

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE  
TO BURNOUT AMONG FACULTY IN SELECTED  
COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE MIDWEST

By

DELORES MAE MEYER

Bachelor of Science  
Wisconsin State University  
Stevens Point, Wisconsin  
1969

Master of Science  
University of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin  
1978

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
December, 1988

Thesis  
1988D  
M612r  
cop 2

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE  
TO BURNOUT AMONG FACULTY IN SELECTED  
COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE MIDWEST

Thesis Approved:

*Gary R. Bice*

Thesis Adviser

*Alan Benson*

*Robert E. Nolan*

*Kenneth St. Olaf*

*Norman N. Durham*

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship of organizational climate factors to burnout among community college faculty in the midwest. Organizational climate was measured using the six first order factors of achievement standards, impulse control, intellectual climate, orderliness, practicalness, and supportiveness, and the two second order factors of development and control as defined by the copyrighted Organizational Climate Index published by FAAX Corporation. Burnout was measured on three subscales--emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment as defined by the copyrighted Educators Survey, a form of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, published by Consulting Psychologists Press.

With deep appreciation I acknowledge the support and assistance of my doctoral committee chairman and dissertation advisor, Dr. Garry Bice. I also appreciate the interest, suggestions, and confidence of the other members of my committee--Dr. Robert Nolan, Dr. Ann Benson, and Dr. J. Kenneth St. Clair. For all these individuals, just saying thank you seems inadequate.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to the administrators and the faculty of the 17 community colleges that participated in the study. The administrators gave permission for participation, provided the names of their full-time faculty members, and distributed the research packets. The faculty took their time to promptly complete and return the research instruments.

I owe a special thanks to the administration and faculty of two community colleges who were instrumental in my completing this degree but who could not participate in the study because of the delimitations placed upon the study. First, to the administration and faculty of Barton County Community College for making the sabbatical and undertaking this degree possible. Second, to the administration and faculty of Highland Community College for their encouragement and support while I completed the research project. The cooperation of both community colleges is very much appreciated.

Words cannot express the appreciation I feel for the special people who continued to show support and assistance while I completed this degree. My mother and father, Lawrence and Lucille Buchanan, were available when needed and helped prepare the research instrument packets and packages for mailing. My children, Charlotte and Dean, and their families provided assistance and encouragement. However, of greatest importance to me was the continual encouragement and support of my husband, Orby. His confidence and consideration were instrumental in making this degree a reality.

Thank you to everyone who contributed for helping me obtain this degree.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. RESEARCH PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Need for the Study . . . . .	3
Statement of Problem . . . . .	3
Purpose of Study . . . . .	3
Research Questions . . . . .	4
Variables . . . . .	4
Limitations . . . . .	5
Delimitations . . . . .	5
Assumptions . . . . .	6
Definitions . . . . .	7
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	12
Burnout . . . . .	15
Organizational Climate . . . . .	28
Measurement of Burnout . . . . .	35
Measurement of Organizational Climate . . . . .	37
Summary . . . . .	38
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	40
Instruments Used in the Study . . . . .	41
Pilot Study . . . . .	48
Population and Sample . . . . .	49
Collection of Data . . . . .	52
Measurement of Variables . . . . .	53
Statistical Measurement . . . . .	54
Summary . . . . .	55
IV. FINDINGS . . . . .	57
Analysis of Responses . . . . .	57
Description of the Sample . . . . .	59
Burnout . . . . .	68
Organizational Climate Factors and Burnout . . . . .	71
Analysis and Interpretation of Data . . . . .	77
Summary . . . . .	86

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	87
Results of the Study . . . . .	88
Conclusions . . . . .	90
Implications . . . . .	91
Recommendations . . . . .	93
Summary . . . . .	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	97
APPENDICES . . . . .	111
APPENDIX A - ITEMS IN SUBSCALES OF THE MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY . . . . .	112
APPENDIX B - ITEMS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND ORDER SCORES OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE INDEX . . . . .	114
APPENDIX C - FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY FORM . . . . .	116
APPENDIX D - COVER LETTER . . . . .	119
APPENDIX E - LINEAR RELATIONSHIP OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND THE BURNOUT SUBSCALES: EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION, DEPERSONALIZATION AND PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT . . . . .	121
APPENDIX F - INTERACTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FACTORS AND DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS WITH A SIGNIFICANT LINEAR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE BURNOUT SUBSCALES .	123

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Range of Experienced Burnout By Category for Post-Secondary Education . . . . .	43
II. Community Colleges and Number of Full-Time Faculty In the Sample . . . . .	51
III. Distribution of Research Instruments and Returns From the Survey . . . . .	59
IV. Number and Percent of Respondents by Gender and Age . . . . .	60
V. Number and Percent of Respondents by Years in Current Teaching Position, Total Years Teaching, and Other Occupational Experience . . . . .	61
VI. Number and Percent of Respondents By Number of Different Educational Institutions in Which Employed . . . . .	63
VII. Number and Percent of Respondents By Level of Education and Subject Category of Teaching . . . . .	64
VIII. Number and Percent of Respondents By Number of Course Preparations Per Semester and Student Ability . . . . .	66
IX. Number and Percent of Respondents With Employee Assistance Programs Provided By the Community College . . . . .	67
X. Number and Percent of Respondents by Burnout Subscale Categorization . . . . .	69
XI. Comparison of Experienced Burnout of Respondents With Burnout Subscale Normative Sample For Post-Secondary Education . . . . .	71
XII. Linear Relationship of the Demographic Factors Identified as Potential Covariates for Use in the Analysis of Covariance . . . . .	74
XIII. Analysis of Covariance of Emotional Exhaustion with Gender, Age, and Career Development Counseling as Covariates . . . . .	79



Table	Page
XIV. Analysis of Covariance of Depersonalization with Gender, Age, Career Development Counseling, and Staff/Professional Development as Covariates . . . . .	81
XV. Analysis of Covariance of Personal Accomplishment with Gender, Age, Number of Institutions, Number of Course Preparations, Career Development Counseling, Collegial Support Groups, and Staff/Professional Development as Covariates . . . . .	84

## CHAPTER I

### RESEARCH PROBLEM

#### Introduction

The environment in which community colleges operate is changing. The boom era of the 1960s and 1970s is over and limited resources seem a certainty for the future. Decreasing financial resources, declining enrollments, changing enrollment mix, increasing criticism of higher education, changing emphasis of community college services and programs, and increasing willingness of students to sue educational institutions are concerns (Clagett, 1980; O'Keefe, 1985; Peterson, 1982).

As the educational institutions have been adapting to the 1980s, there has been an increased emphasis on determining the causes of burnout of employees in human service organizations and determining the consequences of burnout. At the same time, there has also been an increased focus on burnout in education (Mahr, 1983). Most of the research on burnout relates to elementary and secondary teachers. Much of the research relates to the demographics of the individuals and the level of burnout. The limited research on burnout in higher education indicates that burnout is widespread in the faculty. That research also reveals there is a difference in the level of burnout and the demographics of higher education faculty when compared to elementary

and secondary teachers (Di Falco Vander Ven, 1982; Gover, 1983; Melendez, 1986; Melendez & de Guzman, 1983).

The literature identifies two broad conceptual causes of burnout. One concept is that the variables having the greatest significance in relation to burnout are personal in nature (Colasurdo, 1981; Di Falco Vander Ven, 1982). Significant personal characteristics of the individual relate to methods of handling problems, interpersonal style, expression and control of emotions, and conception of self (Colasurdo, 1981; Di Falco Vander Ven, 1982; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; Maslach, 1982). Personality types (Kilpatrick, 1986), life events (Cardinell, 1980), commitment (Anderson, 1985), and discrepancy between individual expectations and reality encountered (Colasurdo, 1981; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980) are also posited as factors significantly contributing to burnout.

The second conceptual cause of burnout is that a relationship exists between burnout and working conditions and factors in the work environment (Bruno, 1987; Forehand & Gilmer, 1964; Glowinkowski & Cooper, 1985; Peterson, 1980). Research has shown a significant relationship between these factors in the organization and burnout: Feedback from the administration (Clagett, 1980; Dick, 1986; Fong, 1984), peer relationships (Dick 1984; Fong, 1984; Youree, 1984), role conflict and role ambiguity (Riffel, 1986; Schwab & Iwanecki, 1981), bureaucratic structure (Riffel, 1986), job content and workload (Gover, 1983; Hudson, 1981), and leadership and management style (Bivens, 1985; Boenisch, 1983; Dick, 1986). The role the organization can play in the burnout syndrome is recognized as significant, especially in bureaucratic systems (Chernis, 1980; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; Maslach, 1982).

### Need for the Study

Educational administrators in community colleges need to be aware of the patterns of burnout in the faculty in order to plan for the reduction and management of that difficulty in the faculty. Implications are that, by removing the barriers or factors relating to burnout, the problem may be prevented, faculty productivity may be increased, and the overall quality of education may be improved (Carroll & White, 1982; Cohen & Brawer, 1982; Clagett, 1980; Golembiewski, 1982; Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987).

### Statement of Problem

There is considerable information about personal demographics and the incidence of burnout of individuals working within an institution. Further, there are some indications that various dimensions of organizational climate contribute to and/or cause burnout.

The problem is that educational organizations, especially in post-secondary education, do not have adequate information about the specific relationship between organizational factors and faculty burnout to address effectively the burnout problems in their institutions. The lack of understanding of organizational factors that are related or contribute to burnout prevents the administration from identifying patterns of burnout as well as determining possible changes that might be needed in the organization.

### Purpose of Study

The research on the relationship of organizational climate and burnout in community colleges is limited. The purpose of this study is

to determine the relationship of the dimensions of organizational climate to the perceived level of burnout among faculty in community colleges.

### Research Questions

The major questions asked were:

1. What is the level of burnout among faculty in community colleges?
2. How do the levels of burnout compare with the normative data for post-secondary education?
3. What are the dimensions of organizational climate that relate to burnout among faculty in community colleges?

### Variables

In this study, the independent variables were the eight indices of organizational climate and eleven selected demographic factors. The indices of achievement standards, intellectual climate, practicalness, supportiveness, orderliness, impulse control, development, and control were operationally defined by the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) (Richman & Stern, 1976). High scores for the factors of organizational climate indicate the presence of the factors in the organization.

The eleven selected demographic factors were based on the review of literature and/or recommendations for further study. The factors selected were: age, gender, number of years in current teaching position, number of years in teaching, number of years in an occupation other than teaching, highest level of education, number of course preparations per semester, number of institutions in which employed as a

full-time faculty member, subject area taught, and availability of intervention strategies at the institution.

The dependent variables in the study were the three aspects of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. The variables were operationally defined by the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) which is also referred to as the Educators Survey (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). High scores on the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales indicated a high degree of experienced burnout; low scores on the personal accomplishment subscale indicated a high degree of experienced burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

#### Limitations

The limitations of the study are as follows:

The study is limited to the extent that the data are based on the perception of the respondents.

The study is also limited to the extent that the respondents are from colleges whose presidents agreed to have their faculty participate in the study. These colleges may not be representative of the total population.

The instruments used in the study do not provide a single measure of burnout or a single measure of a good or bad organizational climate.

#### Delimitations

The following delimitations were placed upon the study:

The population for the study is the community and junior colleges listed in 1985 Higher Education Directory for the states of Arkansas,

Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma that have state, local, or state and local financial support and control. The population was further delimited to the institutions whose president, chief academic officer (vice president for instruction or dean of instruction), officer for occupational or vocational education and assistant academic officer (if included in the organizational structure) were employed by the same institution during the previous academic year.

Only full-time faculty members with full-time teaching assignments were included in the study. Another condition for selection was the faculty member had full-time teaching responsibilities in the same community or junior college during the previous academic year.

The research instruments--the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) and the Organizational Climate Index (OCI)--were selected from instruments that had high reliability and validity ratings for this kind of research.

The study did not attempt to identify the coping strategies of the individuals.

#### Assumptions

The following assumptions were placed upon the study:

It was assumed that the respondents had no difficulty understanding the directions or the statements presented on the MBI and the OCI.

It was assumed that the respondents completed the MBI and the OCI in privacy without knowing how other respondents were answering.

It was assumed that the respondents felt there would be respondent confidentiality and, therefore, felt comfortable expressing their true feelings when completing the MBI and the OCI.

It was assumed that the respondents were unaware that the Educators Survey is a measure of burnout and were not sensitized to the general issue of burnout.

### Definitions

The following definitions are given in order to provide an understanding of concepts basic to the study.

Achievement Standards: A measure of the Organizational Climate Index of the environment factors that are perceived to stress high standards of personal achievement, to maintain high levels of motivation and energy, to provide recognition for work of good quality and quantity, and to constantly subject established procedures to evaluation, revision, and improvement (Richman & Stern, 1979, p. 10).

Burnout: A cumulative stress response of an individual whose job requires extensive contact with people. Burnout is a syndrome characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and feelings of decreased personal accomplishment and effectiveness. Burnout is viewed as a continuous variable, not as a dichotomous variable (Maslach & Jackson, 1986, p. 2).

Community College: For the purposes of this study, a college offering at least a two-year program of college level studies leading to an associate degree that is wholly or principally creditable toward a baccalaureate degree. The college awards the associate degree as its highest degree.



Control: A measure of the Organizational Climate Index that indicates institutional emphasis on an orderly work environment and a restriction of personal or individual expression. Control is a composite score determined by the measures of orderliness and impulse control (Richman & Stern, 1979, p. 11).

Depersonalization: The subscale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory that measures the depersonalization aspect of the burnout syndrome. Depersonalization represents an unfeeling and impersonal response toward the students and colleagues in one's work environment (Maslach & Jackson, 1986, p. 2).

Development: A measure of the Organizational Climate Index that indicates high standards for intellectual achievement while maintaining institutional support for individual growth. Development is a composite score determined by the measures of achievement standards, intellectual climate, practicalness, and supportiveness (Richman & Stern, 1979, p. 11).

Emotional Exhaustion: The subscale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory that measures the emotional exhaustion aspect of the burnout syndrome. Emotional Exhaustion represents feelings of being over-extended and/or exhausted by one's work (Maslach & Jackson, 1986, p. 2).

Experienced Burnout: The feelings of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

Full-Time Faculty: For the purposes of this study, full-time faculty is defined by each institution. A typical definition would

include faculty members who teach at least 15-credit hours per semester, have assigned committee responsibilities, and advise students.

Impulse Control: A measure of the Organizational Climate Index of the environment factors that imply a great deal of constraint and organizational restrictiveness. Faculty feel their behavior is on display and behave accordingly. Opportunities are limited for personal expression or impulsive behavior (Richman & Stern, 1979, p. 11).

Intellectual Climate: A measure of the Organizational Climate Index of the environment factors that are perceived to promote and facilitate scholarly interests and intellectual activities and pursuits (Richman & Stern, 1979, p. 10).

Intervention Strategies: Programs that might be available such as substance abuse programs, substance abuse counseling, stress management programs, stress management counseling, sabbaticals, and time management training.

Job satisfaction: The degree to which an individual experiences a feeling of comfort in the work environment.

Junior College: see Community College. Hereafter called community college.

Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI): A 22-item instrument was used to measure the experienced burnout of the community college faculty in the study (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). To avoid sensitizing the respondent to burnout, the form used with educators is entitled Educators Survey.

Orderliness: A measure of the Organizational Climate Index of the environment factors that indicate procedural orderliness, neatness, conformity of personal appearance and institutional image, and expectation of faculty support of administrative policy (Richman & Stern, 1979, p. 11).

Organizational Climate: A set of characteristics that describe an organization, that distinguish the organization from other organizations, that endure over time, and that influence the behavior of the individuals within the organization (Forehand & Gilmer, 1984).

Organizational Climate Index: An 80-item instrument that was used to measure the perceived psychological climate of the community colleges in the study (Richman & Stern, 1979).

Personal Accomplishment: The subscale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory that measures the lack of personal accomplishment aspect of the burnout syndrome. It represents feelings of successful achievement and accomplishment in one's work with people (Maslach & Jackson, 1986, p. 2).

Practicalness: A measure of the Organizational Climate Index of the environment factors that relate to being well-organized, to having a well-structured organizational hierarchy, and to having clear organizational objectives (Richman & Stern, 1979, p. 10).

Stress: An adaptive response that is a consequence of any action, situation, or event that is seen as disruptive and places demands upon an individual (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987, page 10).

Supportiveness: A measure of the Organizational Climate Index of the environment factors that indicate respect of the individual, a supportive environment, a sense of fair play, and an openness in the work environment (Richman & Stern, 1979, p. 10).

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

During the 1960s and early 1970s colleges were concerned with existing and predicted shortages of instructional personnel. The institutions focused attention on a variety of problems related to faculty recruitment, development, evaluation, and retention. Faculty were mobile and mistakes in appointments could be corrected fairly easily; faculty members would move on to another college (Hudgeons, 1980).

Graybeal (1981) predicted that the 1980s and 1990s would be an era of significant changes in higher education as well as in many aspects of American life and work. He indicated the principal causes of these developments would be demographic and economic and would affect the majority of those employed in higher education.

Faculty have typically entered the professorial ranks with the expectation of job security and stability; status; and upward and lateral mobility within the academic community. Now faculty members encounter limited upward and lateral mobility, and many face the prospect of teaching in the same institution until retirement or of having their positions eliminated entirely. Reduced faculty turnover and budgets limit the ability of institutions to hire new and/or young faculty (Hrutka, 1983; Jacobson, 1985; Melendez & de Guzman, 1983).

The decade of the 1980s has been and is producing a generation of college faculty trying to cope with surprisingly high levels of job stress (Clagett, 1980; Gmelch, Lovrich, and Wilke, 1984; Jacobson, 1985; Mayhew, 1979; Seldin, 1987). In a survey of 2,000 faculty members in 17 colleges, Melendez and de Guzman (1983) found that 62 percent of the faculty acknowledged severe or moderate job stress. Gmelch (1984) reported similar findings from a survey of 1,900 professors at 80 public and private universities. Sixty percent of the daily stress in the lives of the respondents came from their work as faculty members.

