and to indices of maladjustment on paper-and-pencil questionnaires (Duke, 1973; Hersch and Scheibe, 1967; Vega, 1972). With patients who have been hospitalized for psychiatric reasons, a number of researchers have also reported a relationship between externality and severity of psychiatric diagnosis (Cash and Stack, 1973).

Abramowitz (1966) found externals were more apt to report a greater incidence of depression that were internals on the Guilford Depression Scale. Calhoun, Cheney, and Dawes (1974) found a relationship between externality and the presence of relatively stable symptoms of clinical depressions among a non-psychiatric sample of both males and females.

The findings from those studies using a non-psychiatric sample appear to be consistent with earlier studies which reported pathological subjects to have higher external scores than normal subjects. Bialer (1960); Cromwell, Rosenthal, Shakow, and Kahn (1961); Harrow and

Ferrante (1969) reported differences in I-E orientation for committed mental patients and found that schizophrenics were more external than the total sample of non-schizophrenics. Shybut (1968) found psychotics to have higher external scores than either normal or neurotic subjects. Naditch, Gargan, and Michael (1975) found depression to be most associated with externality and high degree of discontent. Boor (1976) investigated the relationship of I-E control to be national suicide rates among ten countries and found those cultures that encouraged high perceptions of externality also seemed to experience the highest national suicide rates.

Related to the studies of externality to depression is Rotter's (1967) conceptualization that externals would lower their expectations for securing valued goals or reinforcement and that such an expectation would result in the decrease of goal-seeking behavior. Bech (1967) included this lack of purposefulness to behavior as being a behavioral correlate to the symptomatology of the depressed. Subsequent studies by Prociuk, Breen, and Lussier (1976) and by Fogg, Kohaut, and Gayton (1977) have confirmed this relationship of hopelessness to an external locus of control dimension.

A puzzling issue through the consideration of the relationship between I-E and maladaptive behavior, however, concerns the discrepant predictions of the relationship between externality and depression. One might expect that individuals who believe that they are responsible for the results of their behavior would be more likely to become depressed when life events do not go well for them than persons who are able to attribute traumatic events to luck, fate, God's judgement, and

so forth. Indeed, Phares (1972) hypothesized that "depressions tend to be associated with people who possess a strong generalized expectancy that outcomes are their own responsibility". The guilt and self-punitiveness often expressed by depressives would be expected to occur when individuals actually believe that they experience life occurrences.

Efran (1963) examined the relationship between I-E and defensiveness and noted that externals showed less forgetting than did internals after failing a problem-solving task. He speculated that... "an external orientation may provide less need to defend against the unpleasant thought of failure, since that orientation gives one a less threatening explanation of failure--forces outside oneself are responsible."

Phares, Ritchie and Davis (1968) reported that after having distinguished their samples in terms of I-E, subjects were administered projective personality tests. After having heard their psychological evaluations (all of a standard format with an equal number of positive and negative appraisals for each subject), externals recalled more threatening information than did the internals. It would appear that differential levels of anxiety in internals and externals produce disparate effects of interference with respect to the recall of threatening materials. Externals orientation would appear to act as a defense mechanism against lowered self-esteem and acts to produce less need to initiate forgetting as an adaptive response to threatening stimuli.

Kolstoe, James, and Randall (1968) suggest that externals have less need to resort to forgetting and denial as defensive strategies since they can readily account for failure by attributing them to impersonal forces. Further support for a defensive interpretation of

externality is found in a study by Phares, Wilson, and Klyver (1971) in which externals attributed more blame for their failures to environmental factors than did internals. Logically, it seems that these strategies would protect the self-esteem and affect of this cognitive psychological style.

If an external orientation does serve a defensive function, then it might be expected that the relationship between I-E and attribution of responsibility would be mediated by the nature of the outcome in the teaching activity. Specifically, externals, following frustration or failure, would be more inclined than internals to rationalize this outcome by attributing it to forces beyond their control. Conversely, successful task performance would engender little or no threat, and therefore differences between internals and externals in assigning responsibility to outside forces would be attenuated (Davis and Davis, 1972). Therefore, it seems that when an outcome is negative, internals will blame themselves more than externals and develop greater amounts of depression and job dissatisfaction.

In summary, individuals are psychologically affected even when being normal, ordinary participating members of society involved in its institutions and structures (Perlin, 1981). This is readily seen in the teaching profession where depression and job dissatisfaction are not uncommon. As reported previously, problems in personal adjustment can often be traced to the attributions individuals make regarding the causes of their behaviors (Abramson, et.al., 1971). In certain social situations, is it more psychologically debilitating when one attributes failure to personal inabilities rather than to environmental

factors? Studies have shown that externals were more apt to report a greater incidence of depression than were internals (Abramowitz, 1966). Other studies have suggested that external orientation would appear to act as a defense mechanism against lowered self-esteem (Phares, Ritchie, and Davis, 1968). Furthermore, Phares (1972) hypothesized that "depressions" tend to be associated with people who possess a strong generalized expectancy that outcomes are their own responsibility. Thus far, it is impossible to disentangle the variables and assert with confidence that depression relates to an external orientation and is unrelated to internal beliefs. A variety of factors could be obscuring relationships here, including the potentially pessimistic wording of external items (Lamont, 1972), possible relationships between internality and social desirability, and the possible difference between assuming responsibility for failures and successes. Obviously, the question still remains with regard to the nature of the association between depression and the cognitive styles in certain social situations.

Teacher Burn-out

According to Education Digest (March, 1979), if teachers are depressed, frustrated, and dissatisfied, they are victims of teacher burn-out.

Spaniol (1979) states that teacher burn-out is related to stress. Feinberg (1978) reports that before treating teacher burn-out, "First we have to determine if the depression is internalized." Stress can be seen as a positive or negative reaction occurring when there is a substantial imbalance (perceived or real) between environmental demand

and the response capability of the individual (Seyle, 1956). As environmental demand increases and/or response capability decreases, the likelihood that the individual will experience stress as a negative reaction becomes more probable.

In the fall of 1977, the Chicago Teachers Union discovered that there was a clear indication that teacher burn-out was a real problem confronting the teachers of Chicago. Teachers who were functioning in stressful situations reportedly needed help in finding solutions to their work-related problems.

In the teaching profession, and particularly in Special Education, teachers are subjected to a considerable amount of student hostility. Teacher aggression in response to frustration and anger is not always expressed either in direct or indirect forms. It may be expressed in bodily symptoms (Dunbar, 1977). This inability or unwillingness to ventilate or retaliate in some acceptable manner furthers a teacher's proness to burn-out. According to Maslach (1977), one sign of burn-out was the transformation of a person with original thought and creativity on the job into a mechanical, petty bureaucrat. She also found that burn-out correlates with other damaging indexes of human stress, such as alcoholism, depression, mental illness, marital conflict, low self-esteem, and suicide. Individuals who burn-out often degenerate into total detachment and dehumanization.

A common response to burn-out is to get out, by changing teaching assignments, moving into administrative work, or even leaving the teaching profession entirely.