Freudenberger (1974, 1977), Maslach (1976, 1982), Freudenberger and Richelson (1980), and Cherniss (1980) refer to the effects of stress as burnout. Watkins (1982) and Melendez and de Guzman (1983) recognize the effects of stress in higher education and refer to burnout in college faculty as the new academic disease. Academic administrators and faculty members must be aware of the symptoms and consequences of burnout, must accept burnout as an issue in higher education, and must see it as a phenomenon that must be dealt with openly (Bolding & Van Patten, 1982; Clagett, 1980; Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilke, 1984; Seldin, 1987; Watkins, 1982).

The popularity of the term "burnout" and the burgeoning literature surrounding it imply that burnout should be studied as a phenomenon of the helping professions rather than as an individual fault or defect (Maher, 1983; Seavicki & Cooley, 1983). Clagett (1980) suggests that burnout and stress will be better understood when viewed as an organizational outcome rather than as symptomatic deficits in the personality of the casualties. The organization may affect an individual's behavior by placing constraints upon freedom of choice,

through rewarding and punishing behavior, and through events in the work environment. These organizational stimuli are perceived differently by individuals and may lead to stress and burnout (Forehand & Gilmer, 1984). The studies to date indicate a need for additional investigation into the relationship between organizational climate and burnout to attempt to identify the factors in the organizational climate that have an effect on burnout (Cherniss, 1980; Clagett, 1980; Kilpatrick, 1986; Maslach, 1982; Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

A review of literature was undertaken to see if there is an established relationship between the dimensions of organizational climate and experienced burnout in faculty in higher education. The literature reviewed reveals that the present study is not an attempt to replicate earlier studies. However, two doctoral dissertations utilized organizational climate and burnout when studying the elementary school setting.

Parrish (1985) investigated the relationship between perceived organizational climate in elementary schools and career burnout among teachers. The study determined the extent to which aspects of organizational climate (development press and control/task effectiveness press) are related to career burnout factors (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment).

Bruno (1987) studied the incidence of burnout among public school principals and teachers in suburban elementary schools and examined the relationship between school organizational climate and the burnout of principals and teachers.

The review of the related literature which follows is presented in four sections: (1) burnout, (2) organizational climate,

(3) measurement of burnout, and (4) measurement of organizational climate.

### Burnout

A great deal of attention has been given to the subject of burnout during the last fifteen years. The term "burnout" was first used to describe an occupational problem in an article on drug rehabilitation center counselors (Freudenberger, 1974). Since that time, the term has been applied in other professional settings such as nursing (Dick, 1986; Jones, 1981), day care (Maslach & Pines, 1977; Pines & Maslach, 1980), police officers (Jackson & Maslach, 1982; Maslach & Jackson, 1979), air traffic controllers (Alexander, 1980), counselors (Anderson, 1985; Boy & Pine, 1980; Lynch, 1981), teachers (Bardo, 1979; Bivens, 1985; Bruno, 1986; Colosurdo, 1981; Di Falco Vander Ven, 1982; Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilke, 1984; Gover, 1984; Parrish, 1985; Seldin, 1987) child welfare (Daley, 1979; Freudenberger, 1977), and mental health (Pines & Maslach, 1978). The human services professionals are often required to spend considerable time in intense involvement with other people. They are often unable to cope with this continual emotional stress and burnout occurs (Maslach, 1976; Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

### Concept of Burnout

Maslach (1982) indicates that burnout is a syndrome characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that occurs among people who do some kind of "people work." Freudenberger and Richelson (1980) and Maslach (1982) state that



burnout is a response to a chronic emotional strain which has developed over a period of weeks, months, or even years.

Edelwich and Brodsky (1980), De Voe, Spicuzza, and Baskind (1983), and Forney and Wiggers (1984) consider burnout to be an attitudinal and behavioral phenomenon that involves a significant loss of motivation, enthusiasm, and energy. The individuals suffering from burnout lack empathy for their peers and their clients.

Maslach (1982) explains that in burnout a negative shift in attitudes toward others occurs. This attitude is characterized by a gradual withdrawal from and blaming of work, clients, and co-workers. The individual also develops a negative attitude toward oneself that includes the loss of a sense of personal accomplishment and feelings of failure and inability to cope.

Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) suggest taking a positive approach to burnout. This approach would enable individuals and institutions to realize that burnout can happen in a person's career and to deal with burnout on an ongoing basis. To the extent that individuals and institutions can anticipate what burnout is and recognize how, when and where it occurs, they will be better prepared to seek realistic remedies.

### Symptoms of Burnout

The literature on burnout consistently focuses on the symptoms of the problem. Research studies have identified a number of symptoms of burnout (Pines, 1982; Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982a). The signs or symptoms of burnout mentioned in the literature indicate that burnout is a

transactional process consisting of job stress, worker strain, and psychological adaptation or adjustment (Cherniss, 1980).

Carroll and White (1982) provide six broad categories of signs that are reliable indicators of burnout. The indicators of burnout relate to health, excessive behavior, emotional adjustment, relationship, value, and attitude.

Pines (1982) found burnout to be positively correlated with turnover, tardiness, and intention to leave a job. Poor physical health, sleep problems, amount of alcohol drinking, headaches, loss of appetite, nervousness, and stomachaches were also found to be positively correlated with burnout (Jaremko, 1984; Maslach, 1976; Pines, 1981, 1982; Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982). Feelings of hopelessness, marriage and family conflict, psychological problems, and loss of idealism about work are also significantly correlated with burnout (Pines, 1982; Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982b). However, satisfaction from work, life and oneself were negatively correlated with burnout (Pines, 1982).

#### Demographic Factors and Burnout

Much of the research on burnout has focused on demographic differences in an attempt to identify certain types of professionals or occupational groups that may relate to the amount of burnout reported. Common demographic variables used in research are sex, race, age, marital status, education, number of years in an organization, number of years in current occupation, number of years in current assignment or position, and employment status (full-time or part-time). Other factors include environmental or working conditions, pay grades, performance

appraisal, time since last promotion, and civil service level differences.

Age. Significant differences were found in the relationship of age groups to burnout. Younger faculty had higher levels of burnout than other groups (Bivens, 1985; Fong, 1984; Forney & Wiggers, 1984; Gover, 1983; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982b; Youree, 1984). Seagle (1986) found the respondents who were 51 and over indicated the highest level of burnout. Colasurdo (1981) found burnout to occur equally frequent at all age ranges. Kilpatrick (1986) examined 34 studies that reported the relationship of age to burnout. "Five studies showed persons under 30 to be especially burned out, and 4 studies find those between 30 and 40 as particularly affected" (Kilpatrick, 1986, p. 92).

Sex. The studies that report the relationship of sex to burnout present mixed findings (Kilpatrick, 1986). Colasurdo (1981), Gover (1983), and Schwab and Iwanicki (1982b) had nonsignificant findings while Di Falco Vander Ven (1982), Youree (1984), and Bivens (1985) found burnout more dominant in males. Seagle (1986) found burnout more prevalent in females.

Level of Education. Kilpatrick (1986) found that 12 of the 24 studies examined reported no difference in burnout based on level of education. The findings of Colasurdo (1981), Gover (1983), Schwab and Iwanicki (1982b), and Bivens (1985) also found no relationship between burnout and education. Burnout covaries directly with years of education in the twelve studies that reported differences in burnout based on education (Kilpatrick, 1986).

Years in Present Occupation. Research does not provide clear support for a relationship between number of years in present occupation and burnout (Bivens, 1985; Colosurdo, 1981; Gover, 1983; Kilpatrick, 1986; Youree, 1984).

Years in Present Position. The number of years spent in the current position or assignment has been suggested as a factor contributing to burnout. Studies exploring this relationship present mixed findings (Kilpatrick, 1986). Fong (1984) found a significant correlation between years in current position and burnout while Colasurdo (1981), Di Falco Vander Ven (1982), Gover (1983), and Schwab and Iwanicki (1982b) found no relationship.

Departmental Differences. Kilpatrick (1986) explored the relationship between burnout and departmental differences. More studies (n = 10) report finding differences in burnout among departments than find no difference (n = 6) in burnout among departments. These figures would tend to support the view that total organizations are heterogeneous with regard to the presence of burnout (Kilpatrick, 1986). However, Kilpatrick (1986) indicates that Golembiewski suggests homogeneity of burnout within departments especially within the immediate first-level subordinates of each manager or supervisor.

Other Factors. Other factors that have a significant relationship with burnout are number of years of noneducation employment (Gover, 1983), students with very different levels of ability (Clagett, 1980; Di Falco Vander Ven, 1982; Melendez, 1986), role overload (Forney & Wiggers, 1984; Melendez & de Guzman, 1983), and salary and fringe benefits (Clagett, 1980; Gover, 1983; Kilpatrick, 1986; Melendez, 1986).

Factors identified as having a nonsignificant relationship with burnout are area of teaching (Di Falco Vander Ven, 1982; Gover, 1983), and teaching load, number of preparations, and teaching required courses (Di Falco Vander Ven, 1982).

### Work Environment and Burnout

Much of the stress and burnout literature suggests that different work environments can significantly affect the staff burnout rates within the organization (Golembiewski, Munzenrider, & Carter, 1983; Kilpatrick, 1986; Maslach & Jackson, 1986; Pines, 1982). Research has shown that in some facilities burnout was significantly higher than in others (Weinberg, Edwards, & Garove, 1979).

Pines presents variables in the work environment that separately and together "have a crucial effect on the likelihood of the individual to burn out" (1982, p. 193) and play an important role in promoting or preventing burnout. These variables are categorized into four dimensions of the work environment: psychological, physical, social, and organizational (Pines, 1982).

The psychological dimension of the work environment includes features that can be emotional (significance, actualization, growth) or cognitive (autonomy, variety, overload) in nature (Pines, 1982).

The physical dimension of an environment includes fixed features, such as space, architectural structure, noise, and the flexibility to change fixed features to suit one's own tastes and needs (Pines, 1982).

The social dimension of the work environment includes all the people coming in direct contact with the individual (service recipients, co-workers, supervisors, and administrators). Factors in the social

dimension of concern in the discussion of burnout would be the number, problems, and relations with service recipients; the work relations, sharing, support, and challenges of co-workers; and the feedback, rewards, support and challenges of supervisors and administrators (Pines, 1982).

The organizational dimension of the work environment includes bureaucratic hassles (red tape, paperwork, communication problems), administrative features (rules and regulations, policy influence, and participation in decision-making), and the individual's role within the organization (role conflict, role ambiguity, and status disorders in career development).

Implications. The implications from the studies relating to the factors within the work environment that affect burnout are that the leadership of the organization can make changes in the work environment which will decrease the potential for burnout (Dick, 1986; Eddy, 1986; Magarrell, 1982; Melendez & de Guzman, 1983; Pines, 1982; Youree, 1984). In working towards a less stressful work environment, the following positive work factors should be emphasized: "organizational flexibility, degree of autonomy granted to the staff, pleasant work conditions; optimal variety, emphasis on work significance and personal growth, time out during periods of stress, and supportive and challenging collegial network" (Pines, 1982, p. 210). When developing the less stressful work environment, the following negative work factors would be minimized: "large ratio of clients to staff, unlimited bureaucratic interference, red tape, paperwork, senseless rules and regulations, role conflict, role ambiguity, and status disorders" (Pines, 1982, p. 210).

### Stress and Community College Faculty

Community college faculty have typically entered the ranks with the expectation of job security and stability. Their responsibility was to teach, and they expected an academically well-prepared student body (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). "The students we now have are different from the students in the 50s and 60s. They come with less academic background, and they need more remediation" (Watkins, 1982, p. 8).

Faculty members now find themselves in institutions that are increasingly involved in providing compensatory education and occupational training. The colleges are reaching out beyond the confines of the campus to offer short courses and events in cooperation with other community agencies, open-circuit broadcasts, and innumerable educative, quasi-educative, and recreational activities. Adult and off-campus programs are used to stabilize enrollments. There are more part-time faculty members, increased student-faculty ratio, and decreased financial resources (Cohen and Brawer, 1982; Mayhew, 1979). Faculty and administration are being asked to do more with less.

Today's faculty faces varying demands: Society's values are changing, parents want emphasis upon the basics, deans want increased productivity and greater involvement in the community, and students drift into and out of classes and want high grades (Cohen and Brawer, 1982; Mayhew, 1979; Watkins, 1982; Youree, 1984). For example, faculty members are inundated with assignments and at the same time are expected to take new and creative approaches to their work (Watkins, 1982; Youree, 1984).

Instruction and course preparation receive less time because of other required activities; involvement with committees, advisement of

students, and completion of administrative assignments consume about 15 percent of the faculty members' time (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985). Increasing emphasis is placed upon the involvement of the faculty in the competition of the recruitment of students and the creation of new clientele within the population (Harper, 1977).

At the conference on burnout sponsored by the City University of New York in 1982, Ayala Pines told conference attendees that the main causes of faculty burnout are "lack of significance in your work" and "lack of control over your environment. The feeling that what you do doesn't matter is a big cause of burnout" (Watkins, 1982). Community colleges are now expecting their faculty to retrain and to teach in areas outside their main area of interest. According to Pines, doing things you don't really want to do, such as teaching a related course instead of one you are academically prepared for, makes you feel that life is out of your control and may contribute to burnout (Watkins, 1982).

In many institutions, the division of academic space deters the development of collegial relationships. Departments are so distant from each other that few faculty members in one department can speak meaningfully to members of another department. Faculty members are cordial, courteous strangers who have little meaningful contact. Rarely does one faculty member talk to another about his career (Watkins, 1982). Burnout rates seem to be lower for those professionals who have access to a support system, especially if they are well-developed and supported by the larger organization. Professionals who actively express, analyze and share their personal feelings with their colleagues



get things off their chest and at the same time have an opportunity to receive constructive feedback from other people. This communication process enables them to develop new perspectives and understanding of their work and relationships (Maslach, 1976; Pines, 1982).

### Organizational Intervention Strategies

Some administrators handle burnout more effectively than others. The organization with leadership, discipline, modeling, goal setting, an atmosphere of constructive guidance from the peer group, and guidance from the management will provide intervention strategies. The organization sponsored programs lend credence to the theory or belief that the organization cares about people (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987). The work environment will be conducive for creating an organizational climate that decreases stress and lowers the potential for burnout (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980).

Kilpatrick (1986) noted that, although the need for measuring the effects of burnout interventions is discussed in research, little appropriate research exists. However, "the literature contains many prescriptions" (Kilpatrick, 1986, p. 144) for the problems of employees relating to stress and burnout. The following section presents a summary of the strategies used by organizations when addressing the factors that lead to increased stress or burnout in the employees.

Strategies. Organizations are using employee assistance programs (EAPs) to assist employees who have problems. Over five thousand programs in the public and private sectors serve approximately ten million employees in the United States (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987).

Today there are two categories of EAPs. The first category includes the traditional programs emphasizing stress prevention and stress management. Many of the programs are the equivalent of the alcoholism programs of the 1940s. Chemical abuse and substance abuse programs, as well as alcohol abuse programs, are provided. These programs are designed for people unable to cope with stressors or to respond to experienced stress (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987).

The second category of EAPs are referred to as "broad-brush" programs (Shore, 1984). These programs do not restrict themselves to providing assistance only to employees with alcohol or drug problems but are designed to help employees deal with a variety of emotional problems whether work related or not. Maximizing individual-organizational relationships, individual strategies for dealing with stress, stress management treatment, and dealing with burnout are representative programs. The rationale for the broad-brush programs is that employees who make use of them are less likely to have an addiction problem and more likely to be experiencing too high a level of dysfunctional stress (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987).

Mayhew (1979) suggests measures that can be considered when providing for the emotional health of the faculty. Seminars, symposia, conferences, and colloquia to deal with the personal problems of faculty may be attempted. Special attention could be given to faculty members struggling against discrimination. However, Mayhew (1979) posits that the chief responsibility rests with the deans and department heads who should be sensitized to the emotional needs of the faculty and can provide the support needed. In addition, administrators who maintain an open-door policy and who encourage faculty members to drop in to talk

about whatever is on their minds can be highly influential in developing an institutional climate that decreases stress.

Quick acknowledges that "stress is an inevitable characteristic of academic life, but it need not become distress" (1987, p. 83). Four preventive systems for stress management appropriate for educational institutions are described by Quick and Quick (1984). Their plan is the development of systems that encompass organizational factors relating to participative management, flexible work schedule, career development, and social support. The implementation of these institutional stress management systems requires an organizational philosophy supportive of individual and institutional health. The leadership must also understand the uniqueness of the institution and those who work within it (Quick, 1987).

Another program for dealing with the issue of stress is a program of anticipatory socialization (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987). New employees of the organization are involved in a program to acquire the knowledge, skills, and values that are needed to make them effective organizational members. The program centers on the individual's expectations in his/her job role. The program provides an opportunity for the individual to have guided exposure to the negative aspects of the job, focuses on dealing with the situations and factors identified as negative aspects, assists in understanding what others expect of them, and develops skills in conflict resolution and negotiation.

A performance feedback program that enables the employee to receive positive as well as negative feedback was proposed by Maslach and Jackson (1982). "Effective performance evaluation is an unrealized goal in many organizations" (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987, p. 256). The

emphasis of the developmental role to be played by performance evaluation, rather than the judgmental role that is frequently the emphasis of the evaluation process, can be a critical factor in preventing burnout (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987).

Shapiro (1982) argues that burnout is a function of neither the individual nor the environment. Burnout is the interaction between the two. Therefore, positive supervisory practices could improve the quality of the interaction of the individual and the environment and reduce the potential for burnout. "The challenge of providing creative supervision includes helping the novice staff member develop investments in work responsibilities, enhancing the competence of advancing staff, and encouraging experienced staff to develop their own styles of supervision and consultation" (Shapiro, 1982, p. 228).

Another suggestion to reduce the severity of burnout involves adjusting the work environment and encouraging positive involvement of the members of the organization (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980). Emotional pressure on the members of the organization can be relieved by restructuring the work environment to rotate responsibilities. This process provides variety for the individuals by periodically redistributing the responsibility for working with clients and for completing administrative tasks (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980).