Burn-out seems to be a complex process which develops gradually

over time and appears to be influenced by social and personal variables. Freudenberger (1977) states that burn-out is a failing, wearing out, or becoming exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength or resources. Some of the behavioral signs of burn-out are excessive rigidness, stubbornness, and inflexibility. Also, the individual has a totally negative attitude. The person looks, act, and seems depressed. The symptoms of burn-out manifest themselves in every area of the workers' life; his relationship to the agency, his life outside, including his emotional attitude and bodily complaints (Freudenberger, 1977).

Teachers of emotionally disturbed children are called upon almost constantly to react emotionally and because the work required is done less often on an intellectual basis than on an emotional basis, the teacher has a hard time leaving the job "at the office" (Freudenberger, 1977). The ongoing concern with the students can severely drain his or her energies and intrude on all aspects of his or her personal life and relationships. The school actually plays a part in promoting burn-out of its staff. Often the administration does not communicate effectively with its teachers. The teachers begin to develop a sense of isolation. They feel a lack of support and believe that they are fighting a lonely battle. Burn-out is a multiple threat; it incapacitates the teacher; it robs the child; it propagates negative feelings and despair within both, and it diminishes coping defenses against despair (Freudenberger, 1977).

Maslach (1977) defined burn-out as "emotional exhaustion resulting from the stress of interpersonal contact." Her findings indicated

that a person who is unable to cope with continued emotional stress loses all concern and emotional feeling for the individuals she or he is trying to help. Gradually, the helper increases the distance between self and clients, becoming less involved emotionally and less concerned about the clients' social, physical, and emotional needs. The professional slowly detaches herself or himself through verbal and non-verbal distancing techniques. This behavior is characterized by not spending time with the client, not having eye contact in an interview, and not responding to the client's needs individually (Maslach and Pines, 1977). There is almost a callous response to the client.

Freudenberger (1977) and Mattingly (1977) both emphasized the enormous task of caring for deprived or difficult children. Special educators, like clinical child care workers, can become disenchanted, disillusioned, angry, and burned out while working with children in need. Teachers often perceive only the child's problems and fail to see any progress or success within their relationship. Lack of perceived success on the job contributes to low self-esteem and eventually to burn-out (Collins, 1977; Daley, 1979; Freudenberger, 1977; Mattingly, 1977; Pines and Kafry, 1978; Proctor, 1979). More importantly, how the teacher perceives the situation, not necessarily the reality of it, contributes to this deterioration of self-esteem (Kyriacou and Stucliffe, 1978).

Research (Freudenberger, 1977; Pines and Kafry, 1978; Reed, 1977) indicated that the helping professionals are constantly expected to provide for the other person. In this client-centered situation, the professional gives and the client receives. Kadushin (1974) stated

"the flow of emotional supplies goes one way, from the worker to the client, and may lead to the emotional depletion of the worker."

Initially, a burn-out victim may have only a vague feeling of personal distress (Mattingly, 1977). At this stage, the teacher may not want to go to work. As burn-out evolves, fatigue and irritability, along with mild depression, boredom and feelings of overwork surface (Freudenberger, 1977). These symptoms can persist for several weeks. Reduction of burn-out at this stage might be accomplished by a short vacation, whereas, if the teacher stays on the job, the degree of burn-out can advance. Resistance to change, however, can also occur (Freudenberger, 1977). The teacher may become less flexible. The teacher may respond to students with cynicism or negativism (Maslach, 1976). The burn-out victim apparently begins to limit social contacts and withdraws from people and activities (Mattingly, 1977). A burned-out teacher may in fact work longer hours and yet contribute less to the education of his or her students. If the subtle signs of burn-out go unnoticed and the stress continues, more serious symptoms can emerge. Some common problems include alcohol and drug abuse, absenteeism, marital conflict, mental illness, depression, and excessive smoking (Cooper and Marshall, 1976; Maslach, 1977).

Burn-out affects people from all walks of life, e.g., mental health, counselors, policemen, firemen, parents, etc. Counselor burn-out is characterized by feelings of frustration, rigidity and omnipotence (Wubbolding, 1979). Parents of autistic children display burn-out due to the exhaustion of their psychological and/or physical resources as a result of long and intense caring for their children

(Sullivan, 1979). Child care workers exhibit widespread burn-out which has necessitated addressing the problem through various stress-moderating techniques, colleague support, and training programs for the reduction of stress (Mattingly, 1977). Whitebook, et.al., suggests that the high rate of turnover and burn-out of child care personnel is linked to working conditions and job dissatisfaction. William Fibkins (1980) has suggested the creation of "teachers centers" to assist in the reduction of teacher isolation and burn-out symptoms.

When one examines "symptoms" of burn-out that have been mentioned in the literature, the meaning of the concept expands even further. Table I presents a list of signs and symptoms of job stress and worker burn-out in the Human Service Programs.

As we have seen from this selective review of the literature, burn-out is a psychological phenomenon that has just recently received attention. Burn-out is a psychologically debilitating "disease" that has a myriad of causes and symptoms attached to it. Professionals in many different walks of life must become more aware of this syndrome in order to produce the necessary intervention actions. What has to be studied in more detail are the internal personal factors that contribute to the development of burn-out and the relationships between these factors and working conditions. This understanding may then result in the manipulation of one factor or the other in order to loosen the grip that burn-out presently has on so many professionals, especially those in the teaching profession.

Table I

Signs and Symptoms of Job Stress and Worker Burn-out in the Human Service Programs

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

Drawn from Berkeley Planning Associates, 1977; Freudenberger, 1979; Maslach, 1976; and Schwartz and Will, 1961.

RECAPITULATION

As we have seen, individuals who feel that control comes from within are called internals, while those who feel that control is from outside are called externals (Chanie, 1965; Hamsher, Geller and Rotter, 1968; McGhee and Crandall, 1968; et.al.). "Internals generally attribute their successes and/or failures to themselves, whereas externals generally credit powerful others--fate, chance, etc." (Bryant, 1974).

It has been stated that it is impossible to disentangle the variables and assert with confidence that depression relates to an external orientation and is unrelated to internal beliefs (Phares, 1978). Thus, the controversy and inconsistencies in the clinical literature continues. However, so many seemingly desirable and undesirable outcomes are associated with the locus of control dimension, sometimes with internality, sometimes with externality, that the concern and confusion regarding the relationship between I-E and depression may never be truly established. Nevertheless, a prime factor in research on I-E scores seems to be the simple recognition that individual differences in interpretation of reinforcement are bound to be highly important contributors of behavior (Phares, 1978).

In terms of burn-out, Cherniss (1980) reports that research suggests that those with an "external locus of control" may be more vulnerable to burn-out. This vulnerability would relate to burn-out as a process in which a service provider psychologically disengages from the work in response to job-related stress. However, this relationship still has yet to be confirmed.

Some factors associated with burn-out that have been demonstrated

to be significant were established by the Berkeley Planning Associates, 1977. The distinction between burn-out and worker turnover was demonstrated empirically in a study of child abuse programs. The researchers found that burn-out and turnover was correlated ($r = .36$), but that the correlation was only a moderate one. In another study, the same researchers discovered that the correlation between burn-out and job satisfaction was $r = .59$. In another study, the correlation between the emotional exhaustion scale of the Maslach Burn-out Inventory and job satisfaction was $r = -.35$ (Maslach and Jackson, 1978).