Administrators will want to respond to workers' concerns, alleviate problems, and improve working conditions where possible. However, Edelwich & Brodsky (1980) caution that administrators are constrained by the "givens" of budgets, bureaucratic politics, etc., just as the front-line workers have constraints. Thus, employees must "learn to accept reality and take responsibility for making the choices that fulfill

their needs" (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980, p. 193). Assistance can be given to help a person accept the parts of the job situation that cannot be changed, to make value judgments, and to act within the constraints of the organization. When it is not possible to change things, the only realistic intervention is to train staff members to cope with the existing conditions (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980).

### Organizational Climate

During the past thirty years researchers have published a great deal about factors that influence the attitudes and behaviors of individuals in organizations. Researchers have drawn distinctions between the geographical and the behavioral work environments. The geographical environment is described as the objective, physical, and social environment of the individual while the behavioral or subjective environment includes the perceptions and reactions to the environment by the individual. It is the behavioral environment that is used to describe the organizational climate (Litwin, 1968; Tagiuri, 1968).

The term organizational climate is used to describe the attributes of subsystems of variables in the environment. Tagiuri explains that "climate has an interpretive quality" (1968, p. 22). He perceives ecology, milieu, social system, and culture to be more descriptive of the organization, and "the climate would depend upon their particular characteristics" (Tagiuri, 1968, p. 22). In this concept, "climate (or atmosphere) would be a less general, a less broad concept than environment. It could be used especially when it is desired to hold the task constant, and to express the character of an enduring situation" (Tagiuri, 1968, p. 22-23). Tagiuri also explains that "a particular

configuration of enduring characteristics of the ecology, milieu, social system, and culture would constitute a climate much as a particular configuration of personal characteristics constitute a personality" (1968, p. 23).

#### Definitions of Organizational Climate

When defining organizational climate, Forehand and Gilmer (1964) emphasize the factors within the organization that vary and can be specified, measured, and incorporated into empirical research. They define organizational climate as "the set of characteristics that describe an organization and that (a) distinguish the organization from other organizations, (b) are relatively enduring over time, and (c) influence the behavior of people in the organization" (Forehand & Gilmer, 1964, p. 362).

Tagiuri stresses the perceptions of the members of the organization; thus, "organizational climate connotes that the environment is interpreted by the members of the organization to have a certain quality to which they are sensitive and which, in turn, affects their attitudes and motivation" (1968, p. 27).

Hellriegel and Slocum incorporate subsystems into their definition of organizational climate: "Organizational climate refers to a set of attributes which can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its subsystems, and that may be induced from the way that organization and/or its subsystems deal with their members and environment" (1974, p. 256).

### Concept of Organizational Climate

Forehand (1968) includes three sets of variables in the concept of organizational climate. The first set of variables are the environmental variables which are external to the individual; e.g., the size and structure of the organization. The second set of variables are the personal variables which includes the individual's aptitudes, attitudes, and motives. The third set of variables in organizational climate are the outcome variables that are determined jointly by the environmental and the personal variables. Satisfaction, job motivation, and productivity are included in the outcome variables.

Another concept of organizational climate considers the interaction of person variables and environmental variables (Joyce & Slocum, 1982). The interpretation of the variations in the environment by the members of the organization determines the degree to which the variables demand or constrain the operation of personal characteristics. Stress and conflict occur when the individual's perceptions of organizational practices and procedures differ from, or are inconsistent with, the common perception of these practices held by others in the organization (Joyce & Slocum, 1982).

### Organizational Influences

Studies show that organizational climate influences the attitudes and behaviors of individuals in organizations (Kaczka & Kirk, 1968; Litwin, 1968; Pritchard & Karasick, 1973; Waters, Roach, & Batlis, 1974). Individuals adapt to organizations through a learning process that relies heavily on consensual validation (James, Hater, Gent, & Bruni, 1978). Stern (1970) indicates this process provides individuals

opportunities to learn the behaviors that are accepted, rewarded or punished by others. The "fit" between a person's perceptions of the climate and the prevailing organization climate influences both job performance and satisfaction.

Five aspects of an organization play a particularly important role in determining an organization's climate (Gilmer & Forehand, 1964): size and shape, leadership patterns, communication networks, goal directions (goals of the organization), and decision-making procedures. The organizational variables affect climate directly (Field & Abelson, 1982). Size (Forehand, 1968; James & Jones, 1976; Payne, Pheysey, & Pugh, 1971), structure (Payne & Pheysey, 1971), technology (Payne et al., 1971), centralization (James & Jones, 1976, Tagiuri, 1968), configuration (Tagiuri, 1968), formalization (James & Jones, 1974; Payne et al., 1971; Tagiuri, 1968), and standardization (James & Jones, 1976; Payne et al., 1971) are organization influences.

Members of the organization indirectly affect organizational climate (Field & Abelson, 1982). Person influences on organizational climate include managerial behavior (Schneider, 1975), leadership patterns (James & Jones, 1974; Tagiuri, 1968), and rewards/controls (James & Jones, 1974; Payne & Pugh, 1976).

#### Dimensions of Organizational Climate

Organizational climate has been presented with numerous dimensions. Research shows that the four common dimensions of autonomy/control; degree of structure; rewards; and consideration, warmth and support are apparent (Waters, Roach, & Batlis, 1974). Meyer (1968) arrived at different descriptors for the dimensions of organizational climate:



responsibility; standards; reward; organizational clarity; and friendly, team spirit.

James and Jones (1974) found that organizational climate influences the perceptions of the individuals. This influence is moderated by the individual's group, task, and personality, (Downey, Hellriegel, & Slocum, 1975; Johnston, 1976; Newman, 1977). During employment, the individual also develops expectancies that are related to job behaviors, motivation, performance, and satisfaction (Newman, 1977). Therefore, the longer individuals are in contact with an organization, the more difficult it is to change their climate perceptions (Schneider, 1973).

Organization climates are important because of the relationship between the climates and the functioning of the organization or unit (Jones & James, 1979). "The climate concept seems to bear most directly on the understanding of individual and small group behavior. Where climate influences the behavior of total organizations, it does so through its influence on individual and small group behavior" (Litwin, 1968, p. 47).

Researchers found that multiple climates can exist within single formal organizations (Drexler, 1977; Johnston, 1976; Jones & James, 1979; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). The multiple climates within organizations are defined by consensus of a group (Drexler, 1977; Johnston, 1976; Joyce & Slocum, 1982; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). Defining organizational climates on the basis of consensus of individuals' psychological climates has the statistical advantage of ensuring that the mean organizational climates are reliable by definition (Joyce & Slocum, 1982).

Sells (1968) suggests that when organizational climate is used as the independent variable, its effects on individual behavior, communication patterns, and the like would be analyzed. If utilized in organizations, this research approach is believed to be more likely to lead to generalizations of systems within the organization which will assist administrators in understanding the behavior of individuals in their work environment (Sells, 1968).

#### Relationship of Organizational Climate And Job Satisfaction

A primary issue raised by researchers regarding the measurement of organizational climate is whether organizational climate is a variant of job satisfaction (Downey et al., 1974; LaFollette & Sims, 1975; Payne, Fineman, & Wall, 1976; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). Job satisfaction and organizational climate have aspects of common interest when investigating specific jobs or the total organization in which the jobs exist (Payne et al., 1976; Hellriegel & Slocum, 1974).

The measures are different in two ways: (1) "job satisfaction is focused upon a particular job, while organizational climate refers to the organization as a whole;" and (2) "job satisfaction concerns a person's affective response to his job, while organizational climate is derived from a person's description of what the organization is like" (Payne et al., 1976, p. 46). Hellriegel and Slocum (1973) see the differences as organizational climate focusing upon the properties of the work environment and job satisfaction assessing the affective response to facets of the work environment.

Several studies addressed the question of whether the measures of organizational climate and measures of job satisfaction are redundant (Downey et al., 1974; Johannesson, 1973; LaFollette & Sims, 1975; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). LaFollette and Sims (1975) investigated the redundancy question. They assessed whether the organizational climate and organizational practices measures behaved as job satisfaction measures in relation to performance. If the measures of climate and satisfaction were redundant, the correlations would be equal. The research showed "that organizational climate and organizational practices factors do not relate to performance as do satisfactions relate to performance" (LaFollette & Sims, 1975, p. 274).

Schneider and Snyder (1975) compared two instruments that were measures of satisfaction and one instrument that measures climate. They found "the two measures of satisfaction were more similar than either of the satisfaction instruments was like the measure of climate" (Schneider & Snyder, 1975, p. 322). Johannesson (1973) and Downey, et. al, (1974) had similar findings when they measured organizational climate, job satisfaction, and job performance in their study of the redundancy of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

When comparing the job satisfaction measures and the organizational climate measure, the respondents, when grouped by position within an organization, "tended to agree more on the organizational climate than they did on their job satisfaction" (Schneider & Snyder, 1975, p. 326). The respondents who had the most "positive" description of the climates of their organizations were not necessarily the most satisfied employees (Downey et al., 1974; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). In some positions, strong correlations exist between the individual's climate perceptions

and feelings of satisfaction; for individuals in other positions, the correlations were not present (Downey et al., 1974; Schneider & Snyder, 1975).

Downey et al., (1974) and Schneider and Snyder (1975) concluded that organizational climate and job satisfaction data are not equivalent; organizational climate is not analogous to the concept of global job satisfaction. Organizational climate measures reflect organization/descriptive differences; job satisfaction measures reflect individual/evaluative differences.

#### Measurement of Burnout

A variety of instruments have been used to measure burnout in educational settings. Kilpatrick (1986) found 19 different instruments had been used to assess burnout. Of the studies reviewed, 57.5 percent (n = 50) used a variation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). Eight studies used one of two versions of the instrument prepared by Jones, five used one of two versions of an instrument prepared by Pines, and three used instruments prepared by Berkeley.

Offerman states that "the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) is the best known and most widely used questionnaire for the assessment of individual occupational burnout among human service workers and other whose work involves intense interaction with other people" (1985, p. 419). "The Maslach Burnout Inventory is a well-constructed, well-researched instrument, which should be of considerable use in diagnosing problems in a wide variety of human service occupations" (Dowd, 1985, p. 905). Dowd also suggested "it should be possible to relate the concept of burnout to a number of behavioral and attitudinal problems

among human service workers and to devise appropriate remedial strategies" (1985, p. 905).

Development of the MBI was based on the need for an instrument appropriate for assessment of experienced burnout of human service workers in a wide range of occupations (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The current version of the MBI was developed over a period of approximately eight years. The early versions of the instrument measured both the frequency and the intensity of experienced burnout. Sufficient evidence has been accumulated to show a fairly high correlation between the two dimensions when subscale scores are computed (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). "Therefore, the current edition of the MBI assesses only the frequency dimension" (Maslach & Jackson, 1986, p. 8).

The frequency dimension was retained because "the frequency format is least similar to the typical format used in other self-report measures of attitudes and feelings. Therefore spurious correlations with other measures, due to similarities of response formats, should be minimized" (Maslach & Jackson, 1986, p. 8). Also, during the development of the instrument, the frequency format produced a scale of approximately equal ratios rather than a scale of equal intervals. Maslach and Jackson indicate "the seven points on the frequency dimension are explicitly anchored for the respondent, creating a more standardized response scale. Therefore, the researcher can be fairly certain about the meanings assumed by respondents for each scale value" (1986, p. 8).

A more extensive description of the Educators Survey, the form of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) designed for use with faculty members, is provided in Chapter 3.

## Measurement of Organizational Climate

The community college environment "may be viewed as a system of pressures, practices, and policies intended to influence" (Pace & Stern, 1958, p. 277) the attainment of the organizational goals. An instrument can be used to measure the impact of factors of the institution upon the individuals within the institution. The information gathered provides a conceptualization of what the individuals perceive they must face and deal with while fulfilling the requirements of their position (Pace & Stern, 1958). Thus, administrators and faculty members can learn something about the dynamics of the college environment and the direction in which the college influences the behavior of the individuals within the institution. The instruments measure what is frequently called the organizational climate.

A number of instruments are used to measure organizational climate. Payne and Pheysey (1971) constructed the Business Organization Climate Index using items from Stern's Organizational Climate Index. The instrument collects 12 types of data about individuals in business organization environments.

Halpin and Croft (1963) used the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to assess the organizational climate in elementary schools. The instrument provides a description of the climate on an eight scale continuum from a closed climate to an open climate. When describing the organizational climate, identification of specific categories of factors within the climate is not possible.

Borrevik (1972) modified the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to measure academic departments in institutions of higher

education. The instrument emphasized the four-year college and university environment and was not validated for institution-wide usage.

Stern and Pace (1958) concentrated on the development of instruments for use in academic settings. The Organizational Climate Index is a general instrument that can be used to characterize a variety of work settings. The development of the instrument was based upon the fact "that people who share a common ideology also tend to share common interpretations of events" (Jones, 1985, p. 552). The instrument was designed for administration to members of an organization. Group scores provide six primary factor scores and two secondary factor scores that describe the individuals' interpretation of the environment. Because different institutional types tend to have slightly different factor structures, separate work environment scores can be determined for the K-12 work environment and the post-secondary work environment.

A more extensive description of the Organizational Climate Index instrument is provided in Chapter 3.

### Summary

Chapter 2 provided a review of the literature and research relating to burnout and organizational climate. The concept of burnout was developed. The symptoms of burnout, demographic factors that have been researched in relation to burnout, relationship of the work environment and burnout, and stress and the community college faculty were discussed. Organizational intervention strategies prescribed in the literature were presented.

The concept of organizational climate was developed. Organizational influences, dimensions of organizational climate, and the

relationship of organizational climate and job satisfaction were discussed.

The most used instruments for the assessment of burnout and organizational climate were identified. A comprehensive review of the instruments used in the study, the Educators Survey, a form of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, and the Organizational Climate Index, is provided in Chapter 3.



## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Existing research studies have identified sources of stress in faculty, have investigated the phenomenon of burnout in select groups, and have constructed instruments for measuring organizational climate. Few research studies have focused on the effect of the dimensions of organizational climate on the perceived level of experienced burnout among faculty. Research of the burnout of community college faculty is even more limited.

This correlational study used the one shot case study design to investigate the relationship of the perceptions of organizational climate and experienced burnout among full-time faculty in selected public community colleges in Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Campbell and Stanley (1963) diagram this study design as follows:

X 0

This chapter is divided into five main sections: Instruments used in the Study, Selection of Sample, Collection of Data, Measurement of Variables, and Statistical Measures. Each section has descriptive information. The procedures and methodology are presented where appropriate.

## Instruments Used in the Study

Three instruments were used to generate the data required for this study: (1) the Educators Survey—a form of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), (2) the Organizational Climate Index (OCI), and (3) a brief demographic survey (the Faculty Demographic Survey) designed by the researcher entitled.

### Burnout

The educational edition, Educators Survey, of the copyrighted Maslach Burnout Inventory, published by Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, California, was used to obtain data concerning the experienced burnout of the subjects of this study. The instrument is labeled Educators Survey to avoid sensitizing the respondents to burnout. The 22-item instrument takes 10-15 minutes to complete and is self-administered.

MBI Subscales. The MBI is designed to determine three different aspects of experienced burnout. The emotional exhaustion subscale assesses feelings of being emotionally overextended. The depersonalization subscale measures an unfeeling and impersonal response towards recipients of one's service, care, treatment, or instruction. The personal accomplishment subscale assesses feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people.

Each aspect of burnout is measured by a subscale that uses from 5 to 9 of the 22 items (Appendix A). Maslach and Jackson (1986) indicate that each of the subscale scores is independent, is to be considered

separately as a measure of the degree of burnout, and is not to be combined with the others into a single total score.

The frequency with which the respondent experiences feelings related to each of the subscales is assessed using a seven-point, explicitly anchored response format. Respondents were to indicate whether they have never had this feeling (0) or, if they had this feeling, to select the best descriptor of how often they felt that way. The six descriptors for how often they felt that way were: (1) a few times a year or less, (2) once a month or less, (3) a few times a month, (4) once a week, (5) a few times a week, and (6) every day.

Degrees of Burnout. Maslach and Jackson (1986) conceptualize burnout as a continuous variable that ranges from low to moderate to high degrees of experienced feeling. Scores for each of the subscales are considered low if they are in the lower third of the normative distribution, average if they are in the middle third, and high if they are in the upper third. The numerical scores for each of the degree of burnout categories are based upon the normative samples for post-secondary education and are shown in Table I on page 43.

In the subscales of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, higher mean scores correspond to higher degrees of burnout. In the personal accomplishment subscale, lower mean scores correspond to higher degrees of experienced burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

TABLE I  
RANGE OF EXPERIENCED BURNOUT BY CATEGORY  
FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

MBI Subscales	Low (lower third)	Average (Middle third)	High (upper third)
Emotional Exhaustion	$\leq 13$	14-23	$\geq 24$
Depersonalization	$\leq 8$	9-13	$\geq 14$
Personal Accomplishment	$\geq 37$	36-31	$\leq 30$

n = 635

Source: Maslach & Jackson, 1986

Reliability and Validity. Reliability and validity have been established for the MBI (Bodden, 1985; Dowd, 1985; Iwanicki & Schwab, 1981; Offerman, 1985). Maslach and Jackson (1986) estimated the internal consistency of the MBI using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. The reliability coefficients established for the subscales were: .90, emotional exhaustion; .79, depersonalization; and .71, personal accomplishment. Iwanicki and Schwab (1981) found similar estimates of internal consistency for teachers when using Cronbach's coefficient alpha: .89 for emotional exhaustion, .76 for depersonalization, and .77 for personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Maslach and Jackson (1986) determined the test-retest reliability by using a sample of graduate students in social welfare and health agency administrators. The two-four week test-retest reliability coefficients for the three subscales were the following: emotional exhaustion, .82; depersonalization, .60; and personal accomplishment, .80. All

reliability coefficients were significant beyond the .001 level. Maslach and Jackson (1986) established the convergent validity in three ways: (1) An individual's MBI scores were correlated with behavioral ratings made independently by a person who knew the individual well; e.g., a spouse or co-worker. (2) The MBI scores were correlated with the presence of certain job characteristics that were expected to contribute to burnout. (3) The MBI scores were correlated with measures of various outcomes that were hypothesized to be related to burnout. "All three correlations provided substantial evidence of the validity of the MBI" (Maslach & Jackson, 1986, p. 10).

Bodden (1985), Dowd (1985), and Offerman (1985) state that the reliability and validity data are sufficient to demonstrate stability and meaning of the burnout construct of the MBI.

### Organizational Climate

The copyrighted Organizational Climate Index published by the FAAAX Corporation, Syracuse, New York, was used to obtain data concerning the perceived organizational climate of the educational institution in which the subject was employed. The 80-item Short Form OCI-375 SF takes about 20 minutes to complete and is self-administered.

The 80 statements describe the environment in which people work. The statements refer to daily activities, rules, policies, regulations, typical interests and projects, features of the physical environment, etc. The statements may or may not be characteristic of the subject's situation because organizations differ.

The subjects identify which statements are characteristic of their colleges. If the statement is characteristic of the subject's

situation, the statement is marked true. If the statement is not characteristic of the subject's situation, the statement is marked false. Each item that is answered as the answer is presented in the scoring key for colleges receives a score of one.

Factors of Organizational Climate. Eight factors of organizational climate are determined by the OCI. Six of the factors are considered as first order indices, and two of the factors are considered as second order indices. The higher the scores for the factors, the more prevalent the factors are in the organization.

Definitions of the Factors. Richman and Stern (1979) defined the eight environment factors of organizational climate. The first six definitions are for the first order factors; the last two definitions are for the second order factors.

**Achievement Standards:** Environments that are perceived as stressing high standards of personal achievement. The tasks are successfully completed, and high levels of motivation and energy are maintained. The established procedures are constantly subject to revision and improvement. The staff is given recognition for work of good quality and quantity (Richman & Stern, 1979).

**Impulse Control:** Environments that are perceived as having a great deal of constraint and organizational restrictiveness in the work environment. "There is little opportunity for personal expression or for any form of impulsive behavior. Faculty and staff feel that their behavior is on display and act accordingly" (Richman & Stern, 1979, p. 11).

**Intellectual Climate:** Environments that are perceived as being conducive to scholarly interests in the humanities, arts, and sciences. The staff and the physical plant are seen as facilitators of these interests. Intellectual activities and pursuits characterize the general work atmosphere (Richman & Stern, 1979).

**Orderliness:** Environments that are perceived as stressing organizational structure and procedural orderliness. Neatness is emphasized. There are pressures to conform to a defined norm of personal appearance and institutional image. The faculty are expected to accept and support administrative policy (Richman & Stern, 1987).

**Practicalness:** Environments that are perceived as being well-organized. The programs are likely to be well-structured and to have clear objectives. The rights and duties of staff are well-defined and the organizational hierarchy is well accepted (Richman & Stern, 1979).

**Supportiveness:** Environments that are perceived as having respect for the integrity of the individual. A supportive environment that closely approximates the needs of the more dependent teachers. A sense of fair play and openness is prevalent in the working environment (Richman & Stern, 1979).

**Development:** Environments that are characterized by high standards for intellectual achievement. Institutional supports for individual growth are maintained (Richman & Stern, 1979).

**Control:** Environments that are characterized as having an institutional emphasis on an orderly work environment and a restriction of personal or individual expression (Richman & Stern, 1979).

First and Second Order Scores. The 80 statements of the OCI are used to determine six first order factor scores and two second order

factor scores (Appendix B). The six first order factors are (1) achievement standards, (2) intellectual climate, (3) practicalness, (4) supportiveness, (5) orderliness, and (6) impulse control. Each score uses ten items from the 80 statements. Scores can vary from a low of 0 to a maximum of 10.

The second order factors are development and control. The development score is the total of the scores for the first order factors of (1) achievement standards, (2) intellectual climate, (3) practicalness, and (4) supportiveness. Development scores can vary from a low of 0 to a maximum of 40. The control score is the total for the first order factors of (5) orderliness and (6) impulse control. Control scores can vary from a low of 0 to a maximum of 20.

Reliability and Validity. Reliability and validity have been established for the OCI. Reliability assessments for internal consistency of the OCI are reported in terms of the Kuder-Richardson 20. The reliability coefficients established for the factors were: achievement standards, .75; intellectual climate, .77; supportiveness, .73; practicalness, .69; impulse control, .65; orderliness, .66; development, .82; and control, .75 (Richman & Stern, 1979). The scale reliabilities are comparable to the reliabilities of other instruments used for assessing organizational climate (Skager, 1972).

Pace and Stern (1958) and Jones (1985) indicate the instrument provides a valid description of very different environments and is capable of revealing sharp distinctions between colleges. The validating information indicates the OCI is capable of distinguishing between institutional environments (Skager, 1972).



### Demographic Factors

The Faculty Demographic Survey (Appendix B) was used to obtain information pertaining to personal variables from the respondents in this study. The instrument was designed to provide personal demographic information relating to the following variables: age, gender, years in current teaching position, years in teaching profession, number of different institutions taught in on a full-time basis, noneducation occupational experience, education, area of teaching, number of course preparations per semester, ability levels of students, and organization intervention strategies.

### Pilot Study

The research instruments which consisted of the Faculty Demographic Survey, the Educators Survey, and the Organizational Climate Index were field tested by 17 doctoral candidates at Oklahoma State University. The pilot study was conducted in an effort to receive input regarding the research instruments in the following areas: (1) ease of completion, (2) completeness and understanding of instructions, (3) estimated time of completion, and (4) any relevant input concerning the research materials or the individual questions.

Thirteen (76.4%) of the candidates returned the research instruments. The respondents suggested employee assistance programs that were not included in the demographic survey. Comments were made that provided different terminology for some of the employee assistance programs that were listed in the demographic survey. The changes indicated by the pilot study were used to finalize the materials for distribution.

## Population and Sample

The community colleges used in this study were from the list of educational institutions in The 1985 Higher Education Directory. The directory lists accredited institutions of post-secondary education that are legally authorized to offer and are offering at least a one-year program of college-level studies leading toward a degree, have submitted the information required for listing, and are accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency.

### Population

The population for this study was the 87 community colleges listed in The 1985 Higher Education Directory that had an affiliation or control of state, local, or state and local and were located in the states of Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Additional criteria for inclusion in the study were that the president and the chief academic officers were employed by the college during the prior academic year and would continue to be employed during the 1988-89 academic year.

An alphabetical list of the community colleges was prepared for each state. The president for each community college was determined by using The 1985 Higher Education Directory and The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1988.

### Sample

For this study a purposive sample of 18 community colleges was chosen from the six state lists. Three community colleges were selected from each of the six states using a list of three random numbers

generated for each state by the computer program SYSTAT: The System for Statistics (1987). The presidents of the community colleges were contacted by telephone. The purpose of the study was explained, and the college president was asked for permission to have the full-time college faculty participate in the study. When requested, a miniproposal was sent for review. If the college president agreed to have the faculty participate in the study, the president was asked to identify an individual at the college to assist the researcher. The individual was contacted by telephone and procedures for the data collection were discussed. The telephone conversation was confirmed by letter.

In the event any of the originally selected institutions could not participate, another random list of numbers equivalent to the number of colleges still needed within the state was generated by the computer program Systat: The System for Statistics (1987). The college presidents identified by the new list of random numbers were contacted using the procedure for the first list of colleges. The process of generating a list of random numbers and contacting college presidents was continued until three community colleges in each state were identified for participation in the study and individuals were contacted to assist with the study. Even though commitments had been received from three community colleges in each state, one eventually did not participate for administrative reasons.

### Subjects

The units of measure of this study were the full-time faculty members employed in the selected community colleges in the states of Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma.

and the faculty member had full-time teaching responsibilities during the prior academic year.

Table II identifies the community colleges that participated in the study and provides the number of full-time faculty members employed by the institution. A total of 624 faculty members were contacted.

TABLE II  
COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND NUMBER OF FULL-TIME FACULTY  
IN THE SAMPLE FOR THE STUDY

State	Community College	Number of Full-time Faculty
Arkansas	Garland County Community College	41
	North Arkansas Community College	18
	Phillips County Community College	40
Colorado	Lamar Community College	24
	Otero Junior College	17
Kansas	Cowley County Community College	35
	Labette Community College	30
	Seward County Community College	41
Missouri	Jefferson College	91
	Penn Valley Community College	82
	Moberly Community College	18
Nebraska	Mid-Plains Community College: McDonald-Delton	22
	Mid-Plains Community College: North Platte	27
	McCook Community College	18
Oklahoma	Carl Albert Junior College	41
	Murray State College	34
	Western Oklahoma State College	45
Total		624

## Collection of Data

The data were collected using three instruments. The first instrument, the copyrighted Maslach Burnout Inventory which was renamed the Educators Survey by Maslach, Jackson, and Schwab (Maslach & Jackson, 1986), was used to measure job-related experienced burnout. The second instrument was the copyrighted Organizational Climate Index that measured the perceived environment in which the subjects work. The third was an instrument designed to elicit demographic information, the Faculty Demographic Survey, which was developed by the researcher. The copyrighted instruments were purchased by the researcher.

The individual appointed by the community college president was contacted by telephone. The purpose of the study was discussed, and the procedures for data collection were outlined. Each college's representative provided a list of the current faculty members who would have full-time teaching responsibilities during the 1988-89 academic year and who had been employed at the college with full-time teaching assignment during the 1987-88 academic year. Each subject was assigned a number to be used during the followup process.

The research instruments were numbered and assigned to the subjects by matching the subject number and the instrument number. The researcher prepared packets of materials for each of the subjects for the study. Each packet consisted of the Faculty Demographic Survey, the Educators Survey (MBI), the Organizational Climate Index (OCI), the OCI answer sheet, and a cover letter (Appendix D) explaining the study and providing instructions for mailing the materials to the researcher in a postage-paid, addressed envelope. The packets of materials for each of the colleges were shipped via UPS to the colleges' representatives.

The college representatives distributed the packets of materials to the subjects on September 8. As the research instruments were returned, the researcher checked off the names of the respondents on the numbered list of subjects. The predetermined minimum acceptable response of 50 percent was attained by September 23 so there was no followup of nonrespondents. A telephone followup of five nonrespondents was conducted during the week of October 3-7. October 7 was the final date for accepting research instruments for use in the study. Questionnaires were returned by 342 (54.8%) of the subjects.

#### Measurement of Variables

The independent variables as measured by the eight factors of the Organizational Climate Index were score data. The respondent was asked to determine whether the statement applied to their organization and to mark the statement True or False. The respondent's answers were compared to the answers in the answer key and one point was given for each answer that matched the keyed answer. Ten statements were used to determine each first order factor score. Each first order factor score could vary from a low of 0 to a maximum of 10. The second order factor score of Development was the total of four first order factor scores: achievement standards, intellectual climate, practicalness, and supportiveness. Development scores could vary from a low of 0 to a maximum of 40. The second order factor score of control was the total of two first order factor scores: Orderliness and impulse control. Control scores could vary from a low of 0 to a maximum of 20.

The independent variables as measured by the Faculty Demographic Survey were frequency data.

The dependent variables as measured by the three subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Educators Survey) were score data. Each of the 22 items were measured by a Likert perception scale with values ranging from 0 to 6. The emotional exhaustion subscale score, which consisted of nine items, could vary from a low of 0 to a maximum of 54. Five items were used to determine the depersonalization subscale score. The score could vary from a low of 0 to a maximum of 30. The personal accomplishment subscale used eight items to determine the score. The Personal Accomplishment score could vary from a low of 0 to a maximum of 48.

The subscale scores were considered separately and were not combined into a single score. Maslach and Jackson (1986) recommend the use of the original numerical scores rather than the categorizations of low, average, and high levels of burnout when performing the statistical analyses. The original numerical scores were used to increase the power of the statistical analysis (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

#### Statistical Measurement

As the research instruments were returned, all variables were coded by the researcher. Appropriate numerical values were used in preparation for the data analysis. Each respondent was treated as a separate case in the data file and was identified by the number assigned during the preparation of the packets of materials. A subfile structure was constructed which would allow for data analysis by college if necessary. The researcher entered the coded data into a data set in the computer, verified each case in the data file, and ran the statistical procedures which tabulated and analyzed the data.

The statistical program SYSTAT: The System for Statistics (1987) was used by the researcher to tabulate the responses from each question and to analyze the data. The data were first analyzed by using the subprograms STATS: STATISTICS and STATS: TABLES for distribution of responses as well as other descriptive statistics.

For comparisons of two groups, the subprogram STATS: TTEST for independent groups was used. The  $p < .05$  level of significance was used to test for significance of differences.

The subprogram CORRELATIONS was used to determine the linear relationship of each of the demographic factors and the dependent variables. If a linear relationship existed and the Pearson  $r$  was significant at the  $p < .05$  level, the demographic factors with significant relationships were identified as covariates.

When three or more groups were involved, the MULTIVARIATE GENERAL LINEAR HYPOTHESIS subprogram was used for ANOVA, ANCOVA, and regression analysis. The ANCOVA was used for analysis when covariates had been identified. The  $p < .05$  level of significance was used to test for significant differences. When the overall  $F$  was significant, the subprogram STATS: TUKEY'S (a) TEST (HSD) was used for post hoc analysis to determine which specific groups differed on the criterion variable.

#### Summary

This chapter presented a description of the research design which guided this study to determine the effect of the dimensions of organizational climate on experienced burnout of community college faculty. The design of this study included the measurement of the independent variables as defined by the Organizational Climate Index and



the researcher developed Faculty Demographic Survey. The dependent variables were the three subscales of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment as measured by the Educators Survey form of the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

The population for this study was the state and/or local controlled community colleges in the states of Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. The sample was 17 community colleges: three from the states of Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, and two from Colorado. The units of measure were described as current full-time faculty who had full-time teaching responsibilities at the same institution during the previous academic year.

The data were collected using the Organizational Climate Index, the Maslach Burnout Inventory, and the Faculty Demographic Survey. Representatives in each of the community colleges in the sample assisted in identifying the subjects and distributing the research instruments.

The data were coded and entered into the computerized data file. The statistical program SYSTAT: The System for Statistics (1987) was used to provide descriptive statistics and to perform statistical analysis T-tests, ANOVAs, ANCOVAs, and multiple regression analysis. When the findings were significant, the post hoc analysis was performed using Tukey's (a) Test (HSD).

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

This chapter presents the analysis of the data from the study investigating the relationship of organizational climate factors and burnout of full-time community college faculty. Three community colleges from Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and two community colleges from Colorado participated in the study.

Demographic data, perceptions of organizational climate factors, and perceptions of experienced burnout were collected from the full-time faculty using three instruments: (1) the Faculty Demographic Survey, prepared by the researcher; (2) the copyrighted Educators Survey (MBI); and (3) the copyrighted Organizational Climate Index (OCI).

In this chapter a description of the sample, the statistical analyses and findings, and the interpretation of the data are presented. The research questions are addressed in relation to the data presented.

#### Analysis of Responses

The research instruments were distributed to 624 full-time community college faculty members via the campus mail system of each of the participating community colleges. Respondents were asked to complete the research instruments and return them to the researcher in addressed, postage-paid envelopes. Fifty-one percent of the full-time faculty members included in the sample responded within two weeks after

the distribution of the research instruments. Because the minimum requirement of a 50 percent response rate was attained from the responses to the first campus-mail distribution, a followup of all nonrespondents was not undertaken.

A telephone followup of a purposive sample of nonrespondents was conducted four weeks after the distribution date. Five nonrespondents were asked to provide the answers to the questionnaires during the telephone conversation. The data collected during the telephone interviews was compared to the mail responses using t-tests. There was no significant difference between the mail responses and the telephone responses. The five telephone responses were included in the sample returns for the study.

There were 342 (54.8%) questionnaires returned by mail. Another five responses were received during the telephone followup of nonrespondents. Twenty-nine (4.6%) of the questionnaires were not usable because of incomplete information. Table III shows the total of 347 responses and response rate of 55.6 percent. After checking for completeness of data, a total of 318 questionnaires (51.0%) were determined usable for the study. Another 277 (44.4%) of the faculty did not respond to the campus-mail distribution and or were not contacted during the telephone followup of nonrespondents.

TABLE III  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS  
AND RETURNS FROM THE SURVEY

Category	Number	Percent
Instruments Mailed	624	100.0
Nonrespondents	277	44.4
Total Sample Size	347	55.6
Unusable Returns	29	4.6
Used in This Study	318	51.0

#### Description of the Sample

The purposive sample of 17 community colleges in the midwest provided the subjects for this study. The 176 male respondents represented 55.3% of the sample. The 142 female respondents were 44.7% of the sample. Fifty-four (54) or 38.0% of the females were in the 36-45 age group while 62 males (35.2%) were in the 46-55 age group. Nearly two thirds of the respondents (65.4%) were from 36 to 55 years of age. Descriptive statistics for gender and age of the respondents are shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV  
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS  
BY GENDER AND AGE

Age	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
25 and below	1	0.7	2	1.1	3	0.9
26-35	34	23.9	27	15.3	61	19.2
36-45	54	38.0	54	30.7	108	34.0
46-55	38	26.8	62	35.2	100	31.4
56 and over	15	10.6	31	17.6	46	14.5
Total	142	100.0	176	99.9	318	100.0

#### Teaching and Occupational Experience

Respondents were asked to indicate the length of time in their current teaching position, the total years in the teaching profession, and the years of noneducation occupational experience. As presented in Table V, 93 (29.2%) indicated they had been in their present teaching position 5-10 years; 41 (12.9%) indicated they had been in their present position more than 20 years.

Table V also shows that the group with the most respondents when identifying the total years of experience in the teaching profession was the group with more than 20 years of experience. That group represents 100 faculty members (32.4 percent). Another 79 (25.6%) respondents had 5-10 years in the teaching profession. The smallest group when

considering total teaching experience represents faculty members who had less than five years of teaching experience. Thirty-one respondents (9.7%) have less than five years of teaching experience.