In conclusion, other distinctions and relationships surrounding the factors and variables associated or comprising the teacher burn-out phenomenon must be established and demonstrated. As stated previously, burn-out is a process that begins with excessive and prolonged levels of job stress. This stress produces strain in the worker (feelings of tension, irritability and fatigue). The process is completed when the worker defensively copes with the job stress by psychologically detaching himself/herself from the job and becoming apathetic, cynical, or rigid (Cherniss, 1980). It is this descriptive field study's aim to seek to further establish relationships and explanations surrounding the burn-out syndrome and its contributing factors.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses stated in the null form were tested:

1. There will be no statistically significant difference between the performance of internals and externals (assessed by Rotter's Locus of Control Scale) on the depression scale (assessed by the Depression Adjective Check List).

2. There will be no statistically significant interrelationships among any combination of the variables of depression (assessed by Depression Adjective Check List), job satisfaction (assessed by Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form), self-esteem (assessed by Self-Perception Inventory - Teacher Form), locus of control (assessed by Rotter's Locus of Control Scale), and years of teaching experience.

Subjects

Fifty public school elementary (n = 33) and high school teachers (n = 17) of emotionally disturbed children served as subjects. A sample of convenience was utilized from the pool of emotionally disturbed teachers in one Chicago, Illinois School District. Teachers for the emotionally disturbed within the district were systematically contacted either in person or by mail to determine if they were willing to participate in the study. They were informed that anonymity would

be guaranteed by the use of a coding system that would negate the need to use any personal identifying information. A coded master list showing which subject was assigned to each coded identification number was maintained by and was accessible only to the investigator. This master list was destroyed after all of the subjects' responses had been obtained. Table II presents a numerical description of the subjects according to sex, race, and years of teaching experience.

Procedure

At the beginning of the first school semester (September, 1980), each participating subject was administered the job satisfaction (Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire), depression (Depression Adjective Check List), and self-esteem (Self-Perception Inventory - Teacher Form) scales. Each subject was re-administered the job satisfaction, depression, and self-esteem post-tests at the end of the first school semester (February, 1981). At that time, the internality-externality scale was administered only once. A specifically constructed demographic survey (See Table VIII) was administered to all subjects at the end of the research project.

Instrumentation

Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale: The dimension of internality-externality was assessed by this 29-item forced-choice scale. This scale determines locus of control orientation for adults. The $\bar{x}$ is 10-12 with a standard deviation of 4. Test-retest reliability ranges from 0.49 to 0.83 depending on time period and particular population (Rotter, 1966). Internal consistency ranged from 0.65 to 0.79

Table II

A Numerical Description of Subjects According to Race, Sex, and Years of Teaching Experience

	Male	Female	Total
Under 1 year of teaching experience			
Black	2	6	8
White	2	5	7
Latino	0	1	1
Total	4	12	16
1-3 years of teaching experience			
Black	1	7	8
White	3	6	9
Latino	0	0	0
Total	4	13	17
Over 3 years of teaching experience			
Black	1	7	8
White	4	5	9
Latino	0	0	0
Total	5	12	17

Totals: M = 13
F = 37
50

Black = 24
White = 25
Latino = 1
50

(Rotter, 1966). This scale can be categorized as a measure of generalized expectancies. It may assess an individual's I-E status over a broad range of situations. The range of scores is from 0 to 23 with 6 filler questions.

Depression Adjective Check List: Depression was measured by administering to all subjects this self-rating scale. The Depression Adjective Check List (DACL) is comprised of 32 descriptive adjectives, to assess current depression among adults. Internal consistency computed depression among adults. Internal consistency computed from a two-way analysis of variance is .81 for males and .85 for females. Split-half reliability coefficients were .90 for males and .92 for females. The DACL was developed in order to provide a brief, reliable and valid measure of self-reported depressive mood. DACL is primarily of use as a measure of subjective transient depressive mood. The Depression Adjective Check List has shown to be significantly correlated with eight of the ten MMPI scales, the Beck Inventory of Depression, the Zung Depression Scale, and the Global Rating of Depression.

The Self-Perception Inventory (Teacher Form): Self-esteem was measured by administering to all subjects this 36-item scale. This inventory uses 36 pairs of dichotomous traits. With four spaces of distance between the two ends of the continuum, the "very" positive position receives a score of +2 when check, the "more" positive position, a score of +1; "more" negative, -1; and "very" negative, -2. The algebraic sum of these individual dimension scores yields an index score. Raw scores are obtained and can be converted to stanines for standardized comparisons. Test-retest reliability (.89) at intervals

of four weeks. Concurrent validity is .37 while predictive validity is .38. Internal consistency is .94. The behavior inferred and measured in the Self-Perception Inventory is operationally defined by the individual responses concerning the perceptions of the self. The instrument is a forced-choice type of semantic differential containing four categories maintained along a continuum between the two terms opposite in meaning (Soares, 1980). The purpose of this instrument is to describe the present affective dimension of adults specifically in regard to themselves. The Self-Perception Inventory (Teacher Form) operationalizes the "self-concept" as a system of perceptions which the individual formulates of himself or herself in awareness of distinctive existence. Predictive validity - SPI scores and prediction of on the job success is significant at the .01 level.

Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Short Form): Job satisfaction was measured by administering to all subjects this 20-item scale. This assessment provides measures for an individual on intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction. Raw scores can be converted to percentile scores which can be utilized with normative data. Hoyt reliability coefficients were found for each short-form scale. The Hoyt reliability coefficient for general satisfaction is .88. The median reliability coefficient for general satisfaction is .90. The stability coefficient for the General Satisfaction Scale - Short Form may be inferred from data on the General Satisfaction scale of the long MSQ, since both scales use the same 20 items. A one-week stability coefficient for the General Satisfaction scale was .89. The stability coefficient for one-year interval was .70. The $\bar{x}$ is 77.88 with a

standard deviation of 11.92 and a standard error of measurement of 3.29. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire is a measure of one of the primary indicators of work adjustment. This questionnaire is predicated in a conceptual framework for research, entitled the Theory of Work Adjustment. This theory uses the correspondence (or lack of it) between the work personality and the work environment as the principal reason or explanation for observed work adjustment outcomes, e.g., satisfaction (MSQ Manual, 1967).

Demographic Job Survey: This survey instrument was developed by the investigator to compile data concerning the subjects' reasons for entering the teaching profession and their perceptions surrounding specific school-related situations. The basic format was taken from a survey instrument development and distributed by the Illinois School Psychology Association. Most of the questions and items presented were either modified or directly extrapolated from the information perceived to be important by the investigator (see Appendix A).