TABLE V  
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS BY YEARS IN CURRENT  
TEACHING POSITION, TOTAL YEARS TEACHING, AND  
OTHER OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Years	Current Position		Total Experience		Occupational Experience	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 5	75	23.6	31	9.7	159	50.0
5-10	93	29.2	81	25.5	80	25.2
11-15	66	20.8	53	16.7	37	11.6
16-20	43	13.5	49	15.4	25	7.9
More than 20	41	12.9	104	32.7	17	5.3
Total	318	100.0	318	100.0	318	100.0

When considering the noneducation occupational experience of the respondents, 50 percent (159) had less than 5 years of experience outside the field of education. Another 80 (25.2%) had 5 to 10 years of noneducation experience. Seventeen respondents (5.3%) had more than 20 years of noneducation occupational experience.

### Number of Institutions

The number of different institutions in which the faculty members had been employed was represented by six categories ranging from one institution to six or more institutions. The faculty member was asked to include the community college where currently employed when identifying the number of different educational institutions in which he/she had been employed. The largest group of responses was employment in one institution. Table VI shows that 106 (33.3%) had taught in only one educational institution. That would indicate that the only educational institution the respondent had knowledge of is the one where he/she was currently employed. Another 95 (29.9%) had been employed by two educational institutions. Two hundred sixty one respondents (82.1%) had been employed in three or less educational institutions. Only 12 (3.8%) had been employed in six or more different institutions.

TABLE VI  
 NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS BY NUMBER  
 OF DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS  
 IN WHICH EMPLOYED

Number of Institutions	Number of Faculty	Percent
1	106	33.3
2	95	29.9
3	60	18.9
4	29	9.1
5	16	5.0
6 or more	12	3.8
Total	318	100.0

#### Education and Subject Area Background

The respondents were asked to identify the broad subject area in which they did the majority of their teaching. They were also asked to indicate the highest level of education attained. Table VII on page 64 provides a summary of the number and percent of faculty by educational level and major subject area of teaching.

The 61 faculty teaching in vocational/technical programs represent 19.2% of the total respondents. Health careers (16.4%) and business (15.1%) were the next most frequently identified subject areas of teaching. The "other" category was used by five respondents who teach developmental classes and two adult/basic education teachers.



TABLE VII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS BY LEVEL OF  
EDUCATION AND SUBJECT CATEGORY OF TEACHING

Subject	Educational Level																	
	Associates		Bachelors		Bachelors+		Masters		Masters+		Specialist		Doctorate		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Business	0	0.0	1	0.3	6	1.9	5	1.6	29	9.1	2	0.6	5	1.8	0	0.0	46	15.1
English/Composition	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.3	16	5.0	5	1.6	3	0.9	0	0.0	28	8.8
Health and Physical Education	0	0.0	2	0.6	2	0.6	3	0.9	4	1.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0	13	4.1
Health Careers	5	1.6	4	1.3	10	3.2	15	4.7	15	4.7	2	0.6	1	0.3	0	0.0	52	16.4
Humanities	1	0.3	0	0.0	2	0.6	4	1.3	19	6.0	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	29	9.1
Mathematics	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	2	0.6	17	5.4	0	0.0	2	0.6	0	0.0	22	6.9
Natural Science	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	5.4	0	0.0	7	2.2	0	0.0	28	8.8
Social Science	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	19	6.0	2	0.6	5	1.6	0	0.0	27	8.5
Vocational/Technical	9	2.8	4	1.3	10	3.1	11	3.1	19	6.0	1	0.3	2	0.6	5	1.6	61	19.2
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3	5	1.6	2	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.3	10	3.1
Total	15	4.7	12	3.8	33	10.4	45	14.2	160	50.3	19	6.0	27	8.5	7	2.2	318	100.0

One half of the respondents (50.3%) had earned their masters and completed additional course work beyond the masters degree. Forty-five respondents (14.2%) had earned their masters degree. More community college faculty had only an associate degree (4.7%) than had bachelors degrees (3.8%). The respondents who checked "other" stated they had occupational experience that was used as the criteria for preparation for employment in the subject area.

Number of Course Preparations  
and Student Ability

In order to determine whether the student mix in the classes was homogenous or heterogeneous, the respondents were asked to tell whether the classes they taught were comprised of students with very different levels of ability. The respondents were also asked how many course preparations were usually required each semester. A comparison of the number of course preparations for the faculty who felt they taught classes with students of similar levels of ability and those who felt they taught classes with students of very different levels of ability is presented in Table VIII. Most of the faculty (92.5%) felt they taught classes with students of very different levels of ability. Nearly one-half (48.4%) had three (24.5%) or four (23.9%) preparations per semester. In contrast, the 12 faculty (3.8%) who felt the students in their classes had similar levels of ability usually had one or two course preparations per semester.

TABLE VIII  
 NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS BY NUMBER  
 OF COURSE PREPARATIONS PER SEMESTER  
 AND STUDENT ABILITY

Number of Preparations	Similar Student Ability Number	Student Ability Percent	Different Student Ability Number	Student Ability Percent
1-2	46	14.5	12	3.8
3	78	24.5	5	1.6
4	76	23.9	3	0.9
5	53	16.7	2	0.6
6 or more	41	12.9	2	0.6
Total	294	92.5	24	7.5

n=318

#### Employee Assistance Programs

A list of various types of possible employee assistance programs was provided in the Faculty Demographic Survey. The respondents were asked to check all the programs that are provided by their community college. Four areas of counseling, eight topics for programs, and four miscellaneous items were included. The respondents were also asked to identify related assistance that is provided by their community college and that was not on the check list. Table IX on page 67 summarizes the employee assistance programs provided by the community colleges.

TABLE IX  
 NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS WITH  
 EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS PROVIDED  
 BY THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program	Number	Percent
Counseling		
Career Development	124	39.0
Smoking Cessation	32	10.0
Stress Management	52	16.4
Substance Abuse	36	11.3
Leave of Absence	195	61.3
Programs		
Collegial Support Groups	20	6.3
Conflict Resolution	8	2.5
Fitness/Exercise	126	39.6
Smoking Cessation	32	10.1
Stress Management	49	15.4
Substance Abuse	26	8.2
Time Management	24	7.5
Sabbatical	191	60.1
Services Made Available Through A Community- based Agency	27	8.5

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer. The total will be more than  $n = 318$  and percents will be more than 100.0.

More than half of the respondents had the opportunity to take a leave of absence or to take a sabbatical. The leave of absence was provided for 195 (61.3%) of the respondents; the sabbatical for 191 (60.1 percent). Over one third had career development counseling (39.0%) and fitness/exercise (39.6%) programs available. Services were

made available to 27 of the respondents (8.5%) through community-based agencies. Conflict resolution programs (2.5%) were identified the least frequently.

### Burnout

The Educators Survey, a version of the copyrighted Maslach Burnout Inventory, was used to assess the level of burnout of the respondents. This 22-item instrument uses the frequency of occurrence as the basis for the response. The 22 items are used to provide three subscales: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. The higher the score on the the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales the higher the experienced burnout. The lower the score on the personal accomplishment subscale the greater the experienced burnout.

The normative data (Maslach and Jackson, 1986) provides three categories of experienced burnout for each of the subscales. The categories are low burnout, average burnout, and high burnout.

#### Level of Burnout

Research question one asked: What is the level of burnout among faculty in community colleges? A summary of the data for the levels of experienced burnout of the respondents for the three subscales is presented in Table X on page 69.

Emotional Exhaustion. Nearly two thirds of the respondents experienced either low or average burnout on the emotional exhaustion

subscale. Of the respondents, 121 (38.1%) experienced low burnout and 118 (37.1%) experienced average burnout.

TABLE X  
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS BY  
BURNOUT SUBSCALE CATEGORIZATION

Subscale	Low Burnout		Average Burnout		High Burnout	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Emotional Exhaustion	121	38.1	118	37.1	79	24.8
Depersonalization	95	29.9	143	44.9	80	25.2
Personal Accomplishment	86	27.0	147	46.3	85	26.7

n = 318

Depersonalization. On the depersonalization subscale, 143 respondents (44.9%) experienced average burnout. High burnout is the least frequently experienced burnout on the depersonalization subscale. One fourth (25.2%) of the respondents experienced high burnout as measured by the depersonalization subscale.

Personal Accomplishment. Nearly one half of the respondents (46.3%) experienced average burnout as measured by the personal accomplishment subscale. About one fourth of the respondents (27.0%)

experienced low burnout and about one fourth (26.7%) experienced high burnout on this subscale.

#### Comparison With Normative Data

Research question two asked: How do the levels of burnout compare with the normative data for post-secondary education? Normative data for the levels of burnout for people employed in the post-secondary education environment were provided with the Educators Survey (Maslach and Jackson, 1986). The mean and standard deviation is available for each of the three subscales. The t-test was used to compare the mean test scores of the respondents with the mean for the normative sample for each of the burnout subscales. There was no significant difference between the respondents and the normative sample. Table XI on page 71 presents the information for the comparison of the experienced burnout of the respondents and the normative sample. This finding varies from the study by Di Falco Vander Ven (1982) in which the experienced level of burnout of the community college faculty was found to be lower than the normative sample.

TABLE XI  
 COMPARISON OF EXPERIENCED BURNOUT OF RESPONDENTS  
 WITH BURNOUT SUBSCALE NORMATIVE SAMPLE  
 FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Subscale	Respondents		Normative Sample		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
Emotional Exhaustion	17.74	9.86	18.57	11.95	0.396
Depersonalization	5.82	4.83	5.57	6.63	0.138
Personal Achievement	38.24	6.73	39.17	7.92	0.784
Total Number	318		635		

t = 1.96  
 .05

#### Organizational Climate Factors and Burnout

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship of the perceived dimensions of organizational climate to the experienced level of burnout among faculty in community colleges in the midwest. Some of the demographic factors identified through the review of research were considered to be, in part, a function of the experienced burnout as well as a function of the perceptions of organizational climate factors. Specific demographic factors were identified to be used as covariates with each of the organizational climate factors during the statistical analysis.

The procedures used to determine the demographic factors to be used as covariates were as follows. The Pearson correlation coefficient was



used to test the assumption of linearity. The identified potential covariates were tested for homogeneity of slope. The potential covariates having a nonsignificant interaction with the independent variables were tested for low correlation between each of the pairs.

### Linear Relationship

The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to test the basic assumption of linearity of the demographic factors and the burnout subscales: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. The demographic factors of gender, age, and career development counseling had a significant linear relationship with the three burnout subscales: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal achievement. A significant linear relationship existed between staff/professional development and the subscales depersonalization and personal accomplishment. Number of course preparations and the employee assistance programs of leave of absence and collegial support groups also have a significant linear relationship with the subscale personal accomplishment. Appendix E presents the  $r$  values ( $df=316$ ,  $cv = .111$ ) for the test of linearity of the demographic factors and the burnout subscales.  $.05$

### Homogeneity of Slopes

Homogeneity of regression was used for the demographic variables that had a significant linear relationship with the burnout subscales and the eight independent variables identified as organizational climate factors. This preliminary test indicated that the assumption of equal regression of slopes was tenable and determined which demographic

factors could be used with each of the organizational climate factors during the analysis of covariance. Appendix F shows the results of the test of homogeneity of slope and the demographic factors with nonsignificant interactions with the organizational climate factors that were considered as potential covariates.

#### Correlations Between Pairs

Huck, Cormier and Bounds state that when two or more covariates are used in the analysis of covariance there is an increase of power "as long as (1) there is a high correlation between each covariate and the dependent variable and (2) there is a low correlation between each pair of covariates" (1974, p. 145). Because of the potential for use of multiple variables in the analysis of covariance, the demographic factors having nonsignificant interactions with the independent variables were tested for correlations between pairs. The results of the Pearson correlation coefficient for each pair of covariates is presented in Table XII on page 74. Only demographic factors with nonsignificant correlations between each pair were used as covariates in the analysis of covariance.

Emotional Exhaustion. The test of linearity identified the demographic factors gender, age, and career development counseling as potential covariates. The homogeneity of regression determined that the demographic factor career development counseling had a significant interaction with the organizational climate factors development and control (Appendix F).

TABLE XII

LINEAR RELATIONSHIP OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS  
IDENTIFIED AS POTENTIAL COVARIATES FOR  
USE IN THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE

	Gender r	Age r	Number of Institutions r	Number of Course Preparations r	Career Development Counseling r	Collegial Support Group r	Leave of Absence r	Staff/ Professional Development r
Gender	1.000	0.153*	0.029	0.089	-0.021	0.050	0.027	-0.170*
Age		1.000	0.249*	0.056	0.139*	0.068	-0.083	-0.009
Number of Institutions			1.000	0.052	-0.125 *	-0.036	-0.106	-0.081
Number of Course Preparations				1.000	-0.072	-0.034	-0.007	-0.035
Career Development Counseling					1.000	0.191*	0.145*	0.202*
Collegial Support Group						1.000	0.126*	0.150*
Leave of Absence							1.000	0.162*
Staff/Professional Development								1.000

n=318; cv = .111  
.05

During analysis of covariance, gender, age, and career development counseling were covariates with six organizational climate factors: achievement standards, intellectual climate, practicalness, supportiveness, orderliness, impulse control. Only gender and age were covariates with the organizational climate factors of development and control during analysis of covariance.

Depersonalization. During the test of linearity, the demographic factors gender, age, career development counseling, and staff/professional development were identified as potential covariates. The homogeneity of regression determined that the demographic factor age had a significant interaction with the organizational climate factors intellectual climate, supportiveness, and development (Appendix F).

During analysis of covariance, gender, age, career development counseling, and staff/professional development were covariates with five organizational climate factors: Achievement standards, practicalness, orderliness, impulse control, and control. Only gender, career development, and staff/professional development were covariates with the organizational climate factors of intellectual climate, supportiveness, and development during analysis of covariance.

Personal Accomplishment. The test of linearity provided the demographic factors gender, age, number of institutions, number of course preparations, career development counseling, collegial support groups, leave of absence and staff/professional development as potential covariates. The homogeneity of regression determined that the demographic factor age had a significant interaction with the organizational climate factor control (Appendix F); gender had a

significant interaction with the organizational climate factors intellectual climate, orderliness, and development; number of course preparations had a significant interaction with the organizational climate factor practicalness; collegial support groups had a significant interaction with intellectual climate and orderliness; and staff/professional development had a significant interaction with the organizational climate factor practicalness.

During analysis of covariance, gender, age, number of institutions, number of course preparations, career development counseling, collegial support groups, leave of absence and staff/professional development were used as covariates with three organizational climate factors: achievement standards, supportiveness, and impulse control. Age, number of institutions, number of course preparations, career development counseling, leave of absence and staff/professional development were used as covariates with two organizational climate factors: intellectual climate and orderliness. Gender, age, number of institutions, career development counseling, collegial support groups, and leave of absence were used as covariates with the organizational climate factor practicalness. Age, number of institutions, number of course preparations, career development counseling, and leave of absence were used as covariates with the organizational climate factor development. Gender, number of institutions, number of course preparations, career development counseling, collegial support groups, leave of absence and staff/professional development were used as covariates with the organizational climate factor control.

### Organizational Climate Factors

The faculty perceptions of organizational climate factors were measured by the copyrighted Organizational Climate Index (OCI). The 80 items of the OCI refer to characteristics of the organization that the faculty member may or may not feel are characteristic of his/her educational institution. The statements refer to daily activities, rules, policies, procedures, regulations, typical interests and projects, features in the physical environment, etc.

Eight factors of organizational climate are determined by the OCI. Six of the factors are considered as first order indices; two of the factors are considered as second order indices. The higher the scores for the factors, the more prevalent the factors are in the organization.

### Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Research question three asked: What are the dimensions of organizational climate that relate to burnout among faculty in community colleges? This section analyzes the relationship of the eight organizational climate factors and the three burnout subscales.

### Emotional Exhaustion

Feelings of being overextended or exhausted by one's work is categorized as emotional exhaustion when using the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach and Jackson, 1986). The factors in the organizational climate as measured by the OCI that were significantly related to emotional exhaustion were the four first order factors of achievement standards, orderliness, practicalness, and supportiveness, and the second order factor of development. Higher factor scores on the

OCI were related to lower emotional exhaustion scores. The more the faculty member perceived the presence of these organizational climate factors, the lower the level of emotional exhaustion within the individual. Table XIV on page 79 summarizes the results of the analysis of covariance for the burnout subscale emotional exhaustion. Some of the characteristics of the organization, as identified by Richman & Stern (1979) in their identification of factors, that were significantly related to faculty members' having low or average emotional exhaustion were the following:

1. Recognition is given for work of good quality and quantity.
2. Tasks are successfully completed.
3. Established procedures are subject to revision and improvement.
4. Institutional image is well defined.
5. Faculty accept and support administrative policy.
6. Program and institutional objectives are clear.
7. Rights and duties of staff are well defined.
8. Institutional programs are well structured.
9. Organizational hierarchy is well accepted.
10. Faculty sense an atmosphere of openness and fair play.
11. Institution supports individual growth. (pp. 10-11)

A significant relationship existed between age and emotional exhaustion when considering the organizational climate factor orderliness. A post hoc test (Tukeys HSD) revealed that the faculty in the 26-35 age group view organizational climate significantly different than the 46-55 age group. The 26-35 age group had higher scores on the orderliness climate factor. This would indicate they perceived the organization as being orderly, having conformity of appearance and

TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION WITH AGE,  
GENDER, AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT COUNSELING AS COVARIATES

Source	F	Probability of F
<u>Primary Factors</u>		
Achievement Standards	3.824	0.001**
Gender	4.486	0.035*
Age	3.991	0.004**
Career Development Counseling	3.897	0.049*
Impulse Control	1.100	0.363
Gender	7.649	0.006**
Age	3.876	0.004**
Career Development Counseling	4.256	0.040*
Intellectual Climate	1.427	0.176
Gender	6.552	0.011*
Age	3.844	0.005**
Career Development Counseling	2.863	0.092
Orderliness	1.929	0.048*
Gender	4.790	0.029*
Age	5.246	0.001**
Career Development Counseling	3.753	0.054
Practicalness	6.468	0.001**
Gender	0.695	0.405
Age	4.076	0.003**
Career Development Counseling	1.908	0.168
Supportiveness	5.181	0.001**
Gender	3.291	0.071
Age	3.551	0.008**
Career Development Counseling	1.289	0.257
<u>Secondary Factors</u>		
Development	47.486	0.001**
Gender	1.281	0.259
Age	4.681	0.001**
Control	0.728	0.394
Gender	6.732	0.010
Age	4.755	0.001**

\* =  $p < .05$ ; \*\* =  $p < .01$



institutional image, and expecting the faculty to support administrative policy. There was no significant difference of the respondents in the other age groups in their perceptions of the organizational climate factors that had significant relationships with emotional exhaustion.