Design and Statistical Analysis

The independent variables were the locus of control construct and years of teaching experience. The dependent variables were job satisfaction, self-esteem, and depression. For null hypothesis one, factorial analysis of variance of the data was utilized. For null hypothesis two, stepwise multiple regression was utilized. In addition, the computations of simple Pearson correlation coefficients were conducted among depression, self-esteem, and job satisfaction. The overall analytic paradigm is as follows:

	Locus of Control		
	Internals A_1	Externals A_2	Number of Subjects
B_1 E.D. Tchrs. Less than a year			16
B_2 E.D. Tchrs. 1-3 years			17
B_3 E.D. Tchrs. More than 3 years			17
Total N =			50

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

For null hypothesis one, factorial analysis of variance was utilized to analyze the data across the independent variables (locus of control and years of teaching experience) and the dependent measure of depression. No significant differences were present for either independent variable when analyzed with depression pre-test or change scores (see Tables V and VI). There were also no significant differences when interaction effects were considered. That is to say, that the depression performance of internals and externals was found not to be significantly different and there was no significant interaction effect. Thus, null hypothesis one was not rejected. In addition, none of the assessed variables in this study (depression, self-esteem, job satisfaction, race, sex, years of teaching experience) accounted for any of the variance for the locus of control dimension.

For null hypothesis two, the inter-relationships among the dependent variables (depression, job satisfaction, and self-esteem) were assessed on both the pre-test and post-test measures (see Tables VII and VIII for details). As can be seen in Table VII, depression and job satisfaction were negatively correlated ($r = -.44$) and significant at the $p < .0013$ level of significance. Self-esteem and job satisfaction were positively correlated ($r = .44$) and significant statistically at the $p < .0012$ level. However, the correlation between

depression and self-esteem was statistically insignificant ($r = -0.26$).

As can be seen in Table VIII, reporting correlations between depression, self-esteem, and job satisfaction post-test measures, the correlation coefficients between the same dependent variables as reported above were again established but of a varying magnitude. Depression and job satisfaction were negatively correlated ($r = -.52$) at the $p < .0001$ level of statistical significance. Self-esteem and job satisfaction were correlated ($r = .28$) at the $p < .04$ level. Again, the correlation between depression and self-esteem was statistically insignificant. Two of the three possible combinations of variables were shown on both pre- and post-test measures to be associated statistically (depression and job satisfaction, self-esteem and job satisfaction).

Further analyses regarding null hypothesis two included using multiple regression on the data. Stepwise regression analyses were computed utilizing depression, self-esteem, job satisfaction, and locus of control as dependent measures. For all models, a variable had to meet the 0.0500 significance level for entry into the model. This assessment allowed for determining whether a new variable which entered the regression equation made a significant and unique contribution to R^2 after accounting for the variables already in the equation. The significant findings are presented in Tables IX through XVIII.

On the pre-test dependent depression variable, job satisfaction entered the equation and yielded R^2 of 0.19547912 and significance at the $p < .0013$ level. When race entered the equation, R^2 equaled 0.28259104 with job satisfaction and race significant at the $p < .004$

and $p < .021$ levels respectively (see Table IX).

On the pre-test dependent job satisfaction variable, self-esteem entered the equation which yielded R^2 of 0.19905885. When years of teaching experience entered, R^2 equaled 0.33907895, R^2 almost doubled. Next, when depression entered, R^2 equaled 0.42830592. Finally, when race entered the equation, R^2 equaled 0.47668447. Together, depression, self-esteem, years of teaching experience and race accounted for almost 50% of the total variance and were statistically significant at the $p < .0024$, $p < .0010$, $p < .0018$ and $p < 0.0473$ levels respectively (see Table X for details).

On the pre-test dependent self-esteem variable, job satisfaction entered the equation with a R^2 of 0.19905885. When years of teaching experience entered, R^2 equaled 0.30466049 with job satisfaction and years of teaching experience significant at the $p < 0.0001$ and $p < 0.0103$ levels respectively (see Table XI for details).

On the post-test dependent variable depression, job satisfaction entered the equation with R^2 equal to 0.27614043 at the $p < 0.0001$ level. No other variable met the 0.0500 significance level for entry into the model. However, alone, job satisfaction accounted for more than 25% of the total variance (see Table XII for details).

On the post-test dependent variable job satisfaction, depression entered the equation at the $p < 0.0001$ level with R^2 equaled to 0.27614043 (see Table XIII for details).

On the post-test dependent variable self-esteem, job satisfaction entered the equation at the $p < 0.0471$ with R^2 equal to 0.07965285. Job satisfaction accounted for a very small amount of the variance in

this model (see Table XIV).

On the change scores (pre-test - post-test) dependent variable depression, job satisfaction entered the equation at the $p < 0.0005$ level of significance with R^2 equaled to 0.22420385. When self-esteem entered, R^2 equaled 0.030594627 with job satisfaction and self-esteem significant at the $p < 0.0005$ and $p < 0.0229$ levels respectively (see Table XV).

On the change scores dependent variable job satisfaction, only depression entered the equation at the $p < 0.0005$ level and yielded R^2 of 0.22420385 (see Table XVI).

On the stepwise regression procedure for change scores for the dependent variable self-esteem, depression entered the equation at $p < 0.0256$ with R^2 equaled to 0.09961975. When years of teaching experience entered, R^2 doubled to 0.18893636 with depression and years of teaching experience statistically significant at the $p < 0.0108$ and $p < 0.0275$ levels respectively (see Table XVII).

When the stepwise regression procedure was used with the locus of control dimension as the independent variable, no other variable entered the equation.

In conclusion, depression, self-esteem, job satisfaction and the locus of control were analyzed using stepwise multiple regression procedures using pre-test scores, post-test scores, and change scores. Analyses of the results have shown that for the dependent measure depression, job satisfaction consistently accounted for some of the total variance (19% - 27%). Therefore, the variable of job satisfaction should be considered when one considers a possible predictor of

depression. Job satisfaction and depression were shown to be clearly associated with each other at a very significant statistical level of $p < .0001$. For the dependent measure of job satisfaction, depression consistently accounted for some of the total variance (9% - 27%). Again, the same previous conclusions could be drawn.

On the change score dimension, years of teaching experience coupled with depression accounted for 18% of the variance. By closely analyzing the data, in addition to job satisfaction, years of teaching experience seemed to be a relatively important predictor with regard to this variable.

It is important to note that on the pre-test dependent variable job satisfaction, the highest R^2 was discovered. Self-esteem, years of teaching experience, depression and race accounted for 0.47668447 of the total variance. This shows the significance of considering these predictors when one thinks of the dependent variable - job satisfaction. It is also noteworthy that no variable entered the locus of control stepwise regression model.

In addition to the determination of specific correlation coefficients, stepwise multiple regression further showed that relationships do exist between depression and job satisfaction, self-esteem and job satisfaction. These results do permit the overall rejection of null hypothesis two with regard to the establishment of interrelationships among some combinations of the variables.

At different stages or times, significant influences of the independent variables on the dependent variables were demonstrated (e.g., depression on job satisfaction, and vice versa, job satisfaction

and years of experience on self-esteem). However, caution in interpretation is noted, because the independent variables were autocorrelated. Obviously, this made prediction less than ideal.