A significant relationship existed between gender and emotional exhaustion when considering the organizational climate factors achievement standards, impulse control, and orderliness. The females had significantly higher levels of emotional exhaustion than did the males.

#### Depersonalization

Having an impersonal response towards students and colleagues in ones work environment is classified as depersonalization when using the Educators Survey (MBI) (Maslach and Jackson, 1936). The factors in the organization as measured by the OCI that are significantly related to depersonalization were the three first order factors of achievement standards, practicalness, and supportiveness, and the second order factor of development. The results of the analysis of covariance for the burnout subscale depersonalization are presented in Table XV on page 81. Some of the characteristics of the organization, as identified by Richman & Stern (1979) in their identification of factors, that were related to faculty members having low or average depersonalization were the following:

1. High levels of motivation and energy are maintained.
2. High standards of personal achievement are stressed.
3. Recognition is given for work of good quality and quantity.
4. Established procedures are subject to revision and improvement.
5. Institutional and program objectives are clear.

TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR DEPERSONALIZATION WITH  
GENDER, AGE, CAREER DEVELOPING COUNSELING AND  
FACULTY/STAFF DEVELOPMENT AS COVARIATES

Source	F-Ratio	Probability of F
<u>Primary Factors</u>		
Achievement Standards	2.995	0.002**
Gender	4.872	0.028*
Age	6.976	0.001**
Career Development Counseling	1.170	0.280
Staff/Faculty Development	2.191	1.240
Impulse Control	0.840	0.580
Gender	8.312	0.004*
Age	6.711	0.001**
Career Development Counseling	2.084	0.150
Staff/Faculty Development	1.814	0.179
Intellectual Climate	0.668	0.738
Gender	4.909	0.027*
Career Development Counseling	2.746	0.099
Staff/Faculty Development	2.118	0.147
Orderliness	1.584	0.119
Gender	5.906	0.016*
Age	7.743	0.001**
Career Development Counseling	1.843	0.176
Staff/Faculty Development	2.659	0.104
Practicalness	3.430	0.001**
Gender	2.821	0.094
Age	6.027	0.001**
Career Development Counseling	0.746	0.388
Staff/Faculty Development	1.110	0.293
Supportiveness	5.382	0.001**
Gender	2.636	0.102
Career Development Counseling	0.965	0.327
Staff/Faculty Development	2.899	0.090
<u>Secondary Factors</u>		
Development	33.561	0.001**
Gender	1.239	0.267
Career Development Counseling	1.372	0.242
Staff/Faculty Development	0.767	0.382

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Source	F-Ratio	Probability of F
Control	1.818	0.178
Gender	6.972	0.009**
Age	6.852	0.001**
Career Development Counseling	2.651	0.105
Staff/Faculty Development	3.245	0.073

\*\*p < .01; \*p < .05

6. Rights and duties of staff are well defined.
7. Institutional programs are well structured.
8. Organizational hierarchy is well accepted.
9. Sense of openness and fair play exists.
10. Institution supports individual growth.
11. Organization provides support that approximates the individual's needs.
12. High standards for intellectual achievement. (pp. 10-11)

High scores on these organizational climate factors as measured by the OCI are related to low or average scores on the burnout subscale depersonalization. There was no significant difference in the groups based upon the demographic factors used as covariates except in the factor gender. Females had significantly higher levels of depersonalization than the males.

### Personal Accomplishment.

The feelings of successful achievement and accomplishment in one's work with people is personal accomplishment (Maslach and Jackson, 1986). Low scores on the burnout subscale personal accomplishment denotes high feelings of personal accomplishment. Individual's experiencing the lack of personal accomplishment have high scores on this subscale. Table XVI on page 84 presents the results of the analysis of covariance for the organizational climate factors as they relate to personal accomplishment. One organizational climate factor, development, was significantly related to personal accomplishment. The organization is characterized, as identified by Richman & Stern (1979) in their definition of factors, as having high standards for intellectual achievement while maintaining the institutional support for individual growth (pp. 10-11). The organization provides an environment that is well organized, well structured, and open to change. This supportive environment provides motivation and encouragement to the individual. The post hoc analysis (Tukeys HSD) showed there was no significant difference in the groups based upon the demographic covariate factors of age, number of course preparations, and number of institutions in which the faculty member had been employed.

TABLE XV

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT WITH GENDER,  
AGE, NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, NUMBER OF COURSE PREPARATIONS,  
CAREER DEVELOPMENT COUNSELING, COLLEGIAL SUPPORT GROUPS,  
AND STAFF/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS COVARIATES

Source	F-Ratio	Probability of F
<u>Primary Factors</u>		
Achievement Standards	0.691	0.717
Gender	4.488	0.035*
Age	2.325	0.057
Number of Institutions	4.329	0.038*
Number of Course Preparations	12.890	0.001*
Career Development Counseling	1.016	0.314
Collegial Support Groups	1.469	0.226
Leave of Absence	5.705	0.018*
Staff/Professional Development	4.731	0.030
Impulse Control	0.637	0.765
Gender	5.712	0.017*
Age	2.484	0.044*
Number of Institutions	1.559	0.172
Number of Course Preparations	2.626	0.035*
Career Development Counseling	2.189	0.140
Collegial Support Groups	1.361	0.244
Leave of Absence	5.916	0.016*
Staff/Professional Development	4.511	0.035*
Intellectual Climate	1.871	0.056
Age	2.159	0.143
Number of Institutions	5.365	0.021*
Number of Course Preparations	12.760	0.001**
Career Development Counseling	2.040	0.154
Leave of Absence	6.640	0.010**
Staff/Professional Development	5.640	0.018*
Orderliness	1.433	0.173
Age	2.469	0.045*
Number of Institutions	1.556	0.173
Number of Course Preparations	2.892	0.023*
Career Development Counseling	2.159	0.143
Leave of Absence	5.738	0.017*
Staff/Professional Development	6.573	0.011*

TABLE XV (Continued)

Source	F-Ratio	Probability of F
Practicalness	1.637	0.104
Gender	1.536	0.216
Age	3.139	0.015*
Number of Institutions	1.852	0.103
Career Development Counseling	1.154	0.284
Collegial Support Groups	1.529	0.217
Leave of Absence	5.945	0.015*
Supportiveness	1.706	0.087
Gender	5.796	0.017*
Age	2.598	0.108
Number of Institutions	5.290	0.022*
Number of Course Preparations	14.943	0.001**
Career Development Counseling	0.917	0.339
Collegial Support Groups	2.214	0.138
Leave of Absence	6.325	0.012*
Staff/Professional Development	5.016	0.026*
<u>Secondary Factors</u>		
Development	16.078	0.001**
Age	2.416	0.049*
Number of Institutions	4.096	0.044*
Number of Course Preparations	11.029	0.001**
Career Development Counseling	1.996	0.159
Leave of Absence	6.268	0.013*
Control	2.463	0.118
Gender	4.261	0.0407*
Number of Institutions	1.235	0.293
Number of Course Preparations	3.761	0.005**
Career Development Counseling	2.087	0.015*
Collegial Support Groups	2.140	0.145
Leave of Absence	6.002	0.015*
Staff/Professional Development	6.543	0.011*

\*p &lt; .05; \*\*p &lt; .01

## Summary

Chapter 4 described the sample of full-time faculty in community colleges in the midwest. The statistical analyses and findings were presented, and the data were interpreted.

Three research questions were addressed:

1. What is the level of burnout among faculty in community colleges?
2. How do the levels of burnout compare with the normative data for post-secondary education?
3. What are the dimensions of organizational climate that relate to burnout among faculty in community colleges?

The level of burnout on the three subscales of the Educators Survey (MBI) for the faculty in community colleges in the midwest was not significantly different from the normative sample. Four primary organizational climate factors and one secondary organizational climate factor as measured by the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) were significantly related to one or more of the three burnout subscales: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. The four primary factors were achievement standards, orderliness, practicalness, and supportiveness. The one secondary factor was development.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This correlational study was designed to assess the relationship of perceptions of organizational climate factors and experienced burnout of full-time faculty in community colleges in the midwest. A second purpose was to determine the level of burnout in full-time community college faculty and to compare the level of burnout with the normative information.

Three research questions guided the research:

1. What is the level of burnout among faculty in community colleges?
2. How do the levels of burnout compare with the normative data for post-secondary education?
3. What are the dimensions of organizational climate that relate to burnout among faculty in community colleges?

Data for the study were collected using three instruments: (1) the Faculty Demographic Survey, (2) the copyrighted Educators Survey (Maslach Burnout Inventory), and (3) the copyrighted Organizational Climate Index. The population for the study was the 87 community colleges in a six-state region. The purposive sample for the study consisted of three randomly selected community colleges in each of the states of Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma and two community colleges in Colorado. The units of measure for the study were the 624 full-time faculty members in the sample.



The research instruments were distributed using the campus mail systems of the community colleges. The research instruments were returned to the researcher in postage-paid, addressed envelopes. The return of 325 research instruments (51.8%) within two weeks of the distribution exceeded the minimum requirement for returns of 50 percent established for the study. A followup of nonrespondents was conducted by telephone. There was no significant difference between the responses returned by mail and the responses received during the telephone followup as determined by t-tests on each item.

A total of 347 research instruments (55.6%) were returned. Examination of the research instruments determined that 318 (51.0%) respondents provided complete data and were usable in this study. The responses were coded by the researcher and were analyzed using the subprograms of the computer program SYSTAT: The System for Statistics (1987).

### Results of the Study

The results of the study are presented in three sections. Each section relates to one of the three research questions.

#### Research Question One

The level of burnout of community college faculty for the three burnout subscales: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment was measured using the Educators Survey (MBI).

Emotional Exhaustion. Of the 318 respondents, 121 (38.1%) experienced a low level of burnout on the emotional exhaustion subscale.

Another 118 (37.1%) experienced an average level of burnout on the emotional exhaustion subscale.

Depersonalization. Three quarters of the respondents experienced either low level or average level burnout. In the average burnout category were 143 respondents (44.9%). The 80 respondents experiencing high levels of burnout on the depersonalization subscale comprised 25.2% of the sample.

Personal Accomplishment. A total of 147 respondents (46.3%) experienced average levels of burnout on the personal accomplishment subscale. About equal numbers of respondents experienced low levels of burnout and high levels of burnout as determined by the personal accomplishment subscale. Low levels of burnout were experienced by 86 (27.0%) of the respondents while high levels of burnout were experienced by 85 (26.7%) of the respondents.

#### Research Question Two

The levels of burnout of the respondents in this study were compared to the levels of burnout in the normative data for post-secondary education provided by Maslach and Jackson (1986) for the Educators Survey (MBI). T-tests were used for the comparison. There was no significant difference between the two groups.

#### Research Question Three

The organizational climate factors with a significant relationship to the burnout subscale emotional exhaustion were achievement standards, practicalness, supportiveness, and development. Demographic factors

that were determined to be appropriate covariates were gender, age, and career development counseling.

For the burnout subscale depersonalization, the organizational climate factors with a significant relationship were achievement standards, practicalness, supportiveness, and development. The demographic factors that served as covariates during the analysis of covariance were gender, age, career development counseling, and staff/faculty development.

The organizational climate factor of development was significantly related to the burnout subscale personal accomplishment. The demographic factors used as covariates during the analysis of covariance were age, number of institutions where employed, number of course preparations per semester, and the employee assistance programs of career development counseling and leave of absence.

### Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn after analyzing the findings of the study and the review of literature.

1. It is concluded that the levels of burnout among full-time community college faculty in the midwest are similar to the levels of burnout of other postsecondary educators.
2. It is concluded that the demographic factors of age and gender are important factors when considering burnout in community college faculty. Other factors that should be given recognition when considering factors related to burnout are the number of course preparations per semester; the number of institutions where a person has

been employed; the availability of career development counseling, leave of absence, and staff/professional development.

3. It is concluded that community colleges that provide an environment of respect, communication, adaptability, structure, expectation, and acceptance will increase the potential for maintaining lower levels of burnout.

4. It is concluded that community colleges that provide standards, motivation, objectives, and opportunities for professional growth will decrease the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization experienced by the faculty. The presence of these factors will also increase the feelings of personal accomplishment by the faculty.

5. It is concluded that since the level of burnout among community college faculty members is more prevalent today than six years ago, community college administrators need to be more cognizant of organizational climate as it relates to faculty burnout.

#### Implications

The results of this study support the concept that there are organizational climate factors that are related to burnout among faculty. When the perception of the presence of these factors in the educational organization is more prevalent, the levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are lower and positive feelings of personal accomplishment are greater. Administrators who are concerned about the potential problem of burnout among their faculty need to be aware of the demographic factors and the organizational climate factors that are related to burnout.

The distribution of the age of the faculty is important. Faculty members in the 26-35 age group perceive the organizational climate factor orderliness differently than do the faculty members in the 46-55 age group. The 26-35 age group perceives the organization as more orderly and structured than does the 46-55 age group. When comparing the two groups, the 26-35 age group also perceives the organization as expecting faculty support of the administration and having conformity of appearance and institutional image. Administrators who want the faculty to perceive orderliness in the organization will need to provide the support, organizational structure, and procedures to support this perception in all groups. However, administrators will need to always be conscious of the difference in perceptions of these two age groups when considering the organizational climate factor orderliness.

Administrators also need to be aware that the number of course preparations per semester, the number of institutions where a person has been employed, the availability of career development counseling, leave of absence, and staff development as they relate to burnout among faculty in their institution should be monitored. There is no particular group of faculty members that is significantly different than any other group in relation to these demographic factors.

Administrators who want to develop a climate that decreases the potential for emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and increases the potential for personal accomplishment among the faculty need to make certain their management of the organization incorporates characteristics of the organizational climate factors of practicalness, supportiveness, achievement standards, and development. These characteristics include stressing high standards of personal

achievement, providing recognition to faculty members for work of good quality and quantity, and treating the faculty with respect.

The policies and procedures of the organization will need to define rights and responsibilities while also providing an atmosphere of openness and fair play. Faculty members also need to be aware of program and institutional objectives. However, the faculty must perceive that these established procedures and objectives are subject to revision and to improvement. Organizations that create this environment provide support for the faculty to express their opinions, to feel their opinions are valued, and to feel their input is important in the decision-making process.

It is also important to provide an organizational climate in which the individual feels the organization is providing support for his/her needs. The activities of the organization need to support the individual's motivations and objectives.

Community college administrators who attempt to develop the organizational climate factors identified in this study acknowledge that burnout is not an individual problem and that organizational climate can be changed. By removing the barriers or factors relating to burnout, administrators may prevent the problem of burnout, may increase faculty productivity, and may improve the overall quality of education.

#### Recommendations

The following recommendations result from assessing the research methodology and the results of the study.

1. This study was completed early in the school year when the faculty had just returned from either a summer or several weeks away

from the classroom. It is recommended that a similar study be developed to determine if the relationship of perceived organizational climate factors and the experienced level of burnout for faculty is different near the end of the semester or the end of the school year.

2. A total of 29 respondents (8.3%) returned research instruments with incomplete data. Of the three research instruments used in the study, the instrument most frequently left incomplete or not attempted was the Organizational Climate Index. It is recommended that a shorter organizational climate factor instrument be developed.

3. During this time of decreasing resources, administrators need to be willing to assess their organizations in order to determine factors that are affecting the productivity of the faculty. If the level of burnout is higher than the normative data provided, administrators should be willing to look at factors that may be related to experiencing higher levels of burnout.

It is recommended that an instrument be developed that could assess both the organizational climate factors and the level of burnout.

4. The sample was community colleges that had stability in the administrative leadership positions for at least one year prior to the study. A study should be developed to gather information to determine if community colleges undergoing changes in the administration are different.

5. The study concentrated on only full-time faculty who had been employed during the previous academic year as full-time faculty. A study should be developed to gather information on the relationship of organizational climate factors and experienced stress for new full-time faculty and for part-time faculty to find out how they are different.

6. There is no data to show how community college administrative personnel differ from the faculty in their perceptions of organizational climate factors and experienced burnout. It is recommended that a study be developed to determine the relationship of organizational climate factors and experienced burnout for administrators and to determine how administrators differ from faculty.

7. Student retention is a concern of community college faculty and administrators. The faculty have more contact with students than anyone else on campus. Student perceptions of faculty are measurable. A study should be developed to determine if there is a relationship between student perceptions of the faculty and the perceived organizational climate factors identified by the faculty.

#### Summary

Chapter V provided a summary of the results of the study, the conclusions of the study, the implications of the study, and recommendations for further research and actions to be taken.

The implications of this study support the position of Quick and Quick that "not all stress at work is attributable to rigid organizational practices and demands" (1984, p. 33). The presence of the organizational climate factors of practicalness, supportiveness, achievement standards, orderliness, and development are related to one or more of the burnout subscales: exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment among faculty.

Community college administrators need to be aware that the level of burnout among community college faculty members is more prevalent today than six years ago. Knowledge of the organizational climate factors



that are related to burnout can help the administrator plan for the reduction and management of that difficulty in the faculty.

## BILBIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, R. J. (1980). "Burning out" versus "punching out." Journal of Human Stress, 6(1), 37-41.
- Allen, B. H., & LaFollette, W. R. (1977). Perceived organizational structure and alienation among management trainees. Academy of Management Journal, 20(2), 334-341.
- Anderson, C. A. (1979). Higher education in transition: An international perspective. Higher Education, 8, 3-8.
- Anderson, R. S. (1985). The relationship between burnout and stress, job satisfaction, and absenteeism among public school counselors (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 1836A.
- Armour, R. A., Caffarella, R. S., Fuhrmann, B. S., & Wergin, J. F. (1987). Academic burnout: Faculty responsibility and institutional climate. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 29, 3-11.
- Bardo, P. (1979). The pain of teacher burnout: A case history. Phi Delta Kappan, 51(4), 252-254.
- Bare, A. C. (1986). Managerial behavior of college chairpersons and administrators. Research in Higher Education, 24(2), 128-138.
- Bivens, L. S. (1985). An investigation of teacher characteristics and the effect of high school principals leadership effectiveness and adaptability on teacher burnout (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 3543A.
- Bodden, J. L. (1985). Review of Maslach burnout inventory. In J. V. Mitchell, Jr. (Ed.). The ninth mental measurement yearbook (Vol. 1, pp. 903-904). Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Boenisch, E. W., Jr. (1983). Leadership style: Job type, stress, and satisfaction among community college student personnel professionals (Doctoral dissertation, 1983, University of Northern Colorado, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 2336A.