Table III

Means Breakdown by Dependent Variables

Variable - Pre-Test	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Depression	50	6.44	3.63
Job Satisfaction	50	74.20	11.23
Self-Esteem	50	47.96	12.38
Variable - Post-Test	**N**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Depression	50	7.04	3.82
Job Satisfaction	50	76.06	11.00
Self-Esteem	50	49.80	12.26

Table IV

Pre-Test Means Breakdown by Independent Variables

Years	N	Depression	Job Satisfaction	Self-Esteem
1	16	5.63	77.25	45.06
2	17	7.59	76.00	48.00
3	17	6.06	69.3	50.65

Locus of Control	N	Depression	Job Satisfaction	Self-Esteem
1	26	6.23	71.65	45.35
2	24	6.67	76.96	50.79

Years	Locus of Control	N	Depression	Job Satisfaction	Self-Esteem
1	1	6	6.67	71.83	39.50
1	2	10	5.00	80.50	48.40
2	1	9	7.00	73.33	47.33
2	2	8	8.25	79.00	48.75
3	1	11	5.36	70.18	46.90
3	2	6	7.33	68.33	57.50

Table V

Analysis of Variance - Dependent Variable: Depression (Pre-Test)

Source	DF	Mean Square		
Model	5	13.52		
Error	44	13.11		
Corrected Total	49			
Source	**DF**	**Type I SS**	**F Value**	**PR>F**
Years	2	35.51	1.35	0.2686
Locus of Control	1	3.77	0.29	0.5943
Years x Locus of Control	2	28.32	1.08	0.3483

Table VI

Analysis of Variance - Dependent Variable: Depression (Change Scores)

Source	DF	Mean Square		
Model	5	24.62		
Error	44	14.52		
Corrected Total	49			
Source	**DF**	**Type I SS**	**F Value**	**PR>F**
Years	2	47.56	1.64	0.2060
Locus of Control	1	1.15	0.08	0.7795
Years x Locus of Control	2	74.41	2.56	0.0886

Table VII

Correlations Among Depression - Job Satisfaction-
Self-esteem - Pre-test

Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| Under HO:RHO=D / N = 50			
	D	JS	SE
D	1.00000	-0.44213	-0.26505
	0.0000	0.0013	0.0629
JS	-0.44213	1.00000	0.44616
	0.0013	0.0000	0.0012
SE	-0.26505	0.44616	1.00000
	0.0629	0.0012	0.0000

Table VIII

Correlations Among Depression - Job Satisfaction-
Self-esteem - Post-test

Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| Under HO:RHO=D / N = 50			
	D	JS	SE
D	1.00000	-0.52549	-0.25791
	0.0000	0.0001	0.0706
JS	-0.52549	1.00000	0.28223
	0.0001	0.0000	0.0471
SE	-0.25791	0.28223	1.00000
	0.0706	0.0471	0.0000

Table IX

MR ON PRE DATA

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Dependent Variable - Depression Pre-Test

R Square = 0.28

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	2	182.08	91.04
Error	47	462.24	9.83
Total	49	644.32	

Source	Standard Error	F	PROB>F
Job Satisfaction	0.04	14.66	0.0004
Race	0.83	5.71	0.0210

Table X

MR ON PRE DATA

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Dependent Variable - Job Satisfaction Pre-Test

R Square = 0.48

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	4	2946.06	736.72
Error	45	3235.14	71.89
Total	49	6182.00	

Source	Standard Error	F	PROB>F
Depression Pre	0.36	10.34	0.0024
Self-Esteem Pre	0.10	12.43	0.0010
Years of Experience	1.52	11.08	0.0018
Race	2.32	4.16	0.0473

Table XI

MR ON PRE DATA

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Dependent Variable - Self-Esteem Pre-Test

R Square = 0.30

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	2	2288.59	1144.29
Error	47	5223.33	111.13
Total	49	7511.92	

Source	Standard Error	F	PROB>F
Job Satisfaction Pre	0.14	18.28	0.0001
Years of Experience	1.91	7.14	0.0103

Table XII

MR ON POST DATA

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Dependent Variable - Depression Post-Test

R Square = 0.28

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	197.14	197.14
Error	48	516.78	10.77
Total	49	713.92	

Source	Standard Error	F	PROB>F
Job Satisfaction Post	0.04	18.31	0.0001

Table XIII

MR ON POST DATA

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Dependent Variable - Job Satisfaction Post-Test

R Square = 0.28

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	1637.19	1637.19
Error	48	4291.63	89.41
Total	49		

Source	Standard Error	F	PROB>F
Depression	0.35	18.31	0.0001

Table XIV

MR ON POST DATA

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Dependent Variable - Self-Esteem Post-Test

R Square = 0.08

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	587.04	587.04
Error	48	6782.96	141.31
Total	49	7370.00	

Source	Standard Error	F	PROB>F
Job Satisfaction Post	0.15	4.15	0.0471

Table XV

MR ON CHANGE SCORES

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Dependent Variable - Depression

R Square = 0.31

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square
Regression	2	233.13	116.57
Error	47	528.87	11.25
Total	49	762.00	

Source	Standard Error	F	PROB>F
Job Satisfaction	0.01	13.97	0.0005
Self-Esteem	0.04	5.54	0.0229

Table XVI

MR ON CHANGE SCORES

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Dependent Variable - Job Satisfaction

R Square = 0.22

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	537.20	537.20
Error	48	1858.82	38.73
Total	49	2396.02	

Source	Standard Error	F	PROB>F
Depression	0.23	13.87	0.0005

Table XVII

MR ON CHANGE SCORES

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Dependent Variable - Self-Esteem

R Square = 0.19

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	2	1061.96	530.98
Error	47	4558.76	96.88
Total	49	5620.72	

Source	Standard Error	F	PROB>F
Depression	0.36	7.04	0.0108
Years of Teaching Experience	1.73	5.18	0.0275

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study was undertaken with two main objectives in mind. One objective dealt with the attempt to clarify the inconsistencies in the clinical literature surrounding the relationships between the locus of control dimension and depression. Which cognitive style of functioning was more likely to be associated with depression, the internal or external orientation? Another objective was concerned with the phenomenon of teacher burn-out. According to Ginsberg (1981), although the problem of burn-out has been obvious to teachers for years, virtually no scholarly research related to it has been conducted. The present study attempted to increase the understanding surrounding some of the variables which might be associated with the burn-out phenomenon such as depression, job dissatisfaction, and loss of self-esteem.

As with all research activities, the present study had some strengths and some weaknesses. One obvious strength was that the entire subject population was teaching the same type of student population (severely emotionally disturbed children). This factor contributed more stability and control of some individual differences to this field study. Another strength was that the instrumentation had some psychometric support. A further positive aspect of the present investigation was the pre-test - post-test design which permitted the

careful analysis of change scores. However, one serious weakness of this study was that the total sample included only 50 subjects which hampers one's ability to generalize the results. Another weakness that should be noted resided in the fact that potential intervening variables (e.g., family life, personal social situations) outside of the work situation could not be systematically controlled. Lastly, being a passive observational field study, one can only refer to relationships among variables and not investigate science's original aim, cause and effect. Nevertheless, the findings do indicate that given the overall strengths and weaknesses, the endeavor was at least partially worthwhile.

Briefly, the findings indicated that the locus of control dimension was not related to amount of depression. This result failed to reject null hypothesis one. However, other results indicated that significant inter-relationships did exist between job satisfaction and depression and job satisfaction and self-esteem. These findings were substantiated through the use of multiple regression analyses, and thus provided support for the partial rejection of null hypothesis two.

As mentioned previously, the present findings provided no empirical support for the rejection of null hypothesis one (There will be no statistically significant difference between the performance of internals and externals (assessed by Rotter's Locus of Control Scale) on the depression scale (assessed by the Depression Adjective Check List).) Based on factorial analysis of variance procedures, locus of control style was not significantly related to performance on the depression scale. Neither did locus of control have any significant association

when the number of years of teaching experience were taken into account.

There seems to be various explanations in regard to these findings. First, one might question the instrumentation that is designed to measure a person's locus of control orientation. Rotter's I-E scale can be categorized as a measure of generalized expectancies. This means that the scale should relate to behavior across a very broad range of situations. Consequently, the I-E scale may not be a significant predictor in a single or specific area or situation. It may show modest but significant correlations with many behaviors but do a lesser job in any specific situation. It is interesting to note that Rotter (1966) himself reported the internal consistency of his scale ranged from 0.65 to 0.79. Thus, it seems that the scale may assess an individual's I-E status over a broad range of situations but that its predictive power to any specific situation might be lessened.

Second, I-E orientation may not be of relative significance either in the defining or reporting of depression. Assuming that the scale is reasonably sensitive, the lack of significant results may indicate that one style of orientation is not better than the other. For instance, when Cherniss (1980) reported that research suggested that those with an "external locus of control" may be more vulnerable to burn-out or when Abramowitz (1966) found externals were more apt to report a greater incidence of depression than were internals, one might question these findings. Burn-out is reportedly associated with numerous negative behavioral manifestations (e.g., high depression, low self-esteem, job dissatisfaction, physical and mental illness, etc.). However, the present descriptive field study did not find any

statistically significant associations among any of these variables and the locus of control dimension. Therefore, these results suggest that one cannot at this time offer clear support for any of the findings in the specific clinical literature previously cited concerning the desirability of possessing either an external or internal cognitive style under frustrating circumstances.

Thirdly, another explanation that might reconcile the contradictory results of this study related to null hypothesis one focuses on the attribution of responsibility. If attribution of responsibility is looked upon as a mediating factor, then the locus of control dimension may have been suppressed. In attribution of responsibility theory, certain individuals vary with regard to how much responsibility they assume under certain circumstances. For instance, Miller and Ross (1975) stated that people tend to attribute their successes to internal factors and their failures to external factors. What if these teachers of severely handicapped children, internals and externals alike, all attributed their failures to factors outside of themselves? If it is the nature of teachers of emotionally disturbed children, regardless of their cognitive style (I-E) to believe that the education and results of education of the severely emotionally disturbed children is out of their direct control, then they logically could attribute the responsibility outside of themselves. Furthermore, if teaching emotionally disturbed children is a continually frustrating, defeating endeavor, one might continue to attribute responsibility to external factors, regardless of I-E dimensions. It may have occurred that these teachers, even though they answered Rotter's scale as either

within the internal or external range, in actuality, they all attributed responsibility similarly and consequently reacted to the other test measures comparably. Regardless of which explanation one assumes, the fact remains that there was no statistically significant difference between the performance of internals and externals (assessed by Rotter's Locus of Control Scale) on the depression scale (assessed by the Depression Adjective Check List).

With regard to null hypothesis two, Freudenberger (1977) and Maslach (1977) described burn-out in terms of emotional exhaustion, deterioration of self-esteem, depression and frustration. Maslach and Jackson (1978) found that emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction was correlated ($r = -.35$). Unfortunately, when one peruses the literature, additional correlations directly related to the variables of burn-out are not found. In the present study, it was discovered that job satisfaction and depression were negatively correlated $r = -0.44213$ (pre-test) and $r = -0.52549$ (post-test). This relationship could be interpreted as follows: as job satisfaction decreases, depression increases. The implication here is that a teacher who is satisfied with his or her job will be a less likely candidate for burn-out. The relationship is moderate but crucial in the chain of developing factors of burn-out. Further support of rejection of null hypothesis two was presented when job satisfaction and self-esteem were shown to be correlated, $r = 0.4416$ (pre-test) and $r = 0.28223$ (post-test). This relationship could be interpreted as follows: the more one is satisfied with his/her job, the better one perceives himself or herself as a teacher. That is to say that one's self-concept ultimately increases

as one's job satisfaction increases. It could be explained that as job satisfaction increases, self-esteem increases, and depression decreases. This statistically, significant relationship provides individuals with some direction to take to reduce the magnitude of teacher burn-out. Analysis of the numerous multiple regression findings also indicated that the aforementioned variables had a measure of association between them. However, stating the specific relative influence on the dependent variable of the independent variables is of great difficulty due to the nature of multiple regression statistics. Nevertheless, interpretation of the results indicated that some of the independent variables made relative contributions as possible predictors, e.g., job satisfaction towards depression, job satisfaction and years of teaching experience towards self-esteem, and depression, self-esteem, years of teaching experience and race towards job satisfaction. This data further supported the contention of the interrelatedness among some of the variables associated with teacher burn-out. Any one of these variables could be a major focus of attention and manipulation in an attempt to reduce the frequency and degree of teacher burn-out.

Currently, large school districts such as Chicago are involved in attempts to reduce the negative symptoms associated with teacher burn-out. Teacher unions have developed support groups where teachers who exhibit the behaviors related to burn-out can go to receive assistance. The teacher burn-out assistance usually consists of having the opportunity to be involved in individual or group counseling with trained personnel. Also, these groups provide teachers the opportunity to discuss problems openly and share communication with colleagues who

may have similar symptoms.

Unfortunately, the causes that create burn-out symptoms in teachers are not being directly addressed. Currently, professionals in the educational arena are basically reacting to the results of everyday factors and causes that may be developing burn-out in the teaching profession. The symptoms of burn-out are apparently being attended to but not the underlying causes. Critical analyses of the problem must be conducted in order that preventive measures can be initiated. Also, greater emphasis must be placed on developing curriculum at the university level that will educate potential teachers on how to cope with stress on the job. Emphasis must be directed toward helping potential teachers and current teachers understand the nature and dynamics of stress and how to best manage it.

It is hoped that both researchers and practitioners will continue to be interested in job stress, burn-out, depression, job satisfaction and other issues related to "human resource management" in the educational realm. Reorganizing and keeping in mind the many levels and dimensions of the phenomenon can assist in generating a greater understanding of an already complex problem. The burn-out problem consists of human affective variables such as stress, frustration, depression and helplessness. It is an arduous problem which will continue to demand increased focus and analysis.

A major source of burn-out in the teaching profession seems to be unfulfilled expectations. Historically, the hope, idealism, and naivete of the reform-minded 1960's is one possible root of the problem (Cherniss, 1980). According to Sarason (1977), the period

following World War II could aptly be named the "Age of Psychology" for people became concerned about the issues of meaning, fulfillment, and authenticity to a greater extent than ever before. Contemporary values also give one "permission" to experience dissatisfaction if one's work becomes tedious or stressful. Thus, the burn-out phenomenon has burst upon the scene and is presently a major focus of concern.

All things considered, burn-out is a particular debilitating coping response to stress and strain experienced on the job. Burn-out occurs when stress, strain, frustration, etc., cannot be dealt with successfully. Burn-out involves a particular way of coping with job-related stress, one which may emphasize withdrawal, detachment, avoidance, lowering of goals and blaming of others (Cherniss, 1980).