- Bolding, J. T., & Van Patten, J. J. (1982). Creating a healthy organizational climate. Washington, DC: American Association of University Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 219 039)
- Borrevick, B. A., Jr. (1972). The construction of an organizational climate description questionnaire for academic departments in colleges and universities. Eugene, OR: Oregon University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 070 427)
- Boy, A. V., & Pine, G. J. (1980). Avoiding counselor burnout through role renewal. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 59, 161-163.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 52(5), 396-424.
- Brayfield, A. J., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 35(5), 307-311.
- Brookings, J. B., Bolton, B., Brown, C. E., & McEvoy, A. (1985). Self-reported job burnout among female human service professionals. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 6, 143-150.
- Briscoe, M. L. (1984). Reflections on academic burnout. ADE Bulletin, 79, 1-7.
- Bruno, J. C. (1988). An investigation of the relationship of organizational climate to the burnout of public school principals and teachers in selected New Jersey suburban elementary schools (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 1066A.
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.) (1972). The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook (Vol. 1). Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.). (1965). The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Cardinell, C. F. (1981). Burnout? Mid-life crisis? Let's understand ourselves. Contemporary Education, 52, 104.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1985). The faculty: Deeply trouble. Change, 17(4), 31-34.
- Carroll, J. F. X., & White W. L. (1982). Theory building: Integrating individual and environmental factors within an ecological framework. In W. S. Paine (Ed.), Job Stress and Burnout: Research, Theory, and Intervention Perspectives (pp. 41-60). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Cherniss, C. (1980). Staff burnout: Job stress in the human services. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cherniss, C. (1982). Cultural trends: Political, economic, and historical roots of the problem. In W. S. Paine (Ed.), Job Stress and Burnout (pp. 83-94). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Clagett, G. (1980). Teacher stress at a community college: professional burnout in a bureaucratic setting. Largo, MD: Office of Institutional Research. Prince George's Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 195 310)
- Clark, B. R. (1985). Listening to the professoriate. Change, 17(5), 36-43.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1982). The American Community College. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Colasurdo, M. M. (1981). A descriptive survey of professional burnout amongst public school teachers in San Diego, California (Doctoral dissertation, International University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 0470A.
- Cooper, C. L., & Marshall, J. (1976). Occupational sources of stress: a review of the literature relating to coronary heart disease and mental ill health. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 49, 11-28.
- Daley, M. R. (1979). Preventing worker burnout in child welfare. Child Welfare, 58(7), 443-450.
- De Voe, M., Spicuzza, F. J., and Baskind, F. R. (1983). Burnout among career services directors. Journal of College Placement, 43(4), 46-50.
- Dick, M. J. (1986). Burnout in nurse faculty: relationships with management style, collegial support, and work load in collegiate programs. Journal of Professional Nursing, 2(4), 252-260.
- Di Falco Vander Ven, M. (1982). An exploratory study of the presence, degree and nature of burnout in community college faculty (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 2934A.
- Dowd, E. T. (1985). Review of Maslach burnout inventory. In J. V. Mitchell, Jr. (Ed.). The ninth mental measurement yearbook (Vol. 1, pp. 904-905). Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Downey, H. K., Hellriegel, D., Phelps, M., & Slocum, J. W., Jr. (1974). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A comparative analysis. Journal of Business Research, 2(3), 233-248.

- Downey, H. K., Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (1975). Congruence between individual needs, organizational climate, job satisfaction and performance. Academy of Management Journal, 18, 149-155.
- Drexler, J. A., Jr. (1977). Organizational climate: Its homogeneity within organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62(1), 38-42.
- Duckworth, D. H. (1985). Is the 'organizational stress' construct a red herring? A reply to Glowinkowski and Cooper. Bulletin of The British Psychological Society, 38, 401-404.
- Eble, K. E. (1985). A positive source of faculty morale. Change, 17(5), 44.
- Eddy, M. E. (1982). Perceptions of work climate at baccalaureate schools of nursing utilizing open curriculum practices (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 1439A.
- Edelwich, J., & Brodsky, A. (1980). Burn-out: Stages of disillusionment in the helping professions. New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Evan, W. M. (1968). A systems model of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept (pp. 107-124). Boston: Harvard University.
- Field, R. H. G., & Abelson, M. A. (1982). Climate: A reconceptualization and proposed model. Human Relations, 35(3), 181-201.
- Fong, C. M. (1984). A study of the relationships between role overload, social support, and burnout among nursing educators (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2868A.
- Forehand, G. A. (1968). On the interaction of persons and organizations. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept (pp. 165-82). Boston: Harvard University.
- Forehand, G. A., & Gilmer, B. V. H. (1964) Environmental variation in studies of organizational behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 62(6), 361-382.
- Forney, D., & Wiggers, T. T. (1984). The saga continues: Stress, strain, and burnout among career development professionals. Journal of College Placement, 45(1), 34-39.
- Forney, D. S., Wallace-Schutzman, F., & Wiggers, T. T. (1982, March). Burnout among career development professionals: Preliminary findings and implications. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 435-439.

- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. Journal of Social Issues, 30(1), 159-165.
- Freudenberger, J. J. (1977). Burn-out: The organizational menace. Training and Development Journal, 31(7), 26-27.
- Freudenberger, H. J., & Richelson, G. (1980). Burn-out: The high cost of high achievement. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Friedlander, F., & Margulies, N. (1969). Multiple impacts of organizational climate and individual value systems upon job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 22(2), 171-183.
- Ginsberg, R., & Bennett, A. (1981). I don't get no respect. VocEd, 56(8), 34-36.
- Glowinkowski, S. P., & Cooper, C. L. (1985) Current issues in organizational stress research. Bulletin of The British Psychological Society, 38, 212-216.
- Gmelch, W. H. (1987) What colleges and universities can do about faculty stressors. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 29, 23-31.
- Gmelch, W. H., Lovrich, N. P., & Wilke, P. K. (1984). Sources of stress in academe: A national perspective. Research in Higher Education, 20(4), 477-490.
- Golembiewski, R. T. (1982). Organizational development (OD) interventions: Changing interaction, structures, and policies. In W. S. Paine (Ed.), Job Stress and Burnout (pp. 229-253). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Golembiewski, R. T., Munzenrider, R., & Carter, D. (1983). Phases of progressive burnout and their work site covariants: Critical issues in OD research and praxis. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 19(4), 461-481.
- Gover, P. E. (1983). Burnout and demographic variables among full-time faculty in selected Illinois public community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 0028A.
- Grahn, J., Kahn, P., & Kroll, P. (1980). General college job satisfaction survey, University of Minnesota. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota University, General College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208 716)
- Graybeal, W. (1981) How changes in enrollment will affect higher education. Today's Education, 70, 54.
- Harper, C. L. (1977) The American University and its institutional environment: Autonomy and constraint. Omaha, NE: Creighton University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 142 121)

- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W., Jr. (1974). Organizational climate: Measures, research and contingencies. Academy of Management Journal, 17(2), 255-280.
- Herman, J. B. (1973). Are situational contingencies limiting job attitude--job performance relationships? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 10(2), 208-224.
- Herman, J. B., Dunham, R. B., & Hulin, C. L. (1975). Organizational structure, demographic characteristics, and employee responses. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13(2), 206-232.
- Herman, J. B., & Hulin, C. L. (1972). Studying organizational attitudes from individual and organizational frames of reference. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 8, 84-108.
- The HEP 1985 higher education directory. (1985). Washington, DC: Higher Education Publications, Inc.
- Hill, M. C. (1983). Some factors affecting the job satisfaction of community college faculty in Pennsylvania. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 7(4), 303-317.
- Hilsum, S., & Start, K. B. (1974). Promotion and careers in teaching. Windsor: NFER Publishing Company Ltd.
- Hrutka, M. E. (1983). Faculty career change in higher education: personal and environmental factors in the decision to leave academia (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 1705A.
- Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., & Bounds, W. G., Jr. (1974). Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Hudgeons, L. T. (1980). Faculty development: A matter of survival. Collegiate News and Views, 49, 21-24.
- Hudson, L. R. (1981). The relationship between job satisfaction and selected factors of teaching workload (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 4737A.
- Iwanicki, E. G., & Schwab, R. L. (1981). A cross-validated study of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 41, 1167-1174.
- James, L. R., Hartman, E. A., Stebbins, M. W., & Jones, A. P. (1977). Relationships between psychological climate and a VIE model for work motivation. Personnel Psychology, 30, 229-254.
- Jacobson, R. L. (1985). New Carnegie data show faculty members uneasy about the state of academe and their own careers. Chronicle of Higher Education, 31(16), 1.

- James, L. R., & Jones, A. P. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. Psychological Bulletin, 81(12), 1096-1112.
- James, L. R., & Jones, A. P. (1976). Organizational structure: A review of structural dimensions and their conceptual relationships with individual attitudes and behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 74-113.
- Jaremko, M. E. (1984). Stress inoculation training: A generic approach for the prevention of stress-related disorders. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62(9), 544-549.
- Jayarathne, S., & Chess, W. A. (1984). Job satisfaction, burnout, and turnover: A national study. Social Work, 29(5), 448-453.
- Johannesson, R. E. (1973). Some problems in the measurement of organizational climate. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 10, 118-144.
- Johnston, H. R. (1976). A new conceptualization of source of organizational climate. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 95-103.
- Jones A. P. (1985). The organizational climate index. In D. J. Keyser and R. C. Sweetland (Eds.). Test Critiques (Vol 2, pp. 551-558). Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.
- Jones, A. P., & James, L. R. (1979). Psychological climate: Dimensions and relationships of individual and aggregated work environment perceptions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 201-250.
- Jones, J. W. (1981). Dishonesty, burnout, and unauthorized work break extensions. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7(3), 406-409.
- Joyce, W. F., & Slocum, J. (1982). Climate discrepancy: Refining the concepts of psychological and organizational climate. Human Relations, 35(11), 951-972.
- Jurgensen, C. E. (1978). Job preferences (what makes a job good or bad?). Journal of Applied Psychology, 63(3), 267-276.
- Kaczka, E., & Kirk, R. (1968). Managerial climate, work groups and organizational performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 12, 253-272.
- Kalis, M. C. (1980). Teaching experience: Its effect on school climate, teacher morale. NASSP Bulletin, 64(435), 89-102.
- Kamber, R. (1984, December 12). Dissatisfied professors and the erosion of shared governance. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 96.



- Keenan, A., & Newton, T. J. (1985). Stressful events, stressors and psychological strains in young professional engineers. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 6, 151-156.
- Keon, T. L., & McDonald, B. (1982). Job satisfaction and life satisfaction: An empirical evaluation of their interrelationship. Human Relations, 35(3), 167-180.
- Kilpatrick, A. O. (1986). Burnout: An empirical assessment of the status and rigor of research (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 1876A.
- Korman, A. K. (1977). Organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1977). Teacher stress: A review. Educational Review, 29(4), 299-305.
- LaFollette, W. R., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1975). Is satisfaction redundant with organizational climate? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 157-278.
- Litwin, G. H. (1968). Climate and behavior theory. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept (pp. 35-62). Boston: Harvard University.
- Lynch, J. J. (1981). Beating burnout. Atlantic City, NJ: Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the New Jersey Education Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 532)
- Magarrell, J. (1982, November 10). Decline in faculty morale laid to governance role, not salary. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1, 28.
- Mahr, E. L. (1983). Burnout and commitment: A theoretical alternative. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 61, 390-393.
- Martin, S. M. (1984). Development and validation of an instrument to assess the organizational climate in community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 1019A.
- Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. Human Behavior, 9(5), 16, 18-23.
- Maslach, C. (1978). Job burnout: How people cope. Public Welfare, Spring, 56-58.
- Maslach, C. (1982a). Burnout: The cost of caring. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Maslach, C. (1982b). Understanding burnout: Definitional issues in analyzing a complex phenomenon. In W. S. Paine (Ed.), Job Stress and Burnout (pp. 29-40). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1978). Lawyer burnout. Barrister, 5(2), 52-54.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1979). Burned-out cops and their families. Psychology Today, 12(12), 59-62.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 2, 99-113.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1986). Maslach Burnout Inventory (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., & Pines, A. (1977). The burn-out syndrome in the day care setting. Child Care Quarterly, 6, 100-113.
- Matteson, M. T., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1987). Controlling work stress. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Mayhew, L. B. (1979). Surviving the Eighties. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- McNeely, R. L. (1983). Organizational patterns, work, and burnout in the public school. Urban Education, 18(1), 82-97.
- Melendez, W. A. (1986). Powerless Prof: From candle bearer to burnout. The NEA Higher Education Journal, 2(1), 63-72.
- Melendez, W. A., & de Guzman, R. M. (1983). Burnout: The new academic disease. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Reports, No. 9. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 255)
- Meier, S. T. (1983). Toward a theory of burnout. Human Relations, 36(10), 899-910.
- Meyer, H. H. (1968). Achievement motivation and industrial climates. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept (pp. 151-166). Boston: Harvard University.
- Mitchell, J. V., Jr. (Ed.). (1983). Tests in Print III. Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Mitchell, J. V., Jr. (Ed.). (1985). The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook (Vol. 1). Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982) Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. New York: Academic Press.

- Muchinsky, P. M. (1976). An assessment of the Litwin and Stringer organization climate questionnaire: An empirical and theoretical extension of the Sims and LaFollette Study. Personnel Psychology, 29, 371-392.
- Newman, J. E. (1977). Development of a measure of perceived work environment (PWE). Academy of Management Journal, 20(4), 520-534.
- Offenberg, R. M., & Cernius, V. (1974). Assessment of Idiographic Organizational climate. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 14(1), 79-86.
- Offerman, L. R., (1985). Maslach burnout inventory. In D. J. Keyser and R. C. Sweetland (Eds.), Test Critiques (Vol. 3, pp. 419-426). Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.
- O'Keefe, M. (1985). Self-inflicted laryngitis: How long can higher education avoid political reality? Change, 17(2), 11-13.
- Pace, C. R. (1968). The measurement of college environments. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept (pp. 128-149). Boston: Harvard University.
- Pace, R. P., & Stern, G. G. (1958). An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 49(5), 269-277.
- Paine, W. S. (1981). The burnout phenomenon. VocEd, 56(8), 30-33.
- Paine, W. S. (1982). Overview: Burnout stress syndromes and the 1980s. In W. S. Paine (Ed.), Job Stress and Burnout (pp. 11-25). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Parasuraman, S., & Alutto, J. A. (1981). An examination of the organizational antecedents of stressors at work. Academy of Management Journal, 24(1), 48-67.
- Parrish, S. U. (1985). An investigation of the relationship between the organizational climate in elementary schools and career burnout among teachers (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 1470A.
- Payne, R. L., Fineman, S., & Wall, T. D. (1976). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A conceptual synthesis. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16(1), 45-62.
- Payne, R. L., & Mansfield, R. (1973). Relationships of perceptions of organizational climate to organizational structure, context, and hierarchical position. Administrative Science Quarterly, 18(11), 515-526.
- Payne, R. L., & Pheysey, D. C. (1971). Organizational climate index: A reconceptualization and application to business organizations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6, 77-98.

- Payne, R. L., Pheysey, D. C., & Pugh, D. S. (1971). Organizational structure, organizational climate, and group structure: An exploratory study of their relationships in two British manufacturing companies. Occupational Psychology, 45, 45-56.
- Perlman, B., & Hartman, E. A. (1982). Burnout: Summary and future research. Human Relations, 34(4), 283-305.
- Peters, D. S., & Mayfield, J. R. (1982). Are there any rewards for teaching? Improving College and University Teaching, 30(3), 105-110.
- Peterson, M. W. (1980). Faculty and academic responsiveness in a period of decline: An organizational perspective. CUPA Journal, 31(1), 95-104.
- Pines, A. M. (1982). Changing organizations: Is a work environment without burnout an impossible goal? In W. S. Paine (Ed.), Job Stress and Burnout: Research, Theory, and Intervention Perspectives (pp. 180-211). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pines, A., & Maslach, C. (1978). Characteristics of staff burn-out in mental health settings. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 29, 233-237.
- Pines, A., & Maslach, C. (1980). Combating staff burn-out in a day care center: A case study. Child Care Quarterly, 9, 5-16.
- Pritchard, R. D., & Karasick, B. W. (1973). The effect of organizational climate on managerial job performance and job satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 9, 126-146.
- Quick, J. C. (1987). Institutional preventive stress management. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 29, 75-84.
- Quick, J. C., Quick, J. D. (1984). Preventive stress management at the organizational level. Personnel, 61(5), 24-34.
- Reynold, W., & Stecklein, J. E. (1981). A three decade comparison of college faculty characteristics, satisfactions, activities, and attitudes. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Minneapolis, MN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 113)
- Richman, J., & Stern, G. G. (1979). Stern personality and environment indexes: A user's technical manual. Syracuse, NY: Faax Corporation.
- Riffel, G. M. (1987). A correlational study of organizational role stress and burnout among directors of special education in Kansas (Doctoral dissertaion, Oklahoma State University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 275.