Burn-out seems to be a complex process which develops gradually over time and appears to be influenced by many personal factors (Freudenberger, 1977). Burn-out has been found to be correlated with other damaging indexes of human stress such as depression, mental illness, marital conflict, etc. (Maslach, 1977). The present study has shown that certain variables of burn-out are interrelated (e.g., depression and job satisfaction, self-esteem and job satisfaction). In addition, years of teaching experience and race were also of relative importance in the prediction of the variables; self-esteem, depression, or job satisfaction.

The findings of this study relative to the internal-external dimension did not closely correspond to findings that have emerged in the locus of control literature. Neither locus of control style performed significantly different in relation to depression. Miller

and Ross (1975) have found evidence for a "self-serving bias" in causal attributions, that is, people tend to attribute their successes to internal factors (e.g., ability and effort) and their failure to external factors (e.g., luck or task difficulty). This self-serving bias may have been the mediating factor in a possible reason why no significant differences were found. Teachers of emotionally disturbed children may have attributed the education of emotionally disturbed children to external factors, regardless of their cognitive style. Frustration and failure may have dictated the situation that most teachers would deny personal responsibility for the education of severely handicapped children and for their dissatisfaction. This may have accounted for the reason why the two groups did not differ in the incidence of depression and both groups behaved similarly.

Burn-out exists and exposing its causes and symptoms in further research is necessary if it is to be eliminated among teachers. Relationships need to be established and further clarified. Researchers need to determine and evaluate which additional variables (such as job security and working conditions) are most likely to produce burn-out symptoms among special educators. How teachers perceive stress factors in terms of their personal success and ability to cope with emotional distress also needs to be systematically investigated.

In conclusion, public school educators, now and in the future, will be faced with a myriad of problems, including the phenomenon of teacher burn-out. Additional information needs to be added to the already existing body of knowledge in order that preventative actions could be taken. A multi-faceted approach to the study of causes and

symptoms of burn-out must be conducted within the context of controlled field experiments. Situational factors, school climate variables, and various personality indexes are of legitimate scientific pursuit and should be vigorously studied. Future research should also include comparative analysis of therapeutic approaches currently being utilized in the treatment of burn-out victims (such as the support program recently developed by the Chicago Teachers Union). Research should also systematically investigate burn-out and special education teachers in other geographical areas (e.g., suburban and rural school districts) in order to determine if the relationships discovered in the present study could be replicated elsewhere. In addition, hopefully, future researchers could develop a reliable teacher burn-out scale that would be of tremendous utility in the identification and remediation of burn-out victims.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Teacher burn-out can be described as an active process or a final state in which an individual is either becoming or has achieved a psychological state of mental drain, emotional exhaustion, stagnation, or physical fatigue. Burn-out can also be operationalized as a reaction to job stress, characterized by exhaustion, depression, and disengagement (Cherniss, 1980). The present investigation has shown that certain variables (depression, job satisfaction and self-esteem) characteristic of burn-out are statistically inter-related. Depression and job satisfaction, self-esteem and job satisfaction were shown to be significantly related. Depression and job satisfaction were negatively correlated while self-esteem and job satisfaction were positively associated. These relationships provide individuals with a clearer understanding surrounding the dynamics of teacher burn-out.

When dealing with the symptoms characteristic of burn-out, different locus of control style subjects did not perform significantly different from each other. That is to say that internals and externals performed similarly on the depression dimension. This performance negated the assertions from various researchers regarding the desirability or undesirability of possessing either an internal or external cognitive style in a frustrating, depressive situation.

While the manifest function of this study was to add further

knowledge to the already existing body of information concerning teacher burn-out, a secondary focus was to provide the teacher in trouble with support. Hopefully, support could come from obtaining a better composite understanding of how certain teacher burn-out associated variables are inter-related and predictive of each other. These predictors could then later be attended to on a more intense preventive basis. Hopefully, this study will generate further interest in the teacher burn-out phenomenon and will motivate other researchers to systematically study this ever-increasing syndrome.

At the present time, professionals in the helping professions are under stress from various perspectives. The innate impersonal structure of bureaucratic organizations will continue to demand that the professionals provide caring and effective services. Public pressure will continue to add increasing anxiety on already stressful teachers.

What needs to be recognized is that teachers require the same consideration that people in other professions seek. Educators need to realize the individual differences of teachers, that teachers need reinforcement and encouragement; and that teachers desire and strive for self-worth, an enhanced self-concept, and for continued involvement in the decision making process that effects their lives. The initiation of a policy to prevent teacher burn-out will be far less costly in terms of human and financial resources than the existing practice of ignoring subtle or direct cries for help from these professionals. A policy of prevention must be based upon a commitment to identify, research, and analyze the framework and practicing paradigm that

educational institutions are working under in such areas as employee relations, industrial psychology, supportive management, etc. The important point is that it is paramount to consider the nature of the interaction between the teacher and the system's methods involved in promoting the employee's mental health.

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, S.I. Locus of control and self-reported depression among college students. Psychology Reports, 1969, 25, 149-150.

Adler, S. Determinants of causal attributions for academic performance. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 5846B.

Altmaire, E., et.al. Attribution therapy: Effects of locus of control and timing of treatment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 481-486.

Beck, A.T. Depression: Clinical, experimental and theoretical aspects. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Bhatia, K., & Golin, S. Role of locus of control in frustration-produced aggression. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 364-365.

Boor, M. Relationship of internal-external control and national suicide rates. Journal of Social Psychology, 1976, 100, 143-144.

Brissett, M., & Nowicks, S. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 35-44.

Calhoun, L.G., Cheney, T., & Dawes, S.A. Locus of control, self-reported depression, and perceived causes of depression. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 736.

Cherniss, C. Staff burn-out. Sage Publications, 1980.

Chicago Teachers Union Survey, 1977.

Chicago Tribune. Teacher burn-out - our classroom crisis. Chicago Tribune, February, 1981.

Davis, W.L., & Davis, E.D. Internal-external control and attribution of responsibility for success and failure. Journal of Personality,

1972, 40, 125-136.

Edelwich, J., & Brodsky, J. Burn-out: Stages of disillusionment in the helping profession. Human Science Press, 1980.

Efran, J.S. Some personality determinants of memory for success and failure. Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1963.

Feather, N.T. Change in confidence following success or failure as a predictor of subsequent performances. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 38-46.

Feather, N.T. Attribution of responsibility and valence of success and failure in relation to initial confidence and task performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 129-144.

Fibkin, W. Teacher centering to reduce burn-out and isolation. Action in Teacher Education, 1980, 31-36.

Fitch, G. Effects of self-esteem, perceived performance and choice on causal attributions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 3, 311-315.

Fogg, M.E., Kohaut, S.N., & Gayton, W.F. Hopelessness and locus of control. Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 1070.

Freudenberger, H. Burn-out: The cost of high achievement. Garden City, New York: Double Day & Co., Inc., 1980.

Freudenberger, H. Journal of Social Issues, 1974, 30.

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

Gardner, D., & Bealty, G. Locus of control change techniques: Important variables in work training. Education, 1980, 237-242.

Gilmor, T.M., & Minton, H.L. Internal versus external attribution of task performance as a function of locus of control, initial confidence and success-failure outcome. Journal of Personality, 1974, 42, 159-174.

Harrow, M., & Ferrante, A. Locus of control in psychiatric patients. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 582-589.

Janze, H.L., et.al. Teacher attitude as a function of locus of control. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1973, 19, 48-54.

Joe, V.C. Review of the internal-external control construct as a personality variable. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 619-640.

Kgriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. A model of teacher stress. Educational Studies, 1978, 1-6.

Lefcourt, H.M. Recent developments in the study of locus of control. In B.A. Maher (ed.), Progress in experimental personality research (vol. 6). New York: Academic Press, 1972.

London, H., & Exner, J. Dimensions of personality.

Maslach, C. Burned-out. Human Behavior, 1976, 10-21.

Maslach, C. Job burn-out: How people cope. Public Welfare, 1978, 36, 56-58.

Maslach, C., & Pines, A. The burn-out syndrome in the day care setting. Child Care Quarterly, 1977, 6, 100-113.

Mattingly, M. Sources of stress and burn-out in professional child care work. Child Care Quarterly, 1977, 127-137.

McNett, I. Federal research lab pursues work-personality connection. APA Monitor, 1981, 12.

McQuire, W.H. Teacher burn-out. Today's Education, 1979, 68, 5.

Naditch, M.P., Gargian, M.A., & Michael, L.B. Denial, anxiety, locus of control and the discrepancy between aspirations and achievements as components of depression. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1975, 84, 1-9.

Phares, E.J., Wilson, K.G., & Klyver, W.W. Internal-external control and the attribution of blame under neutral and distractive conditions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 18, 285-290.

Phares, E.D., Ritchie, E., & Davis, W.L. Internal-external control and reaction to threat. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 402-405.

Pines, A. Burn-out syndrome in day care setting. Child Care Quarterly, 1977.

Procuik, T.J., Breen, L.J., & Lussier, R.J. Hopelessness, internal-external locus of control and depression. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1976, 32, 299-300.

Rabkin, J., & Struening, E. Life events, stress, and illness. Science, 1976, 194, 1013-1020.

Rotter, J.B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80.

Silverman, I. Self-esteem and differential responsiveness to success and failure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 115-119.

Strickland, B. Internal-external expectancies and health-related behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1192-1211.

Sullivan, R.C. The burn-out syndrome. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 1979, 112-126.

Vinakur, A., & Selzer, M. Desirable versus undesirable life events: Their relationship to stress and mental distress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 33, 329-335.

Weiner, B., Heckhausen, H., Meyer, W., & Cook, R. Causal ascriptions and achievement behavior: A conceptual analysis of effort and reanalysis of locus of control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 21, 239-248.

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

Wubbolding, R., & Kessler-Bolotin, E. Reality therapy as an antidote to burn-out. American Mental Health Counselors Association Journal, 1979, 39-43.

APPENDIX A

Table XVIII

Job Survey

Please rank order from 1 to 3 (1 being the most important) your three most significant reasons for your decision to enter the profession.

A. Salary _____
B. Opportunity to help children _____
C. Affiliation with the field of education _____
D. Social Status _____
E. Long vacations _____
F. Opportunity to impact the field of education _____
G. Professional autonomy _____
H. Opportunity to deliver direct service to children _____
I. Interest in working with handicapped children _____
J. Opportunity to see results of one's work _____
K. Opportunity to develop programs _____
L. Other (specify)_____

Please check the characteristics that most accurately describe your school situation.

I. Neighborhood

a. Upper class_____
b. Middle class_____
c. Lower class_____

II. Principal

a. Strong leader_____
b. Weak leader_____
c. Laissez Faire leader_____

III. School Atmosphere

a. Unruly_____
b. Disciplined_____

IV. Materials

a. Available_____
b. Not available_____
c. Available, but limited_____

V. Parent Involvement

a. Good (frequent)_____
b. Fair (sporadic)_____
c. Poor (none)_____

VI. Administration's attitude toward Special Education

a. Supportive_____
b. Non-supportive_____

30 or 60% of the subjects returned their demographic survey (see Table XVIII). A preliminary analysis was conducted on the information in order to determine trends and/or patterns. The subjects were required to rank order from 1 to 3 (1 being the most important) their three most significant reasons for their decision to enter the profession. The following results are provided:

Rank #1 (B) "Opportunity to help children" received the most No. 1 ranks with 57% of the subjects choosing this reason as being most important.

(I) "Interest in working with handicapped children" received the second most No. 1 ranks with 23% of the subjects choosing this reason as being most important.

Rank #2 (I) "Interest in working with handicapped children" received the most No. 2 ranks with 26% of the subjects choosing this reason as being second in importance.

(J) "Opportunity to see one's work" received the next most No. 2 ranks with 20% of the subjects choosing this reason as being second in importance.

Rank #3 (H) "Opportunity to deliver direct services to children" received the most No. 3 ranks with 26% of the subjects choosing this reason as being third in importance.

(J) "Opportunity to see one's work" also received the most No. 3 ranks with 20% of the subjects choosing this reason as being third in importance.

Overwhelmingly, subjects perceived the opportunity to help children as their main reason for entering the profession. However, if one looks at the four major items presented above (B, H, I, J), a more complete picture of the rank order could be established. These four of the twelve items in the survey accounted for 75% of all ranks 1 - 3. Interestingly, three of these four items all directly state the world "children" in the reason. It appears that the response could be grouped under the category of "helping profession". In sum, most of the ranks dealt directly with the concern of helping, working or providing service to children.

Other results that might be of interest relate to the high percentages that dealt with items regarding principal, school atmosphere, and parent involvement:

A. 72% classified their principals as being strong leaders.

B. 72% classified their school atmosphere as being disciplined.

C. 75% classified their administrations as supportive toward special education.

D. 60% classified parent involvement as good (frequent).

This survey developed a composite picture of teachers that, on the most part, seemed the exception rather than the rule. The teachers' perceptions on discipline, parent involvement, and leadership were and are contrary to part and present surveys on these issues (Chicago Teachers Union Survey, 1977 and Chicago Tribune Newspaper Survey, February, 1981). Considering the small magnitude of this survey, extreme caution in generalization is well-advised. However, in the area of Special Education, teacher perceptions may be different than

their regular education colleagues toward certain educational issues. This may be due to a separate set of parameters working within the framework of Special Education e.g., lower teacher-pupil ratio, more opportunity for parent-teacher contact, more training and preparation for behavior deviation from the norm.

In conclusion, the subjects that responded to this survey could be characterized as wanting to help children primarily and eager to see the results of their work. Many of their responses were positive and not indicative of the general teacher population. The small N of the survey tends to diminish its reliability and validity. However, it does suggest that teacher-attitude surveys when undertaken in the future, may want to address separately special education teachers from regular education teachers.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Donald Feinstein has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Ronald R. Morgan, Director
Associate Professor, Foundations of Education, Loyola

Dr. Jack A. Kavanagh
Associate Professor and Chairman, Foundations of Education, Loyola

Dr. Steven I. Miller
Associate Professor, Foundations of Education, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

8/18/81
Date

Ronald R. Morgan
Director's Signature