- Sanders, A., & Watkins, J. F. (1983). Organizational climate changes. The Educational Forum, 47(2), 191-198.
- Schneider, B. (1973). The perception of organizational climate: The customer's view. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57(3), 248-256.
- Schneider, B. (1975). Organizational climates: An essay. Personnel Psychology, 28(4), 447-479.
- Schneider, B., & Bartlett, C. J. (1968). Individual differences and organizational climate I: The research plan and questionnaire development. Personnel Psychology, 21, 493-512.
- Schneider, B., & Bartlett, C. J. (1970). Individual differences and organizational climate II: Measurement of organizational climate by the multi-trait, multi-rater matrix. Personnel Psychology, 23, 493-512.
- Schneider, B., & Snyder, R. A. (1975). Some relationships between job satisfaction and organizational climate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(3), 318-328.
- Schuster, J. J., & Bowen, H. R. (1985). The faculty at risk. Change, 17(5), 13-21.
- Schwab, R. L., & Iwanicki, E. F. (1982a). Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and teacher burnout. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(1), 60-74.
- Schwab, R. L., & Iwanicki, E. F. (1982). Who are our burned out teachers? Educational Research Quarterly, 7(2), 5-16.
- Seagle, E. E., Jr. (1986). Faculty burnout in the California state university system (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 0438A.
- Seavicki, V., & Cooley, E. (1983). Theoretical and research considerations of burnout. Children and Youth Services Review, 5, 227-238.
- Seldin, P. (1987). Research findings on causes of academic stress. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 90, 13-21.
- Sells, S. B. (1968). An approach to the nature of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept (pp. 85-102). Boston: Harvard University.
- Seyle, H. (1980). The stress concept today. In Kutash, I. L., Schlesinger, L. B., & Associates., Handbook on Stress and Anxiety (pp. 127-143). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Shore, H. (1984). SMR forum: Employee assistance programs--reaping the benefits. Sloan Management Review, 25(3), 69-73.

- Skager, R. W. (1972). College characteristics index. In O. K. Buros The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook (Vol 1, pp. 344-348). Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Gregory, M. W. (1987) Faculty stress: The tension between career demands and "having it all." New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 29, 43-52.
- Spicuzza, F. J., Basking, F. R., & Woodside, M. R. (1984). A continuing dialogue on burnout. Journal of College Placement, 45(1), 29-33.
- Stern, G. G. (1970). People in Context. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sweetland, R. C., & Keyer, D. J. (Eds.). (1984). Tests (Library ed.). Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.
- Sweetland, R. C., Keyer, D. J., O'Connor, W. A. (Eds.). (1983). Tests (Library ed., 1st ed.). Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.
- Tagiuri, R. (1968). The concept of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept (pp. 11-21). Boston: Harvard University.
- Volgyes, I. (1982). Is there life after teaching?--Reflections of a middle-aged professor. Change, 14(8), 9-11.
- Waters, L. K., Roach, D., & Batlis, N. (1974). Organizational climate dimensions and job-related attitudes. Personnel Psychology, 27(3), 465-476.
- Watkins, B. T. (1982). A new academic disease: Faculty "burnout." Chronicle of Higher Education, 24(4), 1, 8.
- Wilkinson, L. (1987). SYSTAT: The system for statistics [Computer program]. Evanston, IL: SYSTAT, Inc.
- Williams, J. E., & Johansen, E. (1985). Career disruption in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 56(2), 144-160.
- Willie, R. & Stecklein, J. E. (1981). A three decade comparison of college faculty characteristics, satisfactions, activities, and attitudes. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 113)
- Woodman, R. W., & King, D. C. (1978). Organizational climate: Science or Folklore? Academy of Management Review, 3(4), 816-826.
- The world almanac and book of facts. (1988). New York: Pharos Books.

Youree, B. B. (1984). A study of the levels of burnout as perceived by faculty members in the state universities and community colleges in Tennessee governed by the state board of regents (Doctoral dissertation, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2416A.

Zahn, J. (1980). Burnout in adult educators. Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 4(4), 4-6.

**APPENDICES**



APPENDIX A

ITEMS IN SUBSCALES OF THE  
MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY

ITEMS INCLUDED IN EACH OF THE SUBSCALES  
OF THE EDUCATORS SURVEY

---

Item No.	Statement
-------------	-----------

---

Emotional Exhaustion Subscale

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. I feel used up at the end of the workday.
3. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
6. Working with people all day is really a strain for me.
8. I feel burned out from my work.
13. I feel frustrated by my job.
14. I feel I'm working too hard on my job.
16. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.
20. I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.

Depersonalization Subscale

5. I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects.
10. I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.
11. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.
15. I don't really care what happens to some students.
22. I feel students blame me for some of their problems.

Personal Accomplishment Subscale

4. I can easily understand how my students feel about things.
7. I deal very effectively with the problems of my students.
9. I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.
12. I feel very energetic.
17. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students.
18. I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students.
19. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
21. In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.

APPENDIX B

ITEMS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND ORDER SCORES  
OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE INDEX

ITEMS INCLUDED IN EACH OF THE FACTORS  
OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE INDEX

Factor	Items From The Organizational Climate Index
Achievement Standards	6, 7, 23, 42, 46, 47, 49, 58, 69, and 72
Intellectual Climate	13, 37, 45, 46, 57, 58, 62, 69, 77, and 78
Practicalness	4, 12, 27, 32, 36, 54, 60, 66, 76, and 80
Supportiveness	4, 12, 21, 28, 40, 52, 63, 67, 71, and 80
Orderliness	23, 26, 29, 39, 44, 51, 61, 65, 70, and 75
Impulse Order	11, 16, 18, 20, 30, 43, 53, 55, 73, and 79

<u>Area</u>	<u>Factor Scores Used For Determination Of Score</u>
Development	Achievement Standards Intellectual Climate Practicalness Supportiveness
Control	Orderliness Impulse Control

APPENDIX C

FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY FORM

### FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Directions: Please place a check on the line to the left of the appropriate response.

1. Gender:
  - Female
  - Male
  
2. Age:
  - 25 and below
  - 26-35
  - 36-45
  - 46-55
  - 56 and over
  
3. Number of Years in Current Teaching Position
  - Less than five
  - 5-10
  - 11-15
  - 16-20
  - More than 20
  
4. Total Number of Years in Teaching
  - Less than five
  - 5-10
  - 11-15
  - 16-20
  - More than 20
  
5. Number of Different Institutions Where You Taught on a Full-time Basis *Including* the Present Community College
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6 or more
  
6. Number of Years of Occupational Experience Other Than Teaching
  - Less than five
  - 5-10
  - 11-15
  - 16-20
  - More than 20
  
7. Highest Level of Education
  - Associate
  - Bachelors
  - Bachelors +
  - Masters
  - Masters +
  - Specialist
  - Doctorate
  - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

*(Continued on Other Side)*

8. Subject Category in Which You Do the Majority of Your Teaching
- Business
  - English/Composition
  - Health and Physical Education
  - Health Careers
  - Humanities
  - Mathematics
  - Natural Science
  - Social Science
  - Vocational/Technical
  - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
9. Number of Course Preparations Usually Required Per Semester
- 1-2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6 or more
10. Do the classes that you teach usually include students of very different levels of ability?
- Yes
  - No
11. Please check all of the following employee assistance programs that are provided for the faculty in your college.
- Counseling**
- Career Development
  - Smoking Cessation
  - Stress Management
  - Substance Abuse
  - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- Programs**
- Collegial Support Groups
  - Conflict Resolution
  - Fitness/Exercise
  - Smoking Cessation
  - Stress Management
  - Substance Abuse
  - Time Management Training
  - Wellness
  - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- Miscellaneous**
- Leave of Absence
  - Sabbaticals
  - Services are Made Available Through a Community-based Agency
  - Staff/Professional Development
  - Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Please Return To:  
**Delores M. Meyer**  
**P.O. Box 354**  
**Highland, KS 66035**

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER





# Oklahoma State University

SCHOOL OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078-0406  
CLASSROOM BUILDING 406  
(405) 624-6275

September 8, 1988

Faculty Member  
(Community College)  
(Address)  
(City, State Zip)

Dear Faculty Member

Your assistance is needed to help make a significant contribution to the knowledge about community college faculty. Very little information is available about the topic selected for my doctoral research.

As part of the requirements for my doctoral degree in Occupational and Adult Education Administration at Oklahoma State University, I am attempting to gather information about the relationship of organizational climate factors and stress in full-time community college faculty. The data will help to develop correlations between specific factors in the community college work environment and the self-perceived levels of stress of the faculty members.

Your (title of individual at the college), (individual's name), has agreed that I can ask you to participate in the study. The three research instruments will take 20-25 minutes to complete. The first item is a demographic survey consisting of items suggested in relevant literature and by educational administration specialists. The second item is a copyright stress inventory. The third item is a copyright organizational climate index. The identifying number on each instrument will be used only to follow up on nonrespondents.

Will you please complete the three instruments and return all the documents to me in the enclosed addressed, stamped envelope. A summary of the results of my study will be provided to your community college. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at Highland Community College, (913) 442-3236.

Sincerely

Delores M. Meyer  
Box 354  
Highland, KS 66035

Enclosures



Celebrating the Past . . . Preparing for the Future

APPENDIX E

LINEAR RELATIONSHIP OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND  
THE BURNOUT SUBSCALES: EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION,  
DEPERSONALIZATION AND PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

LINEAR RELATIONSHIP OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND  
THE BURNOUT SUBSCALES: EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION,  
DEPERSONALIZATION AND PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

Demographic Factor	Emotional Exhaustion r	Depersonalization r	Personal Accomplishment r
Gender	0.117*	0.151*	-0.125*
Age	-0.207*	-0.213*	0.123*
Yrs. Teaching Experience	-0.026	-0.071	0.104
Yrs. Current Position	0.009	-0.057	-0.034
Number of Institutions	0.010	-0.015	0.121*
Other Occupational Experience	0.039	-0.014	-0.017
Level of Education	0.035	0.010	0.013
Number of Course Preparations	-0.023	-0.067	0.189*
Ability Levels of Students	-0.107	-0.006	0.004
Area of Teaching	0.027	0.029	-0.022
Employee Assistance Programs			
Career Development Counseling	-0.169*	0.141*	-0.126*
Smoking Cessation Counseling	-0.054	-0.024	-0.034
Stress Management Counseling	0.081	0.031	-0.062
Substance Abuse Counseling	-0.080	0.038	-0.054
Collegial Support Group Programs	-0.124	0.061	-0.124*
Conflict Resolution Programs	0.051	0.011	-0.093
Fitness/Exercise Programs	-0.045	-0.012	0.059
Smoking Cessation Programs	-0.069	-0.026	-0.030
Stress Management Programs	-0.053	-0.031	0.034
Substance Abuse Programs	-0.061	0.004	0.082
Time Management Training	-0.029	-0.053	0.045
Wellness Programs	0.003	-0.047	-0.034
Leave of Absence	-0.043	-0.043	0.150*
Sabbaticals	0.023	-0.006	0.029
Services Available Through			
Community-Based Agency	-0.017	0.068	-0.056
Staff/Professional Development	-0.079	-0.146*	0.190*

df=316; cv =.111  
.05

APPENDIX F

INTERACTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FACTORS AND  
DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS WITH A SIGNIFICANT LINEAR  
RELATIONSHIP WITH THE BURNOUT SUBSCALES

INTERACTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FACTORS AND  
DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS WITH A SIGNIFICANT LINEAR  
RELATIONSHIP WITH EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION

Organizational Climate Factors and Covariates	F	Probability of F
Achievement Standards		
Gender	0.998	0.441
Age	0.277	0.981
Career Development Counseling	1.494	0.149
Intellectual Climate		
Gender	1.185	0.304
Age	1.333	0.691
Career Development Counseling	0.719	0.691
Practicalness		
Gender	0.732	0.679
Age	0.942	0.489
Career Development Counseling	0.702	0.707
Supportiveness		
Gender	0.731	0.680
Age	1.072	0.383
Career Development Counseling	0.912	0.515
Orderliness		
Gender	1.744	0.079
Age	0.889	0.535
Career Development Counseling	1.739	0.080
Impulse Control		
Gender	0.306	0.973
Age	0.634	0.768
Career Development Counseling	0.838	0.582
Development		
Gender	0.041	0.840
Age	0.921	0.452
Career Development Counseling	5.186	0.023*
Control		
Gender	1.276	0.259
Age	0.305	0.875
Career Development Counseling	6.438	0.012*

\* =  $p < .05$

INTERACTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FACTORS AND

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS WITH A SIGNIFICANT LINEAR  
RELATIONSHIP WITH DEPERSONALIZATION

Organizational Climate Factors and Covariates	F	Probability of F
<b>Achievement Standards</b>		
Gender	1.006	0.435
Age	1.766	0.074
Career Development Counseling	1.609	0.112
Staff/Professional Development	1.612	0.913
<b>Intellectual Climate</b>		
Gender	0.439	0.913
Age	2.424	0.011*
Career Development Counseling	0.325	0.966
Staff/Professional Development	1.189	0.302
<b>Practicalness</b>		
Gender	0.960	0.473
Age	0.591	0.804
Career Development Counseling	0.931	0.498
Staff/Professional Development	1.893	0.053
<b>Supportiveness</b>		
Gender	0.812	0.605
Age	2.256	0.019*
Career Development Counseling	0.533	0.850
Staff/Professional Development	0.850	0.571
<b>Orderliness</b>		
Gender	1.318	0.227
Age	0.885	0.539
Career Development Counseling	1.197	0.296
Staff/Professional Development	0.753	0.660
<b>Impulse Control</b>		
Gender	0.803	0.613
Age	1.061	0.391
Career Development Counseling	0.509	0.868
Staff/Professional Development	0.639	0.764
<b>Development</b>		
Gender	0.427	0.514
Age	2.523	0.041*
Career Development Counseling	0.162	0.688
Staff/Professional Development	2.791	0.096

---

Organizational Climate Factors and Covariates	F	Probability of F
Control		
Gender	0.573	0.450
Age	1.272	0.281
Career Development Counseling	1.359	0.245
Staff/Professional Development	3.137	0.077

---

\* =  $p < .05$

INTERACTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FACTORS AND  
DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS WITH A SIGNIFICANT LINEAR  
RELATIONSHIP WITH PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

Organizational Climate Factors and Covariates	F	Probability of F
<b>Achievement Standards</b>		
Gender	0.611	0.788
Age	1.479	0.155
Number of Institutions	1.056	0.396
Number of Course Preparations	1.302	0.235
Career Development Counseling	1.189	0.301
Collegial Support Groups	0.369	0.949
Leave of Absence	0.105	1.000
Staff/Professional Development	1.657	0.099
<b>Intellectual Climate</b>		
Gender	1.928	0.048*
Age	0.888	0.536
Number of Institutions	0.778	0.637
Number of Course Preparations	1.239	0.270
Career Development Counseling	1.583	0.119
Collegial Support Groups	4.256	0.040*
Leave of Absence	1.536	0.135
Staff/Professional Development	1.189	0.301
<b>Practicalness</b>		
Gender	1.654	0.100
Age	0.812	0.606
Number of Institutions	1.635	0.105
Number of Course Preparations	1.939	0.046*
Career Development Counseling	0.414	0.927
Collegial Support Groups	4.931	0.027
Leave of Absence	0.427	0.920
Staff/Professional Development	2.204	0.022*
<b>Supportiveness</b>		
Gender	0.326	0.966
Age	1.574	0.122
Number of Institutions	0.946	0.485
Number of Course Preparations	1.511	0.143
Career Development Counseling	0.646	0.757
Collegial Support Groups	0.421	0.924
Leave of Absence	0.642	0.761
Staff/Professional Development	1.170	0.314



Organizational Climate Factors and Covariates	F	Probability of F
<b>Orderliness</b>		
Gender	2.205	0.036*
Age	0.594	0.802
Number of Institutions	0.323	0.967
Number of Course Preparations	1.782	0.071
Career Development Counseling	1.351	0.210
Collegial Support Groups	4.702	0.031*
Leave of Absence	1.425	0.177
Staff/Professional Development	0.352	0.956
<b>Impulse Control</b>		
Gender	0.484	0.885
Age	1.404	0.185
Number of Institutions	1.386	0.194
Number of Course Preparations	0.981	0.456
Career Development Counseling	0.779	0.636
Collegial Support Groups	0.329	0.965
Leave of Absence	1.370	0.201
Staff/Professional Development	1.378	0.197
<b>Development</b>		
Gender	4.779	0.030*
Age	1.700	0.148
Number of Institutions	1.964	0.084
Number of Course Preparations	0.318	0.866
Career Development Counseling	0.593	0.442
Collegial Support Groups	0.230	0.632
Leave of Absence	0.045	0.832
Staff/Professional Development	2.176	0.141
<b>Control</b>		
Gender	0.620	0.539
Age	3.261	0.012*
Number of Institutions	1.964	0.084
Number of Course Preparations	0.967	0.426
Career Development Counseling	3.447	0.064
Collegial Support Groups	0.023	0.879
Leave of Absence	2.142	0.144
Staff/Professional Development	3.490	0.063

\* =  $p < .05$

VITA 2

Delores Mae Meyer

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE TO BURNOUT AMONG  
FACULTY IN SELECTED COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE MIDWEST

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Coloma, Wisconsin, October 31, 1941, the daughter of Lawrence E. and Lucille H. Buchanan.

Education: Graduated from Westfield Union Free High School, Westfield, Wisconsin, in May 1959; received Bachelor of Science Degree in Secondary Education from Wisconsin State University at Stevens Point in January, 1969; received Master of Science Degree in Continuing and Vocational Education from University of Wisconsin at Madison in August, 1978; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education Degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1988.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Department of Business Education, Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point, January 1969 to May 1970; self-employed provider of office services, Westfield, Wisconsin, January 1971 to December 1976; Office Education Program Coordinator/Instructor, Barton County Community College, August 1977 to July 1988; Dean of Instruction, Highland Community College, Highland, Kansas, August 1988 to present.

Professional Organizations: Administrative Management Society, American Vocational Association, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, American Association of Adult and Continuing Education, Association of Information Systems Professionals, Business and Professional Women's Club, Delta Pi Epsilon, Council of Deans and Directors of Community Services and Continuing Education, Council of Deans of Instruction, Kansas Association of Parliamentarians, Kansas Association of Vocational Administrators, Kansas Business Education Association, Kansas Vocational Association, Mountain-Plains Business Education Association, National

Association of Classroom Educators in Business Education,  
National Association of Parliamentarians, National Business  
Education Association, Wisconsin Business Education  
Association